

Growth and Capital Needs Committee
March 8, 2016
Meeting Notes

I. Dinner

Karin Reynolds, Deputy Superintendent, and Tom Gregory, Chief Financial Officer, welcomed all and asked that members pair up with another and review their own notes on the presentations from the last meeting as they share big ideas from last meeting's presentations.

II. Processing Presentations from 2/23/16:

Biggest learnings/biggest needs - Members reviewed their notes from the presentations already heard. They discussed biggest learnings and biggest needs as follows:

- High Plains has a 491 capacity but has 250 students, what is design capacity? The design capacity is 515.
- Bathrooms
- Additional infrastructure needs to support improved technology in current schools
- Furniture, moveable to support learning environment (classrooms & learning space)
- Age of schools is clearly a determinant in the capital needs.
- Empty space in some buildings indicates that capacity is higher than what is in there. Can we combine learning services needs into one building such as this instead of building a new facility? Karin and Tom shared that, as enrollment increases and boundaries might need to change, this may not be true.
- Are there some schools decreasing in size? Would district commit to keeping the school or combining? Will there always be a neighborhood school? Karin and Tom addressed this and said that there has not been a conversation about this as the district is committed to neighborhood schools as it is to its choice philosophy.
- 2.5 million per year in maintenance with 8% going to deferred is not much.

III. Parking lot questions and comments:

Tom addressed the parking lot questions.

- How many schools in the district need new or updated electrical?
 - Due to the addition of portables and technology changes, six schools currently would benefit from and electrical capacity upgrade.
- What's Facilities doing to address the maintenance issues? (painting, etc.)
 - Facilities staff completes work orders daily on a variety of requests from schools, as well as perform routine and preventative maintenance. Large painting projects are outsourced to vendors, but interior painting is the responsibility of the school custodial staff and Building Manager.

Painting is ongoing and never a “completed project” across all 38 district facilities. It is essential for building level staff to perform routine functions within the building.

- Need to compare what was recommended in the 3/07 report with what they want now.
 - The 2007 report is available in your notebook for comparison.
- How many schools need to have their fire alarm systems all together? (remote rooms, trailers)
 - Ten portables remain unconnected to the main building alarm system.
- It sounds like we need a paradigm shift – instead of making schools responsible for these repairs, use our big economies of scale to do better maintenance and repairs. How do we make that change in approach? Who needs to allow that to happen – so we go from “per pupil” to “priority projects” district wide?
 - Whether the approach used is a per pupil funding approach or a project based approach, appropriate funding of k-12 schools in Colorado remains the significant obstacle.

IV. April Field Trip assignments

Karin shared the schedule and asked that if a member does not plan to attend, please let her know. Karin confirmed that the group touring Challenger Middle School will go through Challenger Learning Center. An administrator will be available at the sites to guide the tour. The three principal members will lead the tours of their own schools.

V. SSIC Presentations

The following schools provided presentations at this meeting, and their presentations are posted on the website.

Academy Endeavour ES presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

Antelope Trails ES presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

Academy International ES Presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

Chinook Trail ES presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

Ranch Creek ES presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

The da Vinci Academy ES presentation

- Presentation posted on GCNC website.

Tom clarified one presentation by sharing that the city water restrictions were the reason fields suffered and were not watered adequately. We are still watering fields if the irrigation is there. At Antelope Trails there is only the school field in the area, no park, so the school play field is

used heavily by the community resulting in no relief for the field. At Rampart High School, the athletic fields are protected by fences so there is relief for the fields and they are in good shape for athletics. Fencing the fields is to keep vehicles off; fields are accessible to people to use appropriately. We have a responsibility to provide a safe field.

Tom said there is a cost to making an appropriate environment for testing complete with isolated and quiet rooms.

