CENTRAL KITCHEN, INSTRUCTIONAL FARM & EDUCATION CENTER



CONSTRUCTION TEAM:

"TRI" VENTURE

• THOMPSON BUILDERS

- DIGITAL DESIGNS
 COMMUNICATIONS
- ECLIPSE ELECTRIC of OAKLAND



LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION = 60 %

UP AND IS ANTHON AND AND

LEASE LEASE BACK – LOCAL BUSINESS UTILIZATION PROJECTS:

Project	Joint Venture Team	Local Business Utilization %
Highland	ADCo/Turner Group Construction/Alten	71%
Calvin Simmons	Cahill/Focon	69%
Washington	Overvaa/TGC	72%
Lowell	Arnez/Focon	70%
La Escuelita Phase I	Turner/ADCo	50%
La Escuelita Phase II	McCarthy/TGC	65%
Montclair	Westbay/CAS	60%
Whittier Phase I	Cahill/Focon	65%

LEASE LEASE-BACK – CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY Legal Update



Two Recent Appellate Decisions Impact on LLB's

<u>DAVIS v. FRESNO Unified School District – June 2015</u> <u>McGee v. Torrance Unified School District – May 2016</u>



DAVIS decision:

- <u>Ouestioned</u> the legality of lease-leaseback contracts awarded without competitive bidding;
- <u>Created</u> legal concern as to whether a large number of lease-leaseback contracts would be considered void;
- <u>Raised doubts</u> as to the continuing viability of leaseleaseback as a procurement method in common use by school and community college districts.

Davis Court:

- Calling something a lease does not mean it is a lease; a court must look at the "substance of the transaction to determine its true character..."
 - only <u>"true"</u> leases qualified as lease-leasebacks exempted from competitive bidding;
- Leaseback must have a:
 - <u>term</u> during which the school district uses the new buildings;
 - lease payments during the lease term;
 - <u>financing</u>

TORRANCE decision:

- <u>Upheld</u> the legality of lease-leaseback contracts awarded without competitive bidding.
- <u>**Refused</u>** to follow *Davis*: <u>**any**</u> "effort to engraft additional requirements such as the **timing** of the lease payments, the duration of the lease, and the **financing** are not based on the plain language" of Education Code section 17406.</u>
- So long as the basic requirements of section 17406 were met competitive bidding would not be required.

- LLB's comply with **Davis Court** requirements:
 - Lease term of one (1) year following occupancy:
 - Incremental Lease payments made on monthly basis
 - Developer finances fifteen percent (15%) of the total Project Cost during Lease
 - District pays nominal interest on financing:
 - 2.5% is added to and included in each monthly lease payment

OUSD LEASE LEASEBACK Agreements are "TRUE LEASES"

OUSD LEASE LEASEBACK Agreements follow the McGee Court's analysis:

>LLB's meet the basic requirements of Education Code section 17406

and

>OUSD's LLB's are always Competitively Solicited

– Despite no requirement to do so...

<u>plus</u>

- LLB's <u>require</u> a genuine joint-venture partnership with small local contractors serving as **Prime Contractors**
 - Enhancing OUSD Local Business Participation Policy
 - Ensuring more Measure J Bond dollars are spent locally