

**Growth and Capital Needs Committee
May 10, 2016**

Meeting Notes

Karin explained the agenda and gave a debrief of the May 2nd public forum and the stakeholder meetings. The feedback received at the public forum and stakeholder meetings was sent to the GCNC on 5/5/16, and it is attached to these minutes with final updates of responses. This document, too, is posted on the website. In addition, the PowerPoint shared at the public forum was sent to the GCNC on 5/5/16 is posted on the GCNC website.

Reminder of the GCNC charge: The Growth and Capital Needs Committee (GCNC) is charged by the superintendent to study district needs and issue findings and recommendations related to new construction, facility additions, per pupil school improvement dollars, capital renewal/improvement, and district infrastructure technology needs. The committee will use the collaborative input model to guide its work.

The GCNC next discussed the 4/26/16 small group feedback to move further toward formalizing recommendations and comments this evening. Karin reminded again that the GCNC must focus on the WHAT not the HOW.

Review Per Pupil Formula Discussion:

Age factor - the GCNC believed four tiers was not enough at the last meeting. Tonight Tom provided a draft with six tiers and a draft with more than six tiers (liners) for consideration, seeking consensus. Discussion followed and members shared following comments:

- After review of formulas, the following was agreed upon:
 - 50% enrollment
 - 50% square feet
 - linear age factor (with even more distinction around this that Tom will develop and send with report.)
- Additional comments:
 - Can we establish a minimum for these newer facilities? AC (does it need the full amount), H.S.A., Briargate Preschool, AOHS
 - If innovation and learning Linear age factor: if we are fixing deterred maintenance then linear age factor increase is not important.
 - 50/50 linear/exponential greater difference between minimum and maximum age and between schools.

Review Remodels/Additions Discussion:

Tom and Karin shared results of GCNC forced matrix from the last meeting, and reminded members that this will be included in the final GCNC report. Discussion followed and members shared both the following comments:

- Agreement with forced matrix results
- Additional comments:
 - Building B at AAHS – clarify matrix#6 – awareness of AFA regulations
 - DVES
 - Something needs to be done to building B at AAHS
 - Came to the top of 100's of competing needs.
 - Importance of audit to make decisions about deferred maintenance.
 - If (formula) ... then ... (deferred maintenance)
 - Facilities audit needs to be compared to the needs and priorities that we address.
 - Existing schools get as much recognition as new schools (health and safety first)
 - Move up the needs for older schools (for each school).
 - Catch up.
 - HPES and CMS – multiple items indicated older schools need things.
 - Need for balance
 - Need to use the facility audit to ensure that older schools' needs are met.

Tom shared that there will be many appendices to the report. Almost any document the GCNC has received will be included.

Karin explained to the group that the report will be emailed to them for review and revision, but no new ideas not discussed this evening should be introduced during that email communication. All agreed.

Review New Construction Discussion

Karin reviewed the small group feedback from the last meeting, and she summarized what she and Tom tallied as a result of small group and individual feedback.

Discussion about the pro's and con's of pools, new construction, meeting the needs of aging schools, the need for balance, and other capital needs ensued, but, in the end, all agreed to the following big ideas:

- Elementary school – 2/3
- Middle school – 1
- High school – 1
- Innovation and Learning Center (ILC)
- Pool, if attached to a school

Discussion followed:

- Leasing and rental issues to be addressed for equity
- New Construction Additional comments:
 - CTES and MS – 2 middle schools
 - K-12
 - Combined savings with K-12
 - ILC – can an existing building be purchased (outdoor space and parking)
 - Can ILC be added to a building that exists or is being built?
 - Opportunities for collaboration with the city for community park next to K-12 with no additional cost for schools to use.
 - Can we afford a pool?
 - Do we need another stadium if we build a high school?
 - Remember that an additional high school would alleviate the need for additional classroom space.
 - The reverse is true as well.
 - Clarify the way choice works OOD and ID – people need to understand. Have a FAQ.

