

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOARD  
September 6, 2007  
Phoenix, Arizona

The School Facilities Board held a board meeting at the Pendergast Learning Center in Phoenix. The meeting began at approximately 10:05 A.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Guests Present</u>
Davidson, Frank, Chair	Jim Nelson, Nadaburg USD
Gober, Patricia	Tina Cook, TUSD
Keenan, Brooks, Vice Chair	Mark Brauner, Red Rock ESD
Marks, Gary	David Cook, Red Rock ESD
Ortega, David	Bob Cervi, Red Rock ESD
Rushin, Tom	Bob Thomas, Marana USD
Taylor, Penny Allee	Al Flores, Vail USD
	Bill Taylor, DLR Group
<u>Members Absent</u>	Katherine Gordon-Wheat, The Weitz Company
Friesen, Lyle, Superintendent's Representative (non-voting)	Brian Fellows, ADOT
Private Business Owner Representative, position vacant	Michael Medeiros, Marana USD
Teacher Representative, position vacant	Tim O'Brien, Deer Valley USD
	Bob Young, Dysart USD
<u>Staff Present</u>	Jim Migliorino, Deer Valley USD
John Arnold, Executive Director	Scott Beck, NTD Architects
Dean Gray, Deputy Director of Facilities	Scott Thompson, Dysart USD
Monica Petersen, Deputy Director of Finance	
Amber Peterson, School Finance Specialist	
Ron Passarelli, Special Projects	
Heather Gamby, Executive Assistant	
Kerry Campbell, Public Information Officer	
Jim Chang, Demographer	
Mike Barfield, District Liaison	
Gerry Breuer, District Liaison	
Sameer Pandey, District Liaison	
Richard Dern, Architect	

- I. Call to Order  
Frank Davidson called the meeting to order at approximately 10:05 A.M.
  
- II. Roll Call (Staff Introductions)  
There were seven Board Members present at this meeting. John Arnold introduced the SFB staff and presented a short bio on each member.

- III. Approval of August 2, 2007 Minutes  
Brooks Keenan moved that the Board approve the minutes of August 2, 2007. Tom Rushin seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.
- IV. Consent Agenda
- a. Consideration and possible vote of Preventive Maintenance Plans  
Penny Taylor moved that the Board ratify the district listed in agenda item IV., Ajo Unified District, David Ortega seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.
- V. Director's Report
- a. Meet the Staff  
See agenda item II.
- b. Audit Review  
John Arnold reviewed the Auditor General's performance audit and sunset review report of the SFB released on August 17, 2007. The audit contains five findings and several recommendations. Staff agreed with the findings and has agreed to implement the following recommendations.

**Finding #1 – New Construction**

**Recommendation #1:** SFB should seek a formal opinion from the Attorney General to determine whether it has statutory authority to award additional monies to pay for specific design features.

**Action Plan:** SFB staff is currently working with the Auditor General's Staff to appropriately frame the question. SFB staff plans to submit the question by September 30, 2007.

**Recommendation #2:** Once the opinion is received, SFB should comply with the opinion.

**Action Plan:** The SFB will comply with any opinion it receives.

**Finding #2 – Building Renewal Formula Needs Study**

There were no recommendations for the SFB related to Finding #2

**Finding #3 – Building Renewal Oversight**

**Recommendation #1:** SFB staff should continue their efforts to improve the oversight of building renewal expenditures by developing and implementing written policies and procedures that describe the review process for assessing the appropriateness of a building renewal expense.

**Action Plan:** The Auditor General has agreed to advise SFB staff on developing appropriate protocols for selecting building renewal expenditures for audit. Additionally, staff has already implemented a new reporting mechanism for building renewal expenditures. Since the FY 2007 building renewal reports are due on October 15, 2007, staff plans to have the audit structure in place by that date.

**Recommendation #2:** SFB should either require its liaisons to conduct annual reviews of building renewal expenditures or contract out for such

reviews. In making the decision, SFB should consider the relative costs of both options.