Questions:

- A member asked about The da Vinci Academy, sounds like the open design is now a nightmare. How big a security issue is it?
 - Mr. Grady shared that we can lock out the exterior and the perimeter. When it was built it didn't look like they considered security. The kindergarten classrooms have doors. The requests would change the fundamental nature of the school. Adding walls and doors change HVAC needs. What is the cost to renovate? This information is on the list from the first meeting.
- A member asked about the cost and durability of turf fields.
 - The life of a field is about 15 years; at one time a football field had a 12 year payback time, now it is closer to a 10 year payback time on that size field. Scaled bigger or smaller field size would change that. Cost is \$450,000 for inside a high school track. Cost was \$50,000 to do turf at Edith Wolford after the fire. We do reuse some of our artificial turf; have reused turf from AF Academy or Sky Sox; and we also reuse concrete pads for batting cages.
- If replacing furniture there is a chance other schools might reuse the older furniture.
 - One school cannot sell their discards to another school; it can be given/accepted.
- New school themes include inadequacy of outlets and rains causing water to come into the building. We should make sure we take these lessons learned to new buildings.
 - We have 35 principals with insight on flexible space and furniture, turning projectors.

Karin shared the article about the Flying Horse project from the Gazette business section.

Karin reminded us of the GCNC charge, to study district needs and make recommendations related to five things:

1. New construction,
2. Facility additions,
3. Per pupil school improvement dollars,
4. Capital renewal/improvement, and
5. District infrastructure technology needs.

VI. Surveying our community – past and future

Tom said in October we hired an outside organization to conduct a sentiment poll asking how the community feels about a possible bond on the November ballot. The questions were pretty high level, such as respondents were asked how they feel about the schools, and whether they feel that the schools have capital needs. Responses indicated strong support for capital improvements, strong sentiments for capital improvements for all schools, and strong sentiment for building new schools. There was also community interest in alternative programs and a strong understanding of the relationship between schools and property values.

Tom reported that the pollster was amazed at the strength of the results. He said comparing our results to other districts around the state that we should go for a bond election in the fall as school district proposals pass at a higher rate in presidential race years.

When asked what impact no tax increase would make in passing this bond, 50% of respondents say it would influence them, and 50% said it would have no impact on their vote.

Questions:

- Since timing right, is it worth looking at higher bond amount?
 - Tom suggested that, based on projections we are limited to what we can take on, next year; that would be \$230,000,000. We could ask voters to approve a billion dollars and justify it, but voter sentiment changes a lot, at some point the voters would have no appetite.
- It is counterintuitive that 190 polled at a lower rate than the 225 number. Why?
 - Tom indicated that he isn't sure why. Last year Boulder polled at 500 million; they polled twice as much as the 300 million question.

Tom reminded the GCNC members that, after we make recommendations, they go to superintendent. Then a second poll goes out about the projects recommended to gauge support language around those themes. The previous ballot question will be provided to the GCNC prior to finalizing our recommendations as well. Tom said a board resolution drives the ballot. If the board agrees to this, that's what we are held accountable for. It will be highly published. We would have an oversight committee to look at all proposed projects including the per pupil building funds. They look at consolidations for group buys. Most of what the GCNC recommends may happen, but may be rearranged based on polling.

Tours

- A member asked if it might be better for small groups to travel to level schools instead of by feeder in order to, for example, look at all high schools for a better comparison. Another member suggested that this is not a competition; it's an evaluation. Better to keep small groups touring to feeder systems to understand communities.
- What about alternative dates for those who want to see other sites? If you wish to see a school not on your list Henry will be available to guide.

Adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Next meeting: March 29th, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m. at RHS Tech Wing

GCNC documents are available at <http://www.asd20.org/committees/gcnc/Pages/default.aspx>

Attendance:

Kathy Armacost, Ralph Braden, Megan Chura, Gary Coulter, Kelly Goyden, Cindy Hardin, Vernita Hare, Ryan Henkel, Kim Hollm, Tammie Mohr, Dan Olson, Matt Pacione, Henry Reitwiesner, Patrick Schumaker, Tony Scott, Anthony Sibley, Robin Stanforth, Jason Stejskal, Vicki Taylor, Will Temby, David Tubb, Mark VanGambleare, Jackie Walls

Absent: Francine Henderson, McKenzie Palmer, Vish Paradkar, Jackie Priessman, Ruth Schoen, Stephen Zamborelli

Ad Hoc Members Present: Dr. Susan Field, Brian Grady, Tom Gregory, Shelley Kooser, Anne Krajcovic, Dr. David Peak, Karin Reynolds, Greg Stephens, Linda Warhoe

Absent: Nanette Anderson, Mark Bissell