

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Note: Review of bond performance was limited by the amount of publicly-available information on each bond program. In addition, comparability of performance metrics is limited by varying levels of information provided and specific circumstances, such as year of approval, timeframe, total budget, size of district, and available district resources. *For this reason, this performance review should not be considered a comprehensive grading, nor should it be considered a validation of any district's current activities or performance.* Rather these findings are intended to be an informative description of the available information on active bond programs. Detailed discussion of each bond program can be found in Appendix A.

In our methodology we propose to analyze the overall performance of each district based on three broad categories: change of scope, cost effectiveness, and timeliness. However, the amount of publicly-available information for several bond programs did not allow us to analyze all of these aspects. We have specifically noted these instances in the respective program reviews contained in this appendix.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Cajon Valley Union School District – Prop D (2008) – \$156,500,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	86.2%
Percentage of proposed projects started or completed ^a	44.4%
Percentage savings on completed projects ^b	23.3%
Percentage increase in bond program contingency fund ^b	14.8%

a) Project Status Matrix 12/31/10

b) Prop D Consolidated Expenditure Report 9/22/10

Note: No information is publicly available to allow us to review the timeliness of Prop D projects completed thus far. We recommend that the district provide public materials comparing actual completion dates to those originally anticipated. This information will allow the public to determine if the Prop D program is on schedule or if delays are to be expected. Additionally, as a newer bond program (approved in 2008) current performance metrics are based on a limited sample of information.

Prop D Ballot Resolution Project List:

- Anza Elementary (1960)
- Avocado Elementary (1970)
- Blossom Valley Elementary (1993)
- Bostonia Elementary (1995)
- Cajon Valley Home School
- Cajon Valley Middle (1953)
- Chase Elementary (1979)
- Community Day (2007)
- Crest Elementary (1956)
- Cuyamaca Elementary (1948)
- Emerald Middle (1958)
- Flying Hill Elementary (1959)
- Fuerte Elementary (1959)
- Greenfield Middle (1959)
- Hillsdale Middle (1995)
- Jamacha Elementary (1991)
- Johnson Elementary (1954)
- Lexington Elementary (1956)
- Los Coches Creek Elementary (2006)
- Madison Avenue Elementary (1958)
- Magnolia Elementary (1952)
- Meridian Elementary (1949)
- Montgomery Middle (1974)
- Naranja Elementary (1957)
- Rancho San Diego Elementary (1986)
- Rios Elementary (1959)
- Sevick (1974)
- Vista Grande Elementary (1981)
- W.D. Hall Elementary (1960)

Of the 29 project site locations listed in the District's ballot resolution, construction has begun or is scheduled to begin at 25 sites. The sites removed from the initial list are Cajon Valley Home School, Community Day School, Cuyamaca Elementary, and Sevick Special Education. Cuyamaca Elementary was removed from the project list due to its closure in 2009. The other two school campuses, Community Day and Sevick, are the District's first and tenth newest campuses, respectively. Additionally, these schools represent a small proportion of the District's overall enrollment, with 20 and 13 students enrolled during the 2008-2009 school year, respectively.¹

The Prop D ballot resolution also provided a list of 10 specific renovations and improvements that

¹ School Accountability Report Card 2008-2009

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

would be funded with Prop D revenues. Thus far, the District has delivered, or still plans to deliver, on all of these specific improvements at the 25 remaining school sites. As of September 22, 2010, the District had expended only \$8.5 million of the original program budget of \$156.5 million and completed three of its planned 27 projects. The District realized savings on all three of these completed projects (clock system upgrades, Meridian water line replacement, and Flying Hill MPR remodel) under the original budgeted costs. These savings total \$215,348 (23.3% of the original project budget) and have allowed the District to increase the Prop D contingency fund by 14.8%. The District has also made significant progress on nine additional projects. Altogether the three completed and nine in-progress projects represent 44.4% of all Prop D projects.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Carlsbad Unified School District – Prop P (2006) – \$198,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	100.0%
Percentage increase in bond program contingency fund	162.9%
Percentage savings on completed projects ^a	10.6%
Change orders as a percent of project costs ^b	3.0%
Percentage of anticipated state matching funds <i>not</i> received	75.1%
Percentage of projects completed within initial construction timeline	81.8%

a) Completed projects include modernization at five campuses: Aviara Oaks Middle School and Hope, Kelly, Magnolia, and Buena Vista Elementary Schools.

b) As reported in the 2008-2009 Performance Audit. Audit only considered the modernization projects at four elementary school sites.

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop P's performance. Examples of the district's commendable level of information provision are: monthly progress reports, an updated program master schedule, and consistently updated information about specific projects on its website.

In 2007, Carlsbad USD drafted a Facilities Master Plan, which outlined how bond proceeds would be spent at various school sites throughout the District. The Master Plan involved construction and modernization at seven pre-existing sites: Carlsbad High School; Aviara Oaks and Valley Middle Schools; and Hope, Kelly, Magnolia, and Buena Vista Elementary Schools. The Master Plan also outlined the construction of a new high school at College and Cannon. Work has already begun at all of these sites, with significant progress being made on the modernization of the four elementary school sites.

The District has experienced significant delays in the construction of a new high school at College and Cannon. According to the Master Plan, the new high school was expected to take four years to construct and be completed by 2011, but construction has been delayed several times and began in October of 2010, with a scheduled completion date of 2013. In December 2007, the District signed a lease-leaseback agreement with Douglas E. Barnhart/Roesling Nakamura Tereda for the construction of the new high school. Over the course of FY 2008, the new high school project start date was set back one year due to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) public and agency comments. In February of 2009, the District ratified an EIR for the new high school project, but continued to face opposition from various agencies due to environmental concerns throughout much of 2009. These delays further pushed back the construction start date into 2010. In addition to significant delays, the District has also experienced a project cost escalation of 9.33% related to environmental delays and CEQA lawsuits.

Not all projects have encountered significant problems. In fact, modernization at the four elementary school sites progressed smoothly and resulted in cost savings for the District. In May 2009, the District received competitive bids (in the traditional design-bid-build format) for modernization at the four

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

sites. These bids came in \$4.4 million under budget. Actual construction costs pursuant to these contracts during the summer of 2009 came in \$3.3 million (22.8%) under budget. Despite cost savings, the Prop P 2008-2009 Performance Audit noted that change orders and cost allowances on these projects totaled 10.7% of project costs.

