

**Questions for the AUSD Superintendent and staff,
from the Lum District Advisory Committee and Experts:**

- 1) What can the District provide the Board and community with that supports the contention that the Miller Pacific Geotechnical Report and results are applicable to existing structures at Lum, and not only applicable to planned construction that only exists on paper?
 - a) Why did the second Geotechnical report not verify results using a Standard Penetration Test?
 - b) Why did the second Geotechnical report not verify results using different simulation software?
 - c) Were there assumptions made in the Geotechnical reports based on new construction, that would not be used when looking at existing structures?

- 2) What data can the District provide the Board and community with that supports the contention that the ZFA letter provides sufficient evidentiary basis upon which the school should be closed without further analysis?
 - a) What evidence, if any, is there that the structures at Lum pose an immediate risk?
 - b) What evidence, if any, is there that the structures at Lum pose an imminent risk?
 - c) What evidence, if any, exists to support a conclusion that the structures at Lum are no longer Field Act or DSA compliant?

- 3) Assuming the Geotechnical results are applicable to existing structures at Lum, that a possible 5" settlement might occur during a seismic event expected to occur every 100 years, what evidence can the District provide to address the following key issues:
 - a) Structural Elements - what studies, measurements, simulations, or other assessments have been done to each of the 5 main "pods" at Lum, and any other smaller structures (portables), to determine that 5" of settlement would result in the failure of each of those structures?
 - i. What data has been gathered to support a finding that there would be significant enough structural failures expected, building by building, to warrant concern?
 - Does that data specifically consider that the multiple Pods at Lum are single story, wide based, steel framed hexagons that are more resistant to structural issues caused by differential displacement than multi-story structures with more narrow bases?

- Does that data specifically consider that Lum buildings have been timely upgraded to conform with DSA standards?

ii. If there is such concern, which of the multiple separate structures at Lum are concerning specifically, and what data supports that conclusion?

b) Non-structural Elements - what, if any, are the documented life safety risks at Lum specifically, using the Structural Performance Category (SPC) rating standard, in the event a 5" settlement, and any impacts on structural integrity that might result from that settlement, during a 100 year seismic event?

i. What evidence supports the conclusion that students and staff would be unable to evacuate each of the structures, where each "pod" has multiple (up to 8 or more) exit doors located around the entire perimeter?

ii. What evidence supports the contention that there is a significant risk posed, in each of the structures at Lum, and that each of the 8+ exits in each pod would be blocked during a 100 year seismic event?

iii. What evidence supports the contention that each of the structures at Lum do not meet California SPC2 standards?

4) Has there been any analysis or data gathered to provide a quantifiable relative life safety risk assessment at Lum, as compared to life safety risks at all other AUSD schools during a 100 year seismic event?

a) Did this assessment consider the relative risks posed to students and staff in a 100 year seismic event at other AUSD facilities, due to issues such as:

i. Different and additional risks posed by multi-story AUSD facilities as compared to single story structures at Lum

ii. The limited numbers of exits at other AUSD schools as compared to Lum

iii. Injuries resulting from egress through narrow corridors and hallways at other AUSD schools, as opposed to the multiple exits from each classroom at Lum

iv. Debris from larger concrete/masonry buildings at other AUSD schools, as opposed to single story, wide based, steel framed hexagonal Pods at Lum

vi. Non—structural risks, such as falling bookshelves, school equipment, etc.

v. Other safety risks posed at other AUSD schools in a seismic event, that are separate and thus different from those that may be experienced at Lum

b) Has the AUSD conducted a district wide assessment of the impact that such a large relocation would have on other schools, students, and families?

5) Has the AUSD investigated mitigation options that might be available?

a) Is the AUSD aware that multi-directional swinging doors can be installed that would allow for egress even if settlement blocked doors from swinging out?

b) Is the AUSD aware that windows can be installed that would allow for egress even if settlement blocked the doors from swinging out?

c) Is the AUSD investigating any remediation or mitigation options?

6) Has there been an independent peer analysis of the structural engineers letter?

a) Did that review conduct it's own assessment of each of the specific issues raised above?

b) Can the district release that independent assessment?

c) Was that independent analysis conducted by a structural engineering firm that does not currently have constructions projects with AUSD, and that would not bid on future construction work to remediate or replace Lum?

7) What if any specific plans or options has the district investigated in terms of alternatives to relocating 500+ students and families?

a) Has the AUSD spoken to State Representative Rob Bonta to discuss expediting portables, if needed?

i. Is the AUSD aware that DSA has a process in place specifically to expedite approval for emergency portables, and that this process has been verified by Rob Bonta's office?

ii. Is the AUSD aware that DSA policies permit placement of temporary portables for emergency situations prior to DSA approval, and that only after placement of emergency portables must DSA must be notified in order to approve the placement, and that temporary approval of those emergency portables would be valid for a maximum of three years, and that these policies have been verified by Rob Bonta's office?

- b) Has the district investigated options that would keep Lum together at a different site?
- c) Are there plans that would allow grade level cohorts to stay together even if they do need to relocate?

-Lum District Advisory Committee