

C.A.S.H. 30TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON SCHOOL FACILITIES

30 YEARS OF SCHOOL FACILITIES LEADERSHIP ADVOCACY ♦ EDUCATION ♦ COLLABORATION

Tuesday, February 24, 2009
2:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.
Sacramento Convention Center
Room 315

Workshop # 12

Legislative Update

Moderator:

Nina Boyd

Orange County Department of Education
(714) 966-4050
nboyd@ocde.us

Panelists:

Kathleen Chavira

Senate Education Committee
(916) 445-2522
kathleenchavira@sen.ca.gov

Tom Duffy

Coalition for Adequate School Housing
(916) 441-3300
tduffy@m-w-h.com

Mavonne Garrity

Office of Senator Lowenthal
(916) 651-4007
mavonne.garrity@sen.ca.gov

Sophia Kwong-Kim

Assembly Education Committee
(916) 319-2329



www.cashnet.org

CALIFORNIA'S
COALITION
for ADEQUATE
SCHOOL HOUSING

Legislative Update

Tuesday, February 24, 2009
2:15 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Sacramento Convention Center
Room 315

School Bond—Administrative and Program Improvements and Fiscal Provisions

- Administrative and Program Improvements
 - OPSC Close Out Audits
 - Amending Full and Final for Certification of Classrooms Built per Pupils Requested
 - SAB Flexibility on 18-month statute
 - Define “binding contracts” for Fund Release Requirement
 - Eliminate MTYRE 6% “Hit”
 - AB 1014 Cleanup for 10-year projection
 - AB 695 Cleanup for Locally-funded facilities
 - Portable Chargeability cleanup

School Bond—Administrative and Program Improvements and Fiscal Provisions

- Fiscal Provisions
 - Offsite Development Funding for NC and Mod
 - Modernization Funding and Grant Increases

Joint Occupancy Incentives

- Permit Joint Occupancy Agreements when district will not occupy the facility but a portion of the facility will:
 - Generate energy
 - Be used for childcare
 - Be used for career-technical education programs
 - Be used for public service

Joint Occupancy Incentives

- Assess prorated property taxes on private partner and deposit revenue into district's general fund. Property taxes not available for revenue limit calculations.

Joint Use

- Reintroduce SB 35 (Torlakson) with improvements and an operative date contingent upon passage of future school bond

Seismic Mitigation Program

- Improve Prop. 13 Seismic Mitigation Program by
 - Widening eligibility aperture by redefining seismically at-risk building
 - Provide funding for interim housing
 - Provide funding for structural evaluation
 - Creation of an Unfunded List

30-Year-Old or Older Portables

- Retire old portable classrooms and replace them with permanent classrooms. Limit the number of classrooms a district can replace per bond cycle.

DSA Close Out

- Streamline DSA Close Out procedures and deal with school board liability issues.

Williams Energy Settlement (WES) Funding

- Provide for greater access to the *Williams Energy Settlement (WES)* funding for schools seeking to improve energy efficiency or to pursue energy generation technologies.



CALIFORNIA'S
COALITION
for ADEQUATE
SCHOOL HOUSING™

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

February 24, 2009

C.A.S.H.'S 2009 LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

School Facility Program Reform: Restoring the Spirit of SB 50

- Funding for Complete, New Schools
- Program Reforms for Modernization
- Modernization Grant Increases
- Special Education Grant Increases
- Funding for Offsite Development (*Marina*)
- Funding for Access Compliance
- Eligibility, Enhancements and Level 2 Developer Fee Increases (match SFP)
- MTYRE 6% "Hit"
- School Construction Annual Grant Adjustment Index
- SAB discretion to extend 18-month statutory provision to enter into contracts

School Facility Program Eligibility: Portable Classrooms

- Restore SFP Eligibility for 30-year-old Portable Classrooms (limit total funding per bond cycle)
- Prohibit SFP Capacity Charge for Portable Classrooms

