



**Hillsboro School District
Bond Advisory Committee
Meeting #4 Meeting Notes
Administration Building
3083 Northeast 49th Place
Wednesday, February 1, 2017
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.**

Bond Advisory Committee Members Present: Blake Boyles, Matthew Buckingham, Rebecca Carey-Smith, Caleb Ford, Lindsay Garcia, Robby Hammond, Melody Hansen, Joelle Hildner, Shawna-Ashley Ingram, LeRoy Landers, Jesse Lovrien, Rob Massar, Dave Militich, Glenn Miller, Rian Petrick, Travis Reiman, Jeremy Stewart, Jennifer Trimble, Joe Vermeire, Dave Vickery, Ryan Wells, Roger Will, Jerry Willey

Bond Advisory Committee Members Absent: Javier Gonzalez, Martin Granum, Deanna Hall, Ed Hayden, Kyle Hayden, Kristina Nguyen, Deanna Palm, Nathan Roedel, Dayle Spitzer, Mike Strande, Kim Strelchun, Kurt Zenner

Others Attending: Frank Angelo, Beth Graser, Carol Hatfield, Sharon McCarty, Kely Purdy, Rick Rainone, Shayna Rehberg, Adam Stewart, Casey Waletich

The following notes focus on questions and comments that Bond Advisory Committee (BAC) members shared and discussed during Meeting #4.

1. Welcome (5 min)

Deanna Palm, Committee Co-Chair
Jerry Willey, Committee Co-Chair

 - Meeting #4 Agenda Review
 - Meeting #3 Minutes

2. Meeting #3 Follow-up Items (15 min)
 - Bond Financing Update: Issue Paper #16 Adam Stewart
 - Three factors affecting revenue (assessed value (AV), tax rate period, tax rate)
 - Three packages – two packages at \$2.24 rate where one has less of a rate drop in 9 years than the other (\$.80 vs. \$1.00); one package at \$2.50 rate
 - AV adjustments – slight increases; \$20-\$30 million more in bond packages
 - Rate length – 9 years vs. 7 years
 - Tax rate – maintain current rate
 - **Comments/Questions**
 - Is the \$395 million bond a “good” package? Yes, mandatory and recommended projects, etc. are included in this package.
 - How is less of a drop in 9 years messaged in the ballot title? There is not necessarily room for that in title. It will make more of a difference for next bond measure (2028).



- What is length of this bond? This is a 20-year bond.
- Davis Demographics Update
 - There is no new or changed data to report.
 - Committee will receive the final report.
- 3. School Bond Package Alternatives (20 min) Adam Stewart/Frank Angelo
 - Assumptions in Revised Alternatives
 - Review New Bond Package Alternatives: Issue Paper #17
 - Difference in base alternative (Package A) – not just classroom technology but infrastructure, too; included funding for new gyms at schools with “cafegymatoriums”; cameras and GPS on buses; no Brookwood replacement
 - Package B – add Brookwood; remove pick-up/drop-off improvements and building exterior painting
 - **Comments/Questions**
 - Why is there a drop in seismic upgrade funding? Upgrades are taken care of in replacing Brookwood.
 - Package C – Includes a second elementary school in South Hillsboro (SoHi), furniture, and land purchase
 - **Comments/Questions**
 - What is involved in “land purchase”? This is strategic time to buy. Even though land purchase is only a line item in Package C, the District may be able to get some funding for it if Package B is spent efficiently. “Land” could be included in any bond title even if not in project list to allow for the possibility of land purchase opportunities.
 - Is there a specific property in mind? There is not a specific property, but areas of interest and expected growth. Is it possible to buy land and lease it for other uses until it is needed and ready for school use? Yes. (Cornelius land is like that.)
 - Concerned about having only \$.80 capacity in 9 years. There is a lot of improvement need for existing facilities now that are not expected to be an issue in 9 years (although maintenance/existing facilities will still need some improvement).
 - What are seismic options? “Life/safety” improvements proposed, instead of “Cadillac” immediate occupancy-level improvements. Most likely, new schools should be built to at least partially be fit for immediate occupancy (e.g., gyms and cafeterias).
 - Why were drop-off and painting exterior projects removed? Those seemed like some of most strategic removals in order to be able to include a second SoHi school.
- 4. Bond Advisory Committee Discussion (40 min) Committee
 - Review New Bond Packages
 - Bond Package Adjustments/Options



