

## November 2017 Bond Project

### EXHIBIT C

#### Bond Advisory Committee Recommendations to the TUSD Superintendent

##### Summary and Recommendation

The Bond Advisory Committee met twice in May. First, they were given an overview of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and then an orientation on the project from the District's bond advisors. In the second meeting, they reviewed the survey results, discussed the various bond scenarios from the FMP, developed pros and cons for each bond amount and then recommended the amount of bond to pursue.

The discussion of the bond amount to recommend focused on two key areas: 1) the amount assessed as the needs in the FMP; and 2) questions 9, 12 and 13 of the survey. The survey questions established public support for a bond as follows:

Bond Amount	"Yes"	"Unsure"
\$300M	54.3%	14.8%
\$240M	61.0%	14.6%
\$180M	69.8%	8.4%

The survey has a 95% confidence interval of  $\pm 5\%$ , which indicates that the \$300M bond has a high risk of not passing; therefore, the committee does not recommend pursuing that bond amount.

***Ultimately, the committee recommends \$240M as the optimum, feasible bond amount to meet District needs. However, they recognize that a lower bond amount, for instance \$180M, will have a greater chance of success in the election and will meet the District's most critical needs.***

The following section provides a more complete description of each bond scenario and the committee's position on each bond amount.

##### Bond Information with Pros and Cons

The bond summary tables below show the costs of each bond amount for homeowners in the District based on the average assessed residential value in the District (\$135,114). The assessed value for tax purposes is the value of property as it appears on the tax bill; it does not necessarily represent the market value, which is usually higher. These costs are preliminary estimates; the District bond advisor, Stifel, will provide final estimates for the bond package.

The table after each bond summary table shows the pros and cons developed by each committee member after a general discussion of pros and cons by all committee members.

\$180M Bond

Facility Repairs	Improved Learning Environments	Annual Cost to Homeowner	Monthly Cost to Homeowner
≈ \$ 160M	≈ \$ 20M	\$ 51	\$ 4.23

Pros	Cons
Safe bet per survey	Why bond if it falls so short
Good PR for Board re-election (fiscally conservative)	Too low amount for needs
Will take care of some needs	Would need to go back too soon for another bond
Almost a sure bet for passage	No \$ for facilities
Higher likelihood of passage	Does not include improvements
Will make some repairs & improvements rather than nothing	Doesn't get us all we need
Has some funds for facilities	No \$ for tech
Best chance to succeed	Too low amount for needs
Likely to pass	Does not fully address improvements
More likely to pass	Not enough to do the job
Greater likelihood of passing, has the basics that will sustain district until AZ state gov't comes through	Less money for improvements
	Does not meet total need
	Should include CTE, community space, tech hub and tech \$
	Bond doesn't address all the facilities' needs
	Board won't move up to \$240M

\$240M Bond

Facility Repairs	Improved Learning Environments	Annual Cost to Homeowner	Monthly Cost to Homeowner
≈ \$ 180M	≈ \$ 60M	\$ 58	\$ 4.86

Pros	Cons
<p>Security has more support (see survey)—more \$ for security included</p> <p>Goes further to address needs</p> <p>Gives option for board to make their decision to decide for \$180M</p> <p>Most of facility needs taken care of</p> <p>Gets us closer to efficient facilities</p> <p>We can keep &amp; recruit teachers and students w/ better facilities</p> <p>In line w/ needs</p> <p>At threshold of passing percent based on survey, \$1.11 per week, what a bargain</p> <p>Similar amount to last bond</p> <p>Good chance to pass w/significant amount in improved learning environments</p> <p>Good metrics, it would pass</p> <p>Lets district provide learning environment improvements</p> <p>Best passable balance between repairs &amp; improvements</p> <p>Has enough \$ for a variety of projects to appeal to the largest # of voters</p> <p>Highest passable \$ amount per survey</p>	<p>Management of this much \$\$\$ can be a struggle</p> <p>May not pass</p> <p>More are against this amount, might not pass</p> <p>Less chance of getting 5-0 Board support</p> <p>Some “stickers shock” involved on full amount (\$240M versus cost to homeowner)</p> <p>Does not give us enough to bring buildings up to date</p> <p>Would need to hire more people to manage</p> <p>Less balance of \$ for learning space improvements (compared to \$300M)</p> <p>Should include CTE, community space, tech hub and tech \$ (included in \$300M)</p> <p>Less \$ for security (voter support in survey)</p>

\$300M Bond

Facility Repairs	Improved Learning Environments	Annual Cost to Homeowner	Monthly Cost to Homeowner
≈ \$ 180M	≈ \$ 120M	\$ 72	\$ 5.97

Pros	Cons
It's what the district actually needs	Survey says... risky to get that amount passed
Fulfills more of actual need & facility repair	Too much won't get voters support
Go big or go home	Too high \$ amount for passage
Gets us where we need to be	Won't pass, chances are too high it won't
Good selling point if we deliver (positive improvements to facilities)	Too big an ask with extra projects won't offset extra expense
More of what voters want in facility improvements	Too high \$ amount for passage
Takes care of most facility needs	Too much, voters won't approve
	Won't get voters support too much \$