The 2008-2009 Performance Audit states that, although the District's anticipated state matching funds have increased from \$25.2 million at project onset to \$35.4 million currently, "CUSD has thus far received no funds." The Audit also notes that, "there currently is no assurance that CUSD will receive any state funds in time to complete its last project in the construction cycle, the New High School." However, since the publication of the Performance Audit, the District has received \$8.8 million in state matching funds (July 2010).

The Audit also notes that due to the District's reliance on uncertain state funding, it is believed that the District will likely need to find alternative funding (such as a bridge loan) to cover a funding gap associated with the end of construction of the new high school at College and Cannon.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Escondido Union High School District – Prop T (2008) – \$98,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	84.6%

Note: No information is publicly available to allow us to review the timeliness or cost effectiveness of Prop T projects completed thus far. The lack of construction information is primarily due to the age of the bond program, approved in 2008, and the relatively recent start of construction (February 2010). However, as more significant progress is made we recommend that the district make an effort to provide the following detailed information regarding Prop T: detailed change order information, expenditures by project, savings/cost overruns by project, and comparison of actual progress made to originally anticipated progress.

Prop T funds were proposed to be used for construction and modernization at three existing campuses (Escondido High School, San Pasqual High School, and Orange Glen High School) and construction of a new “small” high school, Citracado High School. Construction timelines have already been developed for all of these projects and work has begun on the three existing high schools. The final EIR has been completed for the new high school site, Citracado High School, and construction is expected to begin in 2011.

The Prop T ballot resolution included specific details of the work to be done at each of the existing school sites. We find that the currently-developed construction project timelines provided by the District demonstrate significant divergence from the initially proposed scope of work. The table below compares these two work plans; *italics* indicate that the project was to be given “low priority” and completed only if funding remained after all other work had been completed.

Escondido High School	
<i>Ballot Resolution</i>	<i>Construction Timeline</i>
<p>New Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Music/performing arts instructional building • Agricultural classroom addition • Auto Shop classroom addition • Multi-purpose large group instructional classroom/physical education building • <i>Ag (Career Technical Education) farm improvements (two new barns)</i> • <i>Building addition to administration building to improve student support services</i> • <i>Install synthetic field turf for more efficient, cost-effective field maintenance</i> • Landscape and hardscape improvements for safety and school appearance <p>Modernization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remodel photo lab to create science laboratory • Remodel two (2) classrooms to create science laboratory • Remodel two (2) classrooms to create one computer laboratory 	<p>Phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Music/Physical Education building • Home/Visitor ticket booths • Agricultural classroom addition • Administrative building addition <p>Phase 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative building addition • Remodel two science classrooms • Remodel two classrooms to create one computer room • Renovate gymnasium • Photo lab/graphic arts classroom • Auto shop classroom <p>Phase 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovate gymnasium <p>Phase 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New classrooms (general) • Remodel Special Education classroom

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remodel weight room to create two (2) visual arts classrooms and a darkroom • Remodel music classroom to create two (2) general classrooms • Remodel Special Education classroom to create Adult Education office • Remodel portion of Administration Building to create general classroom and offices • Remodel Agriculture (Ag) building • Remove wrestling portable classroom • Replace aging/deteriorating gymnasium floor 	
San Pasqual High School	
<i>Ballot Resolution</i>	<i>Construction Timeline</i>
<p>New Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct two-story classroom building with restrooms • Expand school health services office for improved student services • <i>Construct new physical education building</i> • <i>Install synthetic track and field turf for more efficient, cost-effective field maintenance</i> • Adding additional landscape, hardscape, and security fencing for improved safety/security <p>Modernization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remodel auto shop and small classroom to create two (2) career-technical classrooms • Remodel existing small classroom and convert into janitorial work/storage facility • Remodel Agricultural workshop and convert to a computer laboratory • Remove ten (10) portable classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrestling and dance building • Multiple classroom building • Nurse's Office • Remodel Auto Shop • Miscellaneous modernizations (small scale, two months of work scheduled)
Orange Glen High School	
<i>Ballot Resolution</i>	<i>Construction Timeline</i>
<p>New Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct four (4) general/academic classrooms • Construct computer lab • <i>Construct new Ceramics classroom</i> • Construct two (2) Special Education classrooms • Construct Graphics Arts classroom and Print Shop • Construct Drama classroom • Construct Music/Choral/Band classroom • Construct Culinary Arts classroom and kitchen • Construct Dance and Physical Education/ Multiuse facilities • Adding additional landscape, hardscape, and security fencing for improved safety/security <p>Modernization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remodel aging Performing Arts Center • Remodel existing Ceramics classroom and create two (2) general/academic classrooms 	<p>Phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Print shop building • Ceramics building <p>Phase 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gym and dance building • Culinary arts building

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Based on these sources, we find evidence of a dramatic change in program scope. For example, several projects listed initially as “low priority” (Administration building addition at Escondido High, Physical Education building at San Pasqual, and Ceramics building at Orange Glen High) are included in the first phases of construction, well before the completion of the majority of other projects. Altogether, out of 39 original projects listed, based on the construction timelines it appears that 6 projects have been removed.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Grossmont Union High School District – Prop H (2004) – \$274,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed ^a	72.0%
Percentage costs have increased over original budget	36.8%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^b	5.7%
Percentage of anticipated state matching funds <i>not</i> received	64.1%

a) Note that this is measured using alternative method described below.

b) Prop H Financial Summary through 3/31/10

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop H's performance. Examples of the district's commendable level of information provision are: an annual comprehensive third-party performance review, monthly project progress reports, and consistently updated information about specific projects on its website. We should also note that some of the disparity between performance measures for Prop H and other bond programs can be attributed to macroeconomic factors, such as rapidly increasing construction costs. These conditions were unique to bonds approved in 2002.

The initial board resolution calling for the Prop H bond election listed 149 specific projects at 15 existing school sites within Grossmont Union High School District, as well as the construction of a new high school. Work has begun at all but one of the existing sites, Grossmont Adult School, which appears to have been removed from the program. In addition, the new high school site has been removed from the initial program. In 2007, the Prop H ICOC issued a report stating that the District would not have enough funding to cover a significant portion of the proposed projects under Prop H. The District reported that \$166.8 million more in funding would be required to finish all modernization projects proposed under Prop H.