Seismic Retrofit and Replacement Program

- Funding for Seismic Safety Evaluations
- Funding for Interim Housing
- Creation of an Unfunded Approval list of Qualifying Projects

Sustainable, Green, Grid-Neutral Schools

- California Energy Commission's Solar Program for Schools
- Funding for new Green Building Standards (AB 32)

Alternatives to Low Bid

- Alternatives to low bid for projects that include Green Technology (i.e., cogeneration components, technology to reduce greenhouse gas emissions) in Government Code

Incentives for Joint Enterprise

- Expand Joint Occupancy Opportunities
 - Energy Production
 - Career Technical Education
 - Child Care
- Improve Joint-Use Program

IMPACT OF STATE FISCAL CRISIS ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The PMIB Funding Freeze

The School Facility Program (SFP) and funding provided to school districts under the program continues to be impacted by the “funding freeze” imposed by the State’s Pooled Money Investment Board (PMIB). The PMIB controls state expenses through the administration of the Pooled Money Investment Account (PMIA), from which it grants what are known as AB 55 loans, including funding for school infrastructure projects. All statewide school bond authorizations are funneled through the PMIA and allocated to school districts after they receive state apportionments and request to the Office of Public School Construction that those reserved funds be released.

It is unclear when the PMIB will lift its “freeze” on funding for infrastructure projects and much depends on the state’s ability to sell state general obligation bonds. The state’s \$40 billion deficit in the next 18 months, coupled with the prolonged budget debate and impasse, have made California bonds unattractive to investors and California’s credit rating has been downgraded by Moody’s. Thus, even a budget solution does not guarantee that the PMIB will be able to sell bonds and generate cash to lift the freeze in the short term while it grapples with accumulated debt and expenses that require immediate attention. As a result of the uncertainty, school districts are advised to plan wisely and move cautiously.

When the PMIB imposed the funding disbursement freeze at its December 17, 2008 meeting, C.A.S.H. provided our members with a “Brief Guide to Weathering the Storm.” We felt it important to restate the cautionary measures school districts can take to navigate through this crisis.

Assessing and Managing Construction Project Obligations During the Freeze

A Brief Guide for Weathering the Storm

In order to assist districts in preparing to respond to the state cash flow and bond crisis, C.A.S.H. has prepared a guide list for use by school districts and county offices of education. It is highly likely that many if not most of the school construction projects recently approved for apportionments by the State Allocation Board (SAB) that have yet to receive a fund release will not receive any funding from the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) until the state budget dilemma/cash flow crisis is resolved and the State Treasurer is able to sell bonds. The latter will not occur until the former takes place. Solvency must be the primary goal for district superintendents and boards during this unparalleled period in the history of K-12 education in California. The ability to sell bonds by the State Treasurer may not be immediate upon the resolution of the state budget stalemate. The recommendation to our member districts is that they should prepare to manage their local district cash flow difficulties and related issues for at least three months.

The media is well aware of the critical nature of the actions taken on December 17, 2008 by the Pooled Money Investment Board. Being prepared to address the questions of the media and the public in general during the funding freeze will be critical. It is our hope that this document assists district leaders in preparing to respond.

Below we have identified areas for districts to review relating to projects at the various stages of the State School Facility Program (SFP) process, as well as the planning and construction process. When appropriate we have suggested possible response actions for consideration. It is highly recommended that district legal counsel address issues involving circumstances of awarded bids and executed contracts.

1. District Projects Affected/Not Affected by the Action of the Pooled Money Investment Board

Districts should immediately investigate the status of each of their project applications. Generally projects will fall into the following four categories:

- a. District is preparing to file an application for apportionment;
- b. Districts have received an apportionment but have yet to seek a fund release;
- c. Districts that have filed a 50-05 requesting a fund release for which a state warrant has not been issued;
- d. Districts that have filed a 50-05 requesting a fund release to which the state responded by issuing a warrant releasing funds.

