

## **PVPUSD Facilities Advisory Committee Final Report and Recommendations to the Board**

### **Summary**

The PVPUSD Board of Education formed a Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) to advise the Board regarding facilities needs and conditions at PVPUSD. The Board retained a consultant, DLR Architects, to prepare a facilities modernization report. This report completed in 2018 anticipated a complete District-wide modernization that resulted in a list of projects costing over \$700 million, thus this project list required prioritization. The cost information contained in the DLR report was also based on 2018 data. The FAC was tasked with conducting a review of the DLR report and its underlying assumptions, updating facilities deficiencies lists, updating project cost information, and making a report to the Board containing a recommended and prioritized lists of projects for Board consideration.

The FAC has completed its work. The FAC conducted a very extensive and thorough review of all PVPUSD facilities conditions. PVPUSD facilities are seriously deficient compared with current State standards and have fallen well behind similar neighboring districts.

Currently there is little to no State facilities funding available to PVPUSD. Any improvement to PVPUSD facilities will require local funding. PVPUSD operating funds are among the lowest in the State and have been for many years, providing only minimal maintenance funds that are consumed with annual maintenance. The only potential funding for a major facilities program is through a locally approved school facilities bond.

The FAC completed an updated assessment and estimate of a complete modernization of facilities across the entire District. The cost of this program would far exceed the maximum local bond allowed by State law. The FAC has therefore adopted a project list that does not include a District-wide renovation program. Instead, the FAC list contains specific improvements that are required to address outstanding safety and security issues impacting students and to address only the most critical modernization projects required to sustain operations and to address key instructional program gaps.

It falls to the Board of Education to determine whether to pursue a school facilities bond and in what amount. It further falls to the Board of Education to make its own determination of the priorities and projects recommended by the FAC.

## **Introduction**

This is the report of the FAC. It includes a discussion of the findings and processes the FAC in conducting its review and making its recommendations. It also includes important background information not presented in the DLR report.

## **History of the District**

Development of the Palos Verdes Peninsula began in the 1920s first in Palos Verdes Estates on the north side, and more slowly at the southern and eastern edges. The center part of Palos Verdes was largely undeveloped for many decades and its educational needs were met on the north by a single campus, Malaga Cove, and on the south side by Miraleste Elementary. Older students were sent to more distant schools off of the Hill. That suddenly changed in the post-war baby boom period. Within a single decade, the Palos Verdes population exploded and the entire current Palos Verdes Unified School District school system was built to teach the newly arrived students. The system consists of the following schools:

- 1920s - Malaga Cove (now District headquarters and future Marine Science Center)
- 1929 - Miraleste Early Learning Academy (initially built as an elementary school)
- 1955 - Dapplegray Elementary School (initially built as a middle school)
- 1967 - Ladera Linda Elementary School (currently inactive)
- 1950 - Valmonte Early Learning Academy (initially built as an elementary school)
- 1957 - Lunada Bay Elementary
- 1957 - Silver Spur Elementary School
- 1959 - Cornerstone Elementary School

- 1960 - Rancho del Mar Continuation School (initially built as a community college)
- 1960 - Montemalaga Elementary School
- 1961 - Rancho Vista Elementary School
- 1961 - Palos Verdes High School
- 1962 - Point Vicente Elementary School
- 1963 - Palos Verdes Peninsula High School (initially built as a high school and a middle school)
- 1963 - Miraleste Intermediate School (initially built as a high school)
- 1963 - Mira Catalina Elementary School
- 1964 - Palos Verdes Intermediate School (initially built as a smaller elementary school)
- 1964 - Ridgecrest Intermediate School
- 1964 - Soleado Elementary School
- 1964 - Vista Grande Elementary School

PVPUSD is unique among neighboring districts: the vast majority of buildings were constructed in a single decade instead of being spread out over time. PVPUSD has an unusually high concentration of schools that are 60-70 years old.

PVPUSD schools and buildings have undergone many changes since they were first constructed.

PVPUSD schools evolved as population patterns changed. The period of rapid growth during the baby boom was followed by a baby bust forcing a sharp contraction in student population and mothballing of schools – followed by a new wave of students a decade later and gradual reopening of schools. Development and demographics on the Hill are now stable resulting in a student population that will slowly increase over time.

