

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Executive Summary

Introduction/Context.....	1-1
Identification of Needs	1-2
Leadership and Management of the Committee	1-3

Section 2 - Recommendations

Proposed Scope of Work	
Safety and Security.....	2-1
Academic Enhancement.....	2-2
Buildings and Infrastructure.....	2-2
Relief for Overcrowded Schools.....	2-4
District-wide Facilities.....	2-6
Budget Summary Sheet.....	2-7

Section 3 – Tax and Financial Implications...3-1

Section 4 – Leveraging Our Investment.....4-1

Section 5 – Collateral Issues

Development and Implementation of a Campus and District-Wide Bond Planning Program.....	5-1
Policy and Guidance on Portable Buildings.....	5-2
Improved Reporting, Construction Audits, Survey of Users.....	5-3
Survey of Lunch Period Schedules on Campuses....	5-4
Provide Adequate Maintenance and Operations Budget.....	5-5
Make Educational Specifications Available on the AISD Website.....	5-6
Design Standards.....	5-7

Section 6 – Management of Bond Program...6-1

Section 7 – Proposed Bond Propositions.....7-1

Section 8 – Issues Raised at CBAC Public

Forums.....8-1

Section 9– Appendices

Committee Selection Process and Member List 9-1

Project Summary Sheets.....9-4

Interscholastic Sport Task Force Report.....9-5

List of Volunteer Construction Professionals.....9-6

Frequently Asked Questions.....9-7

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 1:

Executive Summary

Context

In developing a scope of work for the proposed 2004 Bond Program, the Citizens' Bond Advisory Committee considered a variety of issues that impact students' welfare and achievement as well as taxpayers' long-term investment in district facilities. These considerations ranged from issues as varied as the provision of closed circuit cameras and improved building entry systems to enhance the safety and security of our schools, to the renovation of facilities to meet current educational specifications and the construction of new classrooms to relieve overcrowded schools. In doing its work, the Committee identified issues of immediate concern as well as those that, although not currently critical, if left unattended will lead to much more expensive remediation in the long run.

During the course of its deliberations, the Committee visited a representative sample of school facilities and reviewed the results of a comprehensive facility needs survey submitted by AISD campus principals and building managers. The Committee also benefited from the work of more than 100 local, volunteer architects, engineers and construction professionals who conducted additional comprehensive facility needs assessments at all AISD campuses. This cadre of professionals verified the input of campus principals while focusing on the conditions of building components and systems. A professional demographer was also engaged to forecast the impact of new housing starts, planned development, and population trends, etc., on the enrollments of District schools. Additionally, the Committee heard from each organizational unit in the District regarding district-wide needs. Finally, AISD's Department of Construction Management and Maintenance Services staff was available to provide guidance and expertise in interpreting this array of data and cost analyses of proposed bond projects to meet the identified needs.

The result of these efforts was an initial "wish" list of over \$600 million in repairs, renovations and new construction to address the District's facility needs through the year 2010. It was the Committee's job to assess and prioritize these identified needs. At all times, their aim was to develop a scope of work that would minimize the tax impact of the proposed 2004 Bond Program by focusing on projects of highest need, yet be comprehensive enough to safeguard the taxpayers' investment in AISD facilities and grounds.

This exercise consumed a year of effort as the Committee worked through issues such as the safety and security of our schools in these times of uncertainty, the enhancement of facilities to better support quality teaching and learning, the impact of deferred maintenance on the integrity of buildings and their infrastructure, the use of environmentally friendly building standards, and solutions to overcrowded schools in light of projected population shifts.

The next sections of this report describe the breadth of possible projects identified through the various mechanisms employed by the Committee, the process used to set priorities among these projects, the rationale for selecting among priorities, and the Committee's proposed 2004 Bond Program scope of work.

Identification of Needs

The identification of which facility needs to fund under the proposed 2004 Bond Program was the core of the Committee's work. The Committee went about its task in a systematic manner gathering data and input from experts and District stakeholders alike.

School Visits – The Committee began its work by touring a representative sample of elementary, middle and high schools with Construction Management personnel. The schools were selected both for their condition and locations. The goal was to familiarize Committee members with both the range of issues that might be addressed through a bond program and to provide some awareness of the various systems that make up the infrastructure of a school. Together, the sample of schools presented a wide array of conditions and their varied locations underscored the need for repair, renovation, etc., in all parts of the District.

