



Long Range Planning Committee
Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| X | Caryn Becker | X | Brad Geiger | | | | |
|] | Katie Fox | X | Cindy Barnard | | | | |
|] | Gail Feeder | X | Stephanie Stanley | | | | |
| X | Todd Warnke | X | Rudy Lukez | | | | |
| X | Karen Zimmerman | | | | | | |
|] | Kay Dry | | | | | | |

Non-Voting Members

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---------------------|---|-------------|---|-----------------|
| X | Richard Cosgrove | X | Shavon Caldwell | X | Thomas Tsai | X | Thomas McMillen |
| X | Kurt Wolter |] | Meghann Silverthorn | | | | |

Chris Pratt of the DAC and Board of Education member Wendy Vogel were also in attendance

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

Call to Order: Long Range Planning Committee Chair Todd Warnke called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

Approval of January 6th, 2016 Minutes: LRPC Chair Todd Warnke asked for any objections or additions to the January LRPC meeting minutes. None were made. Rudy Lukez moved to approve the January minutes. Brad Geiger seconded. Motion passed.

Charter Update: Tom McMillen, Director of Student and Parent Choice, briefed the committee on the status Charters. He reviewed the status of open enrollment, new Charters in the 2016-17 school year, possible upcoming 2016-17 Charter applications, and the Charter Application Review Team’s timeline.

Open Enrollment: Tom let the group know that the first round of open enrollment (for neighborhood schools) was completed on January 19th. Approximately 3,000 families applied for open enrollment in the District and approximately 1,000 of those families were offered slots on a space available basis. The second round of open enrollment opens February 15th with additional offers forthcoming as schools gauge their space availability.

2016-17 New Charters: Tom informed the committee that STEM High & Academy was approved to expand to a full K-12 program beginning in the Fall of 2016. STEM is projecting their full enrollment at 1,850 K-12 students. They ran their lottery and are expecting a full contingent of K-5 on site by August 2016. Parker Performing Arts is in the due diligence period with a property at E-470 and Chambers Road. They have roughly 600 students committed at this time. They are projecting their enrollment will be approximately 900 for 2016-17 school year. John Adams High is also in the due diligence period on a property at E-470 and Chambers Road. The Board of Education Resolution approving John Adams required 500+ students be committed by 1/5/2016. John Adams fell short of this requirement. The Board of Education will have to decide whether to provide John Adams with an extension or alternatively John Adams could delay opening for another year. This item is not calendared for Board consideration yet.

2016-17 Potential Charter Applications: Tom has seen interest from four different Charter schools for the 2016-17 Charter application cycle. These potential applicants include a grade 7-12 expeditionary learning school, a K-8 full inclusion school modeled off of Vanguard Classical Academy in Aurora, a school modeled off of Lehmen Academy, and an additional campus for an already existing DCSD Charter.

Charter Application Review Team: Tom reviewed the timeline and charge of the Charter Application Review Team and noted that the group now includes an LRPC representative. Stephanie Stanley has volunteered to participate in this process and has agreed to report back to the committee.

Capacity Analysis and Review: Rich Cosgrove, Director of Planning and Construction, reviewed projected school capacities for next school year as well as projected 5 year school capacities. The following possible solutions for those schools with capacity needs were reviewed:

2016-17 Potential Capacity Solutions

| Requirement | Possible Solution |
|----------------|--|
| Franktown ES | Addition of 1 mobile |
| Northridge ES | Replicate Discovery program |
| Clear Sky ES | Leave Meadows ES in MCP for 1-5 years, and reference 5 additional options below for more immediate relief |
| Sage Canyon ES | Addition of 1 mobile |
| DC Oakes | Addition of 1 mobile, and accelerate new construction needed for Alternative Secondary Space to 1-5 year need in MCP |

2020 Potential Capacity Solutions

| Requirement | Possible Solution |
|---------------------|---|
| Franktown ES | Addition of 1 mobile, add Parker ES in MCP for years 6-10 |
| Clear Sky ES | Leave Meadows ES in MCP for years 1-5, reference additional 5 options below for more immediate relief |
| Sage Canyon ES | Add one mobile, consider adding Castle Rock/west Parker ES in MCP for years 6-10 |
| DC Oakes | Accelerate Alternative Secondary School Space in MCP from years 6-10 to 1-5 |
| Prairie Crossing ES | Add 1 mobile, leave Lone Tree/Parker ES in MCP for years 6-10 |
| Meadow View ES | Add 1 mobile, unless no longer needed with a new school in The Meadows |
| Castle View HS | Leave the F-Pod Addition in the MCP for years 1-5 |

