



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Planning and Operations

Project # 572-8100.00

SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI

Tel: Fax:

Bond Oversight Committee Meeting 3

Date	Start	End	Next Meeting	Next Time	Prepared By	Company
4/3/2008	05:34 PM	07:17 PM	5/8/2008	05:30 PM	Charelle Durant	SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI

Location	Next Location	General Notes
SUHSD Board Room	SUHSD Board Room	

Attended By	Non-Attendees
SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI - Jaime Ortiz	Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Yolanda M. Hernandez
SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI - Henry Amigable	
SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI - Charelle Durant	
SUHSD Program Management\Gilbane\SGI - Jeff Scogin	
Sweetwater Union High School District - Karl Bradley	
Garcia Calderón Ruiz, LLP - Marie Mendoza	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Cynthia Melcher	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Andy Berg	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Rudy Gonzalez	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Jane McGill	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - William Tunstall	
Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee - Robert Garcia	

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
1.	Call to Order					

New Business

003-001	Agenda: 1) Call to Order 2) Approval of February 7, 2008 Meeting Minutes 3) Public Comment 4) Review of the Intent of Prop O Bond and Bond Language 5) Discuss Methodology re: Scope of Work 6) Review Proposed Scope of Work 7) Timeline for Proposed Scope of Work 8) Report on Sale of Bonds 9) Other Business	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-002	Attendance: Yolanda M. Hernandez - Absent Jane McGill - Present William Tunstall - Present Rudy Gonzalez - Present					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	Andy Berg - Present Cynthia Melcher - Present Robert Garcia - Present					
		Charelle Durant (GSGI)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes						

New Business

003-003	Correction: Cynthia Melcher's husband is not a graduate of CVH.	Cynthia Melcher (CBOC)				No
003-004	Correction: The title "taxpayer" is written as one word.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-005	The minutes are approved unanimously.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
3. Public Comment						

New Business

003-006	No public comments.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
----------------	---------------------	-------------------------	--	--	--	----

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
4. Review Bond Intent						

New Business

003-007	Since our last meeting, concerns regarding the spirit and intent of Prop O have gone to the Board. One of the charges of the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee is to ensure that the will of the taxpayers and voters be carried out. Once the presentation has been made we can present our finding to the Board. Are there any comments regarding intent? No comments made.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-008	We have someone here to speak about the initial inception of the bond language but, first would like to go over the bond language itself. We would like to discuss the following three major items: 1) Bond funds cannot be expended on projects not described in the bond language. One of our tasks is to ensure that nothing outside of what is described in the bond language is being done in the projects being designed now. Everything we are moving forward with is included in the bond language.					