Inability to complete these projects was blamed on construction cost inflation, inaccurate initial cost estimates, and problems with staff monitoring the program. In the Prop H 2007 Performance Audit, AF Consultants found that the primary factors that resulted in Prop H funding shortfalls included inadequate estimates of the cost of delivering the program exacerbated by construction cost escalation, and lack of overall budget and program management. AF Consultants stated:

“[We] concur with the District's decision to issue an RFP for a Program Manager. We strongly believe that the Program Management function will bring stability to the overall bond program and become a coordinating point for all project activities.”

The report goes on to state that they believe the program “will be more efficiently managed as it enters a new phase.”

In response to the recommendations made by AF Consultants, the District took several steps to improve the future progress of Prop H, including: hiring an outside program manager, revising the scope of work assigned to the master architect and construction manager, revising reporting format, clarifying

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

contracts for architectural services, and developing a better system for recording construction change orders.

Due to the non-comparability of the initial proposed project list established by the District board's resolution calling for the Prop H election and current construction progress reports and project lists, it is not possible to accurately determine the percentage of projects actually completed. As a solution to this problem, our 2007 report suggested comparing the projected cost of completing all of the proposed projects to the District's current available funding. The District's current Prop H budget totals \$428.1 million. Given the District's estimate of \$166.8 million necessary additional funding to complete all Prop H projects, the total cost of all proposed Prop H projects is \$594.9 million. This would suggest that the District has available funding to cover $428.1/594.9 = 72.0\%$ of Prop H projects.

Issues with the implementation of Prop H faced by the District have been compounded by the uncertainty of anticipated state funding. As of June 2010, the District has received only \$35.7 million of an originally anticipated state match of \$99.5 million. The Prop H/U 2008-2009 Audit Report stated that if the remaining state fund does not materialize “Prop H spending will exceed the available cash by 2010/2011,” although Prop H construction is planned to last through 2013.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Grossmont Union High School District – Prop U (2008) – \$417,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	100.0%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^a	2.2%

a) Prop U Financial Summary through 3/31/10

Note: We find that the age of Prop U, approved in 2008, and the relatively small amount of work that has been completed under Prop U thus far (only \$60 million of total \$417 million in bonds have been issued) make it difficult to provide a comprehensive description of Prop U's performance. However, similar to Prop H, we commend the district for its current level of information performance and believe that, as significant progress is made, the information provided by the district will provide an accurate picture of Prop U's performance.

Prop U was passed with the intention of substantially completing the scope of projects originally planned under Prop H. Prop U's relative age (passed in 2008) and integration with Prop H make it very difficult to assess the performance of Prop U specifically. To date, only \$60 million of the total \$417 million Prop U bonds have been issued. However, a few observations can still be made about the future progress of Prop U.

Based on early construction expenditures and cost estimates, the District and its program manager are forecasting all Prop U projects to be completed within the stated budget, but it should be recognized that Prop U is still very early in its development. Also, because of the integration of Prop H and U programs, and the lack of receipt of anticipated state funds for Prop H projects, early Prop U bond funds have been used to complete Prop H programs. By doing so, the District has been able to continue unabated with Prop H projects despite lack of state matching funds; however, should these funds not be received in the future, the District will be required to curtail the scope of Prop U construction. Therefore, although the District currently anticipates delivering on 100% of proposed projects, the future uncertainty of state funding may significantly hamper the District's ability to do so.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District – Prop R (2002) – \$207,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	88.1%
Percentage of projects completed within initial construction timeline	35.0%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^a	3.8%

a) As reported in 2008-2009 Performance Audit

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop R's performance. Examples of the district's commendable level of information provision are: quarterly project performance measures, detailed quarterly expenditure reports, and consistently updated information about specific projects on its website. We should also note that some of the disparity between performance measures for Prop R and other bond programs can be attributed to macroeconomic factors, such as rapidly increasing construction costs. These conditions were unique to bonds approved in 2002.

In 2002, the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Board approved five facilities master plans as a basis for establishing the priorities of expenditure of Prop R funds. Funds were to be used for various projects at two community college campus, Grossmont College and Cuyamaca College, according to the priorities set forth in the facilities master plans. In 2004, a revised Prop R funding plan was developed to outline which specific projects within these plans would be funded going forward. The project list below reflects those selected to be completed under Prop R.

Grossmont College	Cuyamaca College	District-wide
200 Painting 500 Restroom ADA and Gym Applied Sciences (S&N 300) Building 100 IPP Building 200 Complex IPP Chiller/Central Plant Digital Arts/Sculpture Arts Energy Conservation Phase 1&2 Exercise Science/Wellness Building Fire Alarm upgrade Health Sciences Life Safety Road Parking Structure Reroof 200 building Reroof 500 building Science Building Student Services Complex Tech Mall/LRC Theater FPP	Auto Tech Building O Remodel Business/CIS Bus Stop – Walkways Central Plant Classroom Administration Building Communication Arts Energy Conservation Phase 1&2 LRC Additional Remodel Phase 1 LRC Remodel Phase 2 Maintenance Projects P.E. Expansion/Pool Parking Lot Phase 1 Parking Lot Phase 2 Remodel Buildings B-G Replace Water Valves Science and Tech Center Science and Tech Center Phase 2 Student Center	EIR – Cuyamaca and Grossmont Campuses Technology Infrastructure

Of the projects listed above, the District appears to have eliminated funding for the following projects:

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

LRC Remodel Phase 2, Classroom Administration Building, P.E. Expansion/Pool, Science and Tech Center Phase 2, and Reroof Building 500. Altogether, out of 42 projects presented in the Prop R funding plan, the District has completed 37.

In October of 2003, a construction timeline was developed for Prop R's major capital projects. 20 major projects were listed on this schedule. According to project progress reports, 13 of these projects were finished after the scheduled date, while 7 projects were finished on or before the scheduled date. It should be noted that the majority of these projects, although late, were completed within the same scheduled calendar year, and that only one project, a parking structure at Grossmont College, was reported to have faced serious scheduling and budgetary concerns.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Oceanside Unified School District – Prop H (2008) – \$195,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	100.0%
Percentage of completed projects on time and on budget	100.0%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^a	3.5%

a) Change orders are reported for each project; combined change order rate weighs individual project measures by project budget

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop H's performance. However, it should be noted that as a newer bond program, approved in 2008, current performance metrics are based on a limited sample of information.