Districts in Categories “a” & “b” should carefully review the status of their projects for purposes of determining how to proceed with planning and whether to continue making expenditures at this time. These districts are not at risk to the extent that no commitments for construction contracts have been made and professional contracts have been limited to architectural services. Category “b” districts are at risk, however, of the timeline requirements within the SFP to be under contract for at least 50% of the project construction apportionment within 18 months of the apportionment date. Those districts in Category “b” that have entered into construction contracts may need to consider options identified below for addressing their contractual obligations. Districts in Category “c” will have entered into one or more construction contracts as a condition of filing a fund release request and will be financially at risk due to the funding freeze. Districts in Category “d” will have entered into one or more construction contracts as a condition of filing a fund release request and will not be financially at risk in that they have received a fund release.

It is anticipated that some districts will have multiple projects on file with OPSC at various stages in the application and construction process. It is recommended that these districts carefully review the need to proceed with Categories “a” & “b” projects while reserving local capital funds to address the needs of Category “c” projects.

2. Strategies to Address Contractual Obligations to Pay Contractors

It is recommended that districts establish at least four strategies to review and assess their ability to meet progress payments and manage the projects in the absence of state funds.

- a. The first strategy is that of an exhaustive internal review of cash on hand to meet payments anticipated over the life of the construction project. With a goal of protecting the district’s general fund all other funds must be considered. First, each and every capital fund should be reviewed and considered. These funds include but are not limited to general obligation bonds, parcel taxes, developer fees, redevelopment agency proceeds and surplus property income. A portion of the district’s Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes

(TRANS) may be available for use in the short term; these must be repaid periodically during the course of the fiscal year and completely repaid before June 30. Thereafter, reserves within the general fund may need to be considered for a short term inter-fund transfer.

- b. The second strategy is the district's financial advisor's review of options available as reviewed by bond counsel. This would include a review of the ability to use existing funds identified by the internal review. It may include the district's ability to access new funding through Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) based on the district's bonding level as authorized by local elections, and Revenue Anticipation Notes (RANs) based on an apportionment made to the district by the SAB (Categories "b" & "c" above). A BAN is based upon the anticipation of future bond sales and would be repaid with the sale of bonds in the future. A RAN, as with Certificates of Participation (COP's), is guaranteed by the district's general fund. It is important to keep in mind that credit for public agencies is difficult to obtain at this time and may be expensive through the freeze.
- c. The third strategy is a review of contract documents by legal counsel with expertise in construction for purposes of determining the district's options under the contract including ceasing construction temporarily and the ability to terminate the contract.
- d. The fourth strategy is the review of the construction plans and specifications by the architect and construction manager for purposes of identifying cost-saving changes such as reducing the scope of the project through the change order process or changes in the materials identified within the specifications. The former may include the complete elimination of an ancillary building, such as a library, while the latter could include the altering of the roof material from metal to a less costly built-up multiple layered roof. Districts seeking project scope reductions are advised to confer with the California Department of Education and the Office of Public School Construction for potential implications on their approvals.

The district may propose to the contractor that a higher percentage of "retention" be kept by the district during the freeze, with a lesser percentage kept upon the thaw. The common practice is 10%. There are specific statutory requirements relating to contract retentions; therefore, districts should seek legal counsel on this matter.

Each of the four strategies should be utilized and all may be utilized in a coordinated plan to continue the project while keeping the district solvent and avoiding litigation.

3. Managing Professional Services Contracts and Payment Obligations

The district's planning and construction team that may consist of the architect, structural engineer, construction manager or project manager, inspector and other consultants are vital to the ultimate success of the project. It is the norm for these individuals to take great pride in serving the district to deliver the project at hand. It is important to recognize that the compensation to their firm or company for their services is critical to their firm or company's survival. With such in mind and assuming that each professional service is critical to the project, the issue of cost reduction and/or control may be approached through two concepts. The first, much like project scope reduction, is consideration for a reduction of the scope of responsibilities

of one or more members of the team. This will be difficult and will yield only marginal savings if any. The second is a renegotiation of the various contracts with consideration for reductions in payments now with the deferral of the differentials to be paid in full at the time state project funding is received.