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	2) Detailed scopes of work for each projects are not identified in the bond language.					
	3) Specific budgets for each projects are not identified in the bond language. We will be talking about the scope definition process required in order to identify specific projects to be designed at each site	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-009	Robert Anslow is a partner at Bowie Arneson Wiles & Giannone, who represents the District as bond counsel relative to this bond measure. About two years ago Robert was involved in putting together the language for the bond measure brought to the voters in November of 2006 by the district. There were a number of meetings which involved district consultants and district staff, of which some were attended by current Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee members. Robert assisted in putting together the language of the bond measure itself. This was a multi month process lasting from March until July of 2006. There were at least six meetings where multiple people were present.					
	Under Prop 39, approved by the voters in 2000, in order for a school district to qualify they must hold a 55% approval bond measure and they have to have a specified list of facility projects on which they are authorized to spend the bond funds. The reason that was so important and the reason the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee requirements were also put into place was that in the past there had been schools districts that had essentially taken money and used it on projects which arguably were not covered in the bond language. Under the prior general obligation bond authorizations that began in 1986 there was a very broad definition of what you could spend the bond money on, until 2000. One of the requirements, in order to qualify a bond to have a 55% tax approval threshold, was that you have to have a specified list of facilities. One of the other requirements was that a school district had to have a Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee composed of a certain number of people functioning in certain ways subject to certain requirements, which is what caused this committee to be formed.					
	With that in mind and with the school district's help, we drafted exhibit B of the packages handed out, which lists both the bond proposition and other requirements once the bonds are issued and funds are available for financial and performance audits which will come back to the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee. In attachment 1 is a facilities listing given to us in terms of the projects for which the bonds funds could be expended. The facilities are listed, in order, by middle school, high school, vocational schools and adult schools. On the first paragraph there is a comprehensive list designed to give the voter an idea of the scope and types of projects for which bond funds may be expended. The specific lists under each school are those specific facilities that we wanted the voters to be aware that bond funds may be expended only on these particular projects. This is designed to frame those projects for which the bond funds may be expended.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-010	The voters saw Attachment 1 School Facilities Projects.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-011	This is the photocopy of what was actually printed in the ballot statement. On PR-12 GO-16 3rd paragraph from bottom, we told voters that we did not guarantee that these projects would be done because we did not know how far bond monies would go, we did not know what construction costs would be and most importantly, we did not know how much state matching funds or grant funds would be available from time to time. We didn't guarantee that we were going to build every project or that there was a priority. Some school districts have put in a priority list of facilities to be funded. Some schools districts also included specific budgeted amounts for each project.					
	Bowie, Anslow, Wiles & Giannone does not recommend that to clients for three specific reasons:					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	1) If you identify a specific project as the first priority and something locks you up on that project that is outside the scope of your control you may get stalled up in DSA and may not be able to get your plans out in time, you may find that there is hazardous material at a site and you can't build a school there and you can't get the project started. If you have promised the voters that you would start with project A and can't get the project off the ground the voters have a right to be angry.					
	2) We never recommend to a client under a G.O. bond that they put a specific dollar amount next to a project because construction prices are highly variable. A few years ago construction prices were going up at a double digit level of inflation every year. It is difficult to predict where they will be. Here we have a bond program that's really targeted to work out 10 to 15 years. We don't recommend that school Districts put in a targeted budgeted amount. We have only had one client do that and they regretted that, as they ended up having to reach into their general fund.					
	3) The last phrase on page PR-12 GO-8 at the very bottom refers to making the school eligible for state matching funds to build new schools. Essentially the state will put up 50% of the money to rebuild a particular school in certain circumstances. But, they will only do that if there is actually money in Sacramento, CA available to give out. There is no guarantee that the voters in the state will approve future state bond measures to make more of that money available.					
		Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-012	Can the state bond eligibility also apply to the renovations which we are working with here?	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-013	It does work with certain renovations and modernizations in certain state bond measures that are drawn from a different pool of money. The modernization money, at least in my experience, seems to run out a lot faster than new school construction money because there are so many schools in California that need renovation and modernization.					
		Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-014	I was under the impression that we were not looking for too much of that money in this bond proposition anyway because we had used up most of our allocated money through BB.					
		Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-015	We are applying for \$27 million in additional state matching funds.					
		Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-016	Out of \$600 plus million that is a small percentage and the percentages on the first bond were much different because we were just starting out.					
		Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-017	The rules may change if the state changes how much they will do for matching funds or if they change the eligibility rules, which they have done before. We were not anticipating that it would be take 50% of state matching funds to get all of these projects complete. The point I'm trying to get at is that there are a number of variables considered when we did the project list regarding how bond money is used.					
		Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-018	Under Prop O we do not have any funding for new schools and Prop O is all modernization and renovation, correct?					
		Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
003-019	Yes. We are not buying a new site for a new school but there was the ability if we need to push a school across the street or buy a street in order to expand a school. There was flexibility to do that. For example, if you needed to reconfigure a school building and you needed to acquire some property to be able to push out the grounds there would be that ability.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-020	We had number of meetings where, for certain schools, there were projects that were added to the list and subtracted from the list. The list was largely generated by the school district and the consultants based upon meetings with individual principals and individual site counsels at each school. District Consultants had individual meetings with the various principals and site counsels in order to put this list together. This is how we arrived at this list and this program. The school district had a master facilities program that predates measures BB and O of which BB and O are a part, as they are components to a larger scale of facilities funding. That program was not specifically integrated in here because it is a constantly evolving document. The facilities program is a document that changes over time, as assumptions change, as costs change, as student population changes, as construction costs change and as construction methodology changes. It was a background document that helped drive this list but, it was not put in front of the voters and it was not part of the covenant of the voters. What you see here are the four corners of the bond measure.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-021	This presentation has been helpful for me as I had been wondering how the list was generated and if it is discretionary as to whether or not certain monies can be used for certain projects at a school that is listed.	Robert Garcia (CBOC)				No
