


























# Modern Learning and Other Improvements — Possible Options

A citizens group drafted the PPS Long-Range Facilities Plan this year and recommended that the community engage in a series of construction bonds over decades to modernize schools. **PPS is asking you:** (1) whether the district should go out for the first in a series of bonds. If so, (2) which priorities should that first bond address, and (3) which schools should be modernized in that bond. The options below are based on guidance from a second citizens group. PPS staff used that guidance to identify priorities and a sample set of schools, as well as other schools that could be substituted for consideration. These options are a starting point for community feedback: **(See flip side for more detail.)**

<p><b>Priority: Seismic and Access • \$411 Million</b> <b>\$1.00 per \$1000 of Assessed Value for 8 years</b></p> <p><b>2 K-8 rebuilds • \$60 million</b></p> <p>  <b>Arleta Beverly Cleary</b></p> <p><b>5 K-5 rebuilds • \$125 million</b></p> <p>     <b>Abernethy Ainsworth Alameda James John Llewellyn</b></p> <p>\$70 million physical improvements at non-rebuilt schools (wiring, heat, etc.) \$31 million million educational improvements at non-rebuilt schools (science labs, technology, etc.) \$45 million debt repayment \$80million program costs*</p> <p><b>Other schools that fit criteria:</b> Beach PK-8, Boise-Eliot PK-8, Buckman K-5, Creston K-8, Duniway K-5, Grout K-5, Hayhurst K-5, Hosford MS, Jackson MS, Lane MS, Sabin PK-8, Woodlawn PK-8</p>	<p><b>Priority: Potential Funding Partnerships • \$411 Million</b> <b>\$1.00 per \$1000 of Assessed Value for 8 years</b></p> <p><b>1 High School rebuild • \$85 million</b></p> <p> <b>Benson, Jefferson, Lincoln or Roosevelt</b></p> <p><b>2 K-8 rebuilds • \$60 million</b></p> <p>  <b>César Chávez Faubion</b></p> <p><b>2 K-5 rebuilds • \$50 million</b></p> <p>  <b>James John Grout</b></p> <p>\$6 million Planning for 1 High School \$65 million physical improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$20 million educational improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$45 million debt repayment \$80 million program costs*</p> <p><b>Other schools that fit that criteria:</b> Alameda K-5, Beach PK-8, Boise-Eliot PK-8, Buckman K-5, Chief Joseph PK-5, Creston K-8, George MS, Harrison Park K-8, Kelly K-5, King PK-8, Lane MS, Lent K-8, Ockley Green K-8, Peninsula K-8, Sitton K-5, Vernon PK-8, Whitman K-5, Woodlawn PK-8, Woodmere K-5</p>
<p><b>Priority: Condition and Seismic • \$411 Million</b> <b>\$1.00 per \$1000 of Assessed Value for 8 years</b></p> <p><b>1 Middle School rebuild • \$30 million</b></p> <p> <b>Hosford (6-8)</b></p> <p><b>3 K-8 rebuilds • \$90 million</b></p> <p>   <b>Arleta Beverly Cleary Faubion†</b></p> <p><b>3 K-5 rebuilds • \$75 million</b></p> <p>   <b>Abernethy Ainsworth James John</b></p> <p>\$60 million physical improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$31 million educational improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$45 million debt repayment \$80 million program costs*</p> <p><b>Other schools that fit that criteria:</b> Beach PK-8, Buckman K-5, Duniway K-5, Grout K-5, Jackson MS, Llewellyn K-5, Sabin PK-8</p>	<p><b>Priority: High Schools • \$539 Million</b> <b>\$1.50 per \$1000 of Assessed Value for 8 years</b></p> <p><b>3 High Schools rebuilds • \$255 million</b></p> <p>   <b>Franklin Grant Lincoln</b></p> <p><b>1 K-8 rebuild • \$30 million</b></p> <p> <b>Faubion†</b></p> <p>\$6 million Benson Planning \$82million physical facilities improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$26million educational facilities improvements at non-rebuilt schools \$45 million debt repayment \$95 million program costs*</p> <p><b>Other high schools that could be considered:</b> Benson, Cleveland, Jefferson, Madison, Roosevelt and Wilson</p>

**Why these schools**  
Neighborhood K-5, K-8 schools with a poor seismic rating that lack accessibility. Most also need an elevator and/or are high priority for roof replacement.

**Why these schools**  
Schools are in an Urban Renewal Area, New Market Tax Credit Area and/or have a known capital partner. Geographic diversity and building condition further informed these choices.

**Why these schools**  
Neighborhood K-5, K-8, MS schools rated in poor condition and with a poor seismic rating.

**Why these schools**  
**Franklin** has a poor seismic rating and the largest attendance area. **Grant** is in poor condition with the largest enrollment. **Lincoln** has potential PSU, New Market Tax Credit & Urban Renewal partnerships, a large enrollment and provides geographic balance.

† Strong capital partnership influenced Faubion's inclusion.

† Strong capital partnership influenced Faubion's inclusion.

\*Program costs = Required reserves, bond issuance costs, materials and labor cost escalation and improvements to buildings where students attend school while their school is renovated.



