

**CITY OF PEORIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS – DISTRICT 150
MASTER FACILITY PLANNING COMMITTEE**

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

**Submitted to Board of Education Building Committee
October 11, 2005**

A

G Preface

During the past several decades, the Peoria area and its economy have undergone tremendous change. And, as the Community has initiated expansive forward thinking plans to position itself to capitalize on our Community's unique and varied attributes, so too must Peoria Public Schools District 150. This plan is more than the Peoria Public Schools...this Plan is about the continue growth and economic vitality of the community we know as Peoria.

District 150's diversity is one of its most important attributes in preparing students for the challenges faced in an increasingly complex and diverse world. This diversity, combined with curriculums and programs nurturing the highest academic achievement in the State of Illinois, sets District 150 apart from any other in Central Illinois. The District must do more; however, in leveraging its great assets to the benefit of every student enrolled, regardless of socio-economic background. It must think "outside the box" in not only curriculum and faculty/staff development, but facilities development as well if it is to successfully engage its students in the economy and opportunities of tomorrow. Essential to that linkage are the collaborations which must be established and fostered with both public and private sector partners to enhance the learning process in the classroom as well as workplace environments. District 150 must venture out into the perhaps "unconventional" realms of education if it is to seize this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to effect positive change for the future of its students, their families and our greater Peoria community through the proposed facilities development program.

So, it is with this perspective that we set forth these recommendations of the Master Facility Planning Committee for consideration by the Board of Education. We look forward to your endorsement to proceed.

G Executive Overview

By Fiscal 2009 eleven buildings will have been closed, five new or replacements built, several additions constructed, and the remodeling of two, is the “full” or “core” recommendation of the Master Facility Planning Committee. At a minimum, Harrison school will be replaced immediately. White and Blaine Sumner Middle Schools will close. And, Irving, Kingman, Glen Oak, Garfield, and Tyng will be consolidated and phased-out with two new buildings eventually built. Manual High School will add seventh and eighth grades. A lottery and choice will be used to re-allocate students.

Dependent upon funding, Whittier will be replaced on its existing site, Irving and Kingman will be closed and consolidated onto a new “Morton Square” campus, and Tyng and Garfield will be closed and a new building built on the Garfield campus under the Tyng namesake. In the Peoria high attendance area Woodrow Wilson Primary and Loucks Middle Schools will close, a new building of a yet-to-be determined grade configuration will be built near the high school, and the students from both will be re-allocated (though not necessarily to the new building). Keller Primary School will be combined onto one campus and expanded with an addition. Lindberg Middle School will be enlarged with an addition to accommodate continued choice/opt-out selection. Trewyn and Calvin Coolidge Middle Schools will be remodeled but not enlarged. All other buildings will be addressed through a health-life-safety resurvey conducted over a period of four years.

In all, the District would go from 35 buildings on as many sites to 29 on as few as 27 sites by fiscal 2009 and offer both K-4, 5-8, K-6/8, and 7-12 configurations. New, consolidated, and replacement buildings would incorporate “green design” and “community school” concepts. Funding would come from two or more of a number of options including but not solely dependent upon the State School Construction Program.

G Committee Members

The Committee consisted of four separate, but inter-related groups. They are as follows:

Administrative Staff:	Dr. Herschel Hannah Dr. Cindy Fischer Guy Cahill
“Expert” Citizens:	Ray Lees David Henebry Edward J. Barry
Instructional/Support Staff:	Lillie Foreman
Community Members:	Mary Ardapple Thea Robinson Donald Jackson
Board of Education Members:	Mary Spangler Stephen Morris

Other regular attendees and contributors include: Director of Transportation Mike Sullivan; Director of Technology Pat Hampton; Board Secretary Julie Cramer; School Board Member Sean Matheson; Director of Building & Grounds Dave Ryon; and Superintendent Ken Hinton.

G Committee Mission / Overview

This Committee was formed and approved by the Peoria District 150 School Board. The Committee's primary charge was to *conduct a capacity and utilization analysis of District 150's school buildings* for use in providing guidance to the District in meeting the recommendations of the Structural Budget Imbalance ("SBI") Task Force and maintaining and improving the District's priority status on the 2003 State school construction grant list.

Recognizing the sensitivity of the tasks which lay ahead, objectivity became the critical factor in developing a fair and credible evaluation process. Initial meetings focused on that process through which an objective assessment of District schools could be executed. The Committee decided to evaluate each facility based on their respective attributes relating to several primary issues: 1) Health-Life-Safety, 2) Operational Costs and 3) Educational Programs. This assessment was then followed by tours of each school in the District. The Committee was divided into four groups to visit schools in each of the four high school feeder areas. The results of the preliminary analysis were then re-evaluated and modified based on on-site observations of existing conditions.

For additional information on the process see Group Exhibit No. 1, which contains the minutes from all of the meetings.

G Structural Budget Imbalance ("SBI") Task Force

Created in parallel to the Master Facility Planning Committee ("MFPC"), the Structural Budget Imbalance ("SBI") Task Force was charged with identifying \$19,000,000 in "areas of opportunity" for increased operating fund revenues and/or decreased expenditures. Based upon a preliminary, interim report prepared by the Master Facility Planning Committee, the SBI Task Force set \$5,000,000 as the savings goal to be had from the consolidation and closure of school facilities. The task force learned that \$500,000 could be saved in administrative, support, and operational overhead per closed building. They also learned that this amount could increase, on average, to \$1,500,000 per closed building if existing students could be absorbed into the remaining available but under-capacity classroom sections district-wide without having to re-allocate most of the teaching staff. The SBI Task Force left to the MFPC the broad detail as to the "who", "what", "when", "where", and "how" of the same would be achieved.

G State of Illinois School Construction Grant Program Initiative

Peoria Public School District 150 has secured a space on the 2003 School Construction Grant entitlement list. A grant application was filed in 2001-2002. This submission was preceded by a visit to the District by the School Construction Grant

Program Administrator, Karen Shoup, and her staff to assess how many students were considered to be “inadequately housed” according to State of Illinois standards.

Since that meeting, Peoria Public School District 150 has been encouraged by State officials to complete the application process, including the development of a “program statement” and an estimate of capital costs to address facility needs. This process does not require the design and placement of specific facilities, but rather a broad overview of what the District might look like in the year 2020 from a facility organization, size, and broad program delivery perspective. Development of this statement and its funding requirements are necessary to preserve the District’s spot on the Capital Development list and improve its priority status if and when the legislature decides to fund the School Construction Grant Program.

