

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BOND CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Robert Garcia, Chairman

Planning and Conservation League

Michael Lehrer, Vice Chairman

American Institute of Architects, LA

Constance Rice

L.A. City Controller

Barbara Sandoval

L.A. Mayor's Office

Edwin Ramirez

Compensatory Education Advisory Committee

Scott Folsom

Tenth District PTSA

Cliff Mansfield

Thirty-First District PTSA

Tyler McCauley

County of Los Angeles

Aba Ramirez

LAUSD Student Parent

Betty Valles

AARP Legislative Team

Anastacio Medina

American Lung Association

John Hakel

Associated General Contractors of CA

Richard Slawson

L.A. Co. Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

Pilar Hoyos

California Taxpayers' Association

Rupert Grant

L.A. Chamber of Commerce

Tanyika Carter

Staff Aide

Joseph P. Buchman – Legal Counsel

Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP

Thomas Rubin

Oversight Committee Consultant

Healthy Schools, Healthy Parks, Healthy Communities

To: LAUSD Board of Education, Superintendent Roy Romer, Chief Operating Officer Tim Buresh, Facilities Executive James McConnell
From: Robert García, Chairman, LAUSD School Bond Oversight Committee
Cc: LAUSD School Bond Oversight Committee
Re: Healthy Schools, Healthy Parks, Healthy Communities
Date: June 16, 2003 -- REVISED July 29, 2003

Part I. Overview

Los Angeles needs healthy schools, healthy parks, and healthy communities. The Oversight Committee recognizes that school construction, modernization, and repair raise educational reform, human health, and sustainable regional planning concerns. The shared vision between the Oversight Committee and LAUSD is to build and maintain schools that promote the full development of the child, are educationally and environmentally sound, enhance their neighborhoods through design and programming as centers of community, and reflect the wise and efficient use of limited land and public resources, as stated in the Oversight Charter.

Consistent with that vision, the Oversight Committee supports the development of green, sustainable high performance schools as centers of community with the joint use of playgrounds, parks, libraries, and other common areas. The strategic execution plans for new school construction and for modernization and repair express the LAUSD's commitment to implement the stated vision, as do the resolutions for (1) green schools, (2) high performance schools, and (3) joint use of schools, playgrounds and parks adopted by the Oversight Committee, the LAUSD Board of Education, or both. The stated vision is consistent with the recent focus by LAUSD on the concepts of smaller learning centers and the urban learning village. The concept of smaller schools with 300-500-student 'academic houses' is a positive goal which could be incorporated into the next wave of school building in the district.

LAUSD's New Construction program is not only building classrooms, but also Open Space, Libraries, Recreation Facilities, Community Auditoria, and Community Gathering Areas. LAUSD has over 5,245 acres of existing facilities, with 2,021 dedicated as open playground space. About 440 acres are being acquired in the new construction program, and over 240 acres of those will be open space. 240 acres can be very significant to an overdeveloped area such as Los Angeles, and especially an extremely dense area such as the inner city. On the other hand, that is 2 acres per new school, less than the size of a soccer field. In addition, the new construction program will build 139 Basketball courts, 180 Ball Fields, 12 Swimming Pools, and 140 Tennis

Courts; and plant 10,000,000 sq. ft. of grass, and 12,000 trees. In addition, LAUSD is working with county and city leadership for increased greening of our schools and communities through such programs as DWP Cool Schools program, Hollywood Beautification Project (HBP), and the Tree People.

The values at stake are similar for schools, playgrounds, and parks.

Los Angeles is park poor, with fewer acres of parks per thousand residents compared to any major city in the country. There are also unfair disparities in access to good schools, parks, playgrounds, and recreation based on race, ethnicity and class. The families without adequate schools, playgrounds and parks in their own neighborhoods do not have access to cars or a decent transit system to reach playgrounds and parks in other neighborhoods.

Billions of dollars in state and local bond funds are available for the people of the Los Angeles region to invest in schools, playgrounds, and parks. This includes matching funds from approximately \$13 billion in state wide funds from Prop 47 passed in November 2002 for school construction and repair, and \$2.6 billion from Prop 40 passed in March 2002 for parks, clean air, and clean water, as well as \$3.35 billion in local funds from Measure K passed in November 2002 for LAUSD school construction and repair and \$2.4 billion in 1997 for LAUSD school construction and repair. We anticipate that additional state and local school bond measures will be on the ballot in 2004 and coming years. A General Accounting Office report in the mid-1990's estimated that putting school buildings in working order would require a new investment of \$112 billion, a figure that states have been unable to raise on their own.¹

In January 2002 the LAUSD School Bond Oversight Committee published a report documenting the \$600 million gap between school modernization projects and funding under Proposition BB. We produced that report through a process in which the Chairman of the Oversight Committee posed a series of questions to Tom Rubin, the Oversight Consultant, and Mr. Rubin provided the responses and analyses based on his research and interviews with LAUSD representatives.