Public education continues to evolve in ways that impact school buildings. Community college functions once provided by local school districts shifted to nearby community college districts. Kindergarten, transitional kindergarten and early education (preschool) were added to the standard school curriculum.

Vocational programs have shifted to regional centers outside of the District. In their place are now science and technology instruction once only seen in college. An increasing number of actual college courses are now being provided to high school students in PVPUSD high schools. As more parents entered the workforce, after school care and programs emerged and became essential. School playgrounds that once primarily served recess now host community wide recreation and athletic programs.

Expectations of the education system have also changed dramatically. The student body is now considerably more diverse including a larger body of English Learners and special needs students who must be fully integrated into the education system. The community now expects the vast majority of PVPUSD students to go on to college.

The District responded to these multiple forces by reopening schools, then adding new buildings and portable classrooms to existing schools, then converting rooms and buildings to meet new programs and student requirements. In many cases, this means that buildings are now serving needs for which they were never intended and are poorly suited.

### **Current and Long Term Facilities Needs - Demographics**

The Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District now consists of eighteen school sites: two early education learning facilities, 10 elementary schools (TK-5<sup>th</sup> grade), three intermediate schools (6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> grades), two high schools (9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> grades) and one continuation high school.

Palos Verdes neighborhoods are very stable with a very low rate of turnover in housing. Consequently, the District's near and long term student population is stable. A major decrease in population, as seen after the baby boom, is very unlikely to repeat; a major surge in student population as seen in the 1990's is also unlikely.

There are long term trends which will gradually increase the PVPUSD student population:

- The exceptionally high academic performance of the District, especially compared to surrounding districts, remains a powerful force attracting younger families to Palos Verdes.
- Palos Verdes is under the same market and regulatory pressures as other coastal cities to increase its housing supply. The majority of any increase in supply is likely to go to families, increasing the number of resident students attending PVPUSD.
- Palos Verdes has one of the oldest populations in Los Angeles County. A number of market or economic factors can alter the home ownership rate of this population. For example, several recent local developments supported a movement of long-time residents from their single family homes into senior housing – with their former homes being purchased by families with school aged children, resulting in a small surge in elementary aged students. Similar additional developments are in construction or planning.
- The State recently changed rules allowing students of nearby military families who previously would have attended LAUSD to now attend PVPUSD, resulting in another small surge in enrollment.
- A unique demographic issue is posed by the Eastview neighborhood, which is jointly served by both PVPUSD and the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The increasing academic gap between PVPUSD and LAUSD and other perception issues could easily shift more students toward PVPUSD.

While there may be considerable population variation within neighborhoods and between individual schools, the overall District student population demand will remain near current levels and slowly grow over time: the District needs to retain its current overall capacity.

### **Current and Long Term Facilities Needs – Education Standards**

Changes in education standards are requiring significant changes to the District's buildings:

- Classroom technology will continue to expand and be increasingly important to education. Most our students now regularly use computers as a critical part of instruction.

- STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics) programs and facilities continue to expand inside the classroom and in special laboratories and maker spaces.
- Instructional models that were long based on a single teacher in a classroom of children are changing to more collaborative models of team teaching, and using alternative learning spaces that go beyond the traditional classroom.
- Special education programs legally require a variety of specialist and support spaces on campus and accessible to all students.
- Physical education and health education curriculum are now considered important components in the nationwide battle against obesity.
- Activities like athletics and the arts that were once considered peripheral and optional are now considered vital to a well-rounded education – and as a critical prerequisite to college level admissions.

If PVPUSD – and the community – wants to maintain its high standards and educational rankings, its facilities must evolve to accommodate these changes.

Community expectations of our school buildings have also changed. When Palos Verdes was first built, air conditioning in homes was rare; today it is the norm. District schools remain mostly without air conditioning. District facilities are now widely used to provide community recreation and open space. In some areas, school facilities serve as de facto municipal parks. Crime in Palos Verdes has gradually increased. Similarly, school safety and security can no longer be taken for granted and steps must be taken to better protect our children.