District-Wide Facility Needs Presentations – Following its tour of schools, the Committee spent a number of meetings hearing from, and asking questions of, representatives from various committees and departments about District-wide facility needs. These interactions included in-depth discussions on, for example, the enhancement of school safety and security, the improvement of District-wide athletic venues such as Burger, Nelson, and House Park Fields, the upgrading of the District's technological infrastructure, etc. Unlike needs cited by building principals, these District-wide issues are not specific to a given campus. The Committee also had the opportunity to hear a presentation from the District's contracted demographer and the rationale for recommendations on classroom additions and new schools to relieve overcrowding.

Campus Facility Needs Review – After considering the proposed District-wide needs, the Committee began a detailed review of the data submitted by school principals in their facility needs survey and gathered by the volunteer engineers, architects and construction professionals in their building assessments. These data were compiled by school and organized by general categories of building and site improvement needs (e.g., building envelope, functional equity, etc.). Needs were then preliminarily rated a 1 (highest need), a 2 (high need), a 3 (moderate need) or a 4 (low need) within each category of need. Construction Management personnel, with input from the volunteer architects and engineers, performed this data compilation and sorting. The associated estimated cost for meeting each of the identified needs was also included in the materials reviewed by the Committee.

The Committee broke into four groups to do its work. Each group was assigned expert Construction Management personnel to guide Committee members through the data and to answer any technical questions that might arise. The Committee's task was to review each school and to prioritize identified needs within schools. They did this through lively discussion within their assigned groups and as a Committee of the whole at the end of each meeting. Sometimes they agreed with a preliminary need rating and sometimes they did not. In the end, they produced their own preliminary list of what they considered

“highest” needs within each school. Given the number of schools in the District (103) and the volume of data compiled for each school, this exercise consumed several meetings and many hours of discussion.

Principal Feedback – Once the Committee had developed a list of highest needs for each school, it shared these results with the District’s principals and sought their response. They did this because in almost every case, the principals had submitted a more extensive list of needs than that included in the Committee’s outcomes. The Committee felt that it was imperative that principals be made aware that there would be a difference between what they had asked for and what they might receive and that there was a well-established rationale for the discrepancy.

Often a principal’s identified need did not “make the cut” because it would not be fundable under a bond program (e.g., painting a building), or because it was not within the District’s education specifications. Often, what a principal listed, as a “need” would be more appropriately addressed by the District’s Service Center as routine maintenance or repair. Finally, a principal’s request may not have been judged a high priority by the Committee in light of other competing demands for funding under the proposed 2004 Bond Program.

The Committee was also interested in unearthing any other “needs” that might have emerged on campuses since the original data had been collected. These new “needs” were duly considered by the Committee and folded into the mix, when deemed appropriate.

Public Forums– The Committee also held a series of public hearings to gain input from the various constituencies across the District. Again, the Committee considered the merits of this input in light of the identified “highest” needs and the overall proposed 2004 Bond Program.

Leadership and Management of the Committee

The Committee’s work moved forward through the leadership of tri-Chairs, John Blazier, Sheryl Cole and Vincent Torres. It was these individuals who met with Construction Management staff prior to each Committee meeting to set the agenda, review materials and determine what had to be accomplished. The overall Committee schedule was also largely negotiated and facilitated by the tri-Chairs. During Committee meetings, it was the tri-Chairs responsibility to facilitate discussion, solicit input, and keep Committee deliberations on track. The tri-Chairs also took the lead in meeting with principals to solicit feedback and in gathering information at public hearings.

Construction Management Staff and the District’s Director for Bond Execution and Development provided the needed logistics to ensure the Committee’s success. It was they who: defined the role of the Committee in the bond development process; contacted Board-identified Committee member candidates; cataloged the milestones and critical dates that lead to a bond election; secured meeting space; notified Committee members of

upcoming meetings and events; gathered needed information; arranged for speakers and school visits; wrote reports and tabulated data; provided technical expertise and guidance; and, provided food and refreshments for the numerous dinner and lunch meetings that comprised the schedule.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 2:

Recommendations

Safety and Security

Value Statement: *Students and staff must have safe, secure and orderly teaching and learning environments.*

The CBAC designated \$19 million in the bond proposal to address campus safety and security issues. After receiving a list of needs identified by the AISD Police Department (see below), the Committee earmarked \$16 million of the budget to address them, while designating the remaining \$3 million to fund the Community Safety Task Force recommendations.