Prop H ballot resolution, exhibit A-1, lists the following schools as locations to receive funding for modernization, upgrades, and expansion:

- Del Rio Elementary
- Ditmar Elementary
- Garrison Elementary
- Ivey Ranch Elementary
- Libby Elementary
- McAuliffe Elementary
- Mission Elementary
- North Terrace Elementary
- Pacifica Elementary
- Reynolds Elementary
- San Luis Rey Elementary
- Santa Margarita Elementary
- Stuart Mesa Elementary
- Jefferson Middle
- Lincoln Middle
- El Camino High
- Oceanside High
- Ocean Shores High
- Clair W. Burgener Academy

Thus far, no projects have been removed from this list and several early projects have come in under budget suggesting that the District will have adequate funding to complete all proposed projects. However, much of the bond program is left to be implemented and significant uncertainty still exists.

Four Prop H projects have been substantially completed to date, including modernization at two school sites and two athletic fields. The District has reported impressive performance on these projects, with all bids and actual project costs coming in under budget, both athletic fields being completed ahead of schedule, and change order rates less than 10%. Savings on the Lincoln Middle School modernization project, completed using lease-leaseback delivery, are reported to total \$3 million (original budget of \$24.2 million). The athletic fields were delivered using traditional design-bid-build. Bids on the athletic fields at El Camino High and Oceanside High came in 41.3% and 43.2% under budget, respectively. Change orders as a percent of construction costs were 8.55% and 3.26% respectively. Both of these projects were reported to be completed before the scheduled completion date.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Palomar Community College District – Prop M (2006) – \$694,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	95.0%
Percentage savings on completed projects ^a	10.9%

a) The Health Sciences Building (Building S) is the only completed project to date.

Note: No information is publicly available to allow us to review the timeliness of Prop M projects completed thus far. We recommend that the district provide materials comparing actual completion dates to those originally anticipated. This information will allow the public to determine if the Prop M program is on schedule or if delays are to be expected. It should also be noted that current performance metrics are based on a very small sample of the overall program, with only one major project completed thus far.

Prop M project list:

Project	Initial Budget	Current Budget
Natural Science Building	\$5,200,000	\$3,800,000
PC North Education Center	\$64,900,000	\$56,600,000
PC North Education Center – CEQA/EIR	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
Humanities Building	\$100,000	\$2,600,000
S Building Remodel Project	\$4,665,000	\$11,347,300
PC South Education Center	\$10,000,000	\$39,500,000
Multimedia Lab & Planetarium	\$6,912,000	\$8,312,000
San Marcos Campus CEQA/EIR	\$1,500,000	\$350,000
Escondido Center North Wing Retrofit	\$3,000,000	\$2,500,000
Parking Improvement Projects	\$6,445,000	\$1,667,114
Industrial Technology Building	\$16,600,000	\$15,100,000
Theatre Addition and Remodel	\$9,950,000	\$1,950,000
Relocation of Baseball Field	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Landscape Improvements – San Marcos	\$2,000,000	\$500,000
Infrastructure Improvements	\$400,000	\$900,000
Child Development Center	\$100,000	\$100,000
LL Building Remodel	\$150,000	\$150,000
Library/Learning Center	\$2,500,000	\$0
Escondido Center Improvements – Phase 1	\$1,000,000	\$500,000
Information Services Technology Projects	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000
Multidisciplinary Instructional Building	\$0	\$3,000,000

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

So far, only one original proposed Prop M project, a library/learning center, has been defunded as the result of lack of anticipated state funding. However, funding has been shifted amongst the initial projects, largely as a result of staff and academic departmental input. For example, actual costs related to the Natural Science Building project were significantly under budget, so the Natural Science Department elected to shift \$1.4 million in funding for the Natural Sciences Building to the Multimedia Lab and Planetarium for the purchase of new equipment. \$3 million of Prop M funding has also been shifted to a project not previously proposed, a Multidisciplinary Instructional Building. This project was intended to be funded completely with state funding, but construction costs overran the project budget.

Only one major capital improvement project, a Health Sciences Building, has been completed using Prop M funds to date. This project was initially intended to be a renovation of an existing Health Sciences Building; however, the District decided to completely replace the existing building with a larger building to accommodate increased enrollment. As a result, the project's budget was subsequently increased from \$4.7 million to \$11.3 million. Construction began in April of 2009 and was scheduled to be finished in August of 2010, with classrooms ready for students by the fall of 2010. Construction of the new Health Sciences Building sufficiently met this schedule, finishing construction in May 2010, with total recorded expenditures significantly under budget (10.9%).

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Poway Unified School District – Prop C (2008) – \$179,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	100.0%
Cost overruns as a percentage of total project costs ^a	0.2%
Percentage of projects completed within initial construction timeline	55.6%

a) Prop C COC Monthly Report 11/16/10

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop C's performance and commend the Prop C ICOC and PUSD for inclusion of anticipated project timelines in ICOC annual reports and publishing of actual completion dates on the Prop C website. This information holds the district accountable to deliver the projects in a timely manner.

Prop C, and Prop U (2002) before it, have provided funding for PUSD's Building for Success Program. The original intent of this program was to construct, rehabilitate, or modernize facilities at the 24 school sites listed below:

- Canyon View Elementary
- Chaparral Elementary
- Deer Canyon View Elementary
- Garden Road Elementary
- Los Penasquitos Elementary
- Midland Elementary
- Morning Creek Elementary
- Painted Rock Elementary
- Pomerado Elementary
- Rolling Hills Elementary
- Sundance Elementary
- Sunset Hills Elementary
- Tierra Bonita Elementary
- Turtleback Elementary
- Valley Elementary
- Westwood Elementary
- Bernardo Heights Middle School
- Black Mountain Middle School
- Meadowbrook Middle School
- Twin Peaks Middle School
- Abraxas High School
- Mt. Carmel High School
- Poway High School
- Rancho Bernardo High School