### **Seismic Safety**

The Palos Verdes community has to address the seismic safety of our schools. Palos Verdes is bordered by a series of active faults that present near term seismic risk. Our understanding of the number of faults in our area and the threats posed by those nearby faults is evolving and has recently increased. Palos Verdes is also faced with the risk of the San Andreas “big one,” a warning issued with such regularity that many have become immune to the threat. The probabilities of a major earthquake occurring along the San Andreas is 99% over the next 30 years. {Reference Exhibit-USGS Fact Sheet: Forecasting California’s

Earthquakes: What We Can Expect in the Next 30 Years, describing probabilities.} Local schools have survived many earthquakes over the decades – but the energy and duration of those earthquakes pales by comparison to the impact of a nearby Newport-Inglewood earthquake or the most likely San Andreas earthquake. {Reference Exhibit-USGS Circular 1324 The Great Shakeout Scenario, describing the physical breadth and impact of the most likely San Andreas earthquake} We must face the fact that our school buildings will undoubtedly be faced with a near-term major seismic event. The San Andreas is now considered “locked and loaded” by seismic experts with a growing consensus that it will erupt in the near future. <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-california-mexico-earthquake-20170908-htmlstory.html>

PVPUSD must also face the fact that some of its buildings are vulnerable and may not survive such an earthquake. We are putting our children and staff at risk by leaving them in unreinforced buildings.

Many of the vulnerable buildings can be seismically retrofitted. For some buildings, such as the main classroom buildings at Peninsula High School, the cost of retrofitting approaches or exceeds the cost of replacement: it would be economically wiser to replace these structures with new, safe structures that also shift away from the traditional rigid classroom model toward the more flexible learning environments that current educational standards demand.

Earlier seismic engineering evaluations have flagged several buildings of concern. The District is in the process of conducting a more detailed screening process which may reveal additional buildings that require seismic retrofitting and possibly replacement. If additional vulnerable buildings are identified, they also must be retrofitted. This is a high priority: the District is on borrowed time.

### **How well do our schools measure up?**

The entire PVPUSD building stock has an average age of over 60 years. Their age is showing. They have now reached the stage where building systems are worn out and major modernization is required simply to maintain the existing campus capacity. Additional modernization is required to meet current changing educational demands. Modernization is especially needed to address pressing seismic and safety issues. Without a major modernization program across the

entire District, the District will be faced with skyrocketing maintenance costs, increasing disruption due to systems failure, and may be forced to close buildings, and perhaps entire campuses. Without a major modernization, the District's high levels of educational attainment and performance will erode.

The District's facilities age and need for modernization is not unique. That problem has been faced by every neighboring district that incurred a similar baby boom expansion and then had to deal with the problem of older buildings. There are 74 school districts in Los Angeles County that have passed school facilities bonds to address this problem. Locally, Santa Monica, El Segundo, Wiseburn, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, LAUSD and Long Beach school districts all had major building expansions in the 1950s – and all of them have passed school bond measures to fund major modernization programs to deal with their baby-boom era schools. {See Exhibit–LA County School Bond Rates 2016-2017}

#### **2016-2017 School Bond Tax Rate**

- Wiseburn \$184.62
- LAUSD \$131.10
- Manhattan Beach \$92.84
- Redondo Beach \$90.79
- Torrance \$85.71
- Long Beach \$85.39
- El Segundo \$78.80
- Santa Monica-Malibu \$70.06
- PVPUSD \$23.20

In our neighborhood, only PVPUSD has yet to conduct a major modernization program. PVPUSD has passed two smaller facilities bonds a decade ago, but those programs were limited in scope with the majority of funds used to fund portables and add classrooms, to add programs like kindergarten and after school programs, to renovate mothballed schools, or to add technology. Actual modernization of existing buildings was very limited.



PVPUSD now has the lowest tax rate among our neighboring school districts – and almost has the lowest rate in all of Los Angeles County. PVPUSD facilities reflect this lack of investment: PVPUSD also now has some of the worst schools in Los Angeles County.

PVPUSD facilities are now obviously deficient when compared with every neighboring school district.

### **District Facilities Planning & FAC Process**

The District recognized the facilities problem as an issue and began serious planning in 2017-2018. DLR Architects was retained to conduct a formal facilities planning process. That process consisted of the following steps:

- assessment of current and future District needs and student population trends
- development of an educational specification describing specific facilities requirements to support current instructional requirements
- detailed existing conditions assessments of individual schools and buildings and supporting infrastructure
- collaboration and surveys of individual school site councils formed specifically to provide principals, parents and staff input to the planning process
- development of individual school modernization plans identifying buildings to be replaced, reconfigured or modernized as well as improvements needed to utilities, playgrounds and traffic
- cost estimates for the various improvements.