This memorandum presents a series of concerns with a similar process in mind. We anticipate that Facilities staff working with Tom Rubin and the Chairman of the Oversight Committee will provide responses and analyses of the following matters based on information gathered from appropriate LAUSD officials, including Board of Education members, Superintendent Romer, and staff. We will agree upon a time frame for completing the responses, and anticipate that some areas will be addressed before others. The fact that we address an issue does not imply that we believe there is a problem, only that we seek the information necessary to understand the situation.

A. Overcrowding, Year Round Calendars, and Impacts on Education

The use of multi-track, year-round calendars, portable classrooms, and forced busing, the most popular answers to the problem of overcrowding, harms the education, health, and safety of our children. Multi-track calendars allow schools with burgeoning enrollments to house more students without building adequate facilities. Abbreviated calendars do not afford students the opportunity to cover the entire curriculum as effectively as students on a traditional calendar. Concept 6 schools, for example, have 163 days in the school year instead of 180. Temporary portable classrooms provide an inferior learning environment and eliminate much-needed recreational space from school campuses. Forcibly busing students out of overcrowded schools to schools with more space reduces student academic achievement, impedes parental involvement, cuts into recreation and exercise time, and exposes students to diesel and other air toxins. We are particularly concerned by the concentration of overcrowding in the inner cities and the disproportionate representation of low-income students of color in overcrowded schools.

In the search for space, portable classrooms often impinge on playground space. In LAUSD, playground space has become rare, as portable classrooms have proliferated. Wonderland Elementary, with an enrollment of more than 200, has 2 tenths of an acre of playground space; Monte Vista Elementary, with an enrollment of more than 500, has less than half an acre of playground space; Woodlawn Elementary, Wilton Place Elementary, Cahuenga Elementary, Ramona Elementary, and Santa Monica Elementary, each with an enrollment of more than 800, has less than an acre of playground space; and Hoover Elementary and Hobart Elementary, each with an enrollment of 1,500, has only 1 acre of playground space.

B. School, Playgrounds, and Parks

Schools with playing fields, parks, and recreation are not a luxury. Parks and playing fields provide a place to play, watch the birds, walk around, or just sit under a tree. Parks and playgrounds provide recreation for children and their families. Recreation and team sports can improve human health; inspire players and fans; educate players through life-long lessons in teamwork, leadership, and self-esteem; and provide an alternative to gangs, crimes, drugs, violence, prostitution, teen sex, and unwanted pregnancies. Sports are among the most valued cultural and historical resources in many communities, like soccer in Latino and other immigrant communities.

Parks and green playgrounds are the city's lungs, essential components of its health and quality of life. Parks and green playgrounds clean the air, purify pollutants from the ground, break the heat, and breathe life into the neighborhood. Parks can improve surrounding real estate values, create quality jobs, and contribute to the economic vitality of the community.

Education, public health and safety, livability and the economy are all essential priorities. Schools with playgrounds, parks, and recreation advance each one.

C. Human Health

The human health implications of the need for playgrounds, playing fields, parks, and active recreation in Los Angeles are particularly profound.

Nearly 40% of California children are not physically fit and more than 25% are overweight. The problem is most pronounced in Los Angeles County, according to a recent comprehensive study of fifth-, seventh-, and ninth-graders. Los Angeles County is home to eight of the nine state assembly districts with the worst findings. The districts in the County with the highest proportion of overweight children in the state also had the highest concentration of people of color.² The obesity problem is especially acute for children in minority communities. Mexican-American and African-American children are twice as likely as non-Hispanic white children to have a body mass index of more than 25, the definition of overweight.³

A recent study released by the state Department of Education found that most California students are overweight and/or unfit as defined by state standards. The report concluded that fewer than one-fourth of children statewide are physically fit, based on the state's six-part fitness test, known as Fitnessgram. The study showed that test scores improved along with achievement on the Fitnessgram.