To date, work has been substantially completed at 21 of these 24 school sites, with work at the remaining three schools scheduled to be completed by early 2011. The projected total cost for the program is \$201.8 million and the District is also projecting total cost overruns of \$486,389 (0.24%). In a 2008 mid-year report issued by the Prop C ICOC, a construction timeline was provided for each of the schools in the Prop C program. Below is a comparison of the anticipated completion dates provided in the mid-year report to actual completion dates.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Project	Anticipated Completion	Actual Completion
Abraxas High School	August 2008	September 2008
Bernardo Heights Middle School	June 2010	February 2011
Black Mountain Middle School	April 2009	June 2009
Canyon View Elementary School	October 2009	August 2009
Chaparral Elementary School	October 2008	August 2008
Deer Canyon Elementary School	October 2009	August 2009
Meadowbrook Middle School	March 2009	January 2009
Morning Creek Elementary School	December 2009	December 2010
Mt. Carmel High School	August 2009	August 2010
Pomerado Elementary School	August 2009	August 2009
Poway High School	August 2009	March 2010
Rancho Bernardo High School	June 2010	December 2010
Rolling Hill Elementary School	March 2009	March 2009
Sundance Elementary School	November 2009	August 2009
Sunset Hills Elementary School	October 2009	August 2009
Tierra Bonita Elementary School	August 2009	August 2010
Turtleback Elementary School	October 2009	August 2009
Valley Elementary School	February 2009	January 2009

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

San Diego Community College District – Prop S (2002) – \$685,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights^a	
Percentage of identified facilities needs fulfilled	76.4%
Percentage of projects completed within budget	93.5%
Average percentage savings on completed projects	2.8%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^b	5.7%

a) Data obtained from Proposition S and N – Project Summary Table 9/13/10

b) Change orders are reported for each project, combined change order rate weights individual project measures by project budget; only includes completed projects.

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of information to supply an adequate description of Prop S's performance. We should also note that some of the disparity between performance measures for Prop S and other bond programs can be attributed to macroeconomic factors, such as rapidly increasing construction costs. These conditions were unique to bonds approved in 2002.

Prop S ballot resolution, exhibit B, describes a list of proposed projects developed from the District's Master Facilities Needs List. A comparison of the District's Facilities Needs List to the projects currently funded under Prop S is shown below.

San Diego City College	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Humanities Building, Engineering Technology Building, and Business Technology Building; Renovate Child Development Center and Cosmetology Classroom Building; produce campus site plan and EIR • Renovate “T” Building • Renovate “L,” “A” (including Health Services Building), “P” and “M” Buildings; Nursing Services Building; and Sciences Building • Construct speech and language lab; Instruction Visual Arts Center; renovate college instruction radio and instructional television classrooms • Classrooms under lower level of LRC • Acquire land and construct new general classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquisition • Renovate “R” Building • Modular Village • Renovate “L” Building • Campus Site Plan and EIR • Renovate “P” Building • Career Technology Center • General Purpose Classrooms • Child Development Center
San Diego Mesa College	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct classrooms and labs for Instructional Technology Building; construct Allied Health Building; construct Math and Science Building; Visual Arts Renovation; and produce campus site plan and EIR • East Campus Improvement Project: Improve campus safety, emergency vehicle access, and relieve traffic congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus Site Plan and EIR • Renovate Visual Arts Program • Humanities, Language, Cultural Arts Building • Cogeneration Facility • Muir Property acquisition • East Campus Improvement (parking structure, police

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and equip classrooms and labs for Social and Behavior Sciences, Humanities and Language Building • Renovate Tutoring Center; renovate Admissions and Accounting; construct shipping and receiving building; construct cogeneration facilities; build classrooms for Health Services/Physical Conditioning; and ADA access. • Acquire Muir School Site from SDUSD and use as Technology and Design Center. 	<p>station, and road realignment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allied Health Building • Student Services Facility • Social/Behavioral Sciences Building • Fitness Center
<h3>San Diego Miramar College</h3>	
<p><i>Facilities Needs List</i></p>	<p><i>Presently Funded Projects</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and equip study areas, classrooms, labs and academic instructional and support areas for Library/Learning Resource Center; Science and Technology Classrooms Building; Automotive Technology Career Instruction Building; Technology Classroom Building; general education classroom Building; campus site plan and EIR. • Build and equip study areas, classrooms, labs and academic instructional and support areas for Module II of Health Educational Science and Physical Conditioning Facility; College and Police Emergency Services Center; Computing and Distribution Center; campus safety; and ADA access. • Public Safety Institution building construction, renovation and repair. • Repair and Renovation of Science Building; Building A200 including Miramar College Continuing Education Facility; and conversion of Library; Aviation Maintenance Training Technology Center. • Infrastructure improvements, site work, and landscaping. • Relocate four modular buildings. • Renovate former classroom, lab space in A Building to relocate the mailroom/reprographics area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science and Technology Building • Automotive Technology Career Instruction Building • Computing and Distribution Center HVAC upgrade • Cogeneration facility • Construct a “Leave a Legacy Plaza” • Boiler expansion • Arts Village • Reprographic/mailroom relocation • Campus Site Plan and EIR • Hourglass Park Fieldhouse • Library/Learning Center – Design • Arts and Humanities Building – Design • Technology Building – Design • Infrastructure improvements
<h3>San Diego Continuing Education</h3>	
<p><i>Facilities Needs List</i></p>	<p><i>Presently Funded Projects</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Cultural Complex • North City Campus Expansion and Renovation • Acquisition of land to build new campus to replace or supplement current Clairemont Campus. • Acquisition of land to supplement Cesar Chavez Campus. • Repair and renovate Centre City Campus. • Acquisition of land to replace current Mid-City Campus buildings. • District Service Center renovation and expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic Retrofit Centre City Skills Center • Acquisition of land to replace current Mid-City Campus buildings. • Acquisition of land to build new campus to replace or supplement current Clairemont Campus. • Educational Cultural Complex • Consolidation of Centre City and Cesar Chavez Campuses. • North City Campus (Facility/Parking Structure) • District Service Center renovation and expansion
<h3>Districtwide</h3>	
<p><i>Facilities Needs List</i></p>	<p><i>Presently Funded Projects</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace outdated computer hardware and software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer hardware and software • Land Acquisition

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Although Prop S was not intended to cover all of the projects listed in exhibit B, it nevertheless serves as a measure of Prop S performance to consider what proportion of these facilities needs it met. In total, the Facilities Needs List describes 55 specific projects. According to the Prop S Project Summary Table, as of September 2010, Prop S funds had been used to fund, in part or whole, 42 of these projects. 31 of these projects have thus far been fully completed, 29 of which came in on or under budget. On these completed projects the District experienced average change order rates of 5.7%, with only one project, the Hourglass Park Fieldhouse, having a change order rate above 10% (18.69%).

