



Long Range Planning Committee  
Wednesday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2017  
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members

⌋	Caryn Becker	X	Brad Geiger	⌋	Kati Knisley		
X	Laura Jensen	X	Nicole Bolger	X	Bob Binder		
X	Cindy Barnard	X	Rudy Lukez	⌋	Todd Warnke		
X	Chris Williams	⌋	Joyce Mirenzi				
X	Karen Zimmerman	⌋	Stephanie Stanley				
X	Steven Franger	X	Michelle Major				

Non-Voting Members

X	Richard Cosgrove	X	Shavon Caldwell	⌋	Thomas Mc Millen	X	Meghann Silverthorn
X	Kurt Wolter						

X indicates attendance, ⌋ = notification, ⊗ = no notification

**Call to Order**

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

**Review and Approval of March and April 2017 Minutes**

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger asked for any objections or additions to the March and April 2017 LRPC minutes. None were made. Rudy Lukez moves to approve the March minutes. Michelle Major seconded. Motion passes. Rudy Lukez moves to approve the April meeting minutes. Nicole Bolger seconds. Motion passes.

**Academy Charter School Expansion Proposal**

Director of Planning & Construction, Rich Cosgrove informed members that Academy Charter School is currently considering the addition of high school grades to its current K-8<sup>th</sup> grade charter school. A draft proposal outlining the expansion was distributed to members for review. Due to lack of time and the additional coordination needed between Academy Charter School staff and DCSD central administration staff, further discussion on this agenda item has been postponed until a later date.

**LRPC Membership**

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger reminded members that there are still 7 vacant positions (1 in Chaparral feeder, 2 in the Legend feeder, 1 in the Highlands Ranch feeder, 1 in the Mountain Vista feeder, one in the Douglas County feeder, and 1 at large position) available on the committee. He encouraged members to continue recruiting additional members. The following comments and suggestions were made by members regarding membership:

- Karen Zimmerman and Laura Jensen are the current members who have volunteered to work on recruitment. They requested an additional 2 members to help with these efforts. Any members who are interested in assisting can contact Karen or Laura directly or reach out to LRPC Chair Brad Geiger.
- LRPC members are welcome to (and encouraged) to bring those who may be interested in membership to sit in on meetings
- Technology and social media should be utilized as much as possible. Potential recruitment strategies using technology and social media could include
  - Advertising on individual DCSD school web pages

- Advertising on DCSD's main web page and FB account
- Members requested a master contact list for all SAC and PTO members. It is unknown if this list exists and if so who maintains it. Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell stated that she would work with the DCSD School/Community Partnership Coordinator Kathy Brown to identify if this list exists.

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger requested that this topic be revisited at the August 2017 meeting and that the Membership Subcommittee (Karen Zimmerman, Laura Jensen, and 2 additional requested members) provide a status brief at that time.

### **2017-18 Master Capital Plan Review**

Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell provided a high level summary of updates made to the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan. She reviewed changes made to the County's population and development summary, the enrollment summary, the school capacity section, the individual school pages, and the capital needs summary (including new construction needs). Chief Technology Officer Gautam Sethi, Director of Transportation Donna Gratino, and Paul Kleinhans the Security Systems Manager were present to discuss the updates in this year's document to the IT, Transportation, and Safety & Security pages. The following comments and suggestions were made by members regarding the draft IT capital needs portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Needs and costs need to be broken out by year as well. Annual costs need to be shown along with a 5 year lump sum.
- Need to clearly explain the methodology differences in projecting need and calculating costs for IT, Safety & Security, and Transportation versus the methodology used for facility needs.
- Attempt to capture/explain how projecting and estimating technology related needs is different from facility needs, i.e., it's very volatile and can change quickly, need can continue to grow even with flat enrollment, etc.
- Include methodology that explains how IT, Safety & Security, and Transportation does their Tiering and Prioritization onto each respective page
- Capture that capital needs could be sensitive to policy, ex.) A policy change such as a "bring your own device" approach could potentially remove or decrease the device hardware rotation need.