003-022	The priorities, the speed and the allocation are all up to the Board members. The Board members ultimately decide on the priorities and the amount allocated to each project. What the Board members cannot do and what the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee's principal charge is, is to ensure that money is not used outside of the bond measure out of the bond language description. How they allocate money among these various projects is at the discretion of the school Board.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-023	The state mandates certain requirements even prior to the district's priorities, such as compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, upgrade to health, life and safety systems such as fire alarms and updates to codes such as requirements for fire sprinkler systems.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-024	Karl makes a good point. In certain cases the master plan is going to be state needs driven and in certain cases the master plan is going to be student population driven for example, if there are schools that need more classrooms or schools around them that need to be expanded or modernized to take more students to accommodate individual population increases in a particular period of time that is one of the things that the master plan is built to adapt to.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-025	How did we get these items on the list? There is a historical evolution of how we got to Prop O. We did have the masters facilities plan. Can we get an explanation of how that plan came into existence, how from that plan Prop BB items were identified, how when we went to the staff because we had so many different schools we are looking at and there was only so much money, how did all of that happen? Because I think that process gives us an insight into the intent. What are those historical documents and explanations similar to those produced by bond counsel while explaining why we had a 55% verses					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	a 66% approval and how the bonds got to where they are.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-026	We can give a historical background on how we got to the nine projects we are moving forward with right now. The previous program managers did not take copious notes to allow us to backtrack to find what meetings were had or meeting minutes to identify how he came up with this project list.	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-027	I can answer that for Prop O. We had about six meetings here. The attendance at the meetings varied. A number of people from the district including Dianne Russo, as well as Karl Bradley's predecessor attended some of those meetings, not necessarily all. Bruce Husson, the interim Superintendent at the time, was involved in most of the meetings. The previous project program manager was involved as were various people from his firm. Andy Berg came to some of those meetings. There were members of the press at some of those meetings. The attendance of every meeting was not necessarily consistent. The idea was to start with the general overall projects then laid out in the facilities master plan that had been originally drafted for measure BB, subtract out those portions of the projects that either had been or that they then thought were going to be taken care of by BB. This was not an exact science. Then the previous program manager, using the interviews with various principals, added and subtracted certain things from the list. It was very much a collaborative process and in some cases we had as many as 12 or 13 people in the room and sometimes there were as little as 5 or 6.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-028	Robert, I'm hearing you say that those meetings were open to the general public but, were they publicly noticed? Where they technically Brown Act meetings?	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-029	They were not noticed as Brown Act meetings but, I know that a member of the press was present for at least one of those meetings. They certainly weren't secret but, I do not think they were posted on the posting board. We did make it a point to tell the Taxpayers' Association where and when we were meeting. Had a member of the public wanted to sit in on the meetings they probably would not have been prevented but a member of the public may have found the meetings to be very tedious.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-030	Were the original lists generated at the sites?	Jane McGill (CBOC)				No
003-031	In terms of the site lists, I don't know because I didn't really participate in them. I was the information coordinator at the top end level but I wasn't really involved in gathering the project listings and descriptions at the individual schools. I didn't go to each and every individual school to review the needs with the Principals. That was done by the district staff and consultants. Those lists were based upon the then facilities plan which is an evolving document because we are dealing with something that was worked on two years ago which at that point was a year old and the measure BB funds were still being spent. This is why some projects have been added as new needs have been identified or projects that were expected to be funded or had been funded in BB were withdrawn.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-032	Wasn't the master plan to some extent formed by design professionals who would come in and decide what sort of modernizations would need to be done paired with site concerns.					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-033	It was a local process done by professionals with input from the local sites. It was a constantly evolving process because as you go through an individual school you might identify something that you didn't need a year ago or you might find that the need has been met through another process and can now be taken off. The district's very strong goal was to get onto November 2006. The driving force was the turning date to meet that election date in the summer of 2006.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-034	At anytime did that group, when they went to get support for this, say to the general public or the supporters that we were going to accomplish 100% of these projects?	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-035	I cannot speak to what people individually did or did not say at individual school sites. I know that our recommendation was that we build in flexibility and not be confined to a site budget or site priority, as you will not be able to adapt to changing circumstances if you do. I can't speak to what someone might have said to someone else at a school. As bond counsel that is not something we would ever recommend someone do, due to all the variables such as construction costs, state funding, Board priorities, all the different factors at schools and the evolving nature of the facilities plan. It would not have been a good idea. This is why we recommended the existing bond language.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-036	Was there an individual budget assigned to each project?	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-037	As you look at Attachment 1 you will not see a budget amount there. We never recommend that to our clients for the reasons I've identified.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-038	There is a difference here between legality verses what the voters perceive they are getting. When you are a voter you look down this list. What I would do is look to see where my kid is going to school and vote for what is needed at that school. Now, when that project does not get done, I'm upset. I understand the legality of it but I'm still upset. So, that is why we are here and why I had such a problem with the last meeting. As voters, you are being told that for \$600 million this is what you are going to get and you get two sets of consultants, one who says the public will probably vote for up to \$600 million and another says the public will only vote for it if you promise them all this stuff. So, at the Taxpayers' Association what we did before the last series of elections is added to our criteria for support a statement from the school district, which basically said that the in the district's best estimation the amount of money that they are asking for matches the project list as proposed. We are here today because some of those projects are no longer on that list. Legally you are covered. There has never been a question as to whether or not anything illegal is going on. It's a matter of whether or not the public has been misled. Part of the problem is that the people sitting at the table are not the people who put the list together. If some of this stuff is not going to get done then the public should not be charged \$600 million. If the \$600 million was going to do them all and we are not going to have to do them all for whatever reason then we should not need \$600 million dollars.