



Putting  
Children  
First

MeasurWed

Oak Ridge El

*Technology Enhancement Projects Budget & Expenditures as of 6/30/2023*

*Total Budget to date: \$6,480,569*

*Expended to date: \$1,867,496*

*Balance: \$4,613,073*

*Safety and Security Improvement Projects Budget & Expenditures as of 6/30/2023*

*Budget to date: \$2,085,000*

*Expended to date: \$187,580*

*Balance: \$1,897,420*

*PE and Athletic Program Projects Budget & Expenditures as of 6/30/2023*

*Budget to date: \$29,762,500*

*Expended to date: \$61,600*

*Balance: \$29,700,900*

*0 BDC DC 123576 -1.1ETEMC Qg/0EMCcP /0EMCw0(0)TJ*

*Cal Middle Campus Renewal - Design & Construction Phase*

- *Project consist two phases:*
  - 1. Summer 2023 roof replacement &*
  - 2. Summer 2024 ADA improvements, security improvements, interior floor and paint, technology upgrades, bathroom modernizations, and new furniture*
- *Budgeted for \$18 million for both phases. Estimated completion Summer 2024*

*Security and Fencing at Multi-sites - Procurement Phase*

- *Single point of entry during school hours*
- *Raising fences, iron material, installation of camera's, installation of front door technology for screening of visitors (buzzer)*
- *Budgeted for \$2.1M*

*ADA Pathway Concrete Improvements - Planning Phase*

- *Address trip hazards*
- *Survey to be completed summer 2023 to identify & document all hazards*
- *Projects to be completed summer 2024*
- *Budgeted for \$5 million*

*Matsuyama Campus Renewal - Design Phase*

- *ADA improvements, security improvements, interior floorlng* *Mt 1.7 ( c)-8 (m)4.6r*

*(106)*



*synergy that has to go on there. There is one entity that relies on the trust of the other two. The Board trusts the operations people and the CBOC. There is also a 4<sup>th</sup> entity, the auditors. They have done this before and they say that the client is in compliance. If our purpose is to go in and get forensic, I do not know that that is the best way to represent ourselves to the District. If the auditors state that the District is in compliance, our thing is to ask high-level questions and maybe get to the point where we say ok, we understand that they say the District is in compliance. Then the Board asks us what your findings are. Do we have evidence of anything that says that the operations staff conducted themselves with this money in any way that states they are out of compliance? If so, the audit would have shown that.*

*Member Jimenez: Understands the perspective. Sounds like what you are saying is we can trust the auditors.*

*Committee member: Not blindly trust. However, if the auditor who has done the forensic review says the District is in compliance, we do not have the basis to go down a rabbit hole.*

*Member Jimenez: Other people might though. I am trying to find out everyone's area of interest. Approving what the auditors' audit is not our only mission. If you look at the (draft annual report), I am supposed to sign it. I think we need to look into this. There are other findings outside of just the auditors'. Brian and I met with the auditors. They are not looking at the pro*

*Staff: Looking for more information on what we are doing? Or more of getting the word out? Answer: More parent friendly. Staff: We are working on this. Instagram, etc. We are also working on our website and a Measure H webpage to include all of the projects. We would like to make all information readily available for members to take back to the community.*

*Committee member: Concerned about mission creep on this committee. We are talking about some things that are not in the purview of this committee. Staff takes questions on things such as communication to the communities but it is not the purview of this committee. Our focus is narrow. Looking at project lists is also a way we may stray. Our job is to see if the expenditures consist with the bond language. In addition, in the bond language, it is more of project categories not project lists. For the Committee to give input on the projects is not in our purview. We are talking about many good things here that are good discussion but maybe this is not the right forum.*

*Chair Jimenez: My understanding of the law that went through 20 years ago, it reduced the percent to be approved from two thirds to 55% if there was a specific project list provided. If we know more specifically where the money is going to be spent, the criteria to get approval is reduced and the Committee is supposed to be involved. My concern is that a very general specific project list is circumventing the process.*

*Committee member: The best way is to ask the question. And if we go beyond, staff will tell us. If we disagree with that we will deal with it. Until we come upon a barrier, we should not worry about it. We can make our requests.*

*Committee member: I worry that we are going down a path that is not our responsibility and putting a lot of requests on staff may be interesting but may not serve the purpose of the meeting.*

*Staff response (Jesse Castillo): Inaudible.*

*Nathaniel Browning: More to Jesse's point as well, I was the one that helped create the resolution and bond project list and I worked side by side very closely with external specialized counsel in creating all of that to make sure we were following every letter of the law. The bond project list is absolutely correct and by and large created for flexibility for the District, as a need pops up, it can be used within that bond project list. It's not going have, when I say bond project list, it's not going to actually list out projects like CKM baseball field. It is going to be broader categories.*

*Committee member: Why wouldn't you list out the project? Answer (Chris Ralston) i*