This county and statewide problem reflects an epidemic of obesity for children and others in the United States today. This serious public health problem is the result of urban areas with insufficient parks and disparities in access to active recreation, as in Los Angeles, as well as marketing by fast-food chains and individual eating habits. In the last three decades, the number of overweight young Americans has tripled, with no sign the trend is abating.⁴ Public health experts say overweight and unfit children face a greater risk of developing lung disease, diabetes, asthma and cancer.⁵ For the first time, children are being diagnosed with weight-related chronic ailments that usually strike much later in life, including hypertension and Type 2

diabetes. Diseased children, like adults, are at risk for heart and kidney troubles, blindness and limb amputation, but at an earlier age. As they age, these children will strain the health care system.⁶

At the National Institutes of Health, sixteen studies are being financed to study how to change environments to encourage a healthier lifestyle for young people — from day care and after-school activities to educating children about food. Young people in the United States today eat, move, and live quite differently than generations before them. Their lives have become sedentary, with more hours spent in front of a television or computer than at play or doing physical work. Neighborhoods in minority communities often lack adequate safe public places to play and exercise — an essential part of any weight-management equation. Regular exercise and activity can delay or prevent the onset of health complications for an overweight child.⁷

National surveys by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show inequitable disparities in physical activity based on income, race and education. African-Americans and Latinos are more likely than whites to report that they do not participate in any leisure-time physical activity. People with low levels of income and education are also more likely than others to say they participate in no leisure-time physical activity. Black students are more likely than whites to say they did not engage in any recreational exercise in the past week. White students are more likely than black or Latino students to report engaging in vigorous exercise at least three times per week.⁸

The UCLA Center for Health Policy Research recently issued a report on Diabetes in California, making a clear connection between diabetes (the seventh leading cause of death in the U.S.) and obesity, physical activity, race and ethnicity, education, income, and area of residence. UCLA reported that African American and Latino adolescents in California have higher rates of obesity than whites or Asians, placing them at greater risk of developing Type 2 Diabetes. Race and ethnicity and area of residence are significantly associated with elevated risk for obesity—the largest risk factor for Type 2 diabetes—even after controlling for age, gender, education, and income. Californians with lower incomes and less education are less likely to be physically active and are disproportionately affected by obesity. Significantly, adolescents living in urban areas were less likely to participate in regular physical activity than adolescents living in suburban areas.⁹

The UCLA study encourages communities to develop policies and practices that promote safe environments for physical activity, increase opportunities for physical education programs offered before, during, and after school, and address the fact that many people still face limited access to appropriate recreation facilities.¹⁰

D. Crime Prevention

Playgrounds, parks, and recreation programs help prevent gang violence, crime, prostitution, drug abuse, teen sex, and unwanted teen pregnancies. A 1992 study by the Los Angeles County District Attorney concluded that young people join gangs for the expected reasons, including the fact that they “have been excluded by distance and discrimination from adult-supervised park programs.”¹¹ The study recommends that “alternative activities like recreation” should be part of every gang prevention strategy. Organized sports like youth soccer leagues “fill those idle hours that seduce adolescent boys into trouble . . . At the least, they can keep older gang members busy during prime-time-crime hours . . . At the most, they can keep marginal boys too busy for gangs, or give them an excuse not to join.”¹²

E. Equal Justice

Equal access to parks and recreation is a state-wide concern. According to a recent survey on Californians and the environment by the influential California Public Policy Institute, sixty-four percent of Californians say that poorer communities have less than their fair share of well-maintained parks and recreational facilities. Latinos are far more likely than non-Hispanic whites (72% to 60%) to say that poorer

communities do not receive their fair share of these environmental benefits. A majority of residents (58%) agree that compared to wealthier neighborhoods, lower-income and minority neighborhoods bear more than their fair share of the environmental burdens of toxic waste and polluting facilities.¹³

Although – or because – communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately denied the benefits of parks and recreation, these communities were the biggest supporters of California’s recent Proposition 40 – the largest resource bond in United States history, with \$2.6 billion for parks, clean water and clean air. Prop 40 passed with the support of 77% of black, 74% of Latino voters, 60% of Asian, and 56% of non-Hispanic white voters. Seventy-five percent of voters with an annual family income below \$20,000 and 61% with a high school diploma or less supported Prop 40 – the highest among any income or education levels.¹⁴

Proposition 40 demolished the myth that the environment is a luxury that communities of color and low income communities cannot afford or are not willing to pay for.