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-040	When they came to the \$644 million bond issue, that number came from something. What I hear Andy saying is that it came from these lists explaining what's going to be done.					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-041	I don't know what went to the Taxpayers' Association. There are two different sets of consultants: one who says this is the targeted amount of bonds you can approve and the \$644 million was partially driven by that a voter poll. I don't recall ever seeing a forecast when I was drafting the list that said that dollar amount will fund each and every one of the projects listed here.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-045	I recognize that the language here says "may be expended on" but it seems to me that when you put things such as, "to expand physical education facilities, repair outdoor athletic hard courts and rebuild shower and locker rooms," voters are going to look at that and think that is what they are going to get. It's possible that might not happen.	Robert Garcia (CBOC)				No
003-046	That is the risk with any single bond, even if you had a single purpose bond to rebuild a single high school. If any changes in assumptions occur and you couldn't do that as a result of not having enough money, your line of argument seems to be that the district would need to do whatever is required, including shutting classrooms, in order to honor that contract with the voters otherwise they are misrepresenting the issue to the voters.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-047	None of the changes have occurred yet.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-048	It's a fifteen year bond program.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-049	Then you cut them fifteen years down the road if at that time it appears that you're not going to do it. There are items that were on the list that was in the voters' pamphlet that have been crossed off the list.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-050	There are some items being funded by measure BB.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-051	Correct and we go through each of them. We got ones that are highlighted that are going to be done. Some of the ones that are not highlighted are going to be done by BB. My response to that would be that the money should go back to the taxpayers since they don't need all this money. There are still other ones not being done by BB and are no longer slated to be completed.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-052	Are you saying that those projects are never going to get completed?	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-053	Unless we pass another bond.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-054	We may get additional funding from somewhere.	Jaime Ortiz				No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		(GSGI)				
003-055	If we get a decrease in construction costs you may find some of those projects coming back on the list.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-056	You said it was going to cost this amount of money.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-057	There is no budget on an individual project level.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-058	I think that the frustration is that there seemed to be an understanding that there was going to be \$644 million to cover all of these projects. But, as Robert Anslow is bringing up there was no line item to say what would be spent on what. So instead there is a big pool of money. And that is how we got to the \$644 million.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-059	Essentially what you have is a pool which may be spent on these projects.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-060	There was probably more on the wish list than there was money in the pool.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-061	It is possible either that the money and projects balanced at one point or they may not have balanced at another point. When I was drafting this I don't ever remember seeing a budget for the list of projects that essentially backed up to the \$644 million. I think that was done by prior district consultants based on large scale estimates with some projections in there with a large enough contingency built in plus or minus. One of the reasons I went through the number of variables is to essentially say these are the types of variables that do have an impact on every single bond measure. There is no written guarantee. Andy is correct: Legally there is not an issue. I think what you are talking about is a policy issue with the perception among the voters. Andy may be correct in terms of quantifying that, I don't know, unless you've done a poll Andy, that I'm not aware of.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-062	No.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-063	I think that there may be some voters who did view this as a list of projects that would be entirely completed. However, we did tell them in the bond measure that we cannot guarantee that.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-064	More important to me is not what you told the voters but what you told the San Diego Taxpayers' Association. That's why I'm sitting here.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-065	I understand Andy. I did not correspond with the San Diego Taxpayers' Association.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-066	I understand that too but, there is no question that is exactly what was said. That was the list of					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	projects we have every intention of completing unless the variables brought up by Robert Anslow tonight came forward.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-067	Who presented that information?	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-068	The information was presented to the Taxpayers' Association by Bruce Husson, who was the Superintendent at the time and later became a consultant for the district and Chris Dunn, the Program Manager with Harris and Associates, who served as a bond program management before Seville/Gilbane.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-069	One thing we can look at is that some of the items on the list are very general types of things such as upgrading general and special purpose classrooms and labs. You could spend \$50 million at any school and not accomplish that, I can assure you. Some of these things are not getting done at all, maybe that's something that needs to be looked at. You have to decide how to split the pot.	Jane McGill (CBOC)				No
003-070	I would like to clarify something. We can do every single one of those items on this list because there is no specific scope of work tied to each project. If it says "renovate a library," We can spend \$100, put in some new carpet, paint and windows and consider the library renovated. How do you determine how far to go with "renovation"? That is why we go through the specific scoping process with each site committee and identify the current needs at each school.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-071	I am satisfied that a lot of what happened is from people that aren't here. We can't say what was said or what wasn't said. What we have seen in the proposal, what we have seen in the language and heard from bond counsel tonight, is that these projects listed in the bond language are be what you may be able to address if you had sufficient money and bond counsel recommended that based on knowledge that Robert had from other bond issues and other districts.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-072	I think that is a fair statement.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-073	Just to get some clarity, there was an assumption or accusation made that we were doing inappropriate things with Prop O projects. I just want to be clear that we are following all the rules and regulations of Prop 39 on the way we are handling the projects.	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-074	I have not heard that and cannot address it directly. I don't know if anyone on the panel has heard that. Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee unanimously declines having heard that. I think when we get to the methodology of how you got to the list and how the priorities were set I think that will clarify it.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
5. Discuss Scope of Work Methodology						