Replacement and upgrade of fire alarms throughout the District	\$2,394,000
Installation of cameras and CCTV systems at District facilities	\$6,068,389
Other safety and security items:	\$5,239,780
• Card access	
• Access control and network camera for MDF (main distribution frame) and IDF (intermediate distribution frame) telecommunications/technology equipment rooms	
• Fire suppression systems for main computer room at CAC and kitchen exhaust hoods	
Installation of fire alarms and CCTV systems at new elementary campuses	\$1,267,000
Installation of fire alarms and CCTV systems at new middle school campus	\$333,900
Safety and security project contingency	<u>\$696,931</u>
Total:	\$16,000,000

Community Safety Task Force Recommendations

The Traffic and Facility Subcommittee of the Community Safety Task Force has presented the following recommendations for Board consideration. The Board is expected to take action on these items on April 12, 2004.

Emergency and exterior lighting and additional parking	\$875,350
Panic hardware for portables	\$310,500
Campus traffic improvements	\$955,000
Project contingency and soft costs	<u>\$859,150</u>
Total:	<u>\$3,000,000</u>
Safety and Security Total	\$19,000,000

Academic Enhancement and Buildings and Infrastructure

Value Statement: *The district will ensure the provision of instructional facilities and spaces that support the delivery of a challenging, rigorous and equitable education program for all students.*

Value Statement: *The major building systems in each facility must be maintained to protect the health of students and staff and to protect the taxpayers' investment in district campuses, facilities and sites.*

Elementary schools	\$70,510,110
Middle schools	\$34,362,312
High schools	\$48,258,830
Support Facilities	\$6,784,372
Other schools	\$3,549,000
Libraries	\$2,500,000
Play slabs at elementary schools	<u>\$2,200,000</u>
Total:	\$168,164,624

Academic Enhancement

Using the Functional Equity Deficiency Report developed during the 1996 Bond Program, construction management staff assessed each campus to identify any existing functional equity deficiencies. Staff recommended that areas that fell below 70% of the educational specifications or where egregious space deficiencies existed be included in the campus renovations. Recommended renovations include:

- Elementary gymnasiums;
- Dressing rooms at middle schools;
- Fine arts facilities;
- Art rooms;
- Health Services areas;
- Library expansions; and,
- Elementary school outdoor play slabs.

Proposed Renovations

Renovations at the various campuses throughout the District include:

- Improved site drainage at 66 campuses;

- Exterior door repair and/or replacement at 43 campuses;
- Roof repair and/or replacement at 82 campuses;
- Building envelope upgrades for weather tightness and reduction in energy loss at 45 campuses;
- Restroom renovations at 41 campuses;

- Installation of BEMS (building energy management system) and HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning) controls at 35 campuses; and,
- Mechanical system upgrades for improved service and energy efficiency at 88 campuses.

Relief for Overcrowded Schools

Value Statement: *Students and staff must have learning environments that do not impede the teaching-learning process to ensure that all students receive a high quality educational experience.*

New schools and classroom additions include environmental design features incorporated in new construction designs for the first time for the 2004 Bond Program.

In order to minimize the impact on taxpayers, the CBAC used the following assumptions in recommending the construction of new schools and classroom additions:

- Minimize the number of new schools;
- Maximize the use of existing schools;
- Only recommend relief for schools that are projected to be at greater than 125% of permanent capacity in 2007-08;
- Use an undesignated elementary school to respond to shifting population trends beyond the five-year forecast; and
- If warranted, acquire sites for future needs.

New Schools		
Elementary (5)		\$84,582,485
Middle (1)		\$32,441,738
Classroom Additions		\$27,457,608
Land Acquisition		
Future middle school site		<u>\$3,000,000</u>
Total:		147,481,831

PROPOSED NEW AISD SCHOOLS

<u>Type</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Provides Relief</u> (% of Capacity, 2007/ # of portable rooms, 2003)	<u>Cost</u> (exclusive of land costs)
Elementary	Northeast	Norman (152%/26) Jordan (132%/26)	\$16,566,253
Elementary	Southwest	Kiker (127%/22) Mills (110%/8)	\$16,566,253
Elementary	South/central	Menchaca (165%/20) Baranoff (119%/14)	\$16,566,253
Elementary	Southeast	Palm (146%/22) Langford (127%/34) Menchaca (165%/20)	\$18,317,473

Elementary	Undesignated*		\$16,566,253
Middle School	Northeast	Dobie (139%/26) Pearce (122%/10)	\$32,441,738
		Total Cost for New Schools	\$117,024,223

*To be chosen from the following possibilities:

- Colony Park
- Mueller
- Bear Lake PUD
- Oak Hill

PROPOSED AISD CLASSROOM/CORE ADDITIONS

<u>School</u> (% of Capacity, 2007 # of portable rooms, 2003)	<u>Location</u>	Type	<u>Cost</u>
Kealing JH (addition of 6 th grade)	East	12-classroom addition, library addition	\$6,688,800
Graham ES (128%/24)	North central	8-classroom w/ commons, core-cafeteria, gym, library, admin. area	\$3,972,528
Jordan ES (132% /26)	Northeast	8-classroom w/commons	\$1,949,940
Norman ES (152% /26)	Northeast	8-classroom w/ commons, core-kitchen/cafeteria, library, admin. area	\$2,711,520
Baranoff ES (119%/12)	Southwest	8-classroom	\$1,751,220
Kiker ES (127%/22)	Southwest	8-classroom w/commons	\$1,949,940
Palm ES (146% /22)	Southeast	8-classroom	\$1,751,220
Rodriguez ES (111%/24)	Southeast	8-classroom	\$1,751,220
Houston ES (114%/32)	Southeast	8-classroom	\$1,751,220
Akins HS (131%/10)	Southeast	12-classroom	\$2,880,000
Temporary Swing Space during Construction	All	Move portables or rental units	\$300,000
		Total Cost for Classroom/ Core Additions	<u>\$27,457,608</u>

District-Wide Facilities

Value Statement: *District-wide facilities and services support and enhance the effectiveness of both campus and district-wide operations and programs.*

Athletics	\$12,595,100
Media Services	\$1,088,500
Technology	\$12,289,200
Transportation	<u>\$20,000,000</u>
Total:	\$45,972,800

Athletics

Improvements to district-wide athletic facilities include:

- Renovations to existing and city- or county-owned baseball fields;
- Renovations to Butler softball fields;
- Construction of two soccer fields on AISD property;
- Resurfacing tracks and runways at Burger and Nelson stadiums;
- Renovations to Burger Activity arena;
- Expansion of golf practice facilities;
- Expansion of Pharr Tennis Center; and,
- Renovations to House Park, Burger and Nelson stadiums' infrastructure including the installation of artificial turf.

Media Services

Due to the recent sale of the Rio Grande Campus to ACC (Austin Community College, the Media Services Department will have to be relocated. Furthermore, the Department is operating with outdated analogue equipment, which needs to be replaced with digital equipment. Improvements to the Media Services Department include:

- Purchase of digital video equipment (\$700,000); and,
- Renovation of existing AISD facility to provide production and studio space (\$388,500).

Technology

Improvements to the Technology Department include:

- Upgrades to the WAN backbone electronic equipment and LAN switch; and
- Additional voice mail capacity to serve new schools.

Transportation

Improvements to the Transportation Department include:

- Purchase of low-emission buses;
- Improvements at Nelson and Saegert bus terminals; and,
- Acquisition of a site for and construction of a third bus terminal.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 3:

**Tax and Financial
Implications**

Tax and Financial Implications

The proposed bond program amount of \$420,381,033 would result in an approximate \$.042 increase in the district tax rate. For an Austin homeowner with the median home appraisal of \$157,000, the tax increase would be approximately \$5.50 per month. Under the District's current policy, there would be no tax increase in school taxes for homeowners age 65 and older.

These projections are based on the following assumptions:

- the bonds would be sold in four issues, 12 months apart, \$100 million each;
- each bond sale to be dated August 1, with a first coupon payment on February 1st of the following year;
- interest notes to be "PSF Insured" rates and are assumed to increase by 25 basis points for each series of bonds;
- property value growth of 5% annually; and,
- a 98% collection rate.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 4:

Leveraging Our Investment

Leveraging the Taxpayers' Investment

Careful attention to leveraging taxpayers' investment in facilities is best exemplified in the proposal by the Interscholastic Athletics Task Force (IATF). By placing an emphasis on the renovation of existing city facilities or constructing facilities on city or county property, the school district can more economically meet the facility needs of its athletic programs, through sharing the use of these facilities with other governmental partners.

The CBAC reviewed the IATF proposal and has included the following intergovernmental components in the bond program:

- renovation of two city-owned softball fields at Butler Field;
- renovation of two city-owned baseball fields;
- construction of two soccer fields on a combination of AISD, city or county property;
- expansion of six city golf facilities; and,
- expansion of the city-owned Pharr Tennis Center.

Although available for city/county or the general public, Austin ISD students would have first-priority use of these facilities.

Another potential leveraging opportunity is the development of the undesignated elementary school. If the Colony Park subdivision is selected for the undesignated school, city-owned property could be used for the building site. Preliminary discussions to develop a project similar to the J.J. Pickle Elementary/St. Johns Community Center have been held. Such a project would provide both a neighborhood elementary school and an array of city services; e.g., a public library, a health clinic, a community recreation center and a police substation.

Although no swimming program upgrades are being recommended in the Committee's proposal, additional efforts by district staff to work with the City of Austin, the YWCA and other community organizations that have swimming facilities is supported by the CBAC.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 5:

Collateral Issues

During the committee's deliberations, a number of significant ancillary issues, related to but not central to the charge of the committee, emerged. The committee charged members or staff to articulate the committee's position on each of these issues. This is the purpose for this section of the report.

Development and Implementation of a Campus and District-Wide Bond Planning Program

As part of long-term planning for capital improvements, it is expected that a bond program will be proposed on a regular five- to six-year cycle. To be ready for subsequent bond programs, a process must be developed to prepare, organize and update biannually all data required for future bond programs. Initially, this will be a significant amount of work. However, once institutionalized and computerized, the process will be easily executed and updated. This process should include master planning at both the campus and district-wide levels.

At the campus level, each plan should assess assets, i.e., buildings and their systems and physical property, maintenance and repair, replacement of portables per district policy, safety and security, and facility enhancements or modifications that address functional deficiencies or arise from changes in academic requirements resulting from legislative or district actions, or district strategic planning efforts. District staff would be assigned to each school to assist in the development of campus master plans and to ensure the consistency of final products from campus to campus.

At the district level, master planning should include impacts on the facility enhancements or modifications mentioned above, the planning to implement safety and security policies and procedures, district policies related to replacement of portables with permanent structures, and asset management of district-wide facilities. All items in each plan would include associated implementation costs.

The output from the campus and district master planning process would be a document that identifies four categories of capital improvements and their associated costs. These categories are:

- 1) critical – items that must be included in the next bond cycle;
- 2) priority – items that will be assessed and prioritized by the CBAC;
- 3) long term – items like roofs, HVAC systems, etc., that have predictable service lives with high capital replacement costs; and,
- 4) M&O –chronic repair items that are more cost effective to replace than to continue to repair.

Using current demographic data and the products of the campus and district planning process, the CBAC would have up-to-date comparable data for each campus and district-wide facility from which to perform its work.

Policy/Guidance for Portables

A policy should be developed and implemented for reducing the maximum number of portables used on a given campus and for improving the condition of many of the portables now in use. The policy should address the improved siting of portables in consideration of factors such as site drainage and land topography, parking, safety and security, lighting, and relative proximity to restrooms, main office/support rooms and core facilities.

The design of the portables themselves should be modified to include:

- installation of awnings over doors;
- replacement of wall HVAC systems with quieter split-systems that provide adequate quantities of outside air and are more energy efficient;
- site systems to ensure that rainwater does not flow under the portables once they settle; and,
- incorporation of restrooms in middle and high school portables.

This policy should include the scheduled replacement of portables with permanent space when: the number of portables exceeds some critical number; e.g., more than eight; a portable has been on campus in excess of its expected service life; or the school's population has not decreased for a decade or more and permanent space is warranted.

Improved Reporting Including Construction Audits, Survey of Users When Bond Work is Completed and Outreach to the Austin ISD Community (including voters with no direct contact with the schools)

The Austin community has supported over \$100 million worth of design and construction activity in the last 20 years. To maintain this level of support, a process should be developed and implemented to regularly report bond and maintenance work to the entire Austin ISD community. Of particular importance is outreach to those members of the community who actively participate as voters, but no longer have direct linkage to the Austin ISD. A very targeted outreach effort must be designed, planned and implemented to contact these community members. Research on best strategies and venues for reaching this group must be accompanied by periodic outreach activities to ensure that this important public is kept “in the loop”.

The reporting process should include budget reports, schedule tracking and the results of surveys of building users that assess the manner in which the work was completed, the level of interruption to the instructional process and the satisfaction of users with the final product.

This information will be helpful in managing future bond and maintenance work, improving community awareness of the quality of work being produced with their tax dollars and assurance that critical renovation and repair needs are being addressed in a timely, cost-effective manner.

Survey of Lunch Period Schedules on Campuses

One issue raised during the public forums, especially on campuses with high growth, was the need for scheduling unreasonably early lunch periods. It is important to gather lunch schedules and the reasons for the schedules that have been developed. These data will assist in the facilities planning process by helping determine if cafeteria size is the issue or if it is purely a scheduling problem.

