

February 9, 2026

Memorandum

To : Independent Citizen's Oversight Bond Committee (CBOC)

From: Ad Hoc Committee : Viola Gonzales, Andy Nelson & Andrea Dawson

Re: Recommendations to Staff on behalf of CBOC --early review of Draft Facilities Master Plan(FMP)

We recognize that the FMP can serve many useful purposes but it is a requirement for the district to secure matching dollars from the State of California.

We appreciate meeting with staff and value their time and counsel.

Overall, the document seems too wordy and many of us believe it could be much shorter. We don't think the public needs a lesson on box and whisker graphs.

Consider how Sacramento Unified chose to draft their Project Priority Methodology that Sacramento City Unified used. It uses LCAP (<https://scusd-fmp.webflow.io/chapter/project-priority-methodology>).

Questions on Working Assumptions

We believe that the Facilities team should explain the rationale for using 600 students as a benchmark.

We don't agree that the case has been made that OUSD can afford in each bond cycle to build two new elementary schools, one new middle school and one new high given the continued rise of costs.

Moreover, there are references to Tier 1 vs Tier 2 vs Tier 3 without definition or specificity.

What is the Capacity of OUSD Website to provide interactivity? This is unknown to us but it should provide:

- Interactive story map on the internet, Sacramento City Unified is a simple example of one.
- An interactive map of schools and their FCI rankings (similar to the colored dots shown in the school profiles) with tables with more detail appearing when pointer hovers over the dot. The dots could be placed over a "choropleth Census" tract map layer of percent poverty to provide more neighborhood context. We note that districts are too big a geography to offer any neighborhood context.

Weaknesses in the Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should include

1. **The table of proposed criteria to identify major ("transformative") projects** so that executives for whom the summary is intended can see the proposal up front.

2. **How is OUSD going to integrate equity into its decision-making and prioritizing projects?** One recommendation is to create a table of each school with column for Facility Condition Index (FCI) and for an equity index. The Equity index could be constructed from percent LCAP Unduplicated Pupil percentage and % of racial/ethnic groups scoring lowest on reading tests and/or lowest graduation rates. The index should be one numbered like the FCI.

Below is example of item 1 above .



Facilities Condition Assessment and Facilities Master Plan

[Menu ▾](#)

Criteria to Establish Project Priorities

The criteria express a range from Criteria 1 (highest priority), which focuses solely on the stated equity indicators, to Criteria 2, which adds the FCI to a second equity indicator, to Criteria 3, which is the Facilities Condition Index (FCI) only.

Criteria	Neighborhood Opportunity ID	LCAP Student Priority Group	Facility Condition Index (FCI)	Project Type
1 Equity Index only	Neighborhood Opportunity: High Segregation & Poverty	LCAP Student Priority: High OR Moderate-to-High	—	B
2 Equity Index + FCI	Neighborhood Opportunity: Low Resources	LCAP Student Priority : High OR Moderate-to-High	FCI: >= 20%	B



Made in Webflow

20% AND

3.The Executive Summary should also provide an overall picture of facilities.

The Importance of the Facility Conditions Index. We are recommending that a table be constructed that provides a list of all our schools with their Facility Condition Index listed. The index number should be up to two decimal places. (Note our Garfield example further down below.)

The table should show all District Schools including OUSD Charters on district and non-district property. It should also give the count of pupils attending. And there should be a link or reference to prop 39, explaining how these facilities are funded.

