Memo

To: Board of Trustees

From: Facilities and Technology Task Force, Rebecca Egelston Caso, Chair

Date: January 12, 2016

Re: Task Force Recommendations

Since September 2015, the Facilities and Technology Task Force has met eight times to study the capital needs of the District. During those meetings, the task force has received input from District staff in all facets of its operations: facility services, curriculum, technology, campus services, safety and security, food and nutritional services, transportation, athletics, and fine arts. The task force has also received reports and analysis on enrollment projections, debt levels, financing options and tax rate implications.

As requested, the task force considered additional items forwarded by the Board of Trustees following the Board's review and discussion of the interim report. The task force also conducted a public hearing on the draft project list on December 17, 2015. Over 100 people attended the public hearing, of which 25 spoke and 4 others submitted written comments.

Following many hours of meeting, deliberating, discussing and considering stakeholder input, the task force recommends that the attached list of projects totaling $524,725,000 be included in a bond election to be held on May 7, 2016. I would like to point out that this list of projects includes the Performing Arts Venue and the Early Childhood School that you asked the task force to consider following your review of their interim report. I would also point out that the list includes the six turf projects previously removed, which the task force respectfully asks that you reconsider.

You also asked the task force for its input as to whether the election should be structured as a single proposition or multiple propositions. The majority of the task force prefers a single proposition structure.

Finally, the task force was also charged with "Analyzing the District's outstanding debt structure and incorporating proposed new debt in a manner that will have minimal impact on taxpayers." Three illustrative financing models are attached. Model 1 results in a tax rate decrease and Model 2 results in a constant tax rate during the five year life

of the program with declining rates thereafter. Therefore, Models 1 and 2 address this charge.

Model 3 addresses the desire of one trustee (noted separately in the Board's charge) that "any new debt issued over the life of the program would not exceed debt retired during that same time period." Model 3 would result in a tax rate increase during the five year life of the bond program. It is left to the judgment of the Board to determine whether this increase would be considered minimal.

On behalf of the task force, thank you for allowing us to serve the District, and best wishes as you deliberate and make final decisions on our recommendations.