C.A.S.H. continues to advocate for protection for school districts during this unprecedented funding crisis. We are working collaboratively with the Office of Public School Construction and the State Allocation Board, the California Department of Education, and the Division of the State Architect to identify issues and find ways to help districts. *(See Administrative/Regulatory Issues (below) for information on regulatory amendments to mitigate the crisis).*

SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANT INCREASES

There are three significant grant adjustments that will require attention by the State Allocation Board in the short term, two of which are supported in law.

The first is the annual adjustment to the base per-pupil grants reflecting inflationary costs referred to as the CCI (construction cost index) adjustments. This annual adjustment is prescribed by the Education Code.

The second adjustment to the grant, also prescribed in the Education Code, is what we refer to as the AB 127 increase. The increase is so named because it was part of the 2006 bond bill that authorized the State Allocation Board to increase or decrease the base per-pupil grants *for new construction* annually, provided that the increase would not exceed 6%, to “cause the grants to correspond to costs for new school construction.” The adjustment was to be based on a study of school construction costs. Currently, the OPSC plans on using the information provided on the Project Information Worksheet (PIW) to make a recommendation to the SAB.

The third grant adjustment is a regulatory adjustment to the Site Development augmentation (“6% General Site Allowance”) that the board approved in 2006 when it was recognized that this allowance under the old Lease-Purchase Program was not translated into the calculation of the base per-pupil grants when the School Facility Program was created. The 6% General Site Allowance sunsetted in regulation on December 31, 2008. At the January 28, 2009 SAB meeting, the Chair directed staff to bring all of three items to the SAB at the same time.

C.A.S.H. will advocate strongly for the continuance of the 6% General Site Allowance since there was consensus and recognition that it was inadvertently omitted from the calculation of the SFP grants. Further, we continue to discuss the need for funding to allow school districts to build *complete new schools* and therefore need commensurate adjustments to the grants vis-à-vis the AB 127 authorization.

ADMINISTRATIVE/REGULATORY ISSUES

State Allocation Board Actions

The State Allocation Board, through the work of its staff in collaboration with C.A.S.H. and other stakeholders, has acted promptly to approve emergency regulations to cope with the PMIB

funding freeze. The board continues to review the SFP for issues that may harm districts while subject to the freeze. Below is a list of actions taken to date by the board to provide program relief for districts participating in the SFP.

- Stopping the Clock on the 18-Month Limit to Request Fund Release
- Stopping the Clock on the Requirement to Convert Preliminary Apportionments to Final Apportionments
- Clarifying Policy on Bridge Financing/Interfund Borrowing for Financial Hardship Districts

The full text of proposed regulations and the policy on bridge financing can be found on the OPSC website at <http://www.opsc.dgs.ca.gov/default.htm>.

Other issues that C.A.S.H. has identified and has requested that the State Allocation Board and the OPSC consider for relief efforts include the following:

- Financial Hardship Program Requirements
 - Stopping the Clock on the 6-Month Approved Financial Hardship Status Period
 - Stopping the Clock on the 18-Month Substantial Progress Requirement for Advance Site Acquisition/Design Apportionments
 - Ability to Use Savings for *Apportioned* Financial Hardship Projects
- Career Technical Education Program – 12-Month Time Limit on DSA/CDE Approval
- Joint Use Program (Type II Projects) – 12-Month Time Limit on DSA/CDE Approval

California Department of Education Actions

The California Department of Education (CDE) has informed school districts that it will work with them if their Final Approvals or Site Approvals are due to expire while in the funding freeze. CDE's Final Approvals are valid for five years and Site Approvals are valid for two years.