**Action Plan:** Once the protocols for reviewing the building renewal expenditures are established, staff will be able to determine if existing staff will be able to perform the reviews or if outside assistance is necessary. Staff plans to have these decisions in place by October 15, 2007. Once a direction is chosen, SFB staff will develop and implement appropriate training materials to ensure audits are conducted in a consistent manner.

**Recommendation #3:** SFB should provide districts an opportunity to challenge its staff's conclusions regarding inappropriate expenditures.

**Action Plan:** Statute requires the SFB to make the final determination on whether or not an expenditure is appropriate. Therefore, a district's opportunity to challenge staff's findings will take place at a hearing before the Board. SFB staff plans to work with the Attorney General's office to establish the protocols for these hearings. Staff will present the proposed hearing protocols for Board approval at the November SFB meeting.

**Recommendation #4:** Once the process is in place giving districts the opportunity to challenge SFB staff's conclusions, SFB should report inappropriate expenditures to the Superintendent of Public Instruction as required by law.

**Action Plan:** Staff will contact the Department of Education to determine the appropriate methodology for this notification. This step will also be completed in time for the November Board meeting.

#### **Finding #4 – Accounting Controls**

**Recommendation #1:** SFB should develop and implement written policies and procedures that cover:

- a) payments to school districts, including all steps necessary to ensure the appropriate payment for projects; and
- b) regular reconciliation of SFB information against the state-wide accounting system, the Arizona Financial Information System.

**Action Plan:** SFB staff has already started this process and plans to have these policies and procedures written by January 1, 2008.

**Recommendation #2:** Once written policies and procedures are developed, SFB should establish a formal training program for employees involved in the processing and disbursement of payments based on the established policies and procedures.

**Action Plan:** SFB staff plans to include a training program as part of the formal policies and procedures. All current staff is already trained, therefore, the training program will be for future potential turnover.

**Recommendation #3:** SFB should modify its close-out process to:

- a) initiate the close-out procedure when the project award has been all or nearly all distributed instead of waiting to receive a close-out package from the school district; and
- b) include a review to detect duplicate payments and record keeping errors.

**Action Plan:** The close out process is designed to ensure SFB staff does not distribute more funds to a school district than the Board awards. Currently, closeouts are triggered by school districts that notify the SFB they have completed their projects. As the Auditor General points out, if a district does not trigger the close out, it may never happen. SFB staff believes the best way to identify projects that need to be closed is to develop a report that notifies staff when a project either reaches 95 percent expended or has not had a payment for a period of three months. Additionally, staff will implement a trigger within the project tracking system that will identify closed projects.

#### **Finding #5 – IT Controls**

**Recommendation #1:** SFB should strengthen access controls over SFB's project-tracking database by:

- a) using unique account identification numbers and passwords for each employee who uses the database;
- b) restricting database access to only essential users and assigning rights using the rules of least privilege required to complete an employee's assigned task(s); and
- c) establishing an automated edit check on the database that ensures a payment cannot be made in excess of the remaining budgetary capacity of a specific project.

**Action Plan:** Several of the steps the Auditor General recommends will require additional resources being directed to the SFB IT department. Accordingly, staff has requested these resources for the FY 2009 budget, including a dedicated IT professional. In the meantime, staff will take every step possible towards implementing the recommendations within the resources available.

**Recommendation #2:** SFB should develop written policies and procedures for its IT system to address:

- a) access controls;
- b) controls over making changes to the database system; including identifying user needs, identifying necessary changes, documenting changes made, and testing changes before implementation; and
- c) work station management, including restrictions on downloading software from the Internet and requirements to regularly install security patch and virus protection.

**Action Plan:** SFB staff has already started this process and plans to have these policies and procedures written by January 1, 2008.

**Recommendation #3:** Once written policies and procedures are developed, SFB should establish a formal training program that:

- a) communicates SFB policies and procedures to its employees; and

- b) includes security awareness training to help ensure employees understand their role in protecting SFB data.