The following questions were asked by members regarding the draft IT portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Regarding the document management system, have more cost effective opportunities such as central enrollment been considered? Also, has it been considered that this should be a Tier 1 need because it ties into the legal responsibilities of the District?
- Do estimates include needed software updates as well?
- Knowing that technology changes so fast and that some of these needs could be sensitive to policy, how accurate are these projections?

Chief Technology Officer Gautam Sethi noted that a decision to perform enrollment centrally has not been made and that yes, it could be debated that the document management solution should be a Tier 1 item. Because a current document management solution exists but it does not have the specific functionality needed it is classified as a Tier 2 item. Mr. Sethi answered that costs for software updates are included where appropriate. Many of the items listed are purely hardware needs and only include costs for hardware. Mr. Sethi addressed the final question by acknowledging that changes such as a bring your own device approach or increased availability of storage on the cloud could dramatically change technology related needs and costs but what is shown is the District's current best estimate of needs over the next 5 years.

The following comments and suggestions were made by members regarding the draft Safety & Security needs portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Same issue as with IT needs, this doesn't tell us what work needs to be completed by year.
- Make base costs, project management costs, and inflation listed costs format standard throughout document
- This document doesn't capture how much was spent on these items last year. That would be nice information to have

The following questions were asked by members regarding the draft Safety & Security portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Where does money to fund those Tier 1 safety and security needs (that are taken care of immediately) come from?
- Is the need for Transportation cameras a full fleet replacement?

Planning & Construction Director Rich Cosgrove noted that currently there's only one funding source to address the District's most urgent capital needs (such as tier 1 safety & security items) which is fund 10 that is transferred to fund 43. Cash in lieu fees can also be used for capital but only for growth related items, i.e., reinvestment cannot be funded via cash in lieu fees. Paul Kleinhans noted that the bus cameras line item is an estimate for a full replacement of the current system.

The following comments and suggestions were made by members regarding the draft Transportation needs portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Include the size and scope of the District's fleet (and any other capital listed) in a narrative
  - 354 busses in total fleet, 94 SPED busses, every single bus is on route, etc. and general description of different types of vehicles in fleet and service they provide. And interesting facts that talk about capital, i.e. average age of bus is 22 years.
- Clarify that special needs related transportation needs are not discretionary and that they are mandated
- It might be useful to explain that special needs busses can be used for general education transportation needs but not the other way around.
- Clarify the difference between all the transportation related needs in the document, i.e. fleet vs. facility reinvestment at existing terminals vs. new terminals.

The following questions were asked by members regarding the draft Transportation portion of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan. Answers provided by Director of Transportation Donna Gratino are included with each question.