Here are examples of FCI map and table from SFUSD. (page 17 of the MP, IMG 5141)

as of October 11, 2022
*can be printed on (1) 11x17 tabloid sheet of paper

Facility Conditions Assessor
Trips 1-10 Draft Data (9/20/22)

Site name	Address	School type	21-22 Enrolled Students	Campus Requirements Years	Campus Requirements Value	Campus Replacement Value	Campus FCI	Building FCI	Site development FCI	Structure	Electrical System	Site	Windows	Plumbing System	HVAC System	Roof	Interior Construction and Compliance	Exterior Enclosure	Furnishings	Special Construction	Fire Protection	Equipment	Equipment and Maintenance Services	Deferred from 2016 Bond?
1 Rooftop Mayeda	500 Corbett Avenue	ES	252	\$8,221,802	\$14,271,071	58%	61%	21%	0%	92%	25%	68%	39%	114%	125%	44%	32%	125%	77%	125%			Yes	
2 Mission High School	3750 18th Street	HS	1084	\$76,490,832	\$140,331,115	55%	54%	58%	5%	105%	62%	62%	59%	105%	0%	63%	46%	48%	0%	77%		Yes		
3 Balboa High School	1000 Cowgig Avenue	HS	1219	\$82,900,716	\$156,151,092	53%	54%	17%	0%	102%	21%	13%	64%	114%	0%	64%	34%	74%	119%	102%		Yes		
4 Everett Middle School	450 Church Street	MS	605	\$50,881,774	\$95,890,834	53%	54%	23%	0%	74%	41%	19%	5%	100%	118%	73%	36%	123%	0%	93%		Yes		
5 George R. Moscone Elementary School/Las Americas EE5	2576 Harrison Street	ES	419	\$19,569,450	\$39,012,225	50%	51%	22%	1%	94%	23%	114%	83%	89%	35%	97%	55%	125%	0%	100%		Yes		
6 Commodore Sloat Elementary School	50 Darien Way	ES	380	\$14,553,184	\$29,145,804	50%	50%	50%	0%	62%	59%	0%	2%	86%	114%	70%	13%	67%	297%	0%		Yes		
7 Rosa Parks Elementary School	1501 O'Farrell Street	ES	384	\$20,301,481	\$41,741,105	49%	50%	24%	5%	77%	30%	0%	1%	96%	93%	70%	44%	125%	0%	16%		Yes		

Note: Findings are preliminary

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

6

If we understand correctly, the Facility Condition Index (FCI) is the cost of the repairs divided by the replacement cost of the buildings. In the examples in the Master Plan, two numbers are provided and then a color is shown for the FCI range (red yellow green etc), but not the actual numeric value of it.

The table should include: Name of school, facility condition index, year built, square footage of building, number of pupils, campus requirements, replacement value, campus FCI, Building FCI, Site development FCI,Structure, Electrical System, Windows, Plumbing system, HVAC system, roof, and so forth as our example outlines.

In the Garfield example: $\$75\text{M}/\$78\text{M} = 0.96$, shown in red, since it is greater than 0.6.

Facilities Condition	CORE BUILDING SYSTEMS	
OVERALL CAMPUS GRADE	Structure	Deficient
	HVAC	Poor
	Heating Present	✓
	Mechanical Ventilation Present	✗
	% Building area air-conditioned	0%
	Air quality sensors equipped	Ongoing
	Fire Protection	Excellent
	Electrical	Fair
	Plumbing Overall	Fair
	Water Quality Infrastructure	Good
	Water Quality Test	Pass
Deficient		
Facilities Condition Needs by Building Systems (2026)		
PRESENT REPLACEMENT VALUE (2026):		\$78,100,000
CURRENT DEFICIENCIES (2026):		\$75,060,000
DO NOTHING DEFICIENCY COST (2040):		\$184,815,000
CORE BUILDING SYSTEMS		OTHER SYSTEMS

What if most of the schools have FCIs greater than 0.6 so they are all red?

We recommend that the actual number be shown to two decimal places inside the red circle so that everyone can see the value without having to do long division themselves.

The profile examples should come from *different* districts within OUSD, if you are only going to use three examples that include an elementary, a middle school and a high school. Roosevelt might be a good profile as it is under construction but it is not a campus wide modernization; it would be invaluable to see how a project already approved and continues as a work in progress can be captured.

We understand that more considerations will be raised as we continue to work together. We look forward to a productive process.