**Action Plan:** SFB staff will perform the training as soon as the written policies are in place.

**Recommendation #4:** SFB should develop a comprehensive business continuity plan by:

- a) updating and maintaining its plan;
- b) addressing weaknesses identified by the Business Continuity Leadership Task Force; and
- c) testing the plan at least annually.

**Action Plan:** The SFB staff will complete the update of the continuity plan by February 1, 2008. Additionally, staff will schedule an annual business continuity test for March 15. This test will be held on this date every year.

**Recommendation #5:** SFB should modify its IT consultant contract to:

- a) require documentation of the database system, including such information as database structure, data dictionaries, and program code;
- b) establish state ownership of the project-tracking database; and
- c) require testing and SFB staff review of system changes.

**Action Plan:** The current SFB technology contract is set to expire on December 21, 2007. Staff is currently working with the State Procurement office to either establish a new contract or see if a statewide contract will meet SFB needs. In either case, the new contract will have the components recommended by the Auditor General.

**Recommendation #6:** To meet its IT standards, SFB should consider converting a vacant position to an IT position, using a consultant(s), or a combination of the two.

**Action Plan:** Staff consistently considers the best use of state funds.

Mr. Arnold noted that the last two findings were internal issues related to the SFB's resources and size. Mr. Arnold also indicated that among the billions of dollars of payments issued out by the SFB since 1998, there has only been approximately \$63,000 in overpayments, which was recouped. A hearing will be held on September 22, 2007, with the Joint Legislative Audit Committee to review the audit findings. A letter seeking a formal opinion from the Attorney General will be submitted in the next six to eight weeks, with a response expected three to four months after that.

c. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools Report – Draft

John Arnold gave a brief presentation summarizing the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools draft report submitted to the board for review. The report will be posted on the SFB's website for comment. A brief meeting will then be held at the end of September to allow the Board to review the comments before submission

of the final report to the Governor on October 1<sup>st</sup>. The report details the following:

- Goals
  - Integrate Technology
  - Accommodate Student/Teacher Connection
  - Ensure Safety
  - Address Efficiencies in Water & Energy
- Implications
  - School Size
  - Classroom Dimensions

Tom Rushin commended staff on the report, saying that it was well written and a pleasure to read. Brooks Keenan indicated that this endeavor is a great initiative from the Governor and that the staff has done a terrific job. He expressed that while there are some wonderful recommendations in the report, he feels very uncomfortable with the issue of debt financing for schools as a recommendation. Mr. Keenan said that the Arizona Legislature has been struggling against debt financing and there is not a sufficient or sound argument in the report to answer the Legislature's questions or objections. He further indicated that for debt financing to be presented as a formal recommendation, there must be a very sound long-term analysis on the potential impact on the state budget. Mr. Keenan stated that he does not agree with the report's predication that debt financing would save money, and that, on the contrary, it would cost more in the long run.

Frank Davidson stated that it was important that the report reflect that it is a product of input from many sources, so that the Governor's office is aware of the contributions made in this effort. John Arnold indicated that the report's acknowledgments will be made more specific.

Penny Taylor asked whether or not discussions regarding partnerships had taken place between communities, towns, municipalities, etc., and school districts. John Arnold replied that the view of partnerships varies from district to district, with some being excited about it and others reluctant. A formal survey has not been conducted, but there are some districts that have participated in these types of partnerships and are seeing immediate benefits.

Ron Passarelli, SFB Special Projects, explained that there have been conversations with the county associations as well as the League of Cities and Towns, who are aware of the interest in initiating partnerships with local jurisdictions in addition to school districts. These discussions will continue, and the examples from across the country of these types of partnerships and their benefits will be highlighted.

Gary Marks asked that a mass email be sent to school districts informing them that the report would be on the SFB website, and soliciting comments.

David Ortega commended staff on its work on the report. He indicated that the role of parents had not been raised with respect to communication between teachers and parents/grandparents. Although this may be a more operational aspect, communication is important, and this report may be able

to address issues such as good locations for parents to talk to teachers. Mr. Ortega added that the use of technology, such as emails and the internet, to access syllabi and the like could be addressed.