With “closed campuses” for seniors being discussed for possible implementation in the 2004-05 school year, the collection of lunch schedules at the end of the current school year could be used to evaluate facility needs and identify situations in which alternative schedules could be implemented to address the impact of this policy change.

Provide Adequate Operating and Maintenance Budgets

Currently, the district must augment its annual maintenance and operations (M&O) budget through the renovations budgets in bond programs. The M&O budgets for maintenance and plan improvement renovations total \$5.4 million per year, about half the industry standard for an organization the size of Austin ISD. The industry standard is one percent (1%) of the total dollar value of all of the organization's facilities (approximately \$1 billion). Using this standard, the M&O budget for the Austin ISD would be \$10 million.

The challenges with this approach are the following:

- deferred maintenance is funded with debt that is repaid over 20-30 years; and,
- the funding source for much of the district's maintenance needs arrives intermittently, i.e. upon bond passage, making the implementation of an effective, systemic, maintenance process difficult.

Although, choices for funding priorities are very difficult, the Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees increase the current level of M&O funding for maintenance and plant improvements.

Make Educational Specifications Available on the AISD Website

As campuses and communities become more engaged in the facility planning process, the need for easy access to the district's educational specifications will become more important. To facilitate this access, the Committee recommends that the Austin ISD educational specifications for elementary, middle and high schools be made available on the Austin ISD website.

Design Standards

The average age of school buildings in AISD is thirty-nine years. The useful lives of these buildings exceed sixty years. Proper consideration of life-cycle costs must be given when the District makes capital expenditure decisions. Mechanical systems, roofing systems, window systems and other building systems must be evaluated relative to “first cost” and “long-term cost” of installation and operation.

The District should continue to use its time-tested building standards and develop new and additional results-based standards for the use of building materials, products and systems. Lessons learned from AISD’s mold remediation projects in the 2002 Health & Safety Bond Program should be applied in future bond programs. The extensive use of moisture retaining organic building materials should be abandoned in favor of less absorptive, more durable materials with lower maintenance characteristics.

The reasonable use of more sustainable and environmentally responsive materials should also become a part of the District’s building standards.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 6:

**Management of Bond
Program**

Management of Bond Program

Since 1983, the Austin Independent School District has implemented four Capital Improvements School Bond Programs. Management of the 1983 \$210 million program was performed by AISD Construction Management Department staff architects, engineers, clerical and other support personnel. The 1990 \$80 million program was managed by AISD Construction Management staff with some contracted project management assistance provided by a local mechanical engineering firm for projects whose predominant focus was air conditioning, heating, plumbing and electrical system improvements.

The 1996 \$369 million bond program was managed by a joint venture between a nationally experienced program management firm and a local architectural/project management firm. The joint venture program manager was responsible for the management of all aspects of the bond program, reporting to and coordinating with AISD's Construction Management Department on a routine basis and reporting to the Board of Trustees on a quarterly basis.

The 2002 \$49 million Health & Safety Bond Program is currently being administered by AISD's Construction Management Department.

While nationally recognized firms offer a variety and abundance of management systems and other resources that can provide unique benefits in the management of large-scale capital improvements programs, there are down-side risks of having such companies provide these contracted management services.

In order for a program management firm to be successful in its endeavors, which necessarily includes being efficient and profitable, a school district has to be willing to delegate decision-making authority to the management firm. Some of the feedback received relative to the contracted management of the 1996 Bond Program was that individual campus concerns were addressed with much less understanding and with much less sympathy than when addressed by District staff. By its nature, the management firm did not have benefit of District personnel's institutional knowledge of AISD's facilities, educational specifications, design standards and building system preferences, which resulted in some project elements having to be reworked.

Since district personnel have the responsibility for long-term maintenance of district facilities, their personal investment in a high quality finished product is greater than employees of an outside firm that end their relationship with the District at the conclusion of the bond program. Although outside management firms can provide specialized expertise in areas of the program's management, i.e., safety or Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) components, these same resources are available through consultant services in urban communities. In either case, District staff must be intimately involved with these service providers to sensitize them to the unique features and needs of the

various communities that comprise the District to ensure campuses are appropriately served.

District staff can more ably employ a campus-focused management philosophy that properly respects the educational process and are better equipped to make decisions that fairly balance campus opinions with District objectives. District staff will more likely excel in front-line project management efforts, drawing on previously successful solution strategies and their familiarity with AISD design standards, policies, processes and procedures.