F. Building Community and Diversifying Democracy

Schools and parks with playing fields for soccer and other team sports -- such as the Washington Irving Middle School in Glassell Park with a new sports field -- illustrate the ways that active recreation can help build community and diversify democracy. The first types of Latino immigrant organizations in major cities, for example, have been soccer leagues.¹⁵ New Latino immigrants do not organize politically, they organize soccer leagues. Soccer provides a social network that reduces the financial and social costs of immigrating, eases adjustment to a new culture, language, and life, and serves as a source of valuable information, job contacts, and other resources necessary to survive and to prevail.¹⁶ Immigrants meet regularly at parks to play soccer and share information and resources. Social relationships and organizational ties to soccer teams and leagues intensify social integration, sustain communities, and solidify the settlement process. Youth soccer offers the added benefit of bringing families together. Parents go to weekly soccer games to watch their children play. At the games, parents talk, learn about employment opportunities, share information with each other, and spend quality time with their children and their neighbors.

Part Two. Specific Implementation Concerns

With the above background in mind, we ask LAUSD to respond to the following concerns.

A. Planning

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the August 20, 2003, Committee hearing.

1. Should there be a single facilities strategic plan over and above the separate strategic execution plans for construction and modernization? Why or why not?
2. What is the relationship between the strategic execution plans for school construction and modernization on the one hand and the Superintendent’s strategic plan?
3. What are the priority educational objectives identified by the Superintendent and how are they incorporated into the planning process?
 - a. Examples: community and joint use of schools, small learning centers, satellite facilities, alternate calendars, smaller schools, academic houses.

4. Are there comprehensive operational strategic plans that are provided to Facilities for use in planning?
 - a. Example: Is there a preK-12 comprehensive physical education program that clearly identifies educational objectives and what physical facilities are required to allow the educational objectives to be delivered? Is this a holistic program that looks at all aspects of physical education, from nutrition and food service to health science studies to diversity of individual and group sports/athletic opportunities? Does this operational strategic plan incorporate the preK, after school, adult and community services opportunities?
 - b. According to recent news coverage, LAUSD apparently is not in compliance with federal laws on physical education requirements. What are the legal requirements for physical education of students? Is LAUSD in compliance?
 - c. What is the relevance of the Rodriguez consent decree, if any, governing playground size and other relevant issues?
5. How are operational strategic plans and requirements communicated to Facilities; who is the designated authority to approve the requirements and is it differentiated at central versus local district level? How is it verified that Facilities has responded to the operational requirements? (This is a big question. It basically says: Do you have a Client? Do you know who the Client is? Does the Client know who the Client is?)
6. What is needed at the regulatory and legislative level to enable Facilities to respond to educational objectives?
7. How are best practices research incorporated into the planning process? What is the relationship between the state regulatory agencies, educational leaders, and the requirements provided to Facilities for planning, design and delivery of facilities?
8. How does Facilities evaluate existing campus sites for potential re-design? Are there master plans for potential re-design on any existing campus sites? What would be the cost of developing master plans for re-use of existing campus sites on a complex or local district basis?
9. What is the status of the comprehensive graphic facilities management database (proposed as Maximo software)? What is the final objective for the capabilities and maintenance of this software program? Will it have the capability to generate maintenance and operations work tickets? Will it have the capability to record and manage the technology infrastructure? What are the major milestones to having a fully functioning database and what are the obstacles/constraints to completing this?
10. During the planning for the November 2002 local bond, there was extensive work done in developing a “dashboard” evaluation of all the existing campus sites. Has that been completed? Is it utilized?
11. How is LAUSD actively engaging other agencies, bond funds, entities like Trust for Public Land, in the site identification and additional funding search for phase 2?
12. What is the Joint Use and Urban Design Working Group and how will its work be integrated into the Facilities planning and implementation process?
13. Angelo Bellomo has testified before the Oversight Committee on analyzing the impact on communities of color and low-income communities in LAUSD’s environmental impact statements and reports. How will this be implemented?

B. Design

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the September 17, 2003, Committee hearing.

