



**PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (PUSD)
CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (COC) MEETING
Meeting Minutes of June 21, 2017**

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

Date & Time of meeting: June 21, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Quincy Hocutt, Mikala Rahn, Diana Verdugo, Gretchen Vance, Willie Ordonez, Jen Wang, Joelle Morisseau-Phillips,

Absent: Clifton Cates, Glen DeVeer, Steven Cole

PUSD Board Member & COC Board Liaison: Kim Kenne

PUSD Staff: Miguel Perez, Construction Specialist.

Absent: Nelson Cayabyab, Chief Facilities Officer

(Abbreviations used in these minutes: PUSD - Pasadena Unified School District and COC – Citizen's Oversight Committee.)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hocutt

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 2017 MEETING

Ms. Wang

The May 17, 2017 minutes were unanimously approved with the addition of one comment indicating that Ms. Rahn would be providing follow-up assignments for the COC action items. Ms. Rahn indicated that she would, in the future, send out follow-up items in an e-mail to all COC members.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Hocutt

- Ms. Frances Nicholson, an IB teacher at Blair High School, made remarks in regards to:
 - a) The extended time (since 2014) Blair High students have been working in a temporary location while construction has been going on for the new building.
 - b) The poor condition of the furniture, and the teachers' needs to have new ones at the new building.
 - c) Her advice/request to have new magnetic whiteboards (*high durability leads future savings, ease of erasure and ease of hanging teaching materials*) in the new building.
 - d) Continuing bandwidth capacity problems due to inadequate Internet connections when many school computers are online, impacting the educational process quality.

- Ms. Eleni Gallagher and Ms. Lisa Milne, Pasadena High School (PHS) parents, made remarks regarding the need to include the PHS pool in the priority list of projects to be executed by the District with the remaining TT funds. They were especially concerned about the difficulty of understanding the true priorities of the projects due to a confusing priority list. COC members noted that the priority list was difficult to understand, it may not be approved during the upcoming Board meeting, and that the COC had not been kept well informed by Facilities with regards to the priority list. The Board Liaison pointed out that the COC does not advise the Board regarding the priority lists, but oversees expenses. It was noted that priorities on the list were based on accessibility, then fire, life & safety, and then classrooms.

IV. BUSINESS

A. Meeting Minutes

Ms. Wang, Ms. Rahn

- i. **Current state of affairs**
- ii. **Success of new procedure using a private stenographer**

Items “i” and “ii” were addressed together.

Ms. Wang noted that minutes had previously been agreed to be provided within seven business days and that the May minutes were received much later than this. Ms. Wang also noted that the quality of the verbatim transcript was “really good” and that she was hopeful to receive the next minutes earlier. Mr. Perez informed the COC that the Facilities input was constrained by the stenographer’s delivery time. Mr. Perez offered to find out if a shorter delivery time was possible within the terms of the actual contract with the stenographer.

B. Report by Chief of Facilities.

Mr. Cayabyab

Mr. Perez informed the COC that Facilities had not prepared a progress report. Mr. Hocutt noted that he had not seen a Progress Report from Facilities in “many, many months.” It was agreed among the members that the COC would ask Facilities for a monthly Progress of Construction Report and that receiving no report from Facilities was unacceptable.

C. Payment of additional District legal fees out of Prop TT funds

Mr. Hocutt, Ms. Kenne

- i. **COC letter to the Board of 5/23/17 recommending disapproval of BR 114-B**
- ii. **Rewording of BR-114-B in BR 113-B and approval by the Board.**
- iii. **Was there any substantive change in the services to be paid out of TT funds?**

Items “i”, “ii” and “iii” were addressed together.

It was noted that Board Report (BR) 114-F had been unanimously disapproved by the COC, but that BR 113-F had been written as a replacement, with the same wording problems, and was passed by the Board - now there are additional BR’s on the same subject with the same objections, i.e., that the wording allowed “general” legal expenses of the District to be paid for by Measure TT funds, which are

restricted to construction activities only. It was noted by the Board Liaison that since the Board had approved Br 113, the objections of the COC were now procedural. After further comments, it was noted that the COC could refer this question to the Auditors preparing to perform the annual audit.

D. Review of new Board Reports

Mr. Hocutt

Mr. Hocutt showed a Power Point analysis presentation of the Board Reports wherein the slides were sorted by the recommend action: Approval or Disapproval. The Committee unanimously approved all the Board Reports that were marked for Approval, with the exemption of BR# 1212 which received one vote against approval; All BRs with a Disapproval recommendation were disapproved. Within this group, BR's 1201 and 1202 were disapproved, as there was no evidence that PUSD's plan to receive money from the State of California from the Clean Energy Act had been approved by the state. During the discussion it was suggested that the priority-spending plan should be referred to as a Facilities Master Plan since it represented the plan for spending the balance of Measure TT funds. It was also noted that the numbers in the plan are problematic because there is no assurance that the budget numbers contained therein are accurate. It was noted by the Committee that the priority-spending plan was on the "consent" agenda before the Board. That means that the Board could approve all the items with one vote with no discussion of the priorities or the concerns of the COC or the public. It was stated that the spend plan would be pulled from "consent" and discussed separately at a later time. Board Reports 1201,102,103,1204,1210,1213 and 139-B were disapproved by the COC.