This work was completed and presented to the Board and community in 2018 as the ***PVPUSD Facilities Modernization Report*** (the DLR Report). The DLR Report contained a total estimated cost in excess of \$700 million. The DLR report and supporting site assessments and other documents were posted on the District website and made available for public inspection and comment. {See <http://pvpusdplan.org>} Concerns were raised with the total cost - and with the accuracy of the estimate. Concerns were also raised with proposed scope of

**Facilities Advisory Committee  
Final Report and Recommendations  
October 1, 2019**

work: it was widely acknowledged that the scope of work described in the DLR Report was aspirational and contained everything required or desired to modernize every school site in the District and that it was unaffordable.

In 2019, the District formed the Facilities Advisory Committee (the FAC). {See Exhibit-Board Resolution Creating FAC} The FAC is composed of community members with a broad variety of professional qualifications, community affiliations and direct experience with the District as parents or staff.

<b>Facilities Advisory Committee Members</b>		
<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Brach	Matt	Board Member
Crawford	Megan	Board Member
Cherniss	Alex	Superintendent
Butler	Keith	District Administrator
Kamibayashi	Terry	District Administrator
Hafer	Keely	District Administrator
Lin	Christina	District Administrator
Frankwick	Jeff	Palos Verdes Faculty Association
Meade	James	Palos Verdes Faculty Association
Deremiah	Rocky	California School Employees Association
Farrell	Micah	Palos Verdes Administrators Association
Byrne	Christine	Peninsula Education Foundation
Massey	Timothy	PVP Council of PTAs Executive Board
Perez	Rikki	Palos Verdes Peninsula High School Boosters
Applewhite	Katie	Palos Verdes High School Boosters
Abbasian	Arash	Member at Large
Buresh	Tim	Member at Large
Edelson	Howard	Member at Large
Hahn	Jeannie	Member at Large
Kernen	Jenny Redlin	Member at Large
Kim	Tae	Member at Large
Lurie	Steven	Member at Large
Najera	Steve	Member at Large
Roche	Amy	Member at Large
Stott	Andrew	Member at Large
Snyder	Cindy	Committee Administrative Assistant

The FAC was tasked with conducting a comprehensive review of the DLR Report. Specifically, the FAC was tasked with reviewing the prioritization and scope of work defined in the DLR Plan, updating cost estimates, and then making recommendations to the Board for a prospective modernization scope of work that best meets District needs and is affordable. {See Exhibit - Board Resolution}

The FAC first met in April, 2019 and agreed to a detailed work plan with the goal of issuing a final report to the Board in the fall of 2019. The work plan consisted of the following:

- The FAC has held regular public meetings and multiple school sites visits and technical meetings.
- The FAC determined a recommended set of District priorities in ranking modernization projects: (1) Safety; (2) Security; and (3) Modernization.
- The FAC established first round cost reduction principals to be applied across the District:
  - Requiring minimum initial investments in line with the prioritization goals such as the need to modernize bathrooms and basic utility service almost everywhere.
  - Eliminate the more than 50 portable classrooms being used as classrooms. (These are “temporary” structures with a recommended life of 20 years; the PVPUSD portables have an average age in excess of 30 years.)
  - Eliminate new construction to the greatest extent possible except where required by seismic considerations, or to replace portables, or to provide critical education programs not already on site.
  - Eliminate circulation and parking improvements. The majority of schools have traffic issues that are a serious parent and neighborhood concern: however, those needs are secondary to student needs once on campus. Only those improvements necessary for fire protection and direct student safety are being considered
- Prior to the end of the 2018-19 school year, FAC teams visited every school. FAC teams were tasked with reviewing the DLR recommendations then

conducting their own assessment of school conditions, noting any significant recent changes, and to then apply the first round cost reduction principals to make a significant and substantive reduction in scope. This was a collaborative process: the FAC teams met with Principals and site facilities advisory councils and jointly agreed to a revised scope that considered the economic reality of the District. Individual school assessments were reviewed by the entire FAC to ensure continuity and parity in all assessments, and to build awareness of common issues across the District. {See Exhibit-FAC Teams and School Assignments}

