



description of Prop 1D; update on the regulations and funding

- **Duwayne Brooks**
Murdoch, Walrath & Holmes



funding

- Up to 10.5% (\$199.5 million) of the \$1.9 Billion for new construction in Prop 1D.
- Funds to be used to repair, reconstruct, or replace the most vulnerable Category 2 school buildings.



most vulnerable school buildings

- Most vulnerable school buildings determined by DSA.
- Category 2 school buildings that pose an unacceptable risk of injury to its occupants in case of a seismic event.
- Category 2 school buildings are defined in a report prepared by DSA in consultation with the Seismic Safety Commission pursuant to Ed Code Section 17317 as required by AB 300 (Corbett 1999).
- Obtain the list from Dennis Bellet at DSA, dennis.bellet@dgs.ca.gov.



DSA's proposed definition of most vulnerable category 2 buildings

1. The location of the building where the horizontal acceleration response is 1.55g or more based on the 2002 U.S. Geological Survey National Seismic Hazards Maps.
2. The building is designed for occupancy by students and staff.
3. The building is either:
 - C-1, Concrete moment frame
 - PC1A, Precast-tiltup concrete shear wall with flexible roof
 - PC2, Precast concrete frame and roofs with concrete shear walls
 - URM, Unreinforced masonry bearing wall buildings



DSA's proposed definition of most vulnerable category 2 buildings

4. A structural report provided by a structural engineer that demonstrates the lateral force-resisting system of the building does not meet collapse prevention performance objectives, and the specific deficiencies and reasoning for concluding that the building has a high potential for catastrophic collapse.



proposition 1D

- Seismic funding language is in Ed Code Section 17075.10, "hardship assistance in cases of extraordinary circumstances."
- District must comply with either of the following:
 1. Due to extreme financial, disaster-related, or other hardship, the school district has unmet need for pupil housing, and the school district is not financially capable of providing the matching funds, and has made all reasonable efforts to impose all levels of local debt capacity and development fees, OR



proposition 1D

2. Due to unusual circumstances beyond the district's control, excessive costs need to be incurred in the construction of school facilities
- Seismic mitigation work or facility replacement shall be allocated on a 50 percent state share basis.
- Cost estimate will be based on the minimum work necessary as determined by DSA.
- If seismic mitigation work is greater than 50 percent of the funds required to construct a new facility, the school district shall be eligible for funding to construct a new facility.



proposed regulations implementing proposition 1D

- SAB Implementation Committee met on August 3 to discuss the Seismic Mitigation Criteria.
- Staff proposed that all eligible project costs to mitigate the most vulnerable schools as defined by DSA, including ancillary costs, be funded from the \$199.5 million.
- Ancillary costs include design, testing, inspection, abatement of lead paint and asbestos, building code upgrades for fire/life safety requirements, ADA requirements, or other repairs or mitigations required by DSA when a retrofit occurs.



proposed regulations implementing proposition 1D

- DSA's proposed definition of "Most Vulnerable Buildings" would fund 142 school buildings.
- DSA stated that the 1.55 g was selected on the basis that the funds available would fund the estimated 142 buildings.
- Therefore, the definition of most vulnerable was based on the amount of money available in the bond.
- Staff acknowledged that the \$199.5 million would not address all the seismic issues.



proposed regulations implementing proposition 1D

- The information gathered under this program would provide data for future state bond seismic needs.



implementation committee recommendations

1. Set aside money from the \$199.5 million to fund the cost of local school district structural evaluations.
2. Fund some of the items (access, fire and life safety, asbestos, and lead) from SFP new construction and modernization rather than from the \$199.5.
3. Allow funding for interim housing.
4. Clarify whether projects being funded from the \$199.5 million must demonstrate that the building is still needed.



OPSC response to implementation committee recommendations

- While they would include the Imp Committee recommendations in the write-up to the SAB, OPSC did not necessarily agree with those recommendations.
- OPSC will take the item to the August 22 SAB, but they would share the write-up with the Imp Committee members before the August SAB meeting.
- Seismic Mitigation proposed regs are on the August 22 SAB Agenda.