



**PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (PUSD)  
CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (COC) MEETING  
Meeting Minutes of March 15, 2017**

**Location:** Pasadena Unified School District Education Center, Room 229, 351 S. Hudson Ave., Pasadena, CA. 91109

**Date & Time of meeting:** March 15, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.

**Present:** Quincy Hocutt, Clifton Cates, Glen DeVeer, Diana Verdugo, Gretchen Vance, Willie Ordonez, Jen Wang, and Steven Cole.

**Absent:** Chris Romero, Derek Walker, Joelle Morisseau-Phillips, Geoffrey Commons and Mikala Rahn.

**Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Board Member Board Liaison:** Pat Cahalan. Kim Kenne, President of the Board of Education, was also in attendance.

**PUSD Staff:** Miguel Perez, Construction Specialist.

**Absent:** Nelson Cayabyab, Chief Facilities Officer and Nadia Zendejas, Executive Secretary

**I. Call to Order**

*Mr. Cates*

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM

**II. Approval of minutes of February 15, 2017 meeting**

*Ms. Wang*

February minutes was not available in the meeting package for members to vote upon for approval. District staff had not provided draft minutes in a timely manner for Committee members to review before the meeting.

**III. BUSINESS**

**A. Preparation of meeting minutes**

*Ms. Wang, Messrs. Hocutt & Cates*

**i. Current state of affairs**

There was a lengthy discussion regarding preparation of the minutes, specifically questioning the District's duty to provide services as part of the District's administrative support included in the language of Prop 39 and the COC by-laws. Staff agreed they were recording the current meeting and hoped to provide the verbatim transcript and the minutes for this meeting.

**ii. Plan adopted at September 21, 2016 meeting**

Mr. Cates stated that at the September 2016 meeting, the District had agreed with the COC to prepare and provide the minutes.

**iii. Education Code sec. 15280(a), COC bylaws sec. 7.1(c)**

Mr. Cates stated that base on the COC bylaws the District has the obligation to provide administrative assistant to the COC; he also noted that this administrative assistance couldn't be paid from Measure TT funds, per the Education Code.

**iv. History:** Mr. Cates stated that there wasn't a problem with the October, November, December or January minutes and questioned why things had changed.

**Action:** Mr. Cahalan offered to take the problem of preparation of the minutes to the person(s) who could resolve it.

**B. Proposition TT Financial Report: Current status, problems, action** *Mr. Hocutt*

Mr. Hocutt made an extensive presentation demonstrating that the information contained in the current Financial Reports provided by Facilities is not transparent, hard to understand, and in some cases they are misleading the public. The central questions discussed were regarding an inherent conflict of interest, as the entity controlling the budget is the same entity reporting performance against the budget. The current reports are also less useful than they should be from a managerial viewpoint.

A transcript of the questions asked and answers provided is shown below:

*Statement on PUSD Website*

*The Citizens' Oversight Committee is responsible for monitoring project management and expenditures for the \$350 million local school facilities bond passed by voters in November 2008. The Citizens' Oversight Committee members play a critical role in ensuring fiscal accountability and transparency to the public about progress on construction projects undertaken with Measure TT funds. The Committee works closely with the Board of Education and the Superintendent to ensure that projects are completed as planned, within budget, and in accordance with the law.*

**"Jeopardy" Questions**

*Where would you publicly access the Measure TT budget to study it?* Until last month, it was not posted. At the COC's request, it is now on the COC website.

*What were the actual expenditures to build the Blair MIDDLE School?* History of completed projects does not appear in the reports.

*What types of costs are covered in Career Technical Education at Blair High School? What has been spent on it?* \$26 million budgeted in total with \$1.4 million at Blair. Nothing spent. Originally set up to procure computers & laptops. Will be phased out and returned to contingency.

*Roosevelt Elementary School is budgeted for a multipurpose facility. What percent complete are they on that project? What quarter of what year are they scheduled to be complete?* No data of this type exists.

*What were the actual costs to construct Sierra Madre Middle School?* BR 1165 reported the cost at \$ 27.8 million. Do the two reports agree? \$37.8 million on the report does not agree with the BR data.

*What is covered in the line item entitled "Measure T E-rate" at Marshall Fundamental Secondary School?* It has been stated it is for technology infrastructure to support computers. Expenditures on the report are \$438,000 at Marshall and \$5.1 million in total. Can be returned to contingency.

*What is covered under the heading of "Technology Modification?" Are we about complete with that program?* It appears similar to Measure T E-rate??? Percent complete is undetermined.

*How much have we expended on the modernization of Linda Vista Elementary School? Were we budgeted for that?* \$129,000 is spent, perhaps for a needs analysis or CEQA or architectural history. Budget appears to be zero.

*What organization's performance is being tracked by this financial report? What organization allocates the budgets and reports the actuals for this report?* Facilities and Facilities. This non-separation violates budgeting principles.