New Business

003-075 At each of the first nine schools we asked the administrators to form a site committee. That site committee was school specific and included parents, students, community members, certificated staff, teachers, custodians, the principal, some district staff and the architects. Each school formed their own committee. Once the site committee had been formed we were able to have the meetings and scope the projects that we are going to address at each school. We had a total of 38 meetings at 9 sites. Nine of those meetings were publicly advertised for the public to attend in order to understand what we were doing with Prop O at that specific site. This process lasted several months. The earliest meeting took place in September and the last meeting took place in January.

The Prop O bond language that you have in front of you was reviewed at each one of those meetings. At every single one of those meetings we made it a point for the architects to include in their presentation the specific language listed for that school and we reviewed it. Let me walk you through what happened at each one of those meetings and the process. We had four to five meetings for each site.

At the first meeting, the site committee was asked to identify all needs that the school had, in a broad analysis at that time.

Jaime Ortiz
(GSGI) No

003-076 Was the site committee asked to identify needs based on guidelines that were on the school list or based on any need?

Rudy Gonzalez
(CBOC) No

003-077 Any need.

The architect conducted site visits after the first meeting at each school with their engineering teams and verified that the needs the site committee had identified were actually there and in some cases identified structural needs and other accessibility needs that the school may not have been aware of. The architects assigned a rough order of magnitude to those needs and presented that to the school.

The school then started to prioritize based on the following list:

- 1) Health/safety and access issues.
- 2) Structural issues, shell integrity that a building might have.
- 3) Any infrastructure needs.
- 4) Classrooms and interior renovations.

Athletics were toward the later part of the priority list.

Jaime Ortiz
(GSGI) No

003-079 After that, the rough scope of work was developed by the architects with the dollar amounts. The architects created the scope of work and prioritized it based on the needs identified by the committee and by the budget we had given them to work with.

Jaime Ortiz
(GSGI) No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
003-081	At every step of the process we were referring back to Prop O and permitting only the projects which were included in the bond language. At the beginning we asked the site committee what they needed without sharing the list of potential projects with them because we did not believe that Prop O was a total encompassing list. Once we had the total needs and after the scopes were starting to develop we referred to the list to determine what would and would not be permissible per the bond language and we started to weed out the scopes of work that we could not produce.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-082	We didn't want the community to look at the bond language and decide what they wanted and be limited by that because there is some other fairly generic language within the bond which might allow some other improvements that are not apparent in the bullet points by school.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-083	Or you may decide you want to use developer fee monies or other available funds to target those things even if bonds aren't used there. But, it's a part of developing a needs list for each individual school.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-084	I want to make sure that we have a comfortable understanding that the intent of Prop O was always followed and that the intent of which the voters voted for had a guideline for Prop O priorities.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-085	Every step of the way, as the scope was being defined we reviewed the bond language and made sure that what was proposed was actually allowable, per the bond language.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-086	There are no projects on the revised list that were not in the bond language?	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-087	All projects currently in design are in the bond language. With the site committee needs and the budget, the architect started to frame scopes of work. We presented this scope of work to the committee, they had some input and we revised it to include that input in the scope. We presented this same information to the public, told them this is what we are planning to do, this is the direction we are taking, and these are roughly the scopes of work. The public had comments and we incorporated those comments into the scopes of work. The architect had a final document that we presented to the site committee for their approval and explained to them that this final document is what we had come up with for the scope of work at this specific site. That information was presented to the Board as well.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-088	In general how many people are in a site committee meeting and how many people are in a public meeting?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-089	In a site committee meeting attendance varied between 12 and 20 people. In a public meeting attendance varied and at most, went up to 60 people. Again, Program Management continuously reviewed the bond language and verified that what we were proposing was actually permissible. That was the methodology followed to reach the proposed scope of work at each school.					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