John Arnold thanked the Board for its feedback and indicated that their comments and suggestions would be reviewed to see what can be incorporated into the report.

d. Inflation Request to JLBC

John Arnold reviewed the letter forwarded to the JLBC requesting a hearing for an annual inflation adjustment. The requested amount, 5.53 percent, is based on inflation indexes prepared by PinnacleOne and Rider Levett Bucknall. PinnacleOne's index is based on the cost of an elementary school in the Phoenix metropolitan market and reports FY 2007 inflation at 2.2 percent. Rider Levett Bucknall's index includes all types of commercial construction and sets inflation at 8.9 percent. The 5.53 requested is an average of these two indexes. In addition to the inflation increase, SFB staff is also seeking a 5 percent increase for energy conservation initiatives and a 1.6 percent increase for school safety features.

Patricia Gober asked what the large discrepancy between the two indexes was attributed to. John Arnold replied that Dean Gray, Deputy Director of Facilities, was largely responsible for holding the costs of schools down, which affects the K-8 construction only index.

Gary Marks stated that local impact fees definitely drive costs up. More specifically, water conservation and waterless urinals have a great effect on local impact fees. Because of this, our state should look at support for waterless urinals because their effect on local impact fees is so significant. John Arnold indicated that one of Ron Passarelli's special projects will be to liaison with cities on these types of issues, and that the use of waterless urinals will be pushed. Mr. Arnold stated that the City of Phoenix had recently adopted International Building Codes, which do not allow waterless urinals, but that the SFB and others are asking for an exception to made.

Frank Davidson asked whether or not staff expected an interim review this year, as one was requested last year but not placed on the JLBC agenda. John Arnold replied that it is uncertain, and there is no way to predict whether or not an interim review would be granted. Nevertheless, staff will continue to push for one.

1. Presentation by the School Facilities Coalition

Phil Swain of the School Facilities Coalition made a presentation entitled, "Arizona School Construction Funding Recommendations" to the Board. The School Facilities Coalition is comprised of members of the American Institute of Architects, Arizona Builders Alliance, Council of Educational Facility Planners International, Arizona State School Superintendents, and the American Council of Engineering Companies of Arizona. The presentation highlighted the Coalition's position that the SFB's current funding formula is inadequate, and is recommending an immediate formula increase of 16%, with funding being adjusted for

inflation at the time of construction. The Coalition's subsequent recommendation is that a permanent process for funding be developed "to keep pace with construction costs, schedules, and education needs."

Patricia Gober asked Mr. Swaim if the coalition would consider obtaining legal status, in order to be better positioned to lobby if necessary. Mr. Swaim indicated that the coalition would do whatever it could to help the process. Penny Taylor suggested that the coalition invite other organizations to get involved that would not benefit directly from an increase to the new construction funding formula.

Bob Thomas of Marana Unified School District addressed the Board. Mr. Thomas cited the difference in costs of two new schools built in his district. The first, built in 2001, had a total cost of \$5.5 million. The second, a site adapted prototype of the first, was completed in August of 2007 with a total cost of \$10,700,00. The cost alone to get water to this school was \$105,000.

e. Presentation on Safe Routes to School Program

Brian Fellows of ADOT made a presentation to the Board. Information presented included the drastic reduction in the number of children biking and walking to school, and the resulting increase in parents driving their children to school. Effects of this include increased childhood obesity, traffic, and pollution. The Safe Routes to School Program aims to increase physical activity, improve unsafe walking and biking conditions, and improve poor air quality by reducing vehicle emissions.

The Board adjourned for a brief recess at 11:46 a.m. until 11:53 a.m.

f. Energy Grant Criteria and Application

John Arnold explained that HB 2792 established a grant program for energy efficiency upgrades and energy audits. There are two types of grants, one for project development and one for project implementation. The law requires the SFB to work with the State Energy Office in developing the criteria for the grants and the program rules. Draft application forms along with terms and conditions for the grants have been established. Staff is seeking comment on the proposed criteria and will ask the Board for final approval at the October Board meeting.