G Facility Analysis and Assessment Process

As briefly referenced earlier, the Committee’s process addressed three general areas of facility attributes which were analyzed through a quantitative matrix . . . Health-Life-Safety, Operational Costs and Educational Programs. Each of these attribute groups was in-turn subdivided into specific components and sub-components. Each sub-component was assigned a weighted value (relative to others in the attribute group) and “scores” tabulated. The entire committee reviewed and discussed the merits and value of each building attribute analyzed until a general consensus was reached. Specific groups and sub-groups analyzed were as follows:

□ Health-Life-Safety

Health-Life-Safety includes site size, building size, building age, classroom/support space, equipment and its storage, building structure, hazard protection, personal protection, defensible/controlled perimeter, equipment, ADA, lighting, HVAC, sanitation, noise, proximity of building to student population, road/street characteristics, building features, site features, ADA accessibility, building flexibility, site flexibility, student circulation and travel, noise isolation, energy conservation in lighting, energy conservation in HVAC, custodial facilities, custodial systems, expandability of the building and the site (see attached and incorporated herewith Exhibit 2 containing the raw scores of Health-Life-Safety chart as ranked by the Committee).

□ Operational Costs

The Master Facility Planning Committee also reviewed operational costs which include building/construction first cost, life cycle cost, building/equipment-systems first cost, life cycle cost, transportation, proximity to student population, walk/bus demographics, operational overhead, personnel, class size, building size/configuration, energy and efficiency, building rating, systems and equipment, academic achievement, class size, personnel, learning environment, cost savings with different configurations by

grade, 400, 800, 1200 population, by campus, K-8, K-12, other, non-traditional venues, home, hospital, mall, zoo, community college, university, partnerships and collaborations, liability, park district, social services, art organization, businesses, municipalities, trade, community college, college/university, work force development, private schools, other K-12 districts, post office, fire department, police department, DCFS (see attached and incorporated herewith Exhibit 3 containing the raw scores of Operational Costs chart as ranked by the Committee).

□ Educational Programs

Programs were broken down into pre-K, K,2-6, 4-6, middle school, 7-8, 9-10, K-8, gifted, K alternatives, gifted, international baccalaureate, vo-tech, business academy, fine arts, healthcare, alternative MS, alternative HS, cosmetology, character building, foreign language program, tech academy, community school, parental resource centers, annual and daily program models, including 4-day instruction / 1-day institute, traditional 2080-day, 200-day, 220-day/year round, high school late start, 7-hour day, and 8-hour day (see attached and incorporated herewith Exhibit 4 containing the raw scores of Programmatic chart as ranked by the Committee).

G Site Visits

After numerous meetings to define and re-define the categories in the various groups and to place a weighted value upon each of the subcategories, the Master Facility Planning Committee broke into sub-groups (by high school region) and visited the facilities. The sub-groups then rejoined the large group and shared and debated their results. There was then a series of “checks and balances” whereby the groups met and exchanged information and attempted to debunk or dispel misconceptions. The administrative staff was instrumental in confirming, refuting, and refining the findings and observations of the sub-groups. The Committee was also privy to certain demographic information relative to the distribution of school children throughout the District’s boundaries and referenced information and data in “A Study of Educational Facility Needs” prepared by Planning Advocates, Inc. in 2000.

G Community Forums and Civic Gatherings

Exhibit “A” summarizes the feedback received by the Committee from its four forums held during the weeks September 5 – 16 in the Manual, Woodruff, Peoria (Central), and Richwoods high school attendance areas. The same were synthesized into the following general statements by the Committee.

General Recommendation “Statements” to Include in the Final Narrative	How/Where Addressed in Report
<p>1. The school district should make every good faith effort in the community to secure acceptable alternative uses for the school facilities that shall be closed (or for the land upon which they sit). If no alternative use can be found, the school district should be prepared to minimally maintain these buildings, so that they do not detract from the neighborhoods where they are located. Such maintenance might include demolition; and transformation into community parks, to be maintained by the Peoria Park District. Costs for these various efforts should be factored into the school district’s overall master plan.</p>	See Committee Recommendation 6.0.
<p>2. The overarching, overriding goal for the entire capital improvement program should be to offer all students in the school district the best possible education. The committee recognizes – as should the school district – that the school buildings and facilities are (only) one of several different tools that assist in the education of the students.</p>	See “Observations/ Assumptions” number 11.
<p>3. At the same time, when all elements of the school district are at their top form (facilities, programs, faculty and staff, and others), the Peoria community at-large will gain enormously.</p>	See “Forward”
<p>4. The suggested plan of action is the best possible scenario, based on all of the factors that have been carefully examined by the committee. Should the funding for this plan of action not be forthcoming, the committee is prepared to examine a secondary, less ambitious option.</p>	See Recommendations generally and 4.0 – 4.4 specifically.
<p>5. The school district should establish a clear commitment to making all facilities vibrant community centers for the neighborhoods that they serve (and where they are physically located). A corollary to this emphasis should be the development of a careful, detailed plan of implementation of the school closings and openings – a plan that absolutely minimizes disruption and negative impacts to the students, the educational setting, and the neighborhoods.</p>	See Recommendations generally and 3.0 – 3.5 specifically.
<p>6. Every effort should be made by the school district to place students in facilities located in the neighborhoods where they reside. In tandem, every effort should also be made by the school district to absolutely minimize involuntary or arbitrary busing of students.</p>	See Observations/ Assumptions item 9 and Recommendations, generally.

General Recommendation “Statements” to Include in the Final Narrative	How/Where Addressed in Report
<p>7. The only current facility recommendation for the Richwoods Zone is to consolidate, renovate, and possibly expand Keller Elementary School. For a perhaps more holistic approach, Lindbergh and Rolling Acres Middle Schools should be modified or expanded as well (and Richwoods be renovated, too).</p>	<p>See Recommendation number “1.0” and Other Recommendation number “5”.</p>
<p>8. The school district does presently own some properties adjacent to Whittier. Perhaps this school should be maintained, and expanded and renovated, instead of being closed. If this were done, one of the new schools slated for this zone might be deleted from the program.</p>	<p>See Recommendation “1.0”.</p>
<p>9. What makes a community attractive and appealing to people considering settling there? This question should be discussed by the committee, to see if it would impact any of our facility recommendations.</p>	<p>See Assumptions/Observations number “12” and Recommendation “1.0”.</p>
<p>10. Throughout the committee’s process, the four high school campuses were to remain symbolically intact; though their exact detailed usage and configuration might evolve. That evolution should now be discussed in greater detail by the committee, before our process is complete.</p>	<p>See Recommendations “1.0”, generally, and “3.4”, specifically.</p>
<p>11. Exact locations of the new schools (as well as possible high school boundary changes) should be further discussed by the committee at this time, with an eye to providing the community with more details about these.</p>	<p>See Recommendation “1.0”, generally, and “3.2” and “3.3”, specifically.</p>
<p>12. The committee examining the issue of grade configurations (and, in turn, the School Board) needs to provide some clear direction as to the preferred and adopted grade configurations; in order for this facilities committee to then make definitive bricks-and-mortar recommendations about those configurations.</p>	<p>See Operational Costs, Observations/Assumptions, generally, and Committee Recommendations 3.0 – 3.5, specifically.</p>
<p>13. Related, this sub-committee suggested that other, perhaps non-traditional configurations might also be considered (pairing K and One with high school students, for example; or K thru 6 as another example).</p>	<p>(Same as 12 above.)</p>
<p>14. Taking a completely different tack from the comments heard at the four community forum (and elsewhere), the possibility was raised of a very proactive, very comprehensive busing program, for the entire District. Such a program might be almost necessary, to genuinely achieve one of the mission statements of the District; namely, true diversity. This program would be truly comprehensive, equitably mixing all of the students. Yet, the sub-committee was aware that such an idea would be counter to the conventional wisdom – and counter to the goal of neighborhood “community center” schools.</p>	<p>Not addressed as being beyond the scope of this Committee’s charge.</p>
<p>15. Another different idea discussed by the sub-committee was the possibility of gender-specific schools. These might be particularly appropriate or effective for the middle school grades.</p>	<p>Not addressed as being beyond the scope of this Committee’s charge.</p>