6. Review Proposed Scope of Work

New Business

003-092	My intent when this topic originally came up was to address the challenge that Prop O was not being followed, and that there was some kind of slide of hand in how the priorities came up. I would like the committee to have the big picture of what has been done at each school, what was done in BB and the reasons things haven't happened. Because we do represent the community, it is important that we all be on the same page and that we all have the same basic knowledge so that we can report to the community on the reasons we needed to have this level of flexibility.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-093	I have a list of the first nine schools that we will be addressing with Prop O. This is an aerial view site map of what is happening at each school. The areas in red will represent the areas that were done in Prop BB at each school. Areas in blue are areas that we will address in the first phase of Prop O. Areas in green are in the second phase of Prop O. We will go into a timeline shortly after this.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-094	Chula Vista High In the first phase at this school we are building a new multipurpose room, renovating the parking lot, repairing the gym bleachers, modernizing the gym and locker room facilities, the library and the cafeteria. In the second phase we are adding a new two story classroom building, modernizing the administration building, adding a parking drop off loop and relocating the tennis courts.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-095	I have a question. It says upgrade facilities but, then it says new library. Can the school choose to put in a new library instead of an upgrade?	Cynthia Melcher (CBOC)				No
003-100	It is going to cost more for a new construction than it would for a renovation and that cost could be taking away from other something else.	Cynthia Melcher (CBOC)				No
003-101	Normally, the threshold that is used by the industry is if modernization will cost 75% or more of what it would cost to build new you might as well build new. The district's taxpayers and students would be much better served by a new construction that would extend the life of the building, rather than injecting good money into a 60 or 70 year old building.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-102	I thought you were holding them to the bond language and that's where I'm confused. The bond language is saying expand or upgrade.	Cynthia Melcher (CBOC)				No
003-104	If I can also answer Cynthia's question, the specific targeted projects for schools are listed by scope but, if you will go back to page PR-12 GO-9 the first page of Attachment 1, you will see that the					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	language there is designed to expand upon the bullet items. Again, bullets are designed to essentially give framework. This language adds flexibility to those frameworks. And again, we did this deliberately to allow the school district flexibility. While we may not have specifically identified every single walkway, every single floor, every single asphalt area that was going to be repaired or resurfaced or rebuilt, it is designed to give the voter an idea of the kind of project that will be done and the first paragraph there spans upon those types of items.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-105	Robert, you say that if it says in the language of the first paragraph that we might replace lunch shelters but, at three of the schools it doesn't call for bullet points with lunch shelters you can still go into those schools and do the lunch shelters?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-106	If it was part of an overall modernization program for that school, yes.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-107	Then, there is no point to the bullet points.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-108	The bullet points are designed to give framework to what's going on at a particular school.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-109	If you could put an opening paragraph that says "We will build classrooms. We will build lunch shelters. We will improve walkways," listing anything that is possible to do at a school in that opening paragraph and then you have individual projects by schools, those individual projects are meaningless if you are saying it is okay to do just what is in the opening paragraph.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-110	The bullet points here are not meaningless. The only way we could list one of those items under a specific school is if they fit under the other existing bullet points. Some of the existing bullet points are designed to be general such as renovation of certain buildings. Renovation may mean modernization or it may mean to rebuild it. If one of the specific items listed in the first paragraph would fit under the bullets then you can do it at that particular site. Does that clarify it?	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-111	Yes. The original intent was to let the public know what the projects were as you talked about in your original speech.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-112	I do want to say the bullets are not meaningless. The bullets help define what is going to be done at each school but, the bullets are not necessarily designed to be exclusive if a project can be put within them.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-113	For each school we will go into the actual bond language, and identify if we are doing it or not in the first or second phase and if not, we will provide a reason for not doing it right now.	Jaime Ortiz				No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		(GSGI)				
003-117	The items in yellow are being done in due diligence. Would the Committee prefer we only explained what projects are not being addressed? Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee agrees unanimously.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-118	Chula Vista High Science labs are not being addressed because they were modernized as part of Prop BB therefore, the committee did not want us to address science labs.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-119	Do you know when those labs were renovated?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-120	No I don't.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-121	Within the last two years.	Jane McGill (CBOC)				No
003-122	The reason I brought it up is because I was wondering if it was done before this language was crafted for Prop O. There is something in here about upgrading exterior fencing that we did not do on a number of campuses because it was not necessary where the fencing was fine. I get concerned with why it was even in the language if we knew the fencing was fine. Why would we be telling the voters that we were going to do it if it did not need to be done?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-123	There was some BB work ongoing when the bond language was being crafted and right now there is still BB work being done.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-124	In all fairness, because this is basically a whole new staff and the committee is all new except for a couple of us, it is difficult to say what the intent was and what was being done at the time when the bond language was created.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-125	When I look at the bullet points per school, even though some bullet points are somewhat generic, there seems to be some redundancies and upon further investigation I have found some items unnecessary. For example, a bullet point may read, "repair fences" where the fencing is completely in tact and in good shape.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-126	Because Prop O was intended to be a long term measure there were things anticipated to be needed during the 10-15 year scope of measure O.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-127	Chula Vista High					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	<p>Mini gym: The site committee and the community consider this to be a low priority. They currently have a joint use facility on the south side of the campus that they use as a mini gym so having that one they did not want us to build a new one.