- What is the average number of busses replaced per year and how many are taken out of the fleet?
  - We don't typically replace any at this time. Last year we took 11 buses out of the fleet
- Is there a policy that busses be turned off when parked at a school?
  - Our policy is that drivers don't idle for longer than 15 minutes. However, if there's a student on the bus though they will continue to idle to keep the cameras on the bus rolling.
- Do buses have to pass emissions?
  - Yes. They are inspected annually and if we receive a complaint or notification regarding a specific bus.
- Is grade by growth or cohort taken into account when projecting the need for special needs buses, i.e., are you estimating how long a bus will/can be used by a certain cohort of students?
  - No, we don't track by grade. It is extremely difficult to do this as there is a lot of fluctuation in this population. We work directly with our Special Education department to identify where center based programs will be and the capacity they have in those areas for students.
- Why is there a price difference regarding special needs buses in this year's versus last year's document?
  - Prices listed last year were for used buses. Unfortunately, we cannot find these anymore. It is very difficult to find used special education buses. We've also realized that additional wheelchair capacity is needed which the model priced in this year's document includes.
- Do special education buses last as long as general education buses?
  - It depends. Special education buses are typically built on a truck frame (as opposed to being manufactured on site like general education buses) which makes them less durable. However, the special education buses we plan to bid on will be manufactured on site.
- Who do you auction old busses to and where do the proceeds go?
  - The proceeds go directly back into transportation. However, it is very little money. For example, out of the current 13 old busses being auctioned we have had 2 bids each for approximately \$150.
- 20% increase in SPED needs seems like a huge number, how did you get it?
  - Transportation ridership counts which is our internal data. This estimate was built on actual riders that we've counted over the last 5 years. We continue to see a huge increase in ridership for PK and special education. Just the Pre-K piece has grown tremendously over last 5 years. We started with a ridership of 138 in 13-14 and now we're at 300 for the current school year.
- Is there an option to lease buses rather than to buy outright?
  - Yes. The last time this was reviewed and vetted though it was extremely cost prohibitive. The District would have to guarantee that stock would be rotated every year and with our current budget and budgeting process the Transportation department cannot guarantee this. In addition, many of the professionals working in the transportation industry have found these lease agreements are not very good deals.

The following comments and suggestions were made by members regarding the remaining portions of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan:

- Show change in estimated costs between this year and last year
- Define/clarify the enrollment and capacity chart included on each school page
- Provide a by year/annualized cost summary table
- Use a more intuitive color scheme, perhaps one that goes from red as urgent and transitions to cooler colors for less urgent needs.
- Divide out charter school pages from neighborhood school pages and address differences in capital funding between the two via a narrative
- Consider dividing out school pages by

- Divide out school pages into sections by planning area and feeder to form a more clear picture on what is happening with enrollment and capacity
- Include the feeder on every school page (even charter school pages)
- Include the number of mobiles currently on site and what they are being used for on each school page
- Provide a summary of available programming on each school page. Or perhaps a hyperlink to each school's website?
- Include asterisks by or highlight key projects that site administration/staff and parents support. In essence, somehow identify which projects are key for community.
- Rearrange the beginning of the document in the following order- 1.) Methodology 2.) New construction and 3.) School capacity discussion
- Highlight developments that are active (and quickly moving) vs. those that are not active in the development summary
- In the existing conditions page discuss the County's overall economic health a little more. It seems like that in particular would impact residential development and student generation a lot.
- Include median annual household income for people living in Douglas County on the Existing Conditions page
- Include percentage of total costs that is inflation and project management costs on the Executive Summary page.
- Include data on wealth in Douglas County (median household income, wealth rankings) with expenditures of DCSD and neighboring districts. Marry the fact that we have a lot of money and we have a lot of need.

The following questions were asked by members regarding the remaining portions of the 2017-18 Master Capital Plan. Answers provided by Director of Planning & Construction Rich Cosgrove are included with each question.

- How would you prioritize everything in this document if funding became available?
  - Every year Planning & Construction pulls the entire Capital Improvement Plan and we meet consistently over a period of about 4 months with Operations & Maintenance staff. We pull work orders and identify those items needing the most attention and correlate this with the CIP. We focus on Tier 1 items although we acknowledge and analyze Tier 2 needs as well. We target 5-10M per year and submit recommended
- Does an item's Tier ever change?
  - No. The priority changes but the tier never changes
- Has the District ever considered selling dedicated school sites?
  - Our department has not had the horsepower to research this and make a recommendation to the Board. Before this is considered as an option we need to create a ranking or typology of sites (based on if and how they could be used to meet the District's land needs) and we need to identify risks and constraints in doing this. Finally, the District does not technically own the majority of our dedicated sites. Most of these sites currently belong to the local land use jurisdiction and are conveyed to the District when we're ready to design and construct.

**Other**

None

**Board of Education Capital Update**

None

**Adjourn**

Move to adjourn the meeting. Seconded. All ayes. Motion passes to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm.