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## Scenario 1

## Providing Taxpayer Relief through the Debt Service Levy

## Mannheim SD 83 Overview

- Located in west suburban Cook County, adjacent to O'Hare Airport
- K-8 district serving 2,500 students in 6 facilities
- 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 early childhood center and 1 cooperative school for students with low-incidence disabilities
-65\% low income, 45\% ELL
- EBF Tier 4 at 137\% Adequacy
- Receive $\$ 40 \mathrm{M}$ in tax revenue annually
- \$60M budget


## Mannheim SD 83 Example

- In 2014, Mannheim School District 83 had accumulated a healthy fund balance level of $160 \%$
- District did not have a fund balance policy
- Developed a fund balance policy stating that the District's operating fund balance should be no more than $75 \%$ of expenditures and no less than $50 \%$
- Two plans to responsibly spend down fund balance
- Capital Projects
- Plan for all day Kindergarten - Additions at two schools and on internal renovations at one school
- Possible new administration center/pre-school by 2028


## - Address Debt

- The Board wanted to provide taxpayer relief in the future
- Pay down debt
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## Mannheim SD 83 Historical Fund Balance



## Debt Service Options

- The administration and the District's municipal advisor prepared several options for the Board's consideration, including abatement and defeasance scenarios
- In addition to providing taxpayer relief, the District wanted to generate as much present value savings as possible


## Abatement (Annual)

- The Board of Education adopts an abatement resolution, which directs the County Clerk to abate or lower the amount of property taxes to be extended
- Be mindful of the annual abatement resolution filing deadline (eg: February 28, 2025 for levy year 2024)
- The District uses fund balance to pay the amount of debt service that has been abated


## Defeasance <br> (Action taken in FY15 and FY24)

- The District contributes fund balance to defease (pay off) maturities of bonds (ideally callable maturities)
- The funds are used to invest in government securities in an escrow account
- The escrow earns interest until there are sufficient funds to pay off the refunded maturities on their respective maturities/call dates
- When the escrow is funded the bonds are considered retired
- A Certificate of Reduction of Taxes will be filed with the County Clerk
- Be mindful of annual filing deadline (eg: February 28, 2025 for the 2024 levy


## Abatement versus Defeasance

| Abatement | Defeasance |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pros: | Pros: |
| The District has more flexibility/may make <br> abatement decisions on an annual basis <br> Callable bonds may be preserved for future <br> refunding (refinancing) opportunities | The District can generate additional <br> (present value) savings from its fund <br> balance contribution |
| Cons: | Cons: |
| No ability to achieve present value savings | Once the escrow has been funded the <br> District cannot "undo" the defeasance |

## Mannheim 83 - Debt Service Schedule as of 2014



## Call Dates on Bonds in 2014



| Purpose: | AR | WC | WC | WC | WC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AR | AR | AR | AR |
| Callable: | 12/01/21 | N/A | N/A | $12 / 01 / 23$ | $12 / 01 / 24$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AR | Advance Refunding |  |  |  |
|  | WC | Working Cash |  |  |  |
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## Updated Debt Levy Management Plan - 2014 (Defeasance and Abatement)



## Updated/Current Plan

## ABATEMENT

- The Board of Education has continued to adopt annual abatement resolutions since levy year 2014 and will continue to assess annually


## DEFEASANCE

- FY24
- August 2023 - the District defeased all callable maturities on its 2013C Bonds
- Contributed $\$ 9.53$ million of fund balance to pay off $\$ 13.63$ million of debt service
- June 2024
- Will defease all callable maturities on its 2013D Bonds
- Estimated fund balance contribution of $\$ 8$ million to pay off $\$ 9.12$ million of debt service
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## Updated/Current Plan



## Estimated Total Debt Service Levy Reduction Post-2024 Defeasance and Abatements through Levy Year 2032

Total amount of fund balance
contributions and abatements
Total debt service reduction

```
\(\$ 46.7\) million
\(\$ 52.5\) million
```

TOTAL APPROXIMATE SAVINGS TO THE DISTRICT:
\$5.8 million

## Estimated Taxpayer Impact Through Levy Year 2032


(1) Cook County Equalization Factor held constant stating with lew year 2022.
(2) Assumes the District would have filed supplemental ley resolutions for the 2013A and 2013B Bonds.

 S Savings to Date:
(Est. through LY23)


| \$200,000 Homeowner Savings Summary (3)4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2013C <br> Defeasance Homeowner Savings |  |  |  | omeowner Savings |  | tal Net |
| \$ |  | (10) |  | \$ |  | \$ | (53) | \$ |  |
|  |  | (10) |  |  |  |  | (50) |  | ${ }^{(600}$ |
|  |  | (11) |  |  |  |  | (148) |  | $(159)$ |
|  |  | (10) |  |  |  |  | (142) |  | ${ }_{(153)}$ |
|  |  | (11) |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(132)}$ |  | ${ }^{(143)}$ |
|  |  | (12) |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(145)}$ |  | ${ }^{(157)}$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{(87)}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(237)}$ |  | ${ }^{(324)}$ |
|  |  | (89) |  |  |  |  | (234) |  | ${ }^{(324)}$ |
|  |  | (54) | (43) |  |  |  | (228) |  | (325) |
| $\square$ |  |  | (44) |  | (190) |  | (92) |  | ${ }^{(326)}$ |
|  |  |  | (44) |  | (191) |  | (94) |  | ${ }^{329}$ |
|  |  |  | (44) |  | (190) |  | (96) |  | (330) |
|  |  |  | (44) |  | (188) |  | (98) |  | (330) |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{(234)}$ |  |  |  | (100) |  | ${ }^{(334)}$ |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{(233)}$ |  |  |  | (102) <br> $(104)$ <br> $(0)$ |  | ${ }_{(335)}^{1356}$ |
|  |  |  | (231) |  |  |  | (107) |  | (138) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (109) |  | (109) |
| \$ | (304) | (304) | \$ (1, 149) | \$ | (759) | \$ | $\stackrel{(2,420)}{ }$ | s | (4,632) |
|  | (304) | (304) | \$ (43) | \$ | - | \$ | $(1,518)$ | \$ | $(1,866)$ |
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## Estimated Taxpayer Impact Through Levy Year 2032



#  <br> CONFERENCE 

## Projected District Fund Balance Position - Post-2024 Defeasance



## District Fund Balance Position - 2014 versus Estimated 2029



## Takeaways

- Debt service levy management plans must consider several variables, including:
- A school district's fund balance policy and position
- Call dates on outstanding bonds
- Account for future capital projects
- The use of fund balance to pay debt service versus lost interest earnings
- Long-term debt service levy management plans should be updated over time


## Scenario 2

- Managing the District's Levy with an Upcoming Debt Service Drop Off


## Sample Debt Service Schedule

\$25,000,000
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## Options for Debt Service Levy Decline

- Do nothing
- Referendum Bonds
- New or Larger Debt Service Extension Base (DSEB)
- Concept created from the tax cap law
- Limits the ability of certain units of government, including schools, to borrow on a non-referendum basis
- Operating Levy Increase
- Limiting Rate Increase
- Aggregate Extension Increase (vetoed)


## 1. Sample Building Bond Question

Shall the Board of Education of $\qquad$ , $\qquad$ County, Illinois, alter, repair and equip existing school buildings, including improving safety and security, replacing roofs and plumbing, electrical and HVAC systems, updating classrooms, science labs and libraries, improving energy efficiency, build and equip middle school building additions and improve school sites and issue bonds of said School District to the amount of $\$$ $\qquad$ for the purpose of paying the costs thereof?

## Opportunities \& Challenges of Building Bond Referendum

- Opportunities
- Larger projects can be addressed in a shorter time frame to potentially suppress construction cost inflation
- The District has up to five years to issue the bonds after passage
- Voters may like that the increase is only temporary
- Challenges
$\times$ No additional funds provided for the classroom
$\mathbf{x}$ It is not permanent so a future referendum may be necessary

INVEST INYOURSELF IGNITE OTHERS

## 2. Approve DSEB or Higher DSEB

- The voters approve a Debt Service Extension Base ("DSEB") and the county clerks certify the results (see sample ballot question on subsequent slide)
- The District could then issue non-referendum bonds payable from the DSEB anytime thereafter upon completing the process for issuing the desired type of non-referendum bond
- A life safety bond would require a bond hearing
- A working cash bond for capital projects would require a bond hearing and a 30-day petition period


## Sample DSEB Graph
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## Sample DSEB Question

Shall the debt service extension base under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law for $\qquad$ _,
Counties, Illinois, for payment of principal and
interest on limited bonds be established at \$ $\qquad$ for the 2023 levy year and all subsequent levy years [, such debt service extension base to be increased each year by the lesser of $5 \%$ or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the 12 month calendar year preceding the levy year]?

- Note that the question can be asked with and without the "CPI" factor


## Opportunities \& Challenges of DSEB Referendum

- Opportunities
- Provides the District with a long-term financing mechanism
- Future bonds sold against the DSEB will not require direct voter approval (certain non-referendum bonds require a petition period)
- Challenges
$\times$ Ballot language does not include a project description
$x$ Requires more voter education
$\times$ Unless taxable working cash bonds are issued, no additional funds provided for the classroom
$\times$ The ballot question does not permit language to explain the bond tax rate is fallingat same time


## 3. Limiting Rate Increase (see sample below)

Shall the limiting rate under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law for $\qquad$ ,
County, Illinois, be increased by an additional amount equal to $\qquad$ the Timiting rate for levy year 20 and be equal to $\qquad$ \% of the equalized assessed value of the taxable property therein for levy year $\qquad$ ?
(1) The approximate amount of taxes extendable at the most recently extended limiting rate is \$ $\qquad$ , and the approximate amount of taxes extendable if the proposition is approved is \$ $\qquad$ .
(2) For the 2024 levy year the approximate amount of the additional tax extendable against property containing a single family residence and having a fair market value at the time of the referendum of $\$ 100,000$ is estimated to be \$ $\qquad$ .
(3) If the proposition is approved, the aggregate extension for 20 _ will be determined by the limiting rate set forth in the proposition, rather than the otherwise applicable limiting rate calculated under the provisions of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (commonly known as the Property Tax Cap Law).
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## 3. Sample Question to Increase Limiting Rate (Detailed Version)

Shall the limiting rate under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law for County, Illinois, be increased by an additional amount equal to $\qquad$ \% above the'limiting rate for levy year 20_ for the purpose of constructing security improvements, including installing emergency response systems and security cameras, replacing roofing, mechanical, plumbing, heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, constructing accessibility improvements under the Americans with Disabilities Act, renovating libraries to include space for science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) programming, reconfiguring and improving student support spaces, funding student programming and instruction and for other school purposes and be equal to $\qquad$ \% of the equalized assessed value of the taxable property therein for levy year $\qquad$ ?
(1) The approximate amount of taxes extendable at the most recently extended limiting rate is \$ $\qquad$ , is \$ $\qquad$ _.
(2) For the 2024 levy year the approximate amount of the additional tax extendable against property containing a single family residence and having a fair market value at the time of the referendum of $\$ 100,000$ is estimated to be $\$$ $\qquad$ _.
(3) If the proposition is approved, the aggregate extension for 20 will be determined by the limiting rate set forth in the proposition, rather than the otherwise applicable limiting rate calculated under the provisions of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (commonly known as the Property Tax Cap Law).

## Opportunities \& Challenges of Limiting Rate Referendum

- Opportunities
$\checkmark$ The Limiting Rate increase is permanent unless a future Board takes action to reduce all or a portion of it
$\checkmark$ In comparison to a bond referendum, a limiting rate increase can be used to support operations, pay as you go capital needs and to pay the debt service on a financing paid from operating funds (e.g. debt certificate)


## - Challenges

$\mathbf{x}$ The ballot question does not permit language to explain the bond tax rate is falling at the same time
$\mathbf{x}$ Can be difficult to implement predictably in an environment where the reassessment rate is materially different than CPI or $5 \%$ since the interaction between CPI and the EAV reassessment rate will change the Limiting Rate without a referendum
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## How the Tax Cap Works

- Prior Year Extension (amount collected from taxpayers) which can increase annually by the lessor of 5\% or CPI
- The Limiting Rate changes each year based on the relative change in CPI and existing EAV

EAV Reassessment, CPI and Limiting Rate



## Mechanics For Implementation

- Prior to a successful referendum, a district would need to approve a levy to capture the additional dollars plus what is available from PTELL (i.e. the 5\% factor and an estimate for new property)
- The bonds may mature in the same year the higher limiting rate is available, so a district may need to abate all or a portion of the final bond payment and pay with the new operating dollars
- After the abatement, the new operating tax rate will be availabte for other purposes


## 4.?

## Sample Proposition to Increase Aggregate Extension

Proposition to Increase the Aggregate Extension
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Shall the aggregate extension (the total } \\ \text { dollar amount levied by the district for } \\ \text { each of the tax funds included under the }\end{array} & \text { YES } & \\ \text { Property Tax Extension Limitation Law) }\end{array}\right)$
(1) The amount of taxes extended which were subject to the Property Tax Cap (Property Tax Extension Limitation Law) in levy year 20__ was \$ $\qquad$ . If the proposition is not approved, then the taxing district may increase its extension by the lesser of $5 \%$ or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index during the 12 -month calendar year preceding $20 \ldots$. If the proposition is approved, then the taxing district may increase its extension in levy year $20 \ldots$ by an additional $\$$ $\qquad$ -.
(2) For the 20 _ levy year, the approximate amount of the additional tax extendable against property containing a single family residence and having a fair market value at the time of the referendum of $\$ 100,000$ is estimated to be $\$$ $\qquad$ .

- Note: The Governor used an amendatory veto on a portion of the original House Bill. FYI, the House added the provisions of HB 2507 to HA 1 which unanimously passed the House before the House adjourned. The bill was put on the Senate Calendar - order of concurrence with House Amendment 1 - but the Senate adjourned without taking any action on the bill. So for now, this revision is dead until it comes up in the next General Assembly session in 2024.


## Opportunities \& Challenges of Increase Aggregate Extension (Not Currently Available)

## - Opportunities

$\checkmark$ The Limiting Rate increase is permanent unless a future Board takes action to reduce all or a portion of it
$\checkmark$ In comparison to a bond referendum, a limiting rate increase can be used to support operations, pay as you go capital needs and to pay the debt service on a financing paid from operating funds (e.g. debt certificate)
$\checkmark$ Not as challenging as a limiting rate to implement predictably in an environment where the reassessment rate is materially different than CPI or $5 \%$ since the interaction between CPI and the EAV reassessment rate will change the Limiting Rate without a referendum

## - Challenges

$\times$ The ballot question does not permit language to explain the Bond tax rate is falling at the same time

# Questions and Answers 

We thank you for your time!
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