Additional Capacity Relief Options for The Meadows ES area/Clear Sky

- RFP for a STEM/STEAM Charter School on a DCSD dedicated school site (not the Redhawk site which has a prototype elementary school already half designed)
- DCSD Magnet at the Value-Engineered approach, on a DCSD dedicated school site (not the Redhawk site which has a prototype elementary school already half designed), funded by a COP
- Neighborhood prototype elementary school on the Redhawk site, funded by a bond
- DCSD Charter School, with a building corporation and on a DCSD dedicated site. Debt to be paid via PPR
- Reconfigure 6th grade at Clear Sky ES to Castle Rock MS

LRPC Notes and Comments

2016-17 and 2020 Capacity Relief Options

- How is the possible future requirement for all day Kindergarten accounted for?
 - Staff has performed analysis recently which calculated the facilities needed and approximate cost if all current full day Kindergarten was required to transition to full day. With DCSD's current Kindergarten enrollment, the District would need 35 additional classrooms. Cost in MCP listed is for the cost of constructing these.
- Evaluate the assumption that a Charter will provide capacity relief. With those areas that border other Districts in particular, a portion or even the majority of enrollment could be coming from out of the District.
- Consult with other Districts to see what the impacts of their activity will be on enrollment. Ex.) If a neighboring District opens school near our boundary this will definitely impact forecasted enrollment. The same for Religious and/or private schools.

The Meadows/Clear Sky Capacity Relief Option

- I have a major aversion to the value engineered option. I think building a value engineered facility would be result in us digging ourselves deeper into the financial hole we're in. This is my least favorite option.
- Why are we wasting time putting a Bond option up there? This doesn't seem politically feasible. If we are looking for an immediate solution this doesn't seem like this is something that can be implemented within our needed timeline.
- I feel personally that the Bond financed option is what needs to happen...but yes, there needs to be more research and work done around this before it can be considered a feasible option.
- I agree that the value engineered approach is the least preferable. Mainly because of public perception. I think we are going to major concern from parents and the community at large, i.e. "Are we not building quality schools now?" I think in some instances you will have parents and members of the public not wanting to enroll their kids in a school because it's a lower quality building.
- If the COP option is something that is being considered the FOC really needs to review and provide input.
- Regarding the value engineered approach, is there any way of identifying how stressed Clear Sky and other Elementary Schools in the Meadows will be 20-30 years from now? If these schools won't be stressed 20-30 years from now why would we pursue an approach that we know is going to be problematic right around that time?
- We have a model for the value engineered approach...some of our value engineered Charters are around 15 years. We can/should look to these instances to see how facility is holding up and their current capital needs.
- Value engineering works well in some places and not others. I learned through work done with STEM. For example, value engineering really does not work with bathroom design and construction. We spent way more money trying to address issues this value engineering caused than if would have done it to a higher standard in the first place. However, items like polished concrete floors and open ceilings are a great way to save money and haven't impacted students. I would recommend pursuing a blended approach that uses value engineering where appropriate.
- I would definitely recommend that you do not value engineer your mechanical systems. You don't want to skim on that. Energy efficiency savings are huge. The increased utility costs for District if you were to value engineer these components would be really problematic.
- Why is the RFP option focused on a STEM or STEAM program? If this is a true need/demand in this area we need to verify and communicate that. We shouldn't narrow the applicant pool though without knowing this though. (x3, i.e. This comment was mentioned by 3 different LRPC members)