Division of the State Architect Actions

The Division of the State Architect (DSA) submitted, and the Building Standards Commission approved, emergency regulations to extend the maximum four-year DSA approval of architectural plans to a period not to exceed five years for those projects impacted by the PMIB funding freeze. Districts will have to substantiate that their project has been impacted by the freeze in order to be considered for this extension.

MAINTENANCE FUNDING

In light of the State Budget crisis, school maintenance funding and programs have been in danger of being reduced or eliminated throughout 2008 and continue to be in jeopardy going forward. The following is a summary of commonalities and differences between the various plans currently being discussed concerning school maintenance funding and programs.

Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP)

The Democratic budget proposal would eliminate DMP funding for the current year. The Governor's proposal includes \$302 million to fund the DMP in the current year and increases the DMP by \$35.5 million in 2009-10.

Routine Restricted Maintenance Account (RRMA)

Both the Governor's and Democratic budget proposals would reduce the required contribution to the RRMA from 3% to 1% and suspend the deferred maintenance match. The Democratic plan would reduce the contribution for 2008-09 only, while the Governor's proposal would reduce the contribution for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Net Ending Balances for Categorical Programs

The Governor's and Democratic proposals would allow districts to transfer categorical to net ending balances to general fund programs. The Democrats include the DMP but the Governor's proposal does not.

Emergency Repair Program (ERP) Funding

The Democratic proposal would eliminate the \$100 million appropriation made in the 2008-09 Budget Act for the ERP and redirects this funding to Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (current OPSC Status of Funds indicates \$101 million currently in the ERP account). The Democratic proposal also suspends any transfer of funds from the Proposition 98 Reversion Account to the ERP account for 2008-09 and 2009-10. The Democratic proposal also prohibits districts from using ERP funds to supplant deferred maintenance funds and from depositing these funds into district deferred maintenance accounts. The Governor's proposal is silent on ERP funding.

STORM WATER UPDATE

Background and Regulatory Framework

Primary Challenge of Storm Water Regulation

Managing storm water runoff presents significant technical challenges because of its diffuse and episodic nature, the range of pollutants requiring treatment, and the volume of runoff resulting from changes in land cover.

Federal - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) authorized the State to administer the NPDES, which uses statewide and regional programs to fulfill mandated requirements.

State – Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

This is the main statute that governs water quality control in California. Porter-Cologne subjects any activity or factor that affects water quality to regulation and covers point and non-point sources. In addition to pollutant discharges being subject to regulation, Porter-Cologne also regulates parameters such as flow rates or land use changes that can impose physical or temperature impacts. Applies to all waters of the State including wetlands and ground water and establishes the tenet that water discharges to state water are a privilege not a right.

State and Regional Water Board Authority and Regulatory Structure

The Porter-Cologne Act provides the SWRCB and the RWQCBs with the authority to establish water quality objectives, permitting authority and enforcement authority. The coordinated efforts between the State and Regional Boards constitute the primary mechanism through which the state addresses pollution and implements its control program. Members of the nine regional boards are appointed by the Governor.

Summary and Status of SWRCB Permits

Construction Permit

Regulates all construction activity. The SWRCB is in the process of significantly revising the CGP. The existing CGP describes ‘Low-Impact Development’ (LID) techniques, but does not establish a specified level of compliance. The proposed CGP contains much more specified requirements for post-construction storm water runoff by significantly altering the existing framework that relies on municipalities to address post-construction runoff. The draft CGP “...requires mitigating hydromodification by maintaining pre-development hydrologic characteristics on the site.”

