



Long Range Planning Committee  
Wednesday, November 2nd, 2016  
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members

x	Josh Kuper	x	Brad Geiger	x	Kati Knisley		
x	Laura Jensen	]	Anthony Wilemon	x	Bob Binder		
x	Cindy Barnard	x	Rudy Lukez	x	Todd Warnke		
x	Chris Williams	]	Joyce Mirezni	x	Caryn Becker		
x	Karen Zimmerman	]	Stephanie Stanley				
x	Kay Dry	x	Michelle Major				

Non-Voting Members

X	Richard Cosgrove	X	Shavon Caldwell	]	Thomas Mc Millen	x	Meghann Silverthorn
]	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

**Welcome from STEM Principal**

Dr. Penny Eucker and Dr. Karen Johnson welcomed the LRPC to the new STEM Elementary facility and gave a brief overview of the STEM program and facility.

**Review and Approval of October 2016 Minutes**

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger asked for any objections or additions to the October 2016 LRPC minutes. None were made. Rudy Lukez moved to approve the October minutes. Cindra Barnard seconded. Kay Dry and Todd Warnke abstain. Motion passes.

**Energy Performance Contracting**

DCSD Sustainability and Energy Manager LeeAnn Westfall presented information on a proposed energy performance contract currently being reviewed and considered by DCSD leadership. The proposed contract offers the District a means to address current facility improvement needs with future utility savings. Currently, DCSD Cabinet members have decided to move forward with a technical energy audit which will provide more concrete figures of what utility savings will be provided by the contract.

DCSD has been in a contract with McKinstry since 2013 with two phases and has been saving more than the guaranteed utility savings. LeeAnn provided an overview of Phase I and II results as well as a proposed Phase III. The following questions, concerns, and recommendations were noted by LRPC members:

- Has the use of solar and other renewables been considered as part of the contract? Why does this only address energy efficiency?
- Is there a warranty time period?
- What are the educational pieces they're offering? I.e., how are we assured that staff is able to continue operating/performing operations in a way that guarantees savings?
- Clarify savings are on an annual basis.
- Is 30% savings achievable? If not district-wide, clarify the specific locations where this will be achieved.

- How long will this take to implement, i.e. when will we see proposed facility projects/construction completed?
- Provide more clarity on the difference (regarding specific projects to be completed) between 3 options once the technical energy audit is complete.
- The funding mechanism portion of this is difficult to communicate to the public. Would suggest outreach materials and/or a portion of the MCP that communicates this in layman's terms.
- What's the cost for the technical energy audit and who is paying for it?
- What's the approval for phase 3 of the contract look like? Does this go to the Board of Education?
- What other entities and districts doing similar things? Is this industry standard?
- Is there a prepayment or early payment penalty?
- Would advise consideration in using the term "budget neutral". This seems more like cost avoidance rather than a budget neutral item. The difference needs to be clearly communicated to the public.
- We were often asked what options other than a Bond were being pursued during our 2014 outreach. This is an option that could be communicated in response to that question.
- Does this affect our credit rating? More specifically, does this affect our ability to borrow more via COPs?

LRPC member Todd Warnke moved that LRPC support option 2 due to greater energy savings and a greater amount of Tier 1 needs that would be addressed. Rudy Lukez seconds. Josh Kuper abstains. Motion passes.

### **FOC, DAC, LRPC Joint Work**

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger informed members that the outreach subcommittee presented on the District's capital needs at the October 25<sup>th</sup> DAC forum. He stated that 9 additional feeder meetings had been scheduled where the LRPC could participate. He noted that although the charge and work of the joint subcommittee is still vague at this point it's clear that there will be some overlap with the message and outreach plan proposed by the MCP Outreach subcommittee. Brad posed the question to the group of how much the planned work of the joint subcommittee should impact and coincide with the LRPC's already planned outreach. The following questions, concerns, and recommendations were noted by LRPC members:

- Teaming up with the DAC has definite advantages. They have better connections to DCSD schools and communities.
- We have a bigger vision than feeder forums. I'm thrilled DAC is taking over the outreach with DCSD schools/communities but we want to focus more on those organizations and populations that don't have school age children in the school system.
- FOC probably won't have financial recommendations/options ready by the time we want to start our outreach. We should continue moving forward with non DCSD school audiences, especially since it's often very difficult to get on their agendas.
- The outreach subcommittee agrees that the committee should continue to reach out to 70% as the charge, message and plan for the joint subcommittee's outreach is still fairly vague
- Remember that by default we are presenting more than MCP data. There was a lot of frustration in 2014 because the scope and message of what needed to be presented was beyond the LRPC's expertise, bylaws, and charge. An outreach effort that only gives information on the District's capital needs only tells part of the story. I agree that we need to get on organization's agendas now but I think the outreach needs to present a complete picture to the community. This will only happen with the DAC and FOC's involvement.
- Can we verify that the FOC is on board and in concurrence? Last time around they only looked at capital needs so we will want to clarify with them if this effort will address other items.
- If we want to focus on a joint outreach and do this together how long are we willing to wait?
- DAC and SACs have a different focus. We have to reach that huge population that has nothing to do with schools other than they vote.
- I'm totally on board with expanding our outreach to the 70% without kids in the school system. However, our product is students, education, programming, etc. that needs DAC's expertise. How these things are funded,...that's FOC's expertise. We will be more effective in the long run if these pieces of information are included.
- I would take advantage of the energy and momentum members currently have to reach out to the 70% soon
- Are the feeder forums to be used as a public survey? How does that coincide with the message that LRPC needs to communicate?
- Rather than waiting on a complete presentation from the FOC can we simply pull someone in from the FOC to answer questions at presentations?
- Can the Board task the FOC with coming up with these options for funding?

LRPC members agreed that the outreach subcommittee should start scheduling presentations and carry forth with the initially proposed outreach presentation and schedule with the caveat that the presentation could be modified at the future

direction of Board members and the joint subcommittee. Board of Education Directors Meghann Silverthorn and Wendy Vogel noted that the review of a statement of support for the joint subcommittee is on the agenda for the November Board of Education meeting. Members also agreed to defer any further discussion on the topic until after the November Board of Education meeting.

#### **MCP Outreach**

LRPC member Caryn Becker reviewed the final version of the MCP outreach presentation. The following comments and suggestions were made by committee members regarding the presentation:

- Should we include all 3 options for different price options for new construction?
- Suggest including data on historical capital needs funding, i.e. proportion of reported needs that has been funded. This puts scale to the issue.
- Average person needs to grasp this presentation. Simple is better
- Are we going to run this through staff and board for approval the way we did in the past? Similarly, do we need approval for the groups we can present to, specifically political groups/organizations?
- Some feedback and understanding on the Board's input and discussion at the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting would be helpful

#### **LRPC Membership**

The LRPC membership subcommittee recommended two applicants (Steven Franger and Nicole Bolger) for membership. Todd Warnke moved that the committee proceed with presenting the two applicants to the Board of Education at the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Karen Zimmerman seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.

#### **Future Meeting Locations**

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger noted that the December meeting would be at the DCSD administration building (620 Wilcox) and that the location for the January LRPC meeting was still to be determined.

#### **Other**

None

#### **Board of Education Capital Update:**

None

#### **Adjourn**

Rudy Lukez moves to adjourn the meeting. Cindra Barnard seconds. All ayes. Motion passes to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 pm.