Proposed criteria for evaluating the project development grant applications are as follows:

- o Energy Utilization Index (maximum 50 points): Water and energy usage data for the past twelve months on buildings proposed for study.
- o Local Resource Index (maximum 30 points): Per pupil primary net assessed value of individual school district.
- o Study Implementation Funding Plan (maximum 10 points): District's funding plan for implementing the energy and water saving measures identified in the study.
- o District's Energy Plan (maximum 10 points): District's strategy to reduce future water and energy consumption.

The maximum project development grant amount is \$25,000 per district.

Proposed criteria for evaluating the project implementation grant applications are as follows:

- o Energy and Water Savings (maximum 35 points): Estimated project cost and payback in terms of life cycle energy and water savings.
- o Utility Budget Savings (maximum 35 points): Projected energy and water savings as a percent of the overall facility utility budget.
- o Local Resource Index (maximum 20 points): Per pupil primary net assessed value of individual school district.
- o Environmental Savings (maximum 10 points): Environmental benefits the proposed project provides to the community, region, or state as demonstrated by the amount of avoided greenhouse gases or other valid environmental indicators.

The maximum project implementation grant amount is \$100,000 per project and \$250,000 per district.

Patricia Gober asked if the human element of energy and water conservation had been factored in, and suggested that the applications be modified to reflect an interest in this aspect of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools. John Arnold indicated that the hope is to receive an application from a district that has invested in infrastructure changes, but there is no way to predict the types of applications that will be submitted. Ways to incorporate this element into the application will be addressed.

VI. New School Construction

- a. Consideration of New Construction Projects Review, Bids, Bid Packages, and Change Orders (John Arnold suggested that Red Rock Elementary District's request be addressed separately):

Brooks Keenan moved that the Board approve the following:

1. Approve **Blue Ridge Unified District's** request to proceed with CM@Risk Project 090232000-9999-001N, upon staff receipt of necessary documents.
2. Approve **Chandler Unified District's** request to proceed with CM@Risk Project 070280000-9999-020N, upon staff receipt of necessary documents, and that the Board approve additional funding for specific site requirements in the amount of \$130,000, and additional funding for inflation in the amount of \$498,332.
3. Approve **Litchfield Elementary District's** request to proceed with CM@Risk Project 070479000-9999-010N, upon staff receipt of necessary documents, and that the Board approve additional funding for inflation in the amount of \$200,690.
4. Approve **Maricopa Unified District's** request to proceed with CM@Risk Project 110220000-9999-012N, upon staff receipt of necessary

documents, and that the Board approve additional funding for inflation in the amount of \$389,133.

Gary Marks seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

John Arnold explained that on January 4, 2007, the SFB approved a 67,741 square foot K-8 school in the Red Rock Elementary District. The district is requesting an expansion of scope to 97,020 SF. The expansion represents an addition of 29,279 square feet and \$3,889,715 to the project.

Tom Rushin moved that the Board approve **Red Rock Elementary District's** request to proceed with CM@Risk Project 110405000-9999-001N, upon staff receipt of necessary documents, and that the Board approve additional funding for additional square footage in the amount of \$3,889,715, additional funding for specific site requirements in the amount of \$838,248, and additional funding for inflation in the amount of \$1,744,269.