</p> <p>Renovate cafeteria and multipurpose room: There is no multipurpose room at Chula Vista High to renovate. We are building a new one.</p> <p>Upgrade fencing for security: No part of the campus is compromised because of lack of security.</p> <p>Renovate portable classrooms: The direction of the Board is to get rid of as many portable classrooms as we can. We are doing that and the remaining portables are in fairly good condition and are relatively new. We are choosing the newest portables to leave on site so renovating those did not make sense to the site committee.</p>	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-128	Are we keeping enough portable classrooms to adjust for future changes in demographics?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-129	Yes, we are and we are asking each architecture team to identify a site on campus where future growth could potentially go. We are not working on those but, we are identifying where they could go.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-130	<p>Southwest Middle</p> <p>Renovate school support offices and auditorium: The auditorium was built in the 1930s and is a historical building. The cost to renovate it up to current code and standard would be very high and would nearly use up the entire school budget. For that reason is considered a low priority by the school.</p> <p>Upgrade irrigation systems: The current irrigation systems are in good condition. There is no need to upgrade.</p> <p>Covered lunch area and P.E. instructional area: They already have a covered lunch area. The P.E. instructional area is sufficient according to staff.</p> <p>Improve fencing for security: No part of the campus is compromised because of a breach in fencing or lack of fencing around the perimeters.</p>	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-131	We did have a discussion during the meeting regarding school safety/security and fencing. One of the reasons fencing improvements are put in the bond language so often is that given the long term of the bond and given that security measures might change as time went on, if another 9/11 or Columbine were to happen, security systems or fencing might have to be changed due to a mandate. There was a desire, especially with campus security and student safety, to put language in there to allow a lot of flexibility.	Robert Anslow (BOWAME)				No
003-132	<p>Sweetwater High</p> <p>Science labs: There were science labs done under Prop BB.</p> <p>There is another section in a bullet point of the bond language that states that there is a possible acquisition of land to add campus space parking and classrooms to accommodate future student</p>					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	growth. We are not doing this at this time. The site committee considered this low priority especially with the cost of acquiring. There are about twenty properties including a commercial building. The cost of acquiring those would be prohibitive.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-133	It's really hard to do this between program management teams. Cost of land and property has gone down since this bond was passed. To put it down there as something we could do, see the value of the property go down and now hear you say that it is too expensive to buy; there is a disconnect there somewhere. I don't know if you can answer that. The people who put this together thought there was enough money to buy that land and do what they wanted to do. The price of that land has gone down since this thing passed yet we are saying now that we don't have the money to buy it.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-134	The site committee preferred to use that money for other priorities.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-135	That brings up another point. The site committee is a small group of people, not the thousands of people who voted for this. To overturn the will of thousands of voters because of the thirty most local people who showed up doesn't seem right.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-136	I think the more important thing here, and why I thought the process was important to understand, is that when the proposal went forward it was structured in such a way because things do change and it was a maybe. We can't speak to what the other project managers said because they're are not here, nor can we speak to what people were thinking at the time that they voted for these issues because all through the bond language they talk about what may be built.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-138	If you look at the way the language is you can see that it is very clear that it was a proposal and bond counsel explained to us why there was that flexibility. It is intended to be there. Are we fulfilling the spirit of the bond? Are we doing the projects that we have the resources to do? It appears that we are. Whatever comes out of this I would like us as a group to have a finding that we can present to the Board and if there is a descending position we can present that as well. When we are in the community we should feel knowledgeable and comfortable enough to explain how we got here. I cannot speak for the thousands that voted. I can only speak for myself. I read it, I knew what I was voting for, I'm comfortable with it and I vote in this district.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-139	I would like to ask the committee if you would like us to continue line item by line item through all nine schools or do you feel that what you've seen is representative?	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-140	I don't need to go through them. I can read it myself. If I have a question I can bring it up later.	William Tunstall (CBOC)				No
003-141	Based on Rudy's statement, the only thing we are concerned with is, are you doing something that was not in the bond language? There is no question that you are following the language.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
003-142	I want us all to have a comfort level of where we are. Our charge is to oversee this bond proposal and make sure that the voters get what they voted for. I can't speak for them individually nor can I speak for them collectively. We can simply say what has happened and how it happened.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-143	When we submit our report to the Board we can just state it clearly that we find that some projects that were listed in the bond that went before the voters are not being done because of these reasons. By doing that we are fulfilling our obligation and duty as an oversight committee.	Robert Garcia (CBOC)				No
003-144	I would like to read it over and take some time with it because I know all the schools pretty well.	Jane McGill (CBOC)				No
003-145	Should we continue item by item? Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee unanimously voted against.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-146	Do we want to hold off on the timeline for implementation or do we want to hear about that? This meeting was called for the purpose of discussing the issue that came up before the Board, that the Prop O was not being followed and that the voters had been deceived. That I picked up from the Chair of the Taxpayers' Association. That issue should have been brought to the committee to respond to before going to the Board. I am comfortable with our finding but, would like the committee members to be comfortable with it so that when they go out into the community, if someone brings this issue up, I want you to be comfortable in reporting how we got to where we are. The purpose of the meeting was for the committee to prepare a finding, sign off on it and present it to the Board. It seems that our finding is that Prop O is being followed. There are some concerns because items have been deleted but, we don't feel that the spirit of Prop O has been violated but it is something that we are concerned about. Whatever we agree to as a group is fine with me.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