# Modernizing Schools: Information & Possible Options

## Why is PPS considering a school construction bond?

PPS school buildings are aging and in many cases worn out. Roofs and pipes are leaking, electrical systems are inadequate for today's technology, and earthquake resistance is far below current seismic safety standards. In addition, schools need more classroom variety — from large lecture halls to smaller breakout spaces for effective teaching and learning. A bond measure would allow the district to remedy building deficiencies and to modernize learning environments to support student achievement and prepare students to compete in the 21st century and beyond.

## Can a school construction bond also pay for teachers and operational support?

No. A school construction bond can only be used for major renovations or replacement of school buildings. PPS gets state and federal funding to operate the schools (hire teachers, purchase textbooks etc.) as well as from a local option levy, which is a local property tax dedicated to the operation of Portland schools. PPS has not had school construction bond funding for more than 10 years.

## What does a school construction bond pay for?

School bonds typically pay for a blend of full rebuilds of some schools and targeted improvements at others.

**Full rebuilds** address all of the deficient systems and significantly redesigns and rebuilds a school.

- ▶ It creates flexible spaces for learning and other improvements that support student achievement.
- ▶ It is cost-effective. For example, the estimated cost of seismic upgrades needed at Portland schools would be \$422 million if done as stand-alone work but only \$206 million if done as part of full modernizations.

**Targeted improvements** include physical and educational improvements.

- ▶ **Physical improvements** upgrade building systems (heat, electrical, plumbing, fire safety) and building structure (accessibility, roofs, windows, exterior improvements).
- ▶ **Educational improvements** include upgrading classroom and other instructional spaces including libraries, computer labs, art rooms and performance spaces, as well as upgrading science labs, technology and security.

**Program costs** pay for required reserves, materials and labor cost escalation, bond issuance costs and improvements to buildings where students attend school while their school is renovated.

## Where do the four bond options come from and what happens next?

PPS engaged in a series of community listening sessions July-December 2011 and then took the following steps:

- ▶ The **PPS Long-Range Facilities Plan Advisory Committee** met December - April to update the school district's long-range plan for its buildings. The committee included educators, parents, maintenance experts, industry experts and community leaders. The group analyzed building conditions, enrollment forecasts, seismic threats, accessibility needs and the impact of modernized classrooms on student achievement. The group also recommended that the community engage in a series of bonds over time to upgrade PPS schools.
- ▶ A **Bond Development Committee** then considered and refined options for what an initial bond package would contain. That citizens committee included members from the advisory committee and new members. PPS used this group's guidance to develop the options described in this hand-out.
- ▶ **The broader community** is now being asked at a series of

meetings May 22-24, and in an online survey, to weigh in on whether to go forward and if so, to share their views on bond package options.

- ▶ **The school board** would then refer a specific bond package to voters that would describe which schools and what types of improvements would be made and how much it would cost the average property owner.
- ▶ **Voters** who live in the school district would ultimately vote on a bond. Any subsequent bond would also need voter approval.

## What are the criteria that the citizens' group prioritized?

The Bond Development Committee helped PPS establish priorities that the broader community should consider for the first in a series of bonds. PPS staff identified sample schools that met each priority.

### ▶ Seismic and Access

Some schools are more vulnerable to earthquake damage than others, including schools with two or more stories and those with structurally deficient roofs. Some schools need accessibility improvements such as elevators and ramps. All of those needs would be addressed in schools that are rebuilt. *All of the schools recommended under this option are in poor seismic condition and need access upgrades.*

### ▶ Potential Funding Partnerships

Schools identified under this priority have the ability to leverage public or private dollars or other support. For example, Concordia University provides student teachers, and mentors at Faubion K-8, which is next door to the campus. This partnership could also become a funding partnership. In a number of schools, City of Portland urban renewal districts and Federal New Market Tax Credit zones could provide public dollars.

### ▶ Condition and Seismic

One method of measuring building condition is to add up the estimated costs of remedying all building deficiencies and compare that with the cost of building a new building of the same size. The ratio is called the Facility Condition Index or FCI and a higher index means worse conditions. *The schools listed here have an FCI rating of .6 or above.*

### ▶ High Schools

High schools have the largest attendance boundaries or, in the case of focus schools, serve the whole city. *Franklin now has the largest attendance boundary among high schools. Grant is in poor condition with the largest enrollment. Lincoln has partnership potential with PSU, urban renewal dollars and New Market Tax Credits, a large enrollment and provides geographic balance.*

## Why are the sample schools in some cases different than the schools proposed in the 2011 bond?

Since the last bond measure, PPS has updated its building condition ratings to align with a more precise national standard. This changed the ranking of some schools. In addition, public input and the work of the citizens committees narrowed priorities from the last bond. The bottom line is that most PPS schools need work. The effort now is to identify where to begin in a series of possible bonds to upgrade our schools over many years.

## How can I have input on these options?

Attend one of the community meetings May 22-24 or weigh in through an online survey at [www.pps.net](http://www.pps.net). You can also email your views to [schoolmodernization@pps.net](mailto:schoolmodernization@pps.net). The school board will have hearings in June and your testimony is welcome.