*Bonus question: Measure TT is a \$350 million bond. What is the total budget on this report?* \$343.8 million

*The Facilities Committee of the Board of Education has approved a large number of Board Reports in the last six months. Where are those indicated on the report with a line item and showing an increase in budget?* Nothing indicated. Covered under modernization. As a BR is approved, it is assumed to be covered under the previously established modernization budget. They will be adjusted over time as they are needed.

Where do you see coverage for the salaries of the Project Mangers for the various school projects? Doesn't show. They may be in the individual projects but there are indications it may be in Facilities Administration.

WHO is the project manager for the modernization of Blair High School? That information doesn't appear.

Is "Facilities Administration" (under District Service Center) currently on budget? How is that budget allocated?  
It is currently over by about \$400,000. Facilities meets quarterly to adjust the budgets.

**ACTION:** The COC will formally ask Staff to consider revising the format of the financial report to provide improved information to the Board of Education and the public.

**C. Uniform standards for Proposition TT expenditures** *Mr. Cates, Mr. Cayabyab*

- i. Member Comments: Mr. Cates informed the Committee that he has received several comments on the draft of the "Guidelines For The Expenditure Of Measure TT Bond Funds," and that the Committee would wait for other comments; no further action on the matter will be taken until the next meeting.
- ii. District Comments: District staff has responded via iPhone that no new guidelines were needed and that Proposition 39 statements were sufficient.

**D. Uniform procedures for enabling timely Committee review of proposed Proposition TT expenditures**

- i. Possible change of COC meeting date to precede Facilities Committee meeting
- ii. Other steps to ensure that the Board has a real opportunity to consider the COC's recommendations

With regard to items "i" and "ii", a discussion was held presenting the pros and cons of moving the COC meeting to a previous week to ensure the Board has time to consider COC recommendations.

Due to complications in that proposed process, no decision was made and the item was tabled for the next meeting.

**E. Review of proposed Proposition TT Expenditures: Board Reports 1168-1179**

Mr. Perez provided information on the positive results achieved in staff's negotiations with PJHM for Engineering Services for running track resurfacing and other related improvements at Blair High, Elliot, and Washington. After negotiations, proposal costs were reduced by 30% (\$54,307) for Blair and Elliot; and an additional scope was added for Washington with no increase in fees. Mr. Perez informed the COC that the fee reduction was in good part the result of staff's classification of the track resurfacing projects as non-DSA projects, which by their nature generate additional work for the architects.

Mr. Perez explained that the option of getting an overall lower price by joining all three projects into one with a reduced cost due to a volume discount, as had been suggested by the Committee, was not possible.

Mr. Cates asked Facility to provide a copy of bylaw to the Committee which stating why projects have to be independent, even though they are almost identical in content.

**Action:** BR's 1169, 1170, 1171, 1174, 1175 and 1176 were approved with 6 votes for, 0 against and 1 abstention.

BR's 1172 and 1173 previously proposed to be disapproved, due to the non-combining of three projects into one, were also approved (with 2 votes against) based upon the explanation of the non-option of combining the designs for three almost identical running tracks, and the cost savings resulting from Staff negotiations.

#### **F. Reports by the Chief of Facilities**

There was no report on the status of construction projects by District Staff.

To help facilitate future status reports on construction, Mr. Hocutt distributed a proposed "Construction Status Report" form for consideration. He proposed that Project Managers would make inputs to such a consolidated form on a monthly basis. The information requested for each school with ongoing construction projects would be: Projects in Work, Progress/Issues this Month, an estimated percentage of completion, and the Project Manager's name. Staff and COC members were asked to consider using this form and to provide input by the next COC meeting.

#### **G. Committee membership**

- i. Reappointment of members with terms expiring on February 28, 2017:

**Action:** The names submitted to the Board of Education were approved unanimously for an extended term.

- ii. Solicitation and appointment of new members:

Pat Cahalan informed the Committee that two seats are still open, and recommended to extend the period for accepting new members. As two current members must be excused, four seats will be required.

**Action:** The proposal to extend the deadline for new applicants was approved unanimously

- iii. Membership criteria

A suggestion was made on the advisability of a background check requirement. No decision was made at this time.

#### **H. Report by Board Liaison to the COC**

There was no new information reported by the Board Liaison.

#### **I. Report by COC liaison to Facilities Sub-Committee**

It was reported that the Board Liaison has conveyed COC concerns to the Facilities Sub-committee.

#### **J. Report from site council representatives**

Ms. Verdugo informed the Committee that parents at her school sites keep thinking that she is a District representative, and she keeps reminding people she is not. It was also mentioned that the PHS Principal had a problem cleaning the goose excrement, which

cannot be power washed due to Pasadena water restrictions. It was noted that the current water restrictions have exemptions for instances of sanitary clean ups.

**IV. Public Comment**

A public comment was made that delays in repairing of the roof at Linda Vista had increase the possibility to the District that it will have to construct a new building.

**V. Future meeting agenda items, dates, and locations**

The next COC meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the PUSD education center on Hudson Avenue. Agenda items will be developed and distributed before this meeting date.

**VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 PM.

*Mr. Cates*