1. Design quality is enormously important in creating successful learning environments. Is there an evaluation of design quality, in addition to consultant performance at each phase of the project? Is this evaluation in both directions and does it identify potential missed opportunities that should be surfaced to senior management both for decision and for identification of broader patterns in the design management process?"
2. When value engineering or constructability reviews are conducted, is there a checklist that ensures recommendations are implemented in design documents? Are long term costs considered during value engineering, or are only construction costs considered? Is there a feedback loop at construction bid and at project closeout that is incorporated in cost history, design specifications and instructions to the design project managers?
3. What is the current mission, procedures and involvement of the Design Advisory Council (DAC) for the next phase of school development? Will the DAC be involved in the development of Design guidelines and/or recommendations for Phase 2? If not, how will important information and lessons learned become implemented in Phase 2?
4. What percentage of schools designed in the Phase 1 process achieved CHPS certification? For those that did not, why not? Will Facilities require that all schools in the next phase be CHPS certified and what will be done to ensure that no school is missed?
5. Is there a certification process for the joint and community use of schools, playgrounds, parks, libraries and other facilities that is quantifiable by analogy to the CHPS or LEED certification? Should there be? What should the certification standards look like? What is LAUSD doing to develop such a certification process?
6. How many total acres does LAUSD own? How many acres are presently occupied by schools? How many acres of school property does LAUSD own that would be open space without portable classrooms? How many acres of school grounds are used by portable classrooms? How many acres of playground and playing space will each new school have?
7. What are the obstacles to having community and joint use of schools, playgrounds, and parks? What are the solutions -- regulatory, legislative, bureaucratic, or otherwise?
8. What is the City of Los Angeles doing to work with LAUSD to implement the joint and community use of schools, playgrounds, and parks? Is the City doing everything it could and should be doing? If not, why not? What more could and should the City be doing? And vice versa - how is the LAUSD approaching City Agencies? What initiatives are being taken?
9. How is the Facilities group proactively seeking and obtaining additional funding for sustainable initiatives, including energy efficiency grants?

C. Procurement

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the August 20, 2003, Committee hearing.

1. What percentage, number and dollar value of projects in phase 1 were planned for procurement by other methods than design-bid-build? What was the time and cost implications for these alternative methods?
 - a. Example: were the legal and project management costs greater for alternative methods? Did LAUSD learn enough to be able to implement alternative procurement methods without incurring additional legal and management costs and time delays? (What has been the experience of Eric Johnson at Accelerated?)
2. Has LAUSD been able to implement bulk procurement of any items for the new construction program? If not, why?
3. How does the Facilities procurement function recognize and evaluate the value of existing consultant providers, particularly those with high learning curves (such as real estate executives?) How does the Facilities procurement evaluate the cost advantages or disadvantages of consultant services versus employee services?
4. What constraints/obstacles exist in timely, clear, concise procurement requests and service delivery? What time frame is allowed from the point of identification of service need to fully executed and approved consulting contracts?
5. Does Facilities request feed back from prospective professional services bidders on the clarity and feasibility of the procurement RFP/RFQ processes? Does Facilities utilize other agency RFP/RFQ experience and evaluators? How are evaluators selected?
6. What processes are in place to ensure equal opportunity and outreach to local, small and minority businesses down to the subcontractor level? What is the current success rate of outreach?
7. Does Facilities utilize a web-based procurement for general contracting bidding? Pros/cons?
8. What is the status of the RFP for improving outreach to small and locally owned businesses as per the discussions between Oversight Committee members and LAUSD staff?
9. How is Facilities incorporating the new labor compliance regulations into the procurement process?
10. What is the Facilities position and plan to utilize at-risk contracts, or transfer the responsibility/accountability for delivery of construction projects from internal to the external service providers?
11. What regulatory, funding, political, and legislative obstacles still remain to alternative, risk-managed delivery methods? What is the Facilities plan to address these issues in the next 24 months?
12. See also the section on Jobs below.

D. Reporting

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the August 20, 2003, Committee hearing.

1. What are the validation points and processes to make sure the data reported is both timely and accurate?
 - a. Example: Recent reports of the cost overruns at 450 N. Grand. This project went through 3 strategic plan update reviews, monthly project management reports that supposedly identified cost and schedule issues and were approved by the project manager, regional director and

director of construction management who all had access to estimating, constructability and value engineering reviews, and an additional screening of costs due to the Eli Broad opportunities for a performing arts theater over the past 24 months. How did it take so long for the cost overrun to surface? What safety nets are in place for this type of issue?

- b. Example: The additions projects are significantly over budget and as much as 12 to 18 months delayed or more. What actions are taken to mitigate this type of situation rather than just reporting on it for a year? Can we get a special focus report on the failure to deliver on time, the difficulties of poor planning/design, opportunities for correction? These projects are at existing campus sites where the impact is most significant. Can the projects be bundled into 3-5 geographic regions and outsourced to at-risk construction management/general contractor teams to deliver in an expedited manner?
2. There is a significant amount of information on the Facilities website, laschools.org. What are the next steps in maintaining and/or improving this site? What is the role of the facilities information management group within the greater LAUSD technology information infrastructure? Will the quality of this website data continue to be maintained? Why is the Facilities site different from the LAUSD site and why are there no apparent links to either the LAUSD site or to the Oversight Committee site? Why is the Oversight Committee web site virtually impossible to find? Why are there no search engines on the Facilities or LAUSD sites?

E. Management

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the September 17, 2003, Committee hearing.

1. What evaluation metrics are applied to each level of design, project and construction management to ensure that LAUSD is receiving the value contracted for?
2. What is the specific analysis used to determine whether a position is contract, consultant or employee? What obstacles and constraints exist in attempting to implement the appropriate position?
3. What is the typical workload for a project/construction manager?
4. How is planning, development, design and construction management planned for phase 2?
5. What have been the successes/missed opportunities in the real estate relocation program in phase 1? Since the next phase will most likely impact a significantly larger number of residences, what is the plan for phase 2 relocation? Are there funding opportunities for replacement housing stock?

F. Future bonds

The Superintendent and LAUSD staff will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at the same time and under the same conditions as they report to LAUSD Board of Education members.

1. What steps are being taken to prepare for future local school bonds?
2. What steps are being taken to prepare for future statewide school bonds?
3. What steps are being taken regarding joint-use incentives in future local and state school bonds?

4. What steps are being taken to learn from the lessons of Prop 40 in terms of the diversity of support for that proposition, and the importance of parks, air and water for communities of color and low-income communities, particularly in terms of the joint use of schools, playgrounds, and parks?

G. Communications

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the August 20, 2003, Committee hearing.

What steps are in place or being taken to institutionalize the efficient and fair provision of information so that the Oversight Committee can engage in oversight not hindsight?

H. Outreach

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the August 20, 2003, Committee hearing.

How is LAUSD evolving community outreach into true community engagement for the next phase of planning, design and development? What is the relationship between the Facilities community outreach department, the superintendent's office of communications and legislation, and the local district superintendent resources? What is planned to improve the level of information available to the community outreach department and their role in the development of new schools?

The Oversight Committee's recent hearing in Huntington Park drove home the lesson that LAUSD is not reaching the community with information about school construction, modernization, and repair. Parents do not know when their schools will be built, modernized, or repaired, and do not know who to ask. Principals do not have the information. The Oversight Committee has formed a task force to address these concerns and will prepare recommendations within 30 days.

I. Jobs

LAUSD is scheduled to report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at the July 30, 2003, Committee hearing.

As per the discussions between Dr. BJ Hawkins, Oversight Committee members and LAUSD staff, there are a number of issues that, if resolved, would be of assistance to both LAUSD Facilities and to the Centralized Purchasing Department as the new school construction and renovation programs are implemented. The following is largely based on information obtained from Dr. Hawkins from OFS, The Business Doctors.

Currently there are no adequate processes that allow small and local businesses access to the RFP process. This fact reduces SBE's and LBE's ability to be awarded contracts and virtually eliminates opportunities for them to be a prime contractor.

This, however, is a symptom and not the problem. LAUSD's requisition and approval processes for construction and similar activities are manual. This results in the following:

- The paper circulation process required for approval signatures is time consuming, tedious, and opens the possibility for errors and lost or misplaced documents.

- The bidding process is more exclusionary than inclusionary, which is partially the result of obsolete business processes. Further, many of the existing policies are contrary to Best Practices in the field of public procurement.
- Reporting is neither immediate nor accurate. Data is dispersed and neither easily accessible nor auditable.
- It is tedious, time consuming, and at times, impossible to provide timely and accurate reporting.

If the LAUSD online bidding board is compared with the LADWP online bidding solution, the Facilities site contains confusing details and the bids are posted only as a synopsis. Online bidding is not possible.

A vendor is required to call to obtain the bid package. Important supporting documents are also dispersed: the specific school location repair, refurbishment, and modernizations are linked and listed on a separate (www.eBidboard.com) bid board site; the specifications are listed on a separate site (www.cqxpess.com) site; and plans are listed on www.buzzsaw.com. All told, this makes acquiring the entire bid package difficult, if not impossible, for vendors or suppliers.

The requirements of this process limit competition, defeat outreach efforts to small businesses, and make it unlikely that the 25% goal from the LAUSD Board will be achieved.

According to Dr. Hawkins, the OFSTM ProcurementNETTM solution successfully addresses:

- business processes
- best practices in public procurement
- increased awards to small and local business
- lengthy approval and bid processing time

The OFSTM solution has an additional benefit: the reduction of direct and indirect costs associated with purchasing, procurement, and contracts. For example, Dr. Hawkins guarantees savings between 15 and 20% for any transaction that requires more than 7 days processing time.

Without detailed assessment and evaluation, further substantive examples cannot be provided. Nonetheless, the OFS team has spent sufficient time reviewing LAUSD processes and in discussions with staff and vendors to have a clear understanding of what remedies must be implemented to provide a comprehensive solution, according to Dr. Hawkins.

J. Housing

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the November 2003 Committee hearing.

The same land is potentially available for schools, parks, and housing. Is there a strategic plan for LAUSD to address housing issues? What is it? What housing entities or non-profit organizations have been contacted?

K. Equity Analysis

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the September 17, 2003, Committee hearing.

In the spring of 2002 LAUSD began a process to gather, analyze, and publish the information necessary for LAUSD to certify that Proposition BB funds are spent in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of

1964 and its regulations, as well as California Government Code section 11135 and its regulations. Both federal and state law prohibit intentional discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin, as well as unjustified discriminatory impacts for which there are less discriminatory alternatives. We request that LAUSD complete this study not only of BB funds but of Measure K funds as well so that the Oversight Committee and the public can understand the impact of LAUSD's policies and practices on all communities and can evaluate the certification. By asking for this information and certification, we do not in any way insinuate that discrimination has occurred. In particular we ask LAUSD to focus on school construction, modernization, and repair projects in light of the concerns discussed above.

L. Joint Use

LAUSD will report to the Bond Oversight Committee on this issue at or before the October 2003 Committee hearing.

What are the current processes in place to insure joint use be considered as part of the planning process for each school complex, new school, and re-planned/ expanded existing campuses?

How will LAUSD engage other agencies in the planning process for the specific goal of joint use?

How does LAUSD incorporate issues of community and urban design into the planning process?

1. Organizations outside of LAUSD utilize LAUSD facilities for compatible purposes during school hours, after school hours or on the weekends on both short term and long term commitments.
 - a. Design Issues
 - i. Have all new schools have been designed for this type of joint use? Are public areas, such as libraries, auditoriums, athletic facilities, restrooms, etc., accessible by the public without having to open up the entire educational facility (which creates a maintenance and security problem)? Has exterior security access for each facility been designed to limit points of entry without appearing to be a lock-down facility?
 - ii. If the sustainability of the finish materials in the public spaces is of a medium level, this will require correct and persistent maintenance to have a full life span with the increased public use. This is a budgetary reality, and is also the least difficult to modernize/replace at future points. One opportunity is to provide more sustainable materials such as carpeting, acoustical tiles, soft fabric and alternative wall finishes, etc., across the state. An initiative from the DSA could reward those vendors who develop, get DSA approval, and provide reduced pricing to schools in exchange for pre-approved DSA status (and the corresponding volume potential.) What is LAUSD's position on such an initiative?
 - iii. Some existing campus sites have been improved for joint use during the modernization program, but the inability to develop comprehensive campus master plans (rather than design only the component that is currently funded) has restricted the ability of the teams to really take advantage of a lot of opportunities here. This should improve as facilities teams are no longer in crisis/management repair mode. What is LAUSD doing to achieve this?
 - b. Operational Issues
 - i. Operating agreements are for the most part still negotiated and implemented at the local site level, which requires time and a commitment from the local staff and administration to

initiate and administer. Some templates and guidelines are available from central leasing and maintenance/operations, but additional work could be done to make it easier for local site staff to obtain written agreements for items to be covered such as terms of rent/maintenance fees, hours of use, etc. What is LAUSD doing to achieve this?

