

City of Portland, Maine

Finance Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 23, 2017

5:30 p.m., Council Chambers

1. Finance Committee Meeting Agenda

Documents:

[FC AGENDA 02-23-17.PDF](#)

1.I. Finance Committee Meeting Agenda Back-Up

Documents:

[FINANCE COMMITTEE PACKAGE - 2-23-17 FINAL.PDF](#)

1.II. Finance Committee Meeting Agenda Back-Up

Documents:

[SEBAGO TECHNICS_FACILITIES ASSESSMENT OF PORTLAND SCHOOL BUILDINGS_CAPITAL PLAN_02.23.2017_FINAL.PDF](#)

1.III. Finance Committee Meeting Agenda Back-Up

Documents:

[2 VS 4 TIMELINE POTENTIAL COMPARISON.PDF](#)

**City of Portland, Maine
Finance Committee Meeting
Thursday, February 23, 2017
5:30 p.m., Council Chambers**

AGENDA

- 1. \$61M School Bond Proposal - Public Hearing**
- 2. Future Finance Committee Dates**

5. Could we get an update on the Pension Obligation Bond?

*Response from Finance Director: See **Attachment D**, a debt service schedule for our Pension Obligation Bond. The FY18 budget will include \$13.6M of debt service related to the pension obligation bond, and this number increases by approximately \$900M annually until FY26 when our final debt service payments of \$22.3M are due.*

6. Could we get a high level overview of our debt management policy and applicable State limits?

*Response from Finance Director: See **Attachment E**, a summary memo from our Bond Adviser detailing our State and local debt limitations. In summary even if we borrowed \$64M to fund four elementary school constructions we wouldn't be at risk of violating any State or local rules around debt limits. Although we are not pushing up against any of our current limits there is a very low likelihood we could ever borrow to capacity due to the detrimental impact on the tax rate.*

7. Why is the \$61M School Board recommendation on these four elementary schools not being included along with the City FY18-FY22 Capital Improvement Plan and measured against all of the other capital needs of the entire City?

Response from Mayor Strimling: The school bond isn't included in the 5-year CIP because it will have to be voted upon by the electorate. Any borrowing for a specific item that is over (approximately \$3-4M) must be sent to the voters. This is the same process as was used in 1993 when \$15M, and then an additional \$1.2M, was allocated to rebuild our Middle Schools. However, all borrowing ultimately comes from the same pot, so City side needs and School side needs should be weighed together. That is why both are in front of the Finance Committee."

**Major Capital Improvement Program
Summary of Last Three State Rating Cycles**

2001-2002 2004-2005 2010-2011

Projects Evaluated	92	66	71
Scoring Rubric - Total Points	180	200	200
# of Funded Projects	12	20	16
Highest Score	139.13	136.7	144.67
Lowest Funded Score	122.72	116.72	125.02

Priority Ranking # (Rubric Score)

Hall Elementary	58 (83.1)	55 (90.86)	12 (128.73)
Longfellow Elementary	73 (70.24)	48 (95.08)	18 (124.06) (up to #3 on priority list)
Lyseth Elementary	51 (88.64)	53 (91.52)	43 (104.90)
Presumpscot Elementary	62 (79.09)	61 (85.39)	33 (117.50)
Reiche Elementary	67 (76.37)	23 (115.24)	21 (123.39) (up to #2 on priority list)

Attachment A-1