Penny Taylor seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

b. Other New Construction Issues:

Deer Valley Project Numbers 070297000-9999-012N and 070297000-9999-013N: John Arnold explained that in both of these projects, a set of three circumstances led to an unusual funding outcome:

1. The SFB provided funding for a site condition
2. The district provided local funds for enhancements
3. The SFB provided no inflation funds

Because the SFB provided no inflation funds, the district was required to provide contingency funding for the local enhancements. In both of these projects, SFB policy required that any remaining contingency be returned to the SFB to offset the cost of the site conditions. Therefore, the policy inadvertently required SFB staff to retain the local funds that were deposited in the contingency account. The following amounts were retained by the SFB:

Project 012N: \$7,618

Project 013N: \$122,779

Brooks Keenan moved that the Board approve staff's recommendation to amend the award for projects 070297000-9999-012N and 070297000-9999-013N. The amended award shall require all remaining SFB provided contingency to be used to offset the cost of the site conditions. David Ortega seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

Humboldt Unified School District's Project #130222000-9999-005N: John Arnold explained that this project is currently fully designed and is at construction drawing stage. The project was procured using the CM@Risk method of construction delivery and staff has the GMP on this project.

As part of its final review, before bringing a new school construction project to the Board, staff completed a current review of the school district ADM. Based on the current review, staff has determined that the current ADM is not sufficient to recommend starting the construction of the school.

A.R.S. 15-2041 E requires the Board to distribute funds for architectural, engineering, project management, and pre-construction at the time of the original award. SFB rule R7-6-502 D states that that amount will be 5 percent of the total project. The Board has the authority to waive that rule for good cause.

For this project, 5 percent of the total award was distributed to the district. However, the procedure staff has implemented when a project is delayed is to bring the construction documents to the point of submittal for permitting (a fully designed school) with the intention of bringing the entire team back together when the district's ADM again indicates the need for the school. This process brings the construction manager's pre-construction contract to completion and the construction documents to a defined stage in the architect's contract. Since most school districts currently use the CM@Risk method of delivery this stopping point in the process will generally require funding in excess of the awarded 5 percent.

After a careful review of the design and pre-construction contracts, staff has made the following determination.

Project	Pronghorn Middle (005N)
A&E Cost	\$420,600
Pre-construction Fee	<u>\$70,136</u>
Project Manager Fee	<u>\$97,740</u>
Total	<u>\$588,476</u>
5% Distribution	\$422,963
<b>Additional Funds Needed</b>	<b>\$165,512</b>

Penny Taylor asked about the cost of changes to the architectural drawings necessitated by code changes when the district eventually receives approval to proceed with construction. John Arnold explained that the Board would be responsible for funding any changes required. David Ortega moved that the Board accept the staff recommendation to increase the advance distribution for Project 130222000-9999-005N by \$165,512. Brooks Keenan seconded. Motion passed on a 6-0 voice vote. Gary Marks recused himself from discussion and a vote on this agenda item.

Increase Size of Maricopa Unified District's Project 110220000-9999-020N:  
John Arnold explained that the district has received SFB approval for a new 6-8 middle school for 750 students, at 72,503 SF. In June 2007, growth projections for the district indicated that the district qualified for another middle school, but the district decided not to request approval, due to land issues. Now the district is requesting an increase in project 020N from 72,503 SF to 87,003 SF. Staff agrees that this increase is warranted based on the growth projections established in June.

Penny Taylor moved that the Board approve the district's request to increase project 110220000-9999-020N to 87,003 SF. Brooks Keenan seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

VII. Consideration of Request for Land or Real Property Purchase, Lease or Donation including requests from:

a. Step I & II: Justification of Need for Land and Request to Purchase a Specific Site

**Dysart Unified District:** The site is located within a residential development and is bisected with half the property inside and half outside the Luke Air Force Base high noise or accident potential zone.

Patricia Gober asked what liability issues may exist with the parcel being in the flight path of Luke Air Force Base, which resulted in a motion to go into executive session. A motion to go into executive session was made by Penny Taylor. Gary Marks seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote. The Board was in Executive Session from approximately 12:23 p.m. to 12:40 p.m.

When back in regular session, Patricia Gober asked if students are able to play outside safely considering the noise of the military aircraft.

Scott Thompson, Executive Director of Business Services, Dysart Unified District, addressed the Board. Mr. Thompson indicated that although the district has some schools located within Luke Air Force Base's noise contours, students, staff, and teachers do not hear activity when inside school buildings, and that when they are outside, they are used to the noise and are not bothered by it.