- Prior to the end of the school year, the FAC investigated potential funding source outside the District. The State Department of Education is the traditional source of school construction funding. However, the District is ineligible or insufficient funds remain in every existing State program. The State has proposed major school construction bonds for the 2020 and 2022 ballot: however, those bonds are specifically directed toward underperforming and “poor” districts and a backlog of unfunded projects. The targeting language in those bonds and the large backlog of districts with already qualified projects makes it unlikely that PVPUSD will qualify for any significant funds from the State in the near future. The FAC has continued to monitor State school funding legislation.
- The FAC requested District staff to research the potential bonding capacity of the District to establish the maximum potential bond-funded program. State law caps local district total tax rate/bonding capacity at specific levels which then translates into a maximum potential bond revenue that may be self-imposed by local voters: PVPUSD cannot exceed this cap, even with the approval of local voters. This maximum capacity is approximately \$600 million. The Board will ultimately determine whether or not to pursue a bond and if so in what amount. However, PVPUSD cannot exceed this State imposed cap regardless of need or voter preference.
- Over the summer, the FAC teams’ revised scopes of work were assembled and re-priced using DLR unit prices. The same unit prices were used in order to make an “apples to apples” evaluation of how much scope had been reduced by the FAC teams. The first round of FAC scope reductions

reduced the program by more than 25%. However, the FAC also determined that further cuts would be required.

- The Division of the State Architect (DSA) is the regulatory agency that controls school design and construction. DSA recently adopted changes to its building code that increase the seismic criteria for schools. The DSA position is that once approved and built, a school is considered compliant forever – unless it is changed or modernized. If modernization costs approach 50% of replacement costs, that building must be upgraded to meet all current seismic criteria – and all other current code requirements – which can dramatically increase costs. Early this summer, the full impact of this change became apparent. The rule change means that many more buildings are not considered seismically deficient and the cost of addressing those deficiencies has escalated. In many situations, it will become more economical to replace a building than to modernize it. For the District, the impact is uncertain. The two main classroom buildings at Peninsula High School are seismically suspect. Given the age and level of deterioration in the buildings, replacement is the recommended option. Less clear is the impact across the District. The DLR building conditions assessment was based on the prior DSA code and did not go into sufficient detail to be able to identify impacted buildings at this time. It is likely that several other buildings will require seismic upgrades. At the request of the FAC, the Board has authorized retention of a structural engineer to complete this reassessment but this assessment process is incomplete and may require months to complete. For planning purposes, the FAC has presumed that four additional buildings will require replacement due to seismic upgrades.
- Over the summer, District staff were charged with assembling various supporting documents and information to validate assumptions in the FAC revised scopes of work (e.g. confirming actual ages of roofing, confirming utility replacement accomplished to date, conducting water quality tests, establishing portable classroom ages and current actual conditions). District staff also confirmed the scope of work done by measure M to eliminate duplications in the FAC scope of work.

- The FAC determined that the DLR cost estimate used unit prices that are neither current nor accurate and insufficient to support the FAC. At the FAC request, the Board retained an independent cost estimator, Cummings, to provide updated parametric cost information and more detailed unit pricing by subsystem and trade discipline. Cummings provided updated current and projected costs information. Cummings also applied this updated unit pricing to the DLR Report scope of work and FAC first round scope of work. As expected the initial DLR cost estimate rose significantly. {See Exhibit-Master Plan Cost Estimate Comparison: DLR 2018 and FAC 2019}
- This fall, the FAC met to identify further scope reductions that would result in a scope of work aligned with the priorities established by the FAC and within the maximum bonding capacity of the District. It became apparent that the maximum available funding would be largely consumed in addressing significant safety, security and seismic requirements. A large portion of the needed modernization scope of work must be deferred. The specific list of recommended projects and scope of work was then re-estimated by Cummings to confirm the total estimated cost. {See Exhibit-Cummings Estimate dated 10/1/2019}
- In its October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 meeting, the FAC voted to adopt a finalized set of prioritizations and overall facilities needs budget and final report. The PVPUSD Board retains the responsibility and authority to make the final decision on which – if any – projects to adopt.

### **The FAC Scope Recommendations**

PVPUSD faces a facilities backlog in excess of its maximum funding capacity. Even should the Board elect to pursue a maximum bond, there will be insufficient funds to execute a complete modernization across the District – even though such a modernization is completely warranted and would be a prudent use of taxpayer funds.