7. Discuss Timeline

New Business

003-147	I think it would be appropriate for us to learn the timeline. Not that there is any concern about it but, it is something I would like to know. If we are out in the community we will be better able to address timeline questions or concerns.	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-148	This image of the presentation reflects just the first two bond sales which are the projects that we have reviewed today. The first nine schools are in design now and are scheduled to be in design until the end of the year and we will start construction next year on these nine projects. We are scheduled to end construction in first quarter of 2011 on these nine schools. When you read this slide you will see that the top axis shows the time in years and the left axis lists the individual schools. For example on Chula Vista Middle we are in design right now. We are starting construction at the beginning of next year and that will last about a year and a half. The blue is progress that we've accomplished to date.	Jaime Ortiz (SGI)				No

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
003-149	What is the progress that you have accomplished to date?	Robert Garcia (CBOC)				No
003-150	We are in schematic design and we are starting into design development at each of the schools.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-151	How do we know that by looking at this image?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-152	You don't. This is intended to be a very high level schedule of when schools are starting design and when they are finishing construction for Phase I.	Jaime Ortiz (GSGI)				No
003-153	What we would like to see Jaime, is in the case of Chula Vista Middle for example, what design and construction will entail. I think the questions from the community may be regarding what is being worked on, what is scheduled to take place and at which school. This information will give us more of a knowledge base. As we are evolving and moving forward, we would like to know where are we with the different schools so that when we meet with the public or when the public encounters us we can accurately report on the progress of Prop O.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-157	May I suggest that at the next meeting we give you a report of highlighted milestones for every single school and I'll give you the dates that we are going to do schematics and designs? That way it will be a quick summary for each school. Would that be more appropriate for you?	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-158	That would be much more informative.	Jane McGill (CBOC)				No
003-159	I would like to caution staff. When discussing the project process we should ensure that everyone is clear on the terms we use. We have several different levels of complexity. Schematic designs are the preliminary drawings which show in generalities about what that work is going to be. The next level of drawings are design and development drawings which start getting into more detail and for example, may show you where an air conditioning duct is. The product of those designs are the construction documents.	Karl Bradley (SUHSD)				No
003-160	I think Henry has the idea of what we are looking at. We are looking at no more than a half page or a page per school. It's enough to tell us where we are with the project and when we expect to finish it. Those are generally the questions.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-161	We will take care of that next meeting.	Henry Amigable (GSGI)				No
003-162	Let's go ahead and report on the bond sale.					

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
		Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

8. Report on Sale of Bonds

New Business

003-163 You should all have this booklet. This is the final official statement. Essentially this is the booklet of a prospectus for the bonds that we closed on March 27th, the first series \$180 million net construction fund. The official statement contains a lot of financial information relative to the school district and legal requirements. The maturities run through 2047 or about 39 years, essentially. As for the bonds themselves, the description starts on page one, in terms of how they are issued, how they can be redeemed and the book entry system. On page seven there is an allocation of how much proceeds were generated and where all of those proceeds went to. Page nine is a repayment schedule. The right hand column shows the amount of taxes to be levied each year to repay them. The funds are broken out into two funds: a building fund which is the \$180 million net construction fund and a debt service fund. Both of these are held by the county and are used to repay the principal and interest on the bonds. If there was a fairly active secondary market, I don't know how many people in Sweetwater actually ended up buying them, but they were available as an offering to individual retailers. Some of them are probably available on the secondary market, if anyone is interested. If you have any specific dollar number questions I did get a copy of the number ones for the bonds so I can try to answer those.

Robert Anslow
(BOWAME) No

003-164 What is the yield interest rate?

Andy Berg
(CBOC) No

003-165 5.18%

That is essentially a way of averaging maturity dates and interest rates on the various maturities on the bonds.

The premium was about 1.6% in rough numbers. The biggest single expense we had was bond insurance in order to make the bonds AAA. What that does is allows the bond to be sold to any level of investor. The bonds were insured through financial security insurance. You may be aware that several bond companies are no longer rated AAA so at the time we bid the bonds there were essentially only two bond insurers available for this and they both raised their fees considerably because three of the bond insurance companies are not really able to write policies anymore due to the mortgage problems. The bond insurance premium was significantly higher than anybody had anticipated when we started this process back in December.

Robert Anslow
(BOWAME) No

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

9. Other Business

New Business

003-166 I would like to ask that we have another meeting in the next 30-45 days. What I would like us to do is be very comfortable with how this list was put together. Everybody who is here other than bond counsel are new faces. I'm not saying we are going to justify it or prove anything but, at least have an understanding for what happened in the past.

I will contact everyone for availability and if you have any other items for the agenda let me know. I

Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Topic for each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
	<p>primarily want us to have the comfort level of Prop O. We can talk about the time schedule of when construction is going to be happening and for us to have an understanding of where we are.</p> <p>If you guys are out in the community and something comes up feel free to bring it up because I don't want to be blindsided and I don't think any of us do. This is a serious charge. There is quite a bit of money on the table and it is for the benefit of the Sweetwater students, parents and voters that have invested their money. I take it seriously. I was very upset when I found out that the implication was that we as a committee weren't watching what was going on and I think that we do.</p> <p>I want to apologize to the committee. I've written a commentary that I have submitted to the paper for review. I will get copies to you. It is generally is a notice to the public of where we are, what we did under BB, what we are doing under Prop O and inviting them to be a part of it.</p>	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-167	The next regular scheduled meeting is in May. Do you want to pull that?	Jeff Scogin (GSGI)				No
003-168	No keep that. The reason I like setting quarters the first time out is to give the public regular date when they know that we are here. I think that if anything comes up that this panel is willing to give its time and its energy to ensure that the taxpayers, citizens and students are represented. When we are in the community we want to be informed because we are advocates for this project.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-169	We are schedule to meet in May which is within that time frame. Do we need to set another meeting or do we just use that as our next meeting?	Andy Berg (CBOC)				No
003-170	<p>No. That will be our next meeting.</p> <p>This is our committee. It is each one of you that give you time, energy and expertise and if there is an issue that is bothering you bring it forward and I'm prepared to call whatever meetings need to happen. Staff is prepared to address whatever the issues are.</p> <p>Also, our website is up and running.</p>	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
003-171	Meeting ajourned.	Rudy Gonzalez (CBOC)				No
Cc:	Company Name	Contact Name	Copies	Notes		