David Ortega asked if night flights over ballparks, etc., were a concern since the site will experience approximately 100 flights per day. Mr. Thompson replied that in the district's experience, flights run in more of a cycle than a daily pattern due to training schedules, and the district has not experienced problems during day or night.

Patricia Gober asked if there had been a crash in the last 15 years, to which Mr. Thompson replied that there had not been, at least within the restricted zone. He further expressed that he felt the schools in his district were in no more danger than any other schools, as an aircraft could crash at any point while airborne, either inside or outside of the zone.

Tom Rushin indicated that there is a similar situation with a school in his district, and corroborated Scott Thompson's points. He stated that most schools within similar territory have very specific evacuation plans tailored to these types of events.

David Ortega moved that the Board approve the Dysart Unified School District's request to proceed with Step III on 14.5 acres for an elementary site, project number 070289000-9999-042L. Frank Davidson seconded. Motion passed on a 6 -1 voice vote, with Brooks Keenan voting against.

b. Step III

Brooks Keenan moved that the Board approve the following:

1. Dysart Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 13.57 acres for an elementary school site, project number 070289000-9999-036L.
2. Maricopa Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 22.5 acres for a middle school site, project number 110220000-9999-019L.
3. Maricopa Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 13.314 acres for an elementary school site, project number 110220000-9999-021L.
4. Saddle Mountain Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 13 acres for an elementary school site, project number 070390000-9999-012L.

Gary Marks seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

c. Other Land Issues

Florence Unified District: John Arnold explained that Florence Unified District's Land Project 110201000-9999-018L was approved for Steps I & II at the August 10, 2006 Board Meeting. Step III approval was given at the March 1, 2007, Board Meeting.

At the April 5, 2007 Board Meeting, SFB Staff began requesting \$30,000 for Step III funding due to requiring more detailed studies on future school sites, making the studies more expensive.

Florence Unified District's Steps I & II approval authorizing Step III funding at \$18,000 is inadequate and will not cover the cost of the required appraisals and environmental site assessments including soil sampling and testing for residual pesticides and herbicides.

David Ortega moved that the Board accept the staff recommendation to increase the Step III funding for Florence Unified District's Project 110201000-9999-018L from \$18,000 to \$30,000. Penny Taylor seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

VIII. Consideration and Possible Vote of Reduction of Square Footage

Brooks Keenan moved that the Board ratify staff's projection that Tempe Elementary District's reconfiguration of Laird Elementary School from K-5 to K-8 is not projected to cause the district to fall below minimum square footage guidelines within three years. Gary Marks seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

IX. Policy Review

- a. John Arnold explained that this is a new agenda item based on Board policy that all SFB policies be reviewed once per year. A policy will be reviewed at each Board meeting. The policy will then be up for approval at the following month's Board meeting. This month's policy for review is II. Policy Development.
- b. Penny Taylor moved that the Board approve the proposed changes to SFB Policy III. SFB Capital Plans, E. Calculation of Square Footage for New High Schools, which was reviewed at the August Board meeting. David Ortega seconded. Motion passed on 7-0 voice vote.

X. Consideration and Possible Vote of Emergency Deficiency Projects

John Arnold explained that Bowie Unified contacted the SFB requesting emergency funding for the removal of trees in front of the school buildings. Nine trees on school grounds are diseased and some have limbs that have developed interior hollowness, resulting in concerns regarding student safety and potential building damage.

Brooks Keenan moved that the Board approve the staff recommendation to approve the Bowie Unified School District Emergency Deficiency Project and provide funding in the amount of \$18,506.96. Gary Marks seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

XI. Full Day Kindergarten Capital Grants FY 2006

David Ortega moved that the Board approve Superior Unified School District's Full Day Kindergarten Plan. Tom Rushin seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

XII. Future Agenda Items

None.

XIII. Public Comment

None.

XIV. Adjournment

There being no further business, Frank Davidson adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:47 P.M.

Approved by the School Facilities Board on 10/4, 2007

Frank Davidson  
Chair