The FAC developed a recommended project list that is described in detail in the attached Cummings estimate report. {See Exhibit-Cummings PVPUSD Facilities Conditions Assessment Estimate dated October 1, 2019}

The project list was driven by the following three prioritization factors:

1. Safety – Earthquake/seismic, deteriorating roofs, plumbing, electrical systems, drinking water, removal of hazardous materials.
2. Security – Security fencing, security cameras, lighting, and fire/life safety systems
3. Modernization and upgrading – classrooms, access to facilities for students with disabilities (Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)), heating, cooling and ventilation systems and improving energy efficiency.

The FAC specific projects are grouped by three levels:

1. Bare bones must haves –these are critical repairs, Code upgrades, or address serious safety, security or performance issues.
2. Should haves – items necessary to preserve the physical asset and make modest improvements where current buildings are significantly impeding educational delivery like adding gymnasiums at the intermediate schools and removing out of date portables.
3. Nice to Haves – these are facilities improvements that address particularly degraded facilities, community over-use on playgrounds, and traffic.

The FAC considered and specifically rejected the concept of applying funds equally among all schools on a per student basis: the FAC recommends that funds go where the needs are greatest, regardless of perceived parity or lack thereof. The similar ages of the campus and similar needs has resulted in a rough parity between schools. The specific corrections and improvements recommended are far short of a full modernization. However, when attempting to fix one problem, the District will often be required by law to implement wholesale Code upgrades that trigger considerable collateral work resulting in some buildings getting a lot more work than others; this is a result of mandated process, rather than a pre-selected outcome in favor of one campus over another. Similarly, the program does not address some obvious and glaring needs such as IT replacement and upgrade and addressing major traffic issues across the District.

Even with these limitations the recommended list would require a considerable financial investment: the three tiers of recommended projects contain a cost estimate of \$427,948,681:

Note that the estimate, per standard industry practice, this cost does not include escalation. A program of this scale cannot be done all at once – many projects cannot be done while school is in session or will require the use of portables to vacate classrooms while work is done - and will be further paced by the time required for design and permitting, which currently averages more than two years. It is estimated that the average length of a project will be six years. Based on current escalation, this time period would increase costs by an additional 25%.

Note also that the estimate is based on what we know today. The hard fact is that renovation projects are full of surprises – and they are always the kind that cost more to address. For example, the scope of seismic upgrades that will be required is impossible to accurately assess at this time. The FAC recommends that a program contingency of 10% be added to any adopted project list.

Adding these two factors adjusts the FAC recommended project list increases the overall cost as follows:

Tier 1 projects – Bare bones	\$315,259,929
Tier 2 projects – Should have	\$77,917,203
Tier 3 projects – Nice to have	<u>\$34,771,548</u>
Subtotal	\$427,948,681
Escalation 25.62%	<u>\$109,640,452</u>
Subtotal	\$537,589,133
Program Contingency 10%	<u>\$53,758,913</u>
Total Program cost	\$591,348,046

The FAC recognizes that this amount is close to or exceeds the maximum bonding capacity of the District – and that many worthwhile projects will not be addressed. Reasonable people may well argue for a different set of priorities, particularly in Tiers 2 and 3. However, Tier 1 reflects pressing and urgent needs across the District that have driven the listing process.



The FAC recognizes that the Board of Education retains the ultimate responsibility to determine whether or not to pursue a bond, in what amount, and how to allocate those funds to specific projects or purposes.

There are many voices in our community that will have opinions on the ultimate direction of any facilities program. While the FAC is not the community, we are parents and staff, lay people and professionals, and long-time community members who together brought a wealth of diverse talents and experience to this process. Although we have moved very fast, the FAC applied a process that was rigorous, disciplined and uniform. That process brought members of the FAC face to face with the scale and urgency of the facilities backlog faced across the entirety of PVPUSD, a perspective that is unique within our community. This report is a consensus report that reflects the unanimous opinion and recommendation of the FAC. We strongly encourage the Board of Education to act in accordance with the recommendations in this report.

### **Exhibits to PVPUSD Board Agenda**

1. FAC Final Report (this document)
2. Cummings PVPUSD Facilities Conditions Assessment Estimate
3. Board Resolution Creating the FAC
4. LA County School Bond Rates 2016-2017
5. FAC Initial School Visitation Teams
6. Master Plan Cost Comparison: DLR 2018 scope and FAC 2019 scope
7. USGS Fact Sheet: Earthquake Estimate Over the Next 30 Years
8. USGS Circular 1324 The Great Shakeout