



Long Range Planning Committee
 Wednesday, February 7, 2018
 Meeting Minutes

Voting Members

X	Caryn Becker	X	Brad Geiger	•	Kati Knisley		
•	Laura Jensen	X	Nicole Bolger	•	Bob Binder		
•	Cindy Barnard	X	Rudy Lukez	X	Kirsten Hirsch		
•	Chris Williams	X	Joyce Mirezni	X	Martin Mavis		
X	Karen Zimmerman	•	Stephanie Stanley	X	John Freeman		
X	Steven Franger	X	Michelle Major				

Non-Voting Members

X	Richard Cosgrove	X	Matt Van Deusen	X	Chris Pratt, DAC	X	Krista Holtzmann
X	Gautam Sethi	•	Thomas McMillen	X	Marco Fields, DAC	•	Anthony Graziano
X	Erin Kane			X	Andy Jones, DAC		

X indicates attendance

Call to Order

Long Range Planning Committee Chair Brad Geiger called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m..

Minutes of 1-3-18 Meeting

Minutes were approved.

Bond Priorities Discussion

BOE requested LRPC to provide recommendations to BOE on 2/20/18 regarding prioritizing spending on capital needs should a bond be pursued. Director Holtzmann indicated all BOE committees were tasked with this charge.

Geiger indicated MCP is a listing of needs, not a spending model; discussion about general ideas and how to present to the BOE.

Rich Cosgrove and Gautam Sethi prepared information about approaching potential sizes of bonds, understanding that FOC will provide their thoughts on size of bond and cost; numbers of \$200M and \$270M within their preliminary estimates.

Preliminary proposal whether to address all needs across district or if it is a better spending process to focus on some of the neediest schools from a capital perspective.

- Option 1 - look at 5-6 highest need schools
- Option 2 - use MCP as spending model, fix all Tier 1 and move on to Tier 2 High priorities
- Option 3 - any other ideas

Also need to consider charter schools, Transportation and buses, IT needs and new construction. Note that the \$200M figure is interesting, as in 2019 taxes across school district will be dropping off \$200M due to miscellaneous bonds being paid off; if \$200M we'd be asking for tax at same level.

Minutes Approved 3-7-18

Rich Cosgrove discussed the MCP; 2100 line items, per school per scope, professional regulator markup and inflation built in; listing of every neighborhood schools with complete CIP backlog with 4 Tiers. Rich shared a spreadsheet of information for options.

Items discussed, what has biggest backlog, what's been touched, what's the oldest, what's the forecast for continued growth, how does capacity fit in there, committee would need to discuss if capacity should be one criteria; committee would need to decide if capacity is going to be one of the criteria applied. Also discussed was that capacity is an issue at all schools and this needs to be taken into consideration Choice and moving programming that will affect a number of students impacts capacity. Building exterior enhancements are not in the MCP. This is new to this discussion. This is a concept and one could ask for community input as to how that would look.

Introduced were the 6 schools as one proposal:

- DCHS north and south and stadium; stadium built in 1962
- CRMS, oldest MS prototype that we have
- Northridge Elementary, built by the developer, old and worn school
- TRHS built in 1995, significant needs
- PHS, #2 behind HR for backlog
- Sierra MS, significant backlog

There are \$235M in capital needs just at neighborhood schools for top tiers and all priorities. The top 75% Tier 1 items are those that if failed could close a school. New construction options, CVHS most over capacity and has been in the MCP since 2008 for an F Pod. The school has 6 mobiles, will receive 2 more this summer, the hallways are crowded. There are serious issues for capacity.

A concern is not to just do a couple of things, but to look at it from the contracting perspective and cost efficiency, good to renovate a school at one time; contractors busy and have to entice them. Need to consider career tech, vo-tech; wedge for \$2M for utilizing PHS to bring world class there as well as use space that is available; have had some success with auto program there.

Capacity and when do we start addressing obvious need at Sterling Ranch; one option is K-8 idea which gives us some room to expand; need to look at whether Sterling Ranch will generate new students or just re-distribution due to migration of families from one area to another, consider migration in from other states. Sterling Ranch now has about 100 houses being built; look at sales rate, demo prices above \$600K, concern is who is moving in, young families or families with older kids. Reality is that Sterling Ranch is going to demand a school; will be a 30K home community in next 10-20 years.

Director Holtzmann asked if neighborhood schools are value engineered. MCP lists DCSD standards which are comparable to other Front Range K-12 neighborhood schools; value engineering is 85% of the cost of district standards; charters use this; value engineered life cycle is shorter, maintenance and utility costs higher.

Andy Jones, DAC Liaison, asked about the baseline for determining cost of specific projects and how current is the data. New construction is cost per square foot, benchmark with other districts.

Capital renewal, we assess building components in each school every 3 years. Collected data, know age of school, assign tier, per industry standards to tier; assess building components using 5 criteria; priorities updated every year for every school, average age of school in DCSD is 23 years.

- Tier 1 will affect whole building, some will shut it down
- Tier 2 affects program or area
- Tier 3 affects smaller area or quality of life
- Tier 4 discretionary but affects quality of life

4 reasons CIP will increase: inflation, change in condition, assess buildings already assessed with new CIP items added, add life cycle for components in buildings not assessed.

Discussed confidence level in these numbers. We have the markup of 1.33, this is what Front Range uses assuming these would be managed by architect, general contractor and built with scopes that involve codes, new construction would cost more for design. Is plan externally audited; no internally. Other districts sometimes hire a consultant one time; they are not always intimately familiar with systems, and it is not updated. We confirm with our maintenance team and have historical data.

Another bond in 4 years, how do we hit each school now visually so each feels they got something.

Minutes Approved 3-7-18

IT and security numbers represent most but not all urgent needs; does not cover the backlog in MCP, largest part is classroom computers, \$3.2M on refresh. Replacing cameras, 15 cameras in an elementary alone.

Transportation SPED buses; SPED buses had growth 20% in one year; gen ed buses cannot be repurposed to SPED buses. Building enhancements for SPED are identified in MCP; calming rooms added about 1-2 per year and cost \$40-50K per room.

Transportation terminals and land purchases. Is land available or reserved for us. We have a wedge to buy land for future bus terminals and our realtors continue to search.

Irresponsible of committee not to address charter schools and having some portion of bond; if bond is passed would recommend further evaluation with charters to provide better info.

Andy Jones, DAC Liaison and former charter school member; 14 year old charter school have some issues similar. How did you come up with \$4M and is that equitable amount or a needs-based study. Charters provide info to our planner to review. Some charters will hire architect and engineering firm to do an MCP for their school and come up with needs and address on their own.

Support Facilities - any facility that is not a school, Transportation, maintenance, administration, only capital renewal. ADA is another topic; not all buildings are fully ADA compliant, and there are 3 levels. Sometimes we have to react to a student with ADA needs as they progress through school.

Energy savings capital projects are not in the MCP; currently if lights are broken we upgrade to LED; we don't have the funds now to make that choice right now.

Per Pupil Suggestion:

If you take \$40M divide by 64,000 students you have a per pupil dollar amount that you could then allocate to those schools based on enrollment; then put those toward Tier 2,3, and let schools determine what they want to put that money toward this need; may have a Tier 2 need but want to put it to a Tier 3.

Are schools struggling because of demographics or because they look old?

My concern is that of quality model or equity model. Equity model at older schools is where this approach can make a difference and since we are all one district. Like to see us address equity standpoint - older schools with greater needs should get lion's share of the bond.

We have to teach board and public that needs are different.

Per pupil just need to be careful depending on how decision is made entire carpet not a portion, huge success with schools by doing carpeting in entrances, corridors, needs to take that into account that positive result.

Continue to make this recommendation based on the credibility of the MCP. Decision has to be how credible is the MCP and that tends toward as much money to Tier 1s.

How do we address Tiers 2 and 3?

Superintendent's theory that people need to see stuff. More valuable for voters to see what looks new and we're going to get to your school next. Nobody will notice the Tier 1s.

Schools will blast on social media what is being done to their school, may not be able to see it but it's there. Where can we make the impact with the \$50M. Take 2 years of progress restoring trust and transparency. HVAC upgrade for air quality is huge factor in testing, learning for students even though you can't see it. Discussion of what schools received funds in last bond; some received funding for additions. Would want to clarify. Bond has to legally define the objectives. Would want to provide specifics to voters. Percentage set aside for charter schools

Two ideas for presentation to BOE:

1. Addressing focus on some schools TBD
2. Strictly capital by the MCP

Do we want a preferred option, or a combination of both?

Discussion including ideas of touching some schools, most important items first then lesser items, some schools if schools are spread across district, impact has to touch every single student in a meaningful way, each get a piece of the pie, addressing open enrollment and Choice, stewardship piece taking care of what we have to and not bandaid, 6 would give us an impact, might get everyone on board if we hit 75% of Tier 1, if people see benefit of bond, option to cut down for the 6 schools, furniture idea shows impact to students, focus on certain schools and show community what is possible, Highlands Ranch residents are upset about a \$40/year increase for fire department, need to hold steady with tax rate and establish trust with community, less than 30% of residents have kids in district, we can't do it all at once.

Next steps, Brad and Rudy will compile draft of the presentation by 2/16/18 with the two options. BOE presentation is 2/20/18.

Director Holtzmann mentioned a presentation and discussion like tonight would be appropriate; LRPC is doing what BOE has asked, thorough and easy to understand, helps to understanding identification of issues. What helps BOE is to listen to identification of issues so we're not missing issues. BOE is interested in capacity issues, however don't have the luxury of solving every problem before we go to the voters. Mentioned school visits and has been impressed with the maintenance.

LRPC Membership

Joyce Mirenzi has resigned. Three openings. Karen Zimmerman will be setting up interviews.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. Seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.