- ii. Metrics for the actual costs / benefits of these types of joint use need to be established with real data (for example, what is the real cost of keeping classrooms open at night for adult education?) What is LAUSD doing to develop and implement such metrics?
 - iii. Some local campus sites have quite successful long term organizational commitments, such as the neighborhood schools engaged with USC. This model needs to be packaged and provided for those schools that do not have the experience already in place as to how to build this type of community relationship. What is LAUSD doing to achieve this?
 - iv. Additional resources could be provided as a function of the 501C foundation. What is LAUSD doing to achieve this?
 - v. Outside organizations still have a confusing time finding the appropriate places to connect within LAUSD to establish long term relationships. What is LAUSD doing about this?
 - vi. LAUSD needs a public information campaign to celebrate successful joint use relationships currently in place, primarily for the purpose of initiating new partnership ideas in communities and acknowledging to the community that these relationships are a key component of the educational environment. Is there is a single place where one could go to get a complete list of joint use relationships? If so, where? If not, why not?
2. Organizations outside of LAUSD allow LAUSD students, faculty and staff to utilize their facilities for compatible purposes during school hours, after school hours or on the weekends on both short term and long term commitments.
- a. A variety of agreements are facility only arrangements. In other words, LAUSD has a function (such as an adult education class) that needs a space and LAUSD rents the facility outside of LAUSD facilities.
 - b. It is necessary to have an inventory of these types of joint uses where the outside organization is also part of the function and operation (for example, do they participate or provide the training or activity needed by LAUSD?) An example of this type of joint use would be the extremely large number of programs conducted by DWP in their facilities with our students.
 - c. There should also be some inventory of cooperative education programs with community colleges, universities and other adult education programs.
 - d. There should also be an inventory and initiative of private corporate sponsorships and internships for LAUSD students.
 - e. It is necessary to keep in mind any of these types of joint use relationships that might exist with service providers, such as early child care, health and wellness organizations. What is LAUSD doing in regard to each of these joint use opportunities?

- f. There is some reason to believe that there is an extraordinary amount of this happening but with no public information in a coherent manner. What is LAUSD doing to gather, analyze and publish such information?
3. Organizations outside of LAUSD participate in the planning, funding, design, and development of LAUSD owned facilities for the purpose of long term cooperative uses.
 - a. This concept of joint use is centered on the idea that if multiple agencies combine their resources to meet mutually compatible or overlapping needs, the sum of their funding parts will deliver a greater facility whole. This is conceptually possible. What is the impact of the reality of funding rules, timelines, agency staffing, legal restrictions, and insufficient funding? Is this currently a nearly prohibitive venture? What is LAUSD doing about this?
 - b. Several initiatives by local Los Angeles agencies indicate a willingness to develop transparent long term strategic need plans, which are the first tools required to coordinate the conflicting funding rules and deadlines, legal requirements, staffing and resource needs to have a coordinated planning effort. It does not appear that the execution of these initiatives is fully funded, so the actual work product remains to be seen. What is LAUSD doing about this? Can LAUSD identify agencies that are engaged in best practice examples?
 - c. The single most important element for this concept of joint use to work is for the highest level of leadership in each agency to completely and truly embrace the concept, and be willing to provide incentives for their staff to execute this most difficult work process. What is LAUSD doing about this? Can LAUSD identify agencies that are engaged in best practice examples?

CONCLUSION

We look forward to working with LAUSD and the public to address these concerns to serve the best interests of the children of Los Angeles.

¹ A General Accounting Office report in the mid-1990's estimated that putting school buildings in working order would require a new investment of \$112 billion, a figure that states have been unable to raise on their own. Editorial, Federal Help for Crumbling Schools, N.Y. Times, May 16, 2003.

² Charles Ornstein and Erika Hayasaki, "26% of Kids Overweight, Study Finds," L.A. Times (Dec. 12, 2002).

³ Editorial, "The Youth Obesity Epidemic," N.Y. Times (Nov. 29, 2002).

⁴ Id.

⁵ Ornstein and Hayasaki, *supra*.

⁶ "The Youth Obesity Epidemic," *supra*.

⁷ Id.

⁸ Rebecca Flournoy, Regional Development and Physical Activity: Issues and Strategies for Promoting Health Equity, A Policylink Report (Nov. 2002).

⁹ UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, Diabetes in California: Findings from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey (April 2003).

¹⁰ Id.

¹¹ Gangs, Crime and Violence in Los Angeles: Findings and Proposals from the District Attorney's Office (1992).

¹² Id.

¹³ Mark Baldasare, Public Policy Institute of California Statewide Survey: Special Survey on Californians and the Environment vi (June 2002).

¹⁴ L.A. Times state wide exit poll, March 7, 2002.

¹⁵ Juan Gonzalez, Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America 142, 145 (2000).

¹⁶ Pierrett Hondagneu-Sotelo, Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration 55 (1994).