Municipal Permit

Regulates “non-traditional” permittees such as municipalities and schools. In 2003 the Municipal Phase II Permit was revised to include schools, which were previously not subject to the requirements of any of the permits. Essentially, the “Small MS4 Permit” was designed to address post-construction runoff by requiring six minimum control measures, which are essentially Best Management Practices (BMP). The bedrock concept here is to regulate the rate of discharge. Before the requirements of the Small MS4 Permit could be applied to schools by the RWQCBs, the SWRCB had to “designate” schools as subject to the requirements of the permit, but the SWRCB did not designate schools (with a few exceptions). Many schools have chosen to implement the six minimum control measures and other requirements such as developing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) anyway. This permit is currently being revised and includes many of the requirements key requirements proposed in the CGP.

Industrial Permit

Regulates schools to the extent that they operate maintenance and bus yards.

Key Concepts in Permit Reauthorizations

Hydromodification

Changes in land cover are the cause of hydromodification by altering a site’s runoff and transport characteristics. In other words, impervious surfaces, compacted soils, deforestation, and topographic modifications alter the distribution and flow of water across a site, and so a greater percentage of precipitation is converted to overland flow.

Low-Impact Development (LID)

The “end-of-pipe” treatment and control technologies have been the predominate methods of storm water control to date, but the environmental community argues that this system essentially concedes the inevitability of hydromodification, and so deals only with the consequence of development without addressing the root causes of the problem. LID has emerged as an alternative to the traditional management approach. Rather than the traditional centralized approach, LID relies on an integrated system of decentralized, small-scale control measures

which can range from site design practices to technology driven LID BMPS. The underlying principal of LID is that undeveloped land does not present a storm water runoff or pollution problem.

Key Organizations

Environmental – Bay Keepers, National Resources Defense Council

Industry - California Building Industry Association (Californians for Improved Water Quality), California Chamber of Commerce

Public Entities – Coalition for Adequate School Housing, League of Cities, California State Association of Counties, University of California, California State University, Community Colleges, California Department of Transportation

Industry Associations – California Stormwater Quality Association

C.A.S.H. Priorities

- *Numerics and Hydromodication* – Let BMPs work
- *Permit Implementation Date* – Include grandfather provision for schools in permit text
- *Public Review Framework* – Clarify RWQCB project review framework
- *Training* – Develop substantive training programs before permit becomes active

Recent News

Little Hoover Commission releases its review of the State Water Board structure and governance entitled “*Clearer Structure, Cleaner Water: Improving Performance and Outcomes at the State Water Boards*”

C.A.S.H. 2009-2010 LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW AND SUMMARY