G Observations/Assumptions

Several observations and assumptions were made relative to existing conditions within District 150 schools pertaining to classroom sizes, school sizes and grade configurations. These observations and assumptions were based upon the teachers' contract, review of authoritative educational literature, administrative expertise (re: operational, ideal school size and State guidelines), State School Report Card information and the report of the "K-8 Grade Configuration Committee."

1. Class sizes shall be maintained pursuant to the teachers' contract and State guidelines and guidance from available research at between 18 (eighteen) and 24 (twenty-four) for primary grades and 27 (twenty-seven) to 28 (twenty-eight) for middle grades, with buildings experiencing proportionately higher incidents of poverty to have class sizes at the lower end of the range.
2. Special education classrooms are at two-thirds of maximum allowable.
3. Regular division classrooms are at three-quarter maximum allowable student population.
4. "Well configured" buildings can support up to six sections/per grade level (REG).
5. "Poorly configured" buildings can support at best only one section/per grade level (REG).
6. "Well configured" equals physical design allowing for smaller (intimate) learning communities.
7. Classroom allowance for special education equals twenty to twenty-five percent total available rooms (growth bubble at the primary grade level).
8. District-wide, primary and middle school buildings should be designed (new) and/or renovated (old) into "well configured" buildings able to accommodate adequately 500 regular division students; Less than 1000 student population maximum in a well configured building (37 sections); otherwise less than 400 students (17 sections).
9. No displaced student would involuntarily have to leave his/her high school attendance area by bus or other means to attend a District 150 school; that the recommendations contemplated students attending a school as close in proximity to their home as would be practicable; and, that no displaced student would be involuntarily bussed "cross-town."
10. Schools whose buildings scored poorly on the three "adequacy" indices—programmatic, health-life-safety, and/or operational costs and whose AYP trends are of concern should be addressed first.
11. A multitude of variables go into making a school successful including but not limited to experience of teaching staff, readiness of students, the socio-economic mix of students, configuration of grades, size of classrooms and building in terms of number of students, physical size of classrooms and building, intimacy of learning environments, "flow" of building, learning opportunities, parental involvement, presence or absence of natural lighting, sound proofing, technology, and the like; However, the one common denominator upon which all seem to

agree is that success correlates strongest with the strength of the building principal.

12. Good schools are neighborhood anchors that attract and retain homeowners and stabilize enrollments and property values, both of which are relied upon for the funding of schools.
13. Proposed Lindberg expansion only necessary with continued “opt out” and “choice” enrollments.
14. White Middle School students re-allocated to Loucks assume change in latter's “Edison” status and/or change in policy governing students going to an Edison school.

▪ **K-8 Classrooms/Sections**

The Master Planning Facility Committee has relied upon information from both the August, 2000, Study of Educational Facility Needs by Planning Advocates, Inc., relative to population growth and distribution in the district, as well as current information provided to it by the Peoria Public School Administration. Currently the District’s facilities, as a whole, have 461 classroom sections (both regular and special education) needed for its current population. It has the capacity for 586 sections. **On its face, this analysis demonstrates 21 percent unused facility capacity.**

Please refer to Exhibit 5 - K-8 Classrooms/Sections Analysis Chart which provides detailed section counts of current District requirements and space currently available.

Although they were considered in the ranking process, Exhibit 5 excludes the two “special” schools (Roosevelt Magnet and Washington Gifted) because they draw students from throughout the District and not a specific enrollment area.

G Net Cost Savings Potential

If the District determines to follow the Committee’s recommendations as articulated in this report, it could realize as much as \$9 million in savings overall with \$5 million of that going to offset current District funding shortfalls.

Presuming a net number of school closures at six and based on Operations and Maintenance savings of \$500,000 per school closed, a savings of \$3 million could be realized. An additional \$3 to \$6 million in savings could be gained through reductions in staff resulting from the re-allocation of students and more efficient staff to student ratios.

G Committee Recommendations

The primary charge of the Master Planning Facility Committee was to develop a program statement and cost estimate for the adequate and affordable housing of current and future students. The overall score in conjunction with the Committee's general knowledge of the needs in the respective high school attendance zones, helped the Committee arrive at a determination of which facilities should be closed, consolidated, expanded, or new facilities constructed. Secondly, consideration was given to the academic achievement (as measured by Adequate Yearly Progress or "AYP" under NCLB) and the "re-use" or "suitability for acquisition" of a site. Finally, consideration was given to the comments received from the four community forums and the countless civic group gatherings. The detail as to "who" and "what" have been determined by the Committee and to a lesser extent the "when", "where", and "how". These latter most details (i) were not the charge of the Committee, and, (ii) are necessarily left to the District and its administration and/or a specifically charged new committee(s) in developing the "implementation strategy, tactics, and logistics"; Our charge was to provide the broad framework for adoption by the Board of Education that in turn would provide a "point of departure" for administration to develop implementation plans.

The Committee recommends that the District consider the following "full", "minimal", "select implementation", "financing" and "other" recommendations:

1.0 By Fiscal 2009, dependent on subsequent Board adoption of a funding source (see Recommendations 4.0 – 4.4), fully implement the "full" plan including:

Manual Attendance Zone

Close Blaine Sumner, Garfield, and Tyng schools. Replace Harrison school. Selectively renovate and otherwise replace and expand on its existing site the Whittier school. Build a replacement Tyng School on the Garfield campus. Renovate Calvin Coolidge and Trewyn schools. More fully utilize Manual high school by including grades sixth through eighth in a fully segregated and controlled wing from grades 9-12.