- Alternative(s) to Present to Community
- **Comments/Questions/Discussion**
 - Budget cuts are forthcoming (and there is a need for an operating levy), so there is support for maintaining tax rate.
 - It would be interesting to have some conversation at the community meeting to see if, for example, Brookwood replacement is a priority (speak in terms of specific priorities and projects).
 - Clearly frame the difference in packages to taxpayers; e.g., Packages A and B maintain the current tax rate, or Package C go back to rate paid a few years ago. Make a clear “small ask” of so much a month (e.g., approx. \$6). However, polling in the past for other bond measures has shown that it is not necessarily effective to frame this small cost in terms of everyday items like a coffee or other items.
 - If just two packages are forwarded for consideration, eliminate Package B because it limits flexibility in future and there is possibly not as much or enough tax capacity for a second SoHi school in 9 years.
 - Can a project like the Brookwood replacement (do in another 9 years?) be switched for other improvements (e.g., drop off)? There is concern about not having enough capacity without adding an improved Brookwood school. Neighbors are ready for a new school. Improvements (including capacity) at Brookwood could reduce students moved to Rosedale, and open up capacity at Rosedale for growth in SoHi. There is a preference for replacing rather than majorly renovating Brookwood for cost-effectiveness (think voters will agree).
 - What is the community meeting purpose and focus? Focus on projects and project priority, and/or on tax rate?
 - Do not get too into numbers and weeds at the community meeting.
 - Consider the connection of the bond and levy. There is concern about building a second SoHi school and not being able to staff and operate the school.
 - Emphasize the community shelter function of new/replaced schools and new gyms for seismic and safety in case of a major event (e.g., subduction zone earthquake).
 - What projects are not included in these packages that are on other facility needs lists? Even if there is some work leftover (e.g., roofs, seismic), most of the work and needs will be addressed with these packages.
 - Why not keep a \$2.24 rate for the 20-year life of bond? This is constrained by needing to spend a certain amount of revenue in a fixed time and by not knowing what needs there will be later in the 20-year period.
 - Look for opportunities. Brookwood is a benefit because you are investing long-term in a school rather than in temporary, shorter-term improvements (which can be frustrating to taxpayers). It can provide some capacity that may offset the need for a second SoHi school in the near term. Can options (projects removed in some of these packages) be kept open for the community meeting and/or polling?



- What are drop-off improvements? The improvements are primarily for safety, including separated bus and parent drop-off, and provide clarity for student/pedestrian circulation.
- Is there a building-by-building breakdown of improvements? Yes, that will be provided.
- There is support for the lower tax rate in order to appeal to the 70% of voters without students in HSD schools, and because there are not necessarily a lot of big projects that are appealing, especially to those without students. Adam would like to test packages for projects included in packages and some that are not (e.g., field house) if those may be needed to appeal to voters, particularly those without students.
- What is price difference between the two SoHi schools in Package C? One comes later (and costs more) than the first school.
- If we are able to sell the \$2.50 rate now, it will probably be easier to do than later since the rate was recently \$2.50.
- Promote and sell the “good financial stewardship” of maintenance.
- What is the proposed order of projects? The general order would be driven by where improvements and capacity are most needed.
- There is a preference for seeing funding go toward replacing and improving existing schools instead of a second new school in SoHi.
- There is a preference for advancing Packages B and C to the community meeting for clearer differentiation (vs. Packages A and B). Modify Package C by taking out the second school, adding back drop-off improvements and exterior painting, and figuring new rate (probably less than \$2.50).
 - Also consider adding drop-off improvements and exterior paint to Packages B and C, raising up the back end of Package B to accommodate this and removing the second SoHi school and adding drop-off and paint project and any other projects (e.g., safety/seismic, technology) for bringing Package C up to \$443 million.
 - Regarding a second SoHi school, what do we do if growth and development occur even faster than expected? Then the need for a second school will become clear and will be easier to sell in a later bond package.
- Create a display of “parking lot” issues and projects (related to the Master List) – a bulleted list of other projects (not in packages).
- Hold a community meeting after the Board meets about a local option levy.
- It is recommended that pictures of some of these projects be provided at the community meeting (e.g., furniture).

5. Community Open House (10 min)

Adam Stewart

- Community Open House: Issue Paper #18



- **Comments/Questions**

- How many more community meetings will there be or should there be? Hold meetings after the March 8 BAC meeting. Hold meetings at feeder (middle) schools or high schools, as well as at community meeting places for those without students.
- Gresham-Barlow School District had about 8 meetings prior to bond solidification (pre-campaign).
- Consider saving energy to hit community support hard in fall for campaign; phone polls tend to provide most representative and statistically valid data.

6. Next Steps (10 min)

- Report to Superintendent / Schedule Adam Stewart

7. Public Comment (5 min)

- There was no public comment.

8. Next Bond Committee (Meeting #5)

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

6:00pm – 9:00pm

Location: Administration Building