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

San Diego Community College District – Prop N (2006) – \$870,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights^a	
Percentage of identified facilities needs fulfilled	100.0%
Percentage of projects completed within budget	100.0%
Average percentage savings on completed projects	15.9%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs ^b	4.8%

a) Data obtained from Proposition S and N – Project Summary Table 9/13/10

b) Change orders are reported for each project, combined change order rate weights individual project measures by project budget; only includes completed projects.

Note: As with Prop S, we find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of information to supply an adequate description of Prop N's performance. However, it should be noted that current performance metrics are based on a small sample, with only three major projects completed thus far.

Similar to Prop S, the Prop N ballot resolution included a project list developed from the District's Master Facilities Needs List. A comparison of the District's Facilities Needs List to the projects currently funded under Prop N is shown below.

San Diego City College	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct and equip classrooms and labs; academic instructional and support areas for a Science Building, Engineering Technology Building, and Business Technology Building. • Construct and equip academic classrooms and labs, academic instructional and support areas for a Humanities Building. • Repair and renovate existing academic classrooms, labs, and student support facilities, including “A,” “C,” “M” and “D” Buildings. • For improved safety and better access, upgrade infrastructure throughout campus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanities Building/Business Technology Building • Science Building • “D” Building roof • Engineering Technology Building • “C” Building – Language and Speech Therapy • Infrastructure improvements • “M” Classroom Building • “A” Building Renovation
San Diego Mesa College	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct academic classrooms and labs for improved instruction including Math and Science Building, Instructional Technology Building, and Fine Arts and Dramatic Arts Building. • Construct 11,000 ASF facility for instructional materials and supplies storage; construct and equip 65,000 ASF textbook and food service facility. • For improved safety and better access, upgrade infrastructure throughout campus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary Parking • Modular Village • All-Weather Track and Field • Design Center Renovation • Math and Science Building • Infrastructure Improvement • Fine Arts and Dramatic Arts • Instructional Technology Building • Stockroom and Facilities Support Areas • Cafeteria and Bookstore • I-300 Building

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

San Diego Miramar College	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and equip classrooms, labs, and academic instructional and support areas for San Diego Regional Public Safety Institute. • Repair, renovate, and expand existing Science Building for improved instruction. • Repair and renovate existing 15,300 ASF of Aviation Maintenance Technology Center; Construct 14,000 ASF Heavy Duty Advanced Transportation Technology Center; Construct 6,500 ASF expansion of Automotive Technology Career Instructional Building. • Upgrade and construct new student support facilities. • For improved safety and better access, upgrade infrastructure throughout campus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Humanities Building; Technology Building • Library/Learning Resource Center • Automotive Tech. Career Instructional Building • Parking Structure #1 & Police/Emergency Center • Cafeteria/Bookstore & Student/Campus Center • Aviation Maintenance Technology Center • Heavy Duty Adv. Transport. Tech. Center • SD Regional Public Safety Institute- Training • Expansion of Maintenance Facilities • College Service Center • Student Services Ctr (Interim Library) • Science Building- Renovate Classrooms to Labs/Add • Infrastructure Improvements • Campus Safety Enhancements/PIO • SD Regional Public Safety Institute- Driving Range
San Diego Continuing Education	
<i>Facilities Needs List</i>	<i>Presently Funded Projects</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Clairemont/Linda Vista Adult Education Building for occupational and instructional programs that lead to entry-level employment. • Expand Educational Cultural Complex. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Cultural Complex - Phase IIB wing • Clairemont/Linda Vista Campus - Land Acq & Bldg

Prop N is anticipated to fund 100% of the facilities needs listed in the the Prop N ballot resolution, in addition to several projects that were not funded under Prop S. Only three projects have been completed under Prop N. However, all three of these projects have come in on or under budget, with two projects significantly under budget. Altogether, average savings on these projects have been 15.9%. Average change order rates have been 4.8%, and no projects have experienced change order rates above 10%.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

San Diego Unified School District – Prop S (2008) – \$2,100,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed ^a	93.3% - 100%
Percentage of projects completed within initial construction timeline	57.1%
Average percentage savings on completed projects	22.3%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs	1.9%

a) Calculated as the percentage of projects that can still be funded based on district cost inflation estimates.

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of information to supply an adequate description of Prop S's performance. Examples of the district's commendable level of information provision are: publishing of internal performance metrics, monthly project progress and expenditure updates, and quarterly ICOC reports.

A report issued in December 2009 by the Prop S ICOC stated:

“During the initial planning of Prop S, it was thought that the total \$2.1 billion could be issued in as little as 10 years. However, due to a decrease in assessed property values within the district, bond issue amounts had to be reduced and rescheduled over a 15 year period. As a result, it was necessary to delay projects because of the slower pace of receiving Prop S funding.”

As a result of this miscalculation, district staff now estimate that the cost to complete all Prop S projects will exceed anticipated funding by \$140 million under the worst-case scenario and will be on budget in the best-case scenario. In addition, district staff also found that recent bids for construction contracts have been trending upward and the number of bidders per project trending downward. However, the median bid on construction projects is still coming in under the district's previously established construction budget. The ICOC also reports that as a result of unavailable funding the program is “slightly behind schedule”. Despite these issues, in a recent October 2010 program update report from district staff, it is indicated that revenue projections for projects in 2010 and 2011 have been increased by \$155 million. This will allow the district to shorten the overall program timetable and mitigate the problems discussed above.

The October 2010 program update report also discussed five internal performance metrics tracked by the district. The district's performance on these metrics is shown below.

Metric	District Goal	Actual
DSA Plan Review and Approval Period	180 days	2009: 193 days; 2010: 220 days
Request for Information Turnaround	2 weeks	1 week
Program Change Order Rate	5.0%	1.6%
Submittal Time	30 days	19 days
Average Payment Processing Time	30 days	11 days

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Santee School District – Prop R (2006) – \$60,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	100.0%
Percentage savings on completed projects	19.6%
Change orders as a percentage of project costs	2.7%
Percentage of anticipated state matching funds <i>not</i> received	63.5%

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of public information to supply an adequate description of Prop R's performance and we commend the district for publishing an annual third-party performance review.

The Prop R program was established as a way to fund the District's Facilities Modernization Implementation Plan developed in 2005 which called for the modernization of nine District schools. The total projected cost of the entire program is \$165 million. Modernization was to be carried out in two phases: the first, entailing five priority school sites; and the second, entailing the four remaining sites. Prop R funding of \$60 million was to be combined with state funding, developer fees, sale of surplus land and internal borrowing to fund the entire \$165 million program. During the 2007-2008 school year, the District decreased the school of the Prop R program from \$165 million to \$128 million due to declining developer fees and the decision not to sell surplus land. The District aggressively pursued state matching funds to fill the funding gap created by this shift in program financing. By June 2009, the District had achieved State commitments of \$52 million (40.3% of program budget).

Thus far, all planned Phase 1 projects have been completed. All of the projects were completed using a lease-leaseback agreement resulting in no major delays and significant cost savings for the District. The Prop R Performance Audit reports that five Phase 1 projects reviewed, total original budget of \$47.2 million, resulted in a combined savings of \$9.2 million (19.6%). Change order rates for these projects ranged from 0.5% to 5.2%, with an average rate of 2.72%. Much of the Phase 1 construction was funded through Prop R bond issuance, totaling \$41 million to date. Overall the auditors find that,

“Scopes of work promised by the bond issue to each school has been addressed, and scheduled phases have remained reasonably on target. No major delays to project completions have been noted, and no contractor claims have been received to date. There were no liquidated damages assessed as a result of project delays. Because of increased state funding and bid savings, the District has been able to add several 10-Classroom additions, not originally included in the program.”

Unfortunately, with only \$19 million in remaining bond capacity, the District's heavy reliance on state funding to complete Phase 2 projects has forced the District to delay implementation of Phase 2, as the present fiscal crisis has forced the State to defer payment of \$33 million in funding to the District. As a result, Phase 2 projects that were scheduled to begin in 2009 have now been delayed to 2011 or later, contingent upon receipt of the deferred state funding.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

South Bay Union School District – Prop X (2008) – \$59,400,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects still on list	100.0%

Note: No information is publicly available to allow us to review the timeliness or cost effectiveness of Prop X projects completed thus far. The lack of construction information is primarily due to the age of the bond program, approved in 2008, and the relatively recent start of construction, June 2010. However, as more significant progress is made we recommend that the district make an effort to provide the following detailed information regarding Prop X: detailed change order information, expenditures by project, savings/cost overruns by project, and comparison of actual progress made to originally anticipated progress.

Prop X is planned to fund the complete modernization of seven schools, window and plumbing replacement at five schools, and various projects at four other school district sites: VIP Village Preschool Facility, Education Center, Facilities/Transportation Facility, and Purchasing/Child Nutrition Facility. The twelve school sites to receive modernizations are listed below.

- Bayside Elementary (1956)
- Berry Elementary (1971)
- Central Elementary (1952)
- Emory Elementary (1931)
- Imperial Beach Elementary (1943)
- Mendoza Elementary (1999)
- Nestor Elementary (1961)
- Nicoloff Elementary (1959)
- Oneonta Elementary (1959)
- Pence Elementary (1975)
- Sunnyslope Elementary (1991)
- West View Elementary (1949)

Prop X construction began in June 2010 and early project progress indicates that the District will deliver on all projects in the bond program's original scope of work. However, little information is currently available to measure the performance of Prop X in detail.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Southwestern Community College District – Prop R (2008) – \$389,000,000

Projects to be funded by Prop R funds are grouped into five phases of work, as shown below. The District began work on Phase I projects in April 2010. To date, there simply has not been enough progress made by the District to provide adequate information to gauge the performance of Prop R.

Phase I

Corner Parcel Development
Devore Stadium Improvements
Central Plant

Phase II

Remodel of Cafeteria Building 610
Mayan Hall (Theater) Renovation and ADA
Remodel of 330, Science Lab & CR 370
Remodel of 100 BLDGS, Classrooms & Fac. Rest Ctr.
New Horticulture Classroom Building

Phase III

Remodel of Classroom Bldgs (630 & 710)
Replacement of Swimming Pools
Tennis Courts and Lighting
Remodel Gymnasium & Building 1000
Construct M&O Buildings
Landscaping and Entry Construction
Updated Security, Fire Alarms and Tech
Instructional Equipment of Reno/Remo Bldgs.
Utility Replacement/Upgrade (District Wide)

Phase IV

Overall Phase 3 Demo
San Ysidro Construction of a Parking Structure
Replace Roof, MEP, Flooring (District Wide)
Central Power Plant

Phase V

Otay Mesa Phase II Classrooms and Labs
Replacement of Roof, MEP and Flooring (District)

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Sweetwater Union High School District – Prop O (2006) – \$644,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects still on list	100.0%

Note: No information is publicly available to allow us to review the timeliness or cost effectiveness of Prop O projects completed thus far. We recommend that the district update its current Prop O publications to include several pieces of relevant information not currently provided to the public such as: detailed change order information, expenditures by project, savings/cost overruns by project, and comparison of actual progress made to originally anticipated progress.

The Prop O ballot language lists the following school sites as those to receive construction, modernization, and renovation:

- Bonita Vista Middle School
- Castle Park Middle School
- Chula Vista Middle School
- Community Day Middle School
- Eastlake Middle School
- Granger Junior High School
- Hilltop Middle School
- Mar Vista Middle School
- Montgomery Middle School
- National City Middle School
- Rancho del Rey Middle School
- Southwest Middle School
- Bonita Vista High School
- Castle Park High School
- Chula Vista High School
- Eastlake High School
- Hilltop High School
- Mar Vista High School
- Montgomery High School
- Olympian High School
- Otay Ranch High School
- Palomar High School
- San Ysidro High School
- Southwest High School
- Sweetwater High School
- Options Secondary School
- Alta Vista Academy
- Fifth Avenue Academy
- Imperial Beach Technology Academy
- Vocational and Technical Education ACT
- Adult Resource Center
- Chula Vista Adult School
- Montgomery Adult School
- National City Adult School
- San Ysidro Adult School

All of these school sites are listed to receive work under the finalized Prop O Program Master Schedule. To date, work has begun at 9 of the 35 sites listed above.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Vista Unified School District – Prop O (2002) – \$140,000,000

Overall Bond Program Performance Highlights	
Percentage of original projects completed or to be completed	92.9%
Percentage of projects for which final costs exceeded original budget	76.0%
Percentage of projects for which final costs exceeded revised budget (2004)	44.0%

Note: We find that the district currently provides a sufficient amount of information to supply an adequate description of Prop O's performance.

The Prop O ballot language listed 12 specific projects to be funded through the Prop O bond program:

- Two new Magnet High Schools on a single site with shared ancillary and sports facilities
- Guajome Park Academy Expansion
- New Continuation High School
- New Middle School
- Two New K-8 Schools
- Four New Elementary Schools
- Two New Temporary Schools
- Environmental Mitigation of New Sites
- Casita Multipurpose Building
- Washington Multipurpose Building
- Rancho Buena Vista High School Stadium
- Modernization of Existing Schools
- Improvements of Existing Schools
- Educational Technology Infrastructure

The District has delivered all of the projects promised in the Prop O ballot resolution with the exception of two new K-8 schools. It should be noted that an additional Continuation Middle School not listed in the original ballot language (Vista Focus Academy) was constructed.

In 2004, the District realized that actual costs on several projects were exceeding original budgets. As a result, the District revisited its spending plan and prioritized its expenditure of Prop O funds. To cover increasing costs, several planned projects had to be scaled back, including the two new K-8 schools, educational technology upgrades, and general facilities improvements. The table below compares the original budget, revised budget, and final cost of all Prop O projects.

Appendix A – Bond Program Performance

Project	Original Budget	Reconciled Budget	Final Costs
Vista Focus Academy	\$1,200,000	\$2,214,276	\$2,214,183
Temple Heights Elementary	\$14,269,792	\$16,450,234	\$16,289,182
Foothill/Oak Elementary	\$13,110,058	\$16,373,521	\$16,281,364
Hannalei Elementary	\$13,414,829	\$16,898,245	\$16,909,880
Guajome Park Academy	\$36,996,185	\$36,004,092	\$37,703,455
RBVHS Stadium	\$1,684,204	\$4,047,906	\$3,891,485
Washington Multipurpose Building	\$3,346,506	\$4,672,000	\$4,581,714
Casita Multipurpose Building	\$1,200,000	\$1,619,861	\$1,699,703
VHS Modernization	\$11,753,988	\$15,251,011	\$14,502,384
Casita Modernization	\$1,923,849	\$2,640,998	\$2,658,569
Washington MS Modernization	\$356,759	\$384,538	\$257,569
Grapevine Modernization	\$1,833,186	\$2,287,979	\$1,821,962
Monte Vista Modernization	\$1,447,634	\$2,075,486	\$1,994,402
Rancho Minerva	\$20,951,123	\$35,695,893	\$40,281,674
New High School	\$49,624,498	\$79,494,538	\$98,686,241
Maryland/North	\$12,438,340	\$17,637,217	\$15,854,566
Continuation HS	\$12,849,768	\$9,901,279	\$12,008,137
Health and Safety	\$2,385,000	\$502,500	\$623,791
Facilities Improvements	\$3,100,000	\$862,000	\$831,076
Ed. Tech Projects	\$6,000,000	\$755,000	\$750,000
Lincoln Middle School	\$1,575,392	\$1,818,546	\$1,590,685
VAPA	\$67,700	\$124,717	\$165,858
Bobier Elementary	\$899,988	\$1,240,967	\$1,251,730
California Elementary	\$579,242	\$673,001	\$808,073
Crestview Elementary	\$67,227	\$81,869	\$78,742
New K-8 School 1	\$14,128,340	\$345,440	\$158,471
New K-8 School 2	\$10,477,940	\$782,722	\$365,566
Temporary New School	\$800,000	\$0	\$0
Environmental Mitigation for New HS	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0

Of the 25 completed projects listed, the actual final project expenditures exceeded the original budget estimates on 19 projects. However, only 11 of these projects exceeded the District's revised budget estimates established in 2004, while 14 came in below the revised budget estimates. On average, projects came in 26.0% percent above the original budget estimates, but only 1.9% above the revised budget estimates.

The Mission Vista High School project constitutes a large portion of the Prop O budget and has been the program's most notable project. Several factors have contributed to the increasing costs of completing the new high school, but it should be noted that a primary reason for construction delays and increased costs is unrelated to District actions. The site on which Mission Vista High School is now built was purchased by the District from a developer, Cadence Hi Hope Ranch LLC, with the understanding that the developer would take responsibility for utility work necessary to support the new school construct. However, the developer failed to meet this responsibility, delaying the District's work on the new school and forcing the District to take legal action to seek damages from the developer. In June 2010, the District received a favorable ruling requiring the developer to pay the District \$3.4 million to cover the necessary utilities work.

Appendix B – Project Delivery Method Scorecard

Scorecard for evaluation of project delivery methods:

CRITERIA		DELIVERY METHOD OPTIONS									
		1		2		3		4		5	
Criteria	Weight	D-B-B		D-B		CM at-Risk		Multi-Prime		L-LB	
		Rank	Rank x Criteria	Rank	Rank x Criteria	Rank	Rank x Criteria	Rank	Rank x Criteria	Rank	Rank x Criteria
Schedule Flexibility											
District design control											
Awarding on best value											
Low initial cost											
Promoting team work											
Less district management											
Early established final price											
Minimize change orders											
Political Considerations											
Timely completion											
TOTAL											

Instructions:

Step 1 – Assign a weight to each criterion based on established school district priorities; multiple criteria can have the same weight.

Step 2 – Rank each delivery method on a scale of 1 to 10 based on how well the method meets the criteria.

Step 3 – Multiply each rank by the weight.

Step 4 – Total the rank/weight products. The delivery method with the highest total is the most suitable project delivery method.