Peoria High Attendance Zone

Close Woodrow Wilson and Loucks and consolidate with the other schools in the attendance zone. Build one new facility on a site to be determined.

Woodruff Attendance Zone

Close Glen Oak, Irving, Kingman, and White schools. Close one immediately and phase-out two others. Close the remaining three in their entirety with the opening of the two new buildings.

Richwoods Attendance Zone

Construct an addition, enlarge, and fully renovate Keller School onto one campus.

Construct an addition and fully renovate Lindberg schools. Size buildings consistent with the assumption (see number "13") contained herein to accommodate greater "choice" opportunities. Review concentration of special programs at Lindberg School.

2.0 Beginning with Fiscal 2007, implement the "minimum" plan irrespective of funding source to achieve the SBI Task Force recommendations: (i) Close Blaine-Sumner and White Middle Schools, (ii) phase-out Garfield and Glen Oak primary schools, and build a replacement Harrison and Woodruff high attendance area school.

3.0 Between Fiscal 2007 and 2009, complete the following implementations:

1. In Fiscal 2007, begin construction on a replacement Harrison and Woodruff high attendance area School that could be configured K-4, K-6, or K-8 based upon changing demographic-age patterns seen from time to time and community preferences.
2. Beginning in the Manual attendance area in Fiscal 2007 with completion by Fiscal 2009, phase-out of Garfield Primary School: entering kindergarten and first grade Garfield Primary School students may choose, on a lottery basis, to attend Harrison, Roosevelt, Tyng, and/or Whittier Primary Schools beginning in Fiscal 2007; as the entering second graders complete fourth grade (2009), Garfield Primary School would be closed and the remaining students re-allocated to the middle schools. A replacement building would be built on the Garfield site as funds became available with a targeted opening of Fiscal 2009. Upon completion of the new school, Tyng School would close and the students and namesake would relocate to the Garfield site; other balancing of students on a voluntary basis would begin.
3. Beginning in the Woodruff attendance area in Fiscal 2007 with completion by Fiscal 2009, phase-out Glen Oak Primary School and either acquire/swap land in upper Glen Oak Park or adjacent area or expand Von-Stueben campus into K-8: entering kindergarten and first grade Glen Oak Primary School students may choose, on a lottery basis, to attend Hines, Kingman, and Irving Primary Schools in Fiscal 2007; as the entering second graders complete fourth grade (2009), Glen Oak Primary School would be closed and the remaining students re-allocated to the middle schools. Alternatively a new "Glen Oak Park" campus or, a vacated administration center on the Von Stueben campus would be vacated by 2009 and re-purposed with an addition into a primary school.

Separately, property would be acquired adjacent to and/or on the Morton Square Park site. A separate replacement building would be built as funds became available with a targeted opening of Fiscal 2009. Upon completion of the new school, Kingman and Irving schools would be closed. The Glen Oak, Kingman, and Irving primary students would be re-allocated to the "Morton Square Park" and either the Glen Oak Park (preferred) or expanded Von Stueben sites.

4. Close Blaine Sumner (BSMS) and White Middle Schools (WMS): Feeder primary schools would add one or more fifth grades to their existing buildings. Entering fifth graders would remain at their home primary school (see "a" above). BSMS entering seventh and eighth graders would go to the Manual campus. BSMS sixth graders would have the choice, on a lottery basis, to attend a new sixth grade on the Manual campus or fill existing open seats at Calvin Coolidge, or Trewyn Middle Schools. WMS entering sixth, seventh, and eighth graders would have the choice, on a lottery basis, to attend and fill existing open seats at the Sterling, Loucks, Von Stueben, or Lincoln Middle Schools. (White Middle School students leaving the Woodruff attendance area for the middle school years would return to the same for high school.)
5. With the exception of the fifth grade classes returning to the primary schools and the new sixth, seventh, and eighth grade classes on the Manual campus, remaining sixth, seventh, and eighth grade teaching positions at BSMS and WMS along with the kindergarten and first grades in 2007, second grades in 2008, and third through fourth grades in 2009 at Garfield and Glen Oak Primary Schools would be eliminated through attrition to the extent that is possible.

4.0 Finance the new construction, additions, and renovations according to the following plan:

1. For the Harrison School and Woodruff attendance area building replacement, issue Health-Life-Safety Bonds based upon the presumption that the Illinois State Board of Education would concur that the cost of health-life-safety remediation would be greater than the costs of new construction.
2. Secure a \$60,000,000 to \$75,000,000 State of Illinois "School Construction Grant" entitlement and provide for the \$24,000,000 to \$30,000,000 District match by:
 1. counting the \$30,000,000 Harrison School and to-be-named Woodruff high attendance area Health-Life-Safety bond;
 2. as necessary, counting similar bonds for the Garfield/Tyng and Glen Oak/Irving/Kingman school replacements; and,
 3. counting existing balances in the district's restricted Site & Construction, Health-Life-Safety, and Rent funds (in the aggregate totaling an un-audited \$4,572,000 as of June 30, 2005);

3a. Secure passage of a \$60,000,000 to \$75,000,000 school construction bond referendum—less any moneys obtained from 4.2.1/2 above—with the caveat that any moneys from the State School Construction grant program would be used to reduce the debt payments and/or refund the bonds outstanding;

OR, ALTERNATIVELY,

3b. Secure \$60,000,000 to \$75,000,000 in City of Peoria pass-through funding with the exercise of their Public Building Commission authority;

OR, ALTERNATIVELY,

3c. Secure funding from a host of options including:

- (i) public-private partnerships (wherein the facility is leased by the District at below cost for day-time use and managed by the owner for-profit during off-hours),
- (ii) philanthropic grants from individuals and/or organizations
- (iii) intergovernmental cooperation agreements (providing for the sharing of costs)
- (iv) issuance of “alternate revenue bonds” and/or “funding bonds” by the District with repayment tied to operational savings accrued,
- (v) issuance of “working cash bonds” with repayment tied to a separate tax levy, and,
- (vi) issuance of zero coupon bonds deferring repayment to 20-years into the future from accrued reserves derived from operational savings and/or re-allocated levies, or, both.

OR, ALTERNATIVELY,

4. some combination of 2, 3a, 3b, and/or 3c.

5.0 Adopt the “Program Statement” found at Exhibit “7” for submission to the Illinois State Board of Education and set the amount requested at the high end of the range or \$120,000,000 (5 new buildings at up to \$15MM each plus 5 major renovations/additions at up to \$6MM each).