- Looking at this from the long range planning perspective,..the long term solution is to build a neighborhood school. The Meadows is not even close to being completely built out and this will additional neighborhood school will definitely be needed in the near future.
- The option of funding a District Charter through a building corporation is really exciting and could serve as a model and really great new way of doing things.
- It's my understanding that part of the reason Charters are so successful is because it is a grassroots/community driven effort. In most cases, this process is almost completely parent driven. I'm having a hard time seeing how a District Charter would be successful without this grassroots/parent driven process.
- What do the people who live in the Meadows want? Staff really needs to figure this out.
- I agree. That is huge. We definitely need to reach out to the community there to see what their needs and wants are.
- How long/impactful is the grade reconfiguration option really? This seems like a temporary solution.
- Has there been a discussion of building separate Primary and Intermediate schools on the two available sites? Should this be looked into?
- The grade reconfiguration is a temporary fix but it seems like this could be implemented until a long term solution is identified. It seems that Clear Sky is in immediate need of relief so this is what I would advocate for as an immediate step until a more permanent solution is agreed upon.
- A timeframe component needs to be added to this, i.e. how much capacity relief is needed and when? And what is the timeframe for implementing each of these options? This is important information in deciding between options.
- Why aren't there other "No new construction" options being considered? Specifically 4 track? Isn't that a more comprehensive and longer term solution than grade reconfiguration?
- I am uncomfortable making any type of recommendation without input from SAC. I feel we need to get this in front of them before we move to present these options to the Board.
- At this point I don't think we need to communicate this to the SACs. This is our charge as a committee, to review these issues and provide input and recommendations to Board. At some point in the future when we are seriously deciding between alternative options, sure but right now we would just be asking the Board to consider these options. I do however think that the FOC needs to be brought in and consulted. We can make recommendations based off our knowledge of projected enrollment and capacity but at some point the financials need to be reviewed and considered.
- I personally experienced grade reconfiguration at my children's school and my experience with it was that it was definitely preferred to four-track. Four-track is particularly impactful and disruptive to those families with children of multiple ages, where parents have to juggle completely different schedules for their Elementary, Middle, and High School aged children.
- Maybe the new construction options don't need to go to SACs at this point (since it's a Feeder-wide and District-wide issue) but any of the other options that would impact a school directly (grade reconfiguration, 4 track, etc.) definitely need to be communicated to SACs first before they see it at the Board meeting. I can see a lot of public concern in our future if those options are not communicated to the SACs first.
- We need to make clear when communicating this that these are options to be considered not firm recommendations.
- Is there an option of adding an additional mobile to Clear Sky? Should this option be considered?

The committee agreed to hold off on any additional discussion or a motion to present options to the Board until the March meeting. Shavon Caldwell, Planning Manager, agreed to distribute all materials presented to committee members.

LRPC Membership: Rich Cosgrove, Director of Planning and Construction, informed the group that there are currently six interested candidates. Staff has worked with the LRPC Chair, Todd Warnke to revise the interview questions to more accurately reflect the needs and mission of the Long Range Planning Committee. They have also created a telephone reference checklist that will be utilized for all current and future applicants. Rich also briefed that staff is working on actively recruiting members and requested that current members continue to spread the word that we are looking for members.

LRPC Notes and Comments

- We need to make sure to communicate this in a way that it doesn't scare potential members off. We want qualified people but do not make the qualifications so narrow/stringent that potential members are turned off.

Student Involvement: Thomas Tsai, Chief Operating Officer, informed the group that he along with Operations staff recently presented to DCSD Student Advisory Groups. As a result of this outreach, two students are interested in volunteering for the Operations department and potentially participating in future outreach and the LRPC. Thomas Tsai requested feedback from the committee regarding the possibility of a student serving as a voting or as a non-voting LRPC member. Members discussed and agreed that they would prefer student members to serve as non-voting LRPC members. Brad moved that the LRPC bylaws subcommittee draft an amendment (for submission at the March meeting) to the current bylaws allowing a student non-voting member position. Todd Warnke seconded. Motion passed.

Outreach: Todd Warnke, LRPC Chair, briefed the group on the upcoming DAC forum. Todd will present an overview of the 2015-16 Master Capital Plan and take questions from DAC Forum attendees. Rich Cosgrove then briefed the group on the progress on the outreach presentation and materials. The presentation will comprise of a summary of DCSD's current capital needs (from 2015-16 Master Capital Plan), school finance, and development 101 (how residential development relates to capital needs). A draft of the capital needs portion has been completed and was reviewed.

Other: None.

Board of Education Capital Update: None

Adjourn: Rudy Lukez moved to adjourn the meeting. Brad Geiger seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.