After careful consideration of the factors mentioned above, the lingering community perceptions of the difficult challenges encountered in the management of the 1996 Bond Program, and the significant difference in cost when comparing in-district to outside program management, the CBAC recommends that the Board of Trustees utilize the expertise and experience of District staff to manage the 2004 Bond Program.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 7:

Bond Propositions

The CBAC recommends for the Board’s consideration the following bond proposition-packaging configuration. This recommendation is based on an analysis of the information from the community poll about the bond program funded by a citizens’ group.

This recommendation includes four propositions in the broad categories of:

- 1) renovations/environmental improvements;
- 2) safety and security, environmental health and district-wide facilities;
- 3) new schools, classroom additions and land acquisition; and,
- 4) athletics and physical education facilities including leveraging taxpayers’ investment by sharing facilities.

Packaging of the Bond Propositions

Prop 1 - Academic and Building Infrastructure Renovations to Safeguard Investments in District Campuses, Facilities and Sites and Invest in Environmental Health Initiatives and Standards

Value Statement: The district will ensure the provision of instructional facilities and spaces that support the delivery of a challenging, rigorous and equitable education program for all students.

Value Statement: The major building systems in each facility must be maintained to protect the health of students and staff and to protect the taxpayers' investment in district campuses, facilities and sites.

Additional environmental design features are incorporated for construction and renovation designs for the first time in the 2004 bond program.

Elementary Schools	69,056,340
Middle Schools	33,804,712
High Schools	44,794,570
Principals' Recommendations	3,645,950
Other Schools	3,549,000
Libraries	2,500,000
Construction Management	375,000
Technology	12,289,200
Legal	400,000
Subtotal	170,414,772
Program Contingency	17,041,477
Total Prop 1	187,456,249

Prop 2 - Safety and Security, Environmental Health and District-wide Facilities

Value Statement: Students and staff must have safe, secure and orderly teaching and learning environments.

Value Statement: Districtwide facilities and services support and enhance the effectiveness of both campus and districtwide operations and programs.

Safety & Security	19,000,000
Support Facilities	6,784,372
Transportation	8,000,000
Low Emission Buses	12,000,000
Media Services	1,088,500
Asbestos	2,000,000
Legal	160,000
Subtotal	<u>49,032,872</u>
Program Contingency	<u>4,903,287</u>
Total Prop 2	<u>53,936,159</u>

Prop 3 - Relief for Overcrowded Schools/Provision of Equitable Facilities Districtwide

Value Statement: Students and staff must have learning environments that do not impede the teaching-learning process to ensure that all students receive a high quality educational experience.

New schools and classroom additions include environmental design features incorporated in new construction designs for the first time for the 2004 bond program.

New Schools	
Elementary	84,582,485
Middle	32,441,738
Classroom Additions	27,457,608
Land Acquisition	3,000,000
One future middle school site	
Legal	400,000
Subtotal	<u>147,881,831</u>
Program Contingency	<u>14,788,183</u>
Total Prop 3	<u>162,670,014</u>

Prop 4 - Athletic and Physical Education Facilities Including the Efficient Utilization of Taxpayers' Dollars Through Sharing Facilities Among Governmental Entities

Value Statement: High quality district-wide facilities for athletics and physical education are needed to encourage the engagement students in school activities that maximize connectedness between participants and their schools.

Value Statement: Governmental entities maximize the efficient use of taxpayers' dollars when they work cooperatively to construct and/or renovate facilities that they can share.

Athletic Task Force recommendations and renovations to existing facilities	12,595,100
Elementary play slabs	2,200,000
Legal	40,000
Subtotal	<u>14,835,100</u>
Program Contingency	<u>1,483,510</u>
Total Prop 4	16,318,610
Total All Propositions	420,381,033
Total <u>First Three</u> Propositions	404,062,423

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 8:

**Issues Raised at CBAC
Public Forums**

Issues Raised at CBAC Public Forums

In an effort to inform the AISD community of the process used to develop bond recommendations and to provide general information regarding the proposed 2004 Bond Program, the CBAC hosted four public forums:

- McCallum High School – February 17, 2004;
- Small Middle School – February 26, 2004;
- Mendez Middle School – March 2, 2004; and,
- Martin Middle School – March 4, 2004.

After receiving comments from over 140 Austin citizens, the CBAC identified the following emerging issues:

- Construction of a middle school in Southwest Austin on Circle C Tract 101;
- Construction of a Performing Arts Center at McCallum High School;
- Construction of a science/technology wing at Travis High School; and
- Environmental stewardship as an area of emphasis in the 2004 Bond Program.

After listening to the community and reviewing additional information about each of these issues, the Committee decided to recommend to the Board of Trustees that these emerging issues merited further consideration before recommendations with fiscal implications were adopted.

*Citizens' 2004 Bond Advisory
Committee - Final Report*

SECTION 9:

Appendices

Committee Selection Process and Member List

CITIZENS' BOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE 2004 BOND PROGRAM

Purpose of Committee:

- review, verify and prioritize the staff recommendations for a possible scope of work for the 2004 Bond Program; and,
- assist the District in communicating information to the community about the priority recommendations identified during this process.

Proposed Committee Composition:

- a maximum of 20 members led by two co-chairs;
- geographically representative of AISD;
- racially/ethnically representative of the AISD student population; and,
- representative of:
 - parent/teacher organizations
 - the financial community
 - the development/architect/engineer/construction contractor communities;
 - the business community;
 - the health community including those with indoor air-quality expertise;
 - the faith-based community; and,
 - neighborhood associations

Proposed Committee Method of Selection:

- each Trustee appoints two committee members;
- the Board President appoints a co-chair and two committee members; and,
- the Superintendent appoints a co-chair.

TRI-CHAIRS

<i>John Blazier</i>	<i>Sheryl Cole</i>	<i>Vincent Torres</i>
---------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

Laurie Allen
Mark Boyden
Olga Garza
Donetta Goodall
Marvin Griffin
Greg Hartman
Marguerite Jones
Rebecca Lightsey
Annette Lovoi
Louise Lynch
Roy Salinas
Dorcas Seals
Vicky Valdez
Jeff Walker
Terrance Washington
Horace Willis

Project Summary Sheets

Interscholastic Sports Task Force Report

List of Volunteer Construction Professionals

Frequently Asked Questions

Bond Frequently Asked Questions

Question: Why is a bond election needed at this time? What amount is needed?

Response: *The facility needs assessment determined from data collected from campuses, teams of architects and construction professionals and maintenance and construction management staff identified in excess of \$600 million of site and facility needs. The Citizens' Bond Advisory Committee (CBAC) has reduced this amount by one-third to approximately \$400 million, in an effort to be prudent with the level of spending for this bond.*

Question: How will this amount affect my property taxes?

Response: *The District Interest and Sinking (debt retirement) tax rate would increase approximately \$.042. For example, a home valued at \$150,000 would see a monthly tax increase of slightly less than \$5.50 per month.*

Question: What is the tax impact on the homeowner who is 65 or older?

Response: *The proposed Bond Program will have no impact on homeowners who are 65 or older because the amount of property tax that these individuals must pay never exceed what they paid in the year they turned 65. The amount they pay may be lowered, in fact, should the assessed value of their property fall and/or a reduction in the tax rate result in a lower property tax payment.*

Question: If the bond is approved, when will it be implemented?

Response: *Using a reimbursement resolution that permits the acceleration of work, some of the safety and security improvements would begin this summer. Design of the first projects on the master project schedule would begin as soon as architects are selected in October/November of 2004, construction would begin during the 2005 calendar year.*

Question: How will the bond program be managed?

Response: *Although the Board of Trustees has not yet approved a bond program management plan, the CBAC recommendation will be to manage the program with augmented district staff rather than with a program management firm such as the one used in the 1996 Bond Program.*

Question: How will students benefit from the bond program? How will the bond program improve education in Austin?

Response: *Austin ISD students deserve high quality educational facilities. This bond program will provide enhanced educational facilities and spaces, new schools and classroom additions to relieve overcrowding and renovations to major building systems to safeguard the taxpayers' investment in the district's campuses, facilities and sites.*

As new schools are constructed, students in several of the district's overcrowded schools will attend schools that have smaller enrollments, which will result in less demand on the cafeteria, library and gymnasiums.

Question: Which schools would benefit from this proposed bond program?

Response: *All Austin schools would benefit.*

Question: Why are you renovating schools rather than replacing them?

Response: *AISD proposes to renovate rather than replace schools for two reasons: 1) Cost – In today's market, it is much more expensive to build a new school than to renovate. 2) Current codes and regulations – Many of the facilities that will be impacted by the proposed bond projects are on sites that will not accommodate the construction of new schools under current regulations. That is, many of AISD's school sites are too small to meet both the specifications of a modern school building and City of Austin's standards for allowable impervious cover.*

Question: What is the date for the 2004 Bond Election?

Response: *The proposed date is Saturday, September 11, 2004.*