6.0 Employ the following Steps in re-purposing (--i.e., finding an alternate use) and/or disposing of school sites not designated for replacement buildings:

1. As is practicable and desirable, swap with another owner a school site for land to construct a new school building;
2. Engage an appraiser, set a minimum bid price, and sell at auction to the highest bidder decommissioned school sites;

3. If unsuccessful at Step 2, seek a transfer of property to another governmental unit including the City, County, Park District, or other political subdivision;
4. If unsuccessful at Step 3, transfer the property for development to Habitat for Humanity and/or Peoria housing Authority under condition that the site would be developed into a minimum number of single family dwellings upon which real estate property taxes could subsequently be collected;
5. If unsuccessful at Step 4, transfer the property for development by a not-for-profit organization with definitive re-development plans and demonstrated sufficient and verifiable financial wherewithal to renovate and maintain a decommissioned school site;
6. If unsuccessful at Step 5, minimally maintain the site so as the same would not become a blight on a neighborhood including the policing of trash, heating of plant, integrity of the building envelop, mowing of grass, and the like; or,
7. If unsuccessful at Step 6, demolish the building and create a “green field” site for potential future development by the District.

G Other Recommendations

The Committee also recommends that the District continue to address its other educational program development objectives and facility needs by executing the following:

1. Develop an implementation and communication plan for redistribution of student populations within the High School attendance areas taking into consideration the order of school closures and new construction that will minimize the impact on students.
2. Approach potential program and financial partners.
3. Engage an architect(s) and complete a Health-Life-Safety decennial resurvey of the Harrison, Blaine-Sumner, Loucks, Glen Oak, Irving, Kingman, and Garfield schools to support potential funding initiatives; obtain subsequent Board of Education approval to submit findings to ISBE.
4. Upon completion of 3 above, engage architects to continue decennial Health-Life-Safety resurvey of all remaining non-affected buildings for subsequent remediation, renovation, and/or remodeling.
5. Solicit from architects Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the schematic design, developmental design, specification development, bid solicitation, award recommendation, project management, and all other associated components to the replacement of the Harrison School and to-be-named Woodruff high school attendance area school.

6. Solicit from architects Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the schematic design, developmental design, specification development, bid solicitation, award recommendation, project management, and all other associated components to the replacement of the “Tyng/Garfield,” “Morton Square,” “Glen Oak,” and “Peoria high attendance area” schools.
7. As funding becomes known, engage one or more architects through the “quality based selection process” (“QBS”) contemplated in “#6” above; engage the same in the schematic design, developmental design, specification development, bid solicitation, award recommendation, project management, and all other associated components to the renovation/additions to Whittier, Calvin Coolidge, Trewyn , Lindberg, and Keller schools and the four remaining replacement buildings.
8. Incorporate “green design” features into all new buildings and major renovations and select architects with expertise in the same.
9. Develop a capital program cost estimate with architects, engineers and contractors.
10. Develop a funding strategy to finance construction with or without State School Construction Grant Funds; engage financial advisor(s);
11. Seek outside pro-bono assistance in developing a referendum campaign, as necessary.
12. Develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan to explain the proposed plan and its benefit to the community.
13. Continue the school planning, design and siting process by engaging all interested stakeholders in our community including students, parents, teachers, administrators, neighborhood organizations, interested citizens, civic entities, business community representatives and all others interested in developing optimum learning environments for the children of District 150.
14. Engage the Peoria Park District in discussions to acquire land adjacent to or on the Morton Square and upper Glen Oak Park sites. Such discussions might include the swapping of land.
15. Engage Bradley University in discussions to utilize tennis courts adjacent to Whittier campus to support physical education and outdoor recreation activities and, separately, the creation of a professional development laboratory site.
16. Explore use of Franklin and/or new “Morton Square Park” campus as the Math & Science Academy School contemplated by the Med-Tech District Plan.

17. Consideration should be given to creating a K-8 replacement building in the Peoria High attendance area. The concentration of students in the Peoria High attendance area suggests construction of the contemplated new building (K-8 or other configuration) east of University, south of McClure, north of I-74 and west of Knoxville; explore re-locating the District maintenance facility to the greater Peoria Stadium/Roy Rickets campus as a site option for the new building.
18. Just as students are phased-out of schools, it may be necessary to phase the re-allocation of students into new or replacement buildings; administration needs to be sensitive to such possibility in future planning.
19. New additions/renovations at Harrison, Lindberg, Keller, and Whittier should be phased-in in such a manner so as to cause the least amount of disruption: as a new addition comes on-line, move students into the same before abandoning/replacing/renovating the vacated space; the Trewyn and Calvin Coolidge renovations should be scheduled for a summer shut-down period.
20. Direct administration to immediately begin implementation planning.
21. Budget up to \$500,000 from restricted use Health-Life-Safety and/or Site & Construction funds to support planning and implementation activities including, but not limited to: engagement of architects, marketing specialists, attorneys, appraisers, site acquisition, financial consultants, and the like.
22. Authorize administration to develop land “swap” agreements with other governmental units for subsequent Board of Education approval.

G Conclusions

While the Committee took into consideration the potential need for some boundary variances, one of its objectives was to maintain the respective high school attendance zones and work to accommodate the student populations therein. Attached and incorporated herewith as Exhibit 6 is the chart of the final rankings of all of the schools, combining operational values, programmatic values, and health/life/safety values. The chart ranks the primary schools, middle schools and high schools and then gives a rank for an overall facility score. It is worth noting that, if analyzed on a three-tier basis, the ultimate scoring of this Committee, with the exception of two schools, parallels the analysis and ranking on the comprehensive study done in August of 2000.

This Committee, while not specifically charged with cost savings, attempted to take into consideration the potential cost savings on an operational and maintenance basis, and instructional staff basis with the closing of these schools in support of the broader SBI Task Force recommendations. This analysis contemplates, but makes no findings relative to the unknown resale value of the closed facilities or the land upon which those particular buildings are located. The academic achievement of the buildings in making AYP was considered in the identification of buildings for closure. Site selection for new construction was based upon the concentration of students, desire to limit bussing, and the availability of adequate land. Minimizing the disruption in student and family lives—i.e., number of building moves—was a central focus of the “select implementation” recommendations.

EXHIBIT 1 – COMMITTEE MEETING MEMOS

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
April 25, 2005
3:30 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 3:30 p.m. Those in attendance were: Lillie Foreman, Ray Lees, David Henebry, Ed Barry, Herschel Hannah, Cindy Fischer, Dave Ryon, Mike Sullivan, Mary Ardapple, Don Jackson, Steve Morris, Mary Spangler, Ken Hinton, Guy Cahill and Board Secretary Julie Cramer.

Introductions were made by each member present.

Mr. Hinton thanked members for the work they would be doing for the school district and noted that the work will make a defining difference to the District and community for the next ten years.

Mr. Cahill explained that in order to stay on the State "list" for funds, we need to identify and determine the cost of what we want to do with our facilities. We need to look at what the program will look like in the future and the "cost" in the context of operational needs. Mr. Cahill noted that the Facilities Study from 2000 gives the committee a solid basis and it will be used along with information that has occurred since 2000. It will be used in the sense of "what is the best organizational structure of the District." Mr. Cahill also noted that we will have to get a handle on what it costs to operate buildings and what affects those costs.