HOUSE	BILL	AUTHOR	CATEGORY	SUBJECT	AMENDED	LDS	S/O	Staff	SUMMARY
AB	<u>3</u>	Perez	Energy	Renewable Energy Workforce	Intro				Requires PUC to establish a Renewable Energy Workforce Readiness Program
AB	<u>19</u>	Ruskin	Environment	Carbon Footprint Labels	Intro				Directs ARB to establish a voluntary carbon footprint labeling program for consumer products
AB	<u>26</u>	Hernandez	Facilities	Bid Preference	Intro				Makes health benefits payments a factor in awarding bids on public works
AB	<u>31</u>	Price	Facilities	Procurement	Intro				Changes parameters re small business and disabled veterans state contracts
AB	<u>44</u>	Blakeslee	Energy	Electrical Energy	Intro				Directs PUC to allow additional return on investment for electrical energy storage facilities
AB	<u>45</u>	Blakeslee	Energy	Wind Energy Systems	Intro				SLI to encourage local agencies to foster installation of small wind energy systems
AB	<u>46</u>	Blakeslee	Energy	Energy Conservation	Intro				Extends sunset for energy conservation assistance program to 2015
AB	<u>49</u>	Feuer	Environment	Water Usage	Intro				Requires state to reduce urban per capita water usage by 20% by 2020
AB	<u>64</u>	Krekorian	Energy	Renewable Energy	Intro				Recasts various provisions re electrical corporations and renewable energy requirements
AB	<u>118</u>	Logue	Facilities	Environment/Energy	Intro				Repeals AB 32 of 2006 —CA Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
AB	<u>122</u>	Coto	Facilities	Small Schools	Intro				Creates program to use state grants for small schools; sunsets in 2015
AB	<u>174</u>	Carter	Miscellaneous	School Dist Organizatio	Intro				Amends criteria re formation of school district. Prescribe CEQA provisions in these.
AB	<u>177</u>	Price	Energy	Green Economy	Intro				SLI to enact the Green Economy Inclusion Act of 2009
AB	<u>210</u>	Hayashi	Facilities	Green Bldg Standards	Intro				Technical bill re city and county building code changes re green building standards
AB	<u>211</u>	Mendoza	Facilities	Building Locks	Intro				Requires all school facility rooms to have lockable locks from the inside starting in 2010.
AB	<u>216</u>	Beall	Facilities	Contract Disputes	Intro				Requires all contract with local agencies to contain provisions re binding arbitration for claim disputes over \$100,000
AB	<u>220</u>	Brownley	Facilities	2009 Bond Act	Intro				Enacts 2009 K-University Bond Act in unspecified amounts for November 3, 2009
AB	<u>228</u>	Huffman	Facilities	Outdoor Lighting	Intro				Requires Energy Comm to adopt minimum energy efficiency standards for outdoor lightin
AB	<u>231</u>	Huffman	Environment	Outdoor Lighting	Intro				Directs ARB to schedule fees for deposit in the newly created Climate Protection Trust Fund
AB	<u>234</u>	Huffman	Energy	Federal Stimulus Funds	Intro				SLI re distribution of federal stimulus funds for energy efficiency projects
AB	<u>238</u>	Adams	Energy	Electric Transmission	Intro				SLI re smart grid technologies
AB	<u>253</u>	Fuller	Facilities	Career Technical Ed	Intro				SLI re districts with high drop out rates participating in a career technical educ development
AB	<u>262</u>	Bass	Energy	Federal Stimulus Funds	Intro				Specifies administrative agencies for receipt of federal stimulus energy funds.
AB	<u>280</u>	Blakeslee	Facilities	Federal Stimulus Funds	Intro				Creates program in CA Earthquake Authority for use of federal stimulus funds for facilities.
ACA	<u>1</u>	Silva	Finance	Appropriations Vote	Intro				Requires every bill costing more than \$150,000 annually to be approved by 2/3 vote
ACA	<u>3</u>	Blakeslee	Facilities	Bond Funding Source	Intro				Provides that state issued bonds provide self-funding mechanism
ACA	<u>5</u>	Calderon	Facilities	Initiative Bonds	Intro				Requires state bond acts promulgated by initiative to contain self financing provisions
ACA	<u>9</u>	Huffman	Facilities	Local 55% votes	Intro				Extends 55% local bond vote authorization to other local entities besides schools.
SB	<u>7</u>	Wiggins	Energy	Net Energy Metering	Intro				Requires electric utilities to give credit to consumers with positive net energy metering balance at the end of a 12 month contract.
SB	<u>14</u>	Simitian	Energy	PUC	1/29/2009				Prescribes various new duties for the Public Utilities Commission
SB	<u>45</u>	Padilla	Facilities	Prevailing Wage	Intro				Requires DIR to levy fee on all state issued bond for monitoring prevailing wage law
SB	<u>93</u>	Kehoe	Facilities	Redevelopment	Intro				Revises conditions re property involving other public agencies
SB	<u>99</u>	SLG	Facilities	Local Bond Pooling	Intro				Requires resolution authorizing bond pooling to be approved at a regular meeting.
SB	<u>104</u>	Oropeza	Environment	Global Warming	Intro				Adds nitrogen trifluoride to global warming gases re air pollution
SB3X	<u>22</u>	Benoit	Personnel	Noninstructional Service	Intro				Authorizes schools and colleges to contract for non-instructional services
SCA	<u>4</u>	Ducheny	Finance	Initiative Measures	Intro				Requires any initiative submitted to the electorate to contain self funding source