[Editor's note: all the noted BR's were approved by the Board of Education the following day.]

E. Proposition TT Financial Report

Mr. Hocutt

i. District's response to outstanding requests for information.

Mr. Hocutt noted that Facilities has provided the COC some of the information the COC has asked for in order to produce the COC's proposed financial report, but information is still lacking to make a complete report.

ii. What's next? Proposed formats.

Mr. Hocutt, Ms. Kenne

Mr. Hocutt presented a rough draft of a proposed "Construction Status Report" requesting it be updated and submitted by Facilities on a monthly basis; Ms. Kenne asked to have the following additional information included in that report:

1. The project number or resource code number be on this report
2. That architect and contractor initials or a short name be included
3. The stage/phase the project is in
4. The projected or estimated end of the stage the project is in
5. The whole project estimated completion date
6. Percentage of completion, only when project is at the Construction stage.

Ms. Vance noted that having separate Financial and Status Reports would be a good idea and encouraged Facilities to follow through.

Mr. Hocutt then presented a newly revised draft of the proposed “Financial Report,” based on the new spend-out plan. Subsequently Ms. Vance noted that her idea was to have a Financial Report that staff could readily pull out of the accounting system. Ms. Rahn asked Mr. Perez about the possibility of getting a report similar to the one Mr. Hocutt presented; Mr. Perez answered that the Chief of Facilities has offered to prepare something similar on a quarterly basis, not on a monthly basis.

It was pointed out that there are potential problems in the accounting system with regard to budgets, expenditures and commitments, and this matter was postponed for further discussion.

Ms. Rahn expressed her extreme disappointment in not having the information the COC is asking for, although some of the information has been provided. Ms. Vance made a request for a representative of Colbi Technologies to meet with the COC to help explain how data from the current systems can be used for the proposed reports.

Mr. Perez was emphatically asked to take the proposed reports back to Facilities and ask for a commitment as to how and when they can start to be produced.

Facilities was put on notice that the COC intends for its concerns to be heard by the PUSD and taken seriously.

F. Outstanding requests for information

Mr. Hocutt

- i. How the numbers contained in April 2017 “Spend-out Plan” were derived and reconciliation with last approved budget**
- ii. Norma Coombs project information, including reconciliation with numbers shown on the “Spend-out Plan”.**
- iii. Law requiring separate bids for 3 similar athletic tracks (promised by Facilities on March 15, 2017)**
- iv. Institution of follow-up procedures by the COC**

Discussion of Item F was postponed until the next meeting due to the lateness of the hour.

G. Uniform standards for Proposition TT expenditures

Mr. Hocutt

The Uniform standards for Proposition TT expenditures were unanimously approved by the COC and will be posted on the COC website.

H. Committee membership

Ms. Vance

i. Appointment of new members

Ms. Vance informed the COC that acceptance of the prospective new members to the COC would be voted upon in the upcoming Board of Education meeting.

ii. New member orientation package

Ms. Vance informed the Committee that the new member orientation presentation would be e-mailed to all, and that she would schedule a meeting with the new members to discuss it, before the next COC meeting.

I. Report by Board liaison to the COC

Ms. Kenne

Ms. Kenne discussed several items:

1. She had enjoyed interviewing the candidates for membership in the COC and thanked Mr. Hocutt for assisting her.
2. She attended a Facilities staff meeting last week and that it was “very informative.”
3. She thought that during the last couple of months the budget numbers in “Accountability” (*the PUSD accounting system for Facilities*) have not been updated.
4. She expressed that she is not comfortable yet that the District is ready to vote on the prioritization plan for the rest of the TT funds, and that more clarity is needed on the budget numbers.
5. She informed the COC that the Boundary and Consolidation Committee has not started meeting yet.
6. She shared her concern regarding the COC’s viewpoint that many of the “needs analysis” studies should not have been charged to Measure TT due to the fact that funds to do actual construction (based on those studies) will not be available.
7. She expressed the opinion that the COC needed a parliamentarian who could keep us on track and on a timed agenda.
8. She noted that the upcoming Board of education agenda included a discussion of the plans for the Linda Vista Elementary school site.

J. Report by COC liaison to Facilities Committee

Mr. Cole was not present at the meeting

K. Report from Site Council Representatives

Ms. Verdugo & Mr. Ordonez

A report was given on the Site Council activities at Roosevelt, Washington and at DAC (the District Advisory Council.) It was noted that site councils are not always properly communicative about their meeting times. A request for name tags (from Facilities) was made for those persons attending the site council meetings. A request was made for a future discussion as to whether the COC members should be attending site council meetings.

Mr. Ordonez reported he had attended a Facilities meeting wherein the architects for Longfellow and contractors had discussed current plans. He noted that a discussed objective was to keep the project below the \$5 million mark. Ms. Vance noted that the budget in the spend-out plan for Longfellow is only \$2M. Ms. Kenne noted that the \$5M project(s) included more activity than is currently listed on the spend-out plan. (*One of the disapproved Board Reports had included architectural fees based on both projects.*)

V. FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS, DATES, AND LOCATIONS *Mr. Hocutt*

The next COC meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 19, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the PUSD Education Center on Hudson Avenue.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hocutt

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24 PM.