The group broke into three sections to brainstorm different configurations of buildings and programs. Those ideas are on the attached sheets.

The next meeting will be Monday, May 02, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in the Superintendent's Conference Room of the Administration Building.

Julia A. Cramer
Board Secretary

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
May 2, 2005
3:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 3:00 p.m. Those in attendance were: Lillie Foreman, Ray Lees, David Henebry, Edward J. Barry, Jr., Herschel Hannah, Cindy Fischer, Ken Hinton, Dave Ryon, Mary Ardapple, Don Jackson, Thea Robinson, Mary Spangler, Guy Cahill and Board Secretary Julie Cramer.

Mr. Dave Ryon began by stating that the handouts members have are a compiled listing of the ideas from the April 25, 2005 meeting. Mr. Ryon asked for any corrections to the data.

Mrs. Ardapple asked for e-mails with minutes from the last meeting and a reminder of the next meeting dates and assignments to be done. If information is sent by e-mail Mrs. Ardapple would like an explanation of the information. Members are to "RSVP" to the e-mail to let Mr. Cahill know if they will be attending the next meeting.

Mrs. Ardapple asked for clarification on the "four high schools" concept. Mr. Cahill replied that this group will have a part in defining what "four high school campuses" will look like. Mrs. Ardapple would like to suggest that we need to put that message out to the public. Mr. Hinton introduced that there will be "four learning campuses." One could be K-12, or one could be a tech center. Mr. Hinton will get research information to the group on different configurations. Mr. Hinton stated, "Your charge is to look at all situations and take the groups' ideas back to the Board; could be a Pre-K into Jr. College concept. The opening and closing of programs will come from this group. We are looking at schools that we have now and are asking how can we do it better."

Mr. Henebry noted that the District needs to provide the appropriate "definition" for the State when applying for funding for new school construction. If the District provides plans to the State with the number of classrooms and square feet, the District can change the plans but if you take away square feet, you lose dollars – so it is imperative that the plan be ambitious.

Mr. Cahill reported there needs to be a subcommittee to draft a response to questions from the Structural Budget Imbalance Committee. Ed Barry, Ray Lees, David Henebry and Mary Spangler will be working with Mr. Ryon.

Mr. Ray Lees presented listings addressing areas that need to be interfaced with facility planning. The group dismissed into three sub-groups to work on giving value to the items on the sheets. Mr. Cahill noted that three things need to be done: 1. Validate that the group has covered everything on the sheets. 2. Decide the scale 1-5 etc. 3. Arrive at a consensus on weighting. Each group will use the same criteria to rate the items. The next meeting will be to talk about how the groups arrived at their results.

NEXT MEETING – Monday, May 9, 3:00 p.m. Administration Building, Room 1.

Julie Cramer, Board Secretary

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
May 9, 2005
3:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 3:00 p.m. Those in attendance were: Ray Lees, David Henebry, Edward J. Barry, Jr., Cindy Fischer, Stephen Morris, Dave Ryon, Mary Ardapple, Thea Robinson, Mary Spangler, Guy Cahill and Board Secretary, Julie Cramer.

Mr. Barry began the meeting by explaining the work that the sub committee had completed. The group presented and discussed the comparative costs of new vs. old buildings, the potential savings of different campuses including different configurations of grades, community collaboration possibilities and preliminary cost analysis of different configurations. The group will present their findings to the Structural Budget Imbalance Task Force.

Group 1 explained their Facilities Attributes Comparative Analysis sheet for Health-Life-Safety issues. Each school had a total facility score that was arrived at by adding each area score. The area score was a combination of value factor and the multiplier. The handout explained how each section was defined.

Groups 2 and 3 met to finish their sheets. Their reports will be made at the next meeting.

Next Meetings – Wednesday – May 18 – 3:00 p.m. Superintendent's Conference Room
Monday – May 23 – 3:00 p.m. Superintendent's Conference Room

Julie Cramer, Board Secretary

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
May 19, 2005
3:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 3:30 p.m. Those in attendance were: Steve Morris, Lillie Foreman, Ray Lees, Dave Henebry, Edwin Berry, Herschel Hannah, Cindy Fiwscher, Dave Ryon, Mary Ardapple, Mary Spangler, Ken Hinton, Guy Cahill and Assistant Board Secretary Debbie Sullivan. Absent were committee members Don Jackson and Thea Robinson.

The committee spent much time discussing facilities and the various scoring that would be used in the evaluations.

The committee divided into 4 groups. Each group was assigned a high school region. Members of each group will tour the buildings in each high school region by June 13th to determine how classrooms are being used. The groups are:

- Group 1 – Manual – Dave Ryon, Steve Morris, & Lillie Foreman
- Group 2 – Peoria High – Ed Berry, Guy Cahill, Mary Spangler
- Group 3 – Woodruff – Dave Henebry, Cindy Fischer, Thea Robinson
- Group 4 – Richwoods – Ray Lees, Mary Ardapple, Herschel Hannah

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
June 13, 2005
3:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 3:15 p.m. Those in attendance were: Ray Lees, Edward J. Barry, Jr., Cindy Fischer, Stephen Morris, Dave Ryon, Mary Ardapple, Lillie Foreman, Mary Spangler, Guy Cahill, Herschel Hannah and Board Secretary Julie Cramer.

Mr. Cahill began the meeting by noting that the Committee needed to report to the Board of Education what the District will look like from the "60,000 foot view" into the future and how can we save money - and ultimately - how to adequately house the population the we have now and in the future.

Handout sheets on Facilities Attributes Comparative Analysis on Operational Costs, Health Life Safety, Intangible Costs and Programs were distributed. Weighting of the "Programs" sheet was discussed. Dr. Fischer noted that the numbers on the Programs sheet need to be refigured, some are backwards. Consensus was to give all items on the Programs sheet the weight of 20.

Each group discussed the buildings they had toured in a specific high school region. Qualities, good and bad, of each building were noted. Mr. Morris noted that the District is not "retreating," but this is an opportunity we are given for redesign and rebirth.

NEXT MEETING – Monday, June 20, 2005 - 3:00 p.m. in the Superintendent's Conference Room. The scoring on all sheets will be completed and totals calculated. The group will discuss what decisions need to be made regarding closing of buildings considering the present K-4 and 5-8 model. If time permits, consideration will be given to other models (K-8 or K-6 and 7-8).

Julie Cramer, Board Secretary

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
June 27, 2005
6:30 a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Guy Cahill at 6:30 a.m. Those in attendance were Michael McCarten, Mike Sullivan, John Henry, Guy Cahill, Lillie Foreman, Thea Robinson, Dave Ryon, Ray Lees, David Henebry, Cindy Fischer, Pat Hampton, Stephen Morris, Mary Spangler and Sean Matheson.

Mr. Cahill began by stating there was concern that the overall weighting is driving decisions on individual schools. The group broke into sub groups to discuss the scores.

The group decided to have another meeting on July 6, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in the Superintendent's Conference Room.

Julie Cramer
Board Secretary

Peoria Public Schools
Master Facility Planning Committee
July 6, 2005
3:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Guy Cahill. Those in attendance were: Guy Cahill, Mary Ardapple, Ray Lees, Stephen Morris, Mary Spangler, David Henebry, Herschel Hannah, Edward J. Barry, Jr., Cindy Fischer, Ken Hinton.

Mr. Cahill began by passing out new score sheets for operational costs, health-life-safety, programs and facility score sheet. Changes were made to the facility score sheet for White school. On all sheets 1 is low 5 is high.

Mr. Cahill then presented the rankings from the 2001 facility study and compared those to this group's findings. Mr. Henebry noted that this committee had used a different rubric. Rankings stayed mainly consistent with Loucks and Whittier showing the most change.

The next activity was the discussion of the "Observations and Assumptions" listed below.

1. Special Education classrooms were at 2/3 allowable number
2. Regular division classrooms were at 3/4 allowable (Most were 17, 18, 19)
3. A well configured building could accommodate up to 6 sections per grade level
And could be designed for smaller learning communities (wings)
4. A poorly configured building would have 4 or less sections per grade level
5. Classroom allowances – 20-25% total rooms need to be set aside for special education
(If you build 40 new classrooms, 10 would be for special ed)
6. Growth Bubble – seems to be at the primary and moving up
7. Classroom guideline – 24 students in primary and 28 students in middle school sections

Mr. Cahill explained that the ultimate goal is to figure out how many classrooms will be needed to accommodate the current and anticipated future student population by attendance area.

The following summary by high school region is the number of classroom sections there currently are and the number needed.

	Current Number	Number Currently Needed
Manual High School Region	169	111
Peoria High School Region	152	120
Woodruff High School Region	151	121
Richwoods High School Region	114	108

Much discussion was held on which areas needed schools closed and new schools built and/or additions to existing buildings. Task Force members looked at the scores of the buildings to determine how many buildings were adequate and how many more need to be built to achieve adequacy in each attendance area. Some thoughts were:

- Someone needs to decide what the program needs are currently and in the future
- What will the grade level configuration be
- Blaine and Harrison need to be closed in phase 1
- Close Garfield, Tyng, Whittier and build 2 new schools (could be K-8)
- Calvin Coolidge and Trewyn could expand
- Attendance boundaries could be changed
- Close Loucks and consolidate with Woodrow Wilson – build new
- Franklin and Columbia fit in with the Heart of Peoria Concept
- TJ and Sterling have land if expansion is needed
- Close Glen Oak, Irving, Kingman, White – build 2 new
- Expand Lincoln
- Poverty areas respond better in K-8 settings
- The Richwoods area is maxed out
- Kellar needs an expansion to end up with only one building
- The Developmental Center could move to the empty Kellar building

Mr. Cahill emphasized that the State Capital Development Fund monies provide funding for districts. The group needs to construct a program statement for the District to be eligible for funding. If funding would be available, they would pay 70% and the district would pay 30%. Dr. Hannah noted that partnerships could be formed with community groups such as the library or the park district. Mr. Cahill noted that funds through Community Development Block Grants might be accessed.

Savings derived from consolidating and building could amount to 120 fewer staff members with the thought of netting 60 positions. The savings in operations from closing buildings and rebuilding could be 3 million and staff savings could be 3 million. These figures assume the District would receive funds from the School Construction Grant. Mr. Hinton stressed that the change in staffing would come through attrition.

Dr. Hannah thought it would make sense to show the state the District was interested in having a math, science, technology building. Mr. Hinton reported that he had been talking with the Med Tech Group and the Heart of Peoria Group.

Mr. Cahill explained that the state has already acknowledged that 1/5 of our student population is inadequately housed and this is what our eligibility is based on. The District then decides what types of buildings and how many buildings we would need.

Mr. Cahill announced that next we need a writing team to draft the recommendations. Ray Lees and Stephen Morris volunteered for the committee.

The next meeting will be July 15, 2005 1:00 p.m. in the Superintendent's Conference Room. Mary Ardapple will provide cookies.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Julie Cramer
Board Secretary

EXHIBIT 6

MASTER FACILITY PLANNING COMMITTEE - FACILITY SCORE SHEET

Intangible Score		Operational Score		Health-Life-Safety Score		Program Score		6/30/2005					OVER ALL RANK	PLAN ADVC
Primary Schools	Score	Primary Schools	Score	Primary Schools	Score	Primary Schools	Score	H.S. ZONE	TOTAL	GROUP RANK				
Charter Oak -- 1979	680	Charter Oak -- 1979	1025	Charter Oak	1540	Charter Oak	1400	R	4645	1	6	5		
Franklin Edison -- 1921 / 1959	680	Franklin Edison -- 1921 / 1959	795	Franklin Edison	980	Franklin Edison	1400	P	3855	5	20	27		
Garfield -- 1959	680	Garfield -- 1959	605	Garfield	1110	Garfield	1400	M	3795	8	24	19		
Glen Oak -- 1989	680	Glen Oak -- 1989	835	Glen Oak	715	Glen Oak	1400	W	3630	9	26	25		
Harrison -- 1901	680	Harrison -- 1901	485	Harrison	715	Harrison	1400	M	3280	12	30	31		
Hines -- 1948.	680	Hines -- 1948.	625	Hines	1110	Hines	1400	R	3815	6	21	23		
Irving --1898	680	Irving --1898	400	Irving	715	Irving	1400	W	3195	14	32	32		
Thomas Jefferson --1949	680	Thomas Jefferson --1949	765	Thomas Jefferson	1110	Thomas Jefferson	1400	P	3955	4	17	22		
Keller -- 1959 / 1941	680	Keller -- 1959 / 1941	755	Keller	1225	Keller	1400	R	4060	3	14	21		
Kingman -- 1903	680	Kingman -- 1903	405	Kingman	715	Kingman	1400	W	3200	13	31	29		
Northmoor-Edison -- 1963	680	Northmoor-Edison -- 1963	990	Northmoor-Edison	1150	Northmoor-Edison	1400	R	4220	2	11	17		
Tyng -- 1913 / 1992	680	Tyng -- 1913 / 1992	665	Tyng	715	Tyng	1400	M	3460	10	28	24		
Whittier -- 1914	680	Whittier -- 1914	525	Whittier	715	Whittier	1400	M	3320	11	29	20		
Woodrow Wilson -- 1944	680	Woodrow Wilson -- 1944	615	Woodrow Wilson	1110	Woodrow Wilson	1400	P	3805	7	22	26		
Middle Schools	Score	Middle Schools	Score	Middle Schools	Score	Middle Schools	Score	H.S. ZONE	TOTAL	GROUP RANK	OVER ALL RANK			
Mark Bills -- 1979	680	Mark Bills -- 1979	985	Mark Bills	1595	Mark Bills	1600	W	4860	2	2	2		
Blaine Sumner -- 1927 G.S.	680	Blaine Sumner -- 1927 G.S.	755	Blaine Sumner	725	Blaine Sumner	1640	M	3800	12	23	28		
Calvin Coolidge --1930 G.S.	680	Calvin Coolidge --1930 G.S.	695	Calvin Coolidge	890	Calvin Coolidge	1640	M	3905	10	18	12		
Columbia -- 1931	680	Columbia -- 1931	675	Columbia	890	Columbia	1640	P	3885	11	19	16		
Lincoln -- 1993 Expandability	680	Lincoln -- 1993 Expandability	1440	Lincoln	1475	Lincoln	1600	W	5195	1	1	1		
Lindbergh -- 1963 ok - G.S.	680	Lindbergh -- 1963 ok - G.S.	840	Lindbergh	1255	Lindbergh	1600	R	4375	3	8	3		
Loucks -- 1914	680	Loucks -- 1914	545	Loucks	725	Loucks	1640	P	3590	14	27	18		
Rolling Acres -- 1957 G.S.	680	Rolling Acres -- 1957 G.S.	865	Rolling Acres	1095	Rolling Acres	1600	R	4240	5	10	14		
Roosevelt (K-8) -- 1932 Windows	680	Roosevelt (K-8) -- 1932 Windows	995	Roosevelt (K-8)	865	Roosevelt (K-8)	1600	M	4140	7	13	13		
Sterling -- 1962 G.S.	680	Sterling -- 1962 G.S.	815	Sterling	1120	Sterling	1600	P	4215	6	12	7		
Trewyn -- 1949	680	Trewyn -- 1949	850	Trewyn	1120	Trewyn	1600	M	4250	4	9	10		
Von Steuben -- 1936 G.S.	680	Von Steuben -- 1936 G.S.	870	Von Steuben	890	Von Steuben	1600	W	4040	8	15	11		
Washington -- 1954 G.S.	680	Washington -- 1954 G.S.	755	Washington	960	Washington	1640	R	4035	9	16	15		
White -- 1903	680	White -- 1903	750	White	725	White	1640	W	3795	13	25	30		
High Schools	Score	High Schools	Score	High Schools	Score	High Schools	Score	H.S. ZONE	TOTAL	GROUP RANK	OVER ALL RANK			
Manual -- 1961	680	Manual -- 1961	1005	Manual	1275	Manual	1820	M	4780	2	4	6		
Peoria -- 1916	680	Peoria -- 1916	1120	Peoria	965	Peoria	1760	P	4525	4	7	9		
Richwoods -- 1955	680	Richwoods -- 1955	1075	Richwoods	1325	Richwoods	1740	R	4820	1	3	4		
Woodruff -- 1936	680	Woodruff -- 1936	1070	Woodruff	1170	Woodruff	1740	W	4660	3	5	8		
Special Schools	Score	Special Schools	Score	Special Schools	Score	Special Schools	Score	H.S. ZONE	TOTAL	GROUP RANK	OVER ALL RANK			
Jamieson (Special Needs) -- 1975	680	Jamieson (Special Needs) -- 1975	792	Jamieson (Special Needs)	1220	Jamieson (Special Needs)	1100	P						
Valeska Hinton ECEC -- 1993	680	Valeska Hinton ECEC -- 1993	1310	Valeska Hinton ECEC	1400	Valeska Hinton ECEC	1220	M						
Additional Facilities	Score	Additional Facilities	Score	Additional Facilities	Score	Additional Facilities	Score	H.S. ZONE	TOTAL	GROUP RANK	OVER ALL RANK			
Adult Education Building -- 1911	680	Adult Education Building -- 1911	590	Adult Education Building	765	Adult Education Building	1340	M						
Greeley Alternative -- 1912	680	Greeley Alternative -- 1912	590	Greeley Alternative	745	Greeley Alternative - M.S.	1460	W						
Peoria Alternative -- 19__	680	Peoria Alternative -- 19__	0	Peoria Alternative - Part of Adult Ed Cen.	0	Peoria Alternative - H.S.	1480							
Admin. Bldg./Diagnostic Learning Ctr.	680	Admin. Bldg./Diagnostic Learning Ctr.	0	Admin./Diagnostic Learning - NA.	0	Admin. Bldg./Diagnostic Learning Ctr.	160	W						
Bus Maintenance Facility	680	Bus Maintenance Facility	0	Bus Maintenance Facility	0	Bus Maintenance Facility	0	R						
Lee Storage	680	Lee Storage	0	Lee Storage	0	Lee Storage	0	M						
Maintenance Facility	680	Maintenance Facility	0	Maintenance Facility	0	Maintenance Facility	0	P						
Roy Rickets Center	680	Roy Rickets Center	0	Roy Rickets Center	0	Roy Rickets Center	60	R						
Stadium Area	680	Stadium Area	0	Stadium Area - NA.	0	Stadium Area	0	R						

EXHIBIT 7.
ISBE / CDB PROGRAM STATEMENT

The Peoria Public Schools currently maintain thirty-five (35) schools including a compliment of twelve (12) primary and an equal number of middle schools. There are two special schools, one each for the arts and gifted. There are four high schools, an alternative school, a special needs school, and an adult education center to serve its nearly 15,000 students. Nearly half the buildings were built before the Depression with two constructed in 1898. The Illinois State Board of Education has determined that more than 3000 students are inadequately housed.

It is proposed that the Peoria Public Schools close eleven of its lowest scoring (--i.e., facility adequacy) schools, construct five new replacement buildings, add-on to two, and renovate two for a total twenty-nine (29). Upon completion, the district will have six primary schools, eleven middle schools, three K-6/8 schools, and four high schools including one incorporating seventh and eighth grades. It will retain the school for the arts, gifted school, alternative school, special needs school, and the adult education center. One of the schools will be designated a math & science academy in conjunction with broader community efforts to create a medical/technology district. All new construction will incorporate "community school" and "green building" concepts. The new configuration is expected to support the current and anticipated student enrollments through the year 2015.

The district expects the cost of the program to equal \$120,000,000 with the district providing its share in match of up to forty percent of the cost, or \$48,000,000. The District has or will soon have the necessary match of funds derived both from available restricted reserves and the sale of a health-life-safety bond (for the replacement of a minimum of two and as many as six buildings the cost of which to remediate is greater than the cost of replacement).