Karin asked Tom to share District 20's commitment to TCA should a bond be approved in November. Tom spoke about TCA and this bond. He reminded the group that David Tubbs presented to the GCNC long ago. The idea is that District 20 doesn't compete TCA projects against non TCA projects. If a bond were to pass, TCA would be allocated money. It would be similar to last bond. Issuances of bonds happen over time. Whether TCA gets the funds at each issuance or all at once is negotiated between the D20 BOE and the TCA BOE. Legal issues, with tax proceeds and relationship between TCA and the taxpayers of D20. i.e. TCA wants to take \$X to go to the old Mountain View Elementary (now TCA Central). TCA owns it all, so what is the legal obligation between TCA and D20 taxpayers if they improve the place. It only becomes an issue if TCA were to close the doors. So essentially TCA would get a dollar amount.

Tom said the board has the challenge to figure out how to react to all of the capital needs; the tough part is balancing. The GCNC does not have to do this, the elected officials do this.

Remaining recommendations that were not discussed at the last meeting were addressed in small groups and then the large group:

Capital renewal/improvement - Tom explained the small groups will talk about the things that are not remodels/additions or new constructions. We call them capital renewal.

Large group discussion following small group processing resulted in the following:

Capital Renewal/Improvements:

- Agreement with the statement from 2007 report with the following ideas included:
 - Use facilities audit to meet biggest needs to determine % (more/less than 8.7%?) % follows needs.
 - Optimize capital reserve fund.

- Take care of aging facilities.
- Deferred maintenance needs to be addressed so all schools have the same basic necessities before we build new schools, PPB, and additions and remodels.
Examples: electrical, AC, bathrooms, fire suppression, safety/entrance ways.
- Highest priority – levels the playing field with all schools.
- Scheduled maintenance instead of FA.
- Strike specifics.
- Strike 8.7%.
- Recommendation for rotating audit every five years.
- Let facilities determine frequency.
- No modifications.

District infrastructure technology needs - this is the other bucket need. Discussion followed and members shared both the following comments as well as the comments shared on the attached document that highlights the recommendations for all five buckets. Members were given a statement from the 2007 report to the Board, and asked to review it to determine if it represents current need still. Shelley said in the 2007 recommendations they talked about the PPT for technology. We've moved away from the ebb and flow of bond funds replenishing technology. There is now a consistent amount provided to schools annually.

Large group discussion following small group processing resulted in the following:

District Infrastructure Technology Needs:

- Agreement with the statement provided with the following additional thoughts:
 - Awareness of need for technology safety.
 - Importance of LMS
 - All seem to be priorities that will bolster the district.
 - High impact for kids and teachers.
 - Prescribed schedule. Some internal/external recommendations.
 - Guarantee for follow through.
 - What do we want to finance for 20 years?
 - Infrastructure is the priority.
 - Not top priority with bond money.
 - Ok to swap as is.
 - Ensure

Tom reminded the GCNC members that the recommendations will be polled. He pointed out that, historically, transportation and facility department needs do not poll well.

A member asked to not forget a bond oversight committee.

The GCNC broke into small groups. Group work attached.

Closure – summary statement

Karin shared two questions and asked members to respond on the paper that they were provided. Their responses will be included in the report, and they are included at the end of these minutes.

Tom said with the 2007 committee (since the bond was still being spent) spent time on what did we do well implementing the bond? He asked the committee members to report on what should stay the same, etc.

Karin also asked members to write a final paragraph to the final report to the Superintendent and to the BOE. What is it that they need to know?

Ralph thanked Tom and Karin for their excellent facilitation.

When asked, Tom said we could do another bond financially in 8-10 years.

Karin said they GCNC would receive a draft report of the recommendations by tomorrow (Wednesday, 5/11) midnight. Members are to respond within 24 hours. Then GCNC would receive another updated report to read through sometime this weekend.

Adjourned at 8:30 p.m. as members finished their summary statements.

Remaining Meetings: none!

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, Francine Henderson, Ryan Henkel, Kim Hollm, Dan Olson, Matt Pacione, McKenzie Palmer, Vish Paradkar, Jackie Priessman, Henry Reitwiesner, Patrick Schumaker, Anthony Sibley, Robin Stanforth, Jason Stejskal, Vicki Taylor, Will Temby, David Tubb, Mark VanGampleare, Jackie Walls, Stephen Zamborelli

Absent: Tammie Mohr, Ruth Schoen, Tony Scott

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

Absent:

Growth and Capital Needs Committee

Final Thoughts

May 10, 2016

1. When you consider the Long Range Capital Facilities Committee report from 2007, specifically page 2, on which the last committee reported what needed to be sustained and what needs to be improved, what would you recommend to the superintendent and the BOE?
 - We need to continue to work towards improving existing facilities.
 - Establish Bond Oversight Committee; find funding source (outside bond funds) for security department; address building rental inequities (i.e. AAHS); establish regular maintenance needs for all buildings. Do not wait for bond \$ - there should be a regular schedule for all maintenance (e.g. roof replacement schedule).
 - Remove as many modular classroom buildings as possible; repair deficiencies reported in audit and facilities management department; remodel older facilities to our “standards”; build new to accommodate current and future students. The decision making phase felt a little rushed.
 - Sustain – communicate and educate community are most important! Improve – keep all items listed with “work toward bringing all schools up to a defined level of adequacy” being top on my list. Emphasis should be on this issue prior to new construction consideration.
 - Bond Oversight Committee; maintenance schedule for all facilities that allows for continuing maintenance and limiting amount of deferred maintenance; function of new facilities is key – architecture should enhance the function, not hinder it (da Vinci, DCC); CM team to manage construction; standardized educational specification for all new construction – set a standard for all our facilities!
 - Work toward bringing all schools up to a defined level of adequacy; fix older buildings and bring them up to speed to all other schools.
 - I feel all the bullet points are appropriate for the bond issue coming forth.
 - The two lists are already comprehensive. Somehow, there needs to be a way to communicate to the various individual school communities why the certain projects “made the cut” vs. those that didn’t. You do not want concerned parents thinking that their school’s needs were ignored.
 - Oversight committee; educate and communicate with community; balance fixing old/current with building new; construct for cost vs sustainability; construct for function over form; bring all schools up to a minimum level.
 - First two bullet points are mandatory (construction management team and CBEOC); maximum transparency to community is mandatory; designing for LEED is important;

bring ALL schools up to a **defined level of adequacy** (also called educational specifications); reconvene the committee **one time** after facilities audit has been distributed to discuss what we learned from the audit that was really surprising.

- The largest goal that needs to be sustained is bringing all the schools up to the same level of adequacy so we can have a fair yet competitive learning environment for all students.
- I agree with the last recommendation.
- The creation/updating of a facilities oversight committee to ensure that all buildings maintain a district standard, as all facilities need “checkups” routinely and no routine timetables have been meeting any guideline.
- I would recommend an oversight committee to ensure that taxpayers’ monies is spent accordingly and no fraud, waste and abuse takes place.
- To be sustained – communication, presentation to staff and community; To be improved – use of technology in teaching and learning. Sustained life cycle replacement funding (TCO). Improved physical safety for students and staff.
- I agree that we need to continue to carry out the goals/plans from the 2007 committee specifically as it pertains to technology, we need to have a better understanding of what technology is worth investing in because it will “stand the test of time” and what technology will be improved quickly and be rendered obsolete.
- Citizen committee to promote bond; over communicate
- Sustained: update wiring/cabling infrastructure – security; improved: fire wall upgrading
- No changes to recommend
- I recommend to fix and keep up the current schools first; then we need to build new schools to fit the growth in our district. We have so many needs in our current schools that need priority before we do anything else.
- Sustain: great list! Keep as is! Items to improve: need better communication about how “choice” really works; bring all schools up to a minimum level of facility adequacy.
- Construction Management Team; Bond Oversight Committee; spend money closest to the students; establish committee to promote bond election.
- It appears to me that the district needs to educate our community about two items. Please focus on 1) choice students and how they have minimal impact on our growth and how full the schools are; 2) the growth that is expected to come. Growth coming in four to five years seems to be a difficult concept to understand.
- The BOE and superintendent should strongly consider bringing all outdated/aging schools up to a benchmark standard before any and all new schools and facilities are built.
- Efforts to educate community resulting in support; establish citizens committee to promote bond election; work towards bringing all schools “towards” adequacy; Construction Management Team.

2. You have spent about 40 hours in discussion about capital needs in District 20. Please write the final concluding/summary paragraph for our report to the superintendent, and, ultimately, the Board of Education and community.

- If budgets were unlimited, it would be possible to fund all new construction, all building improvements, all special projects along with safety, security, transportation and athletics. Unfortunately budgets are not unlimited, so the most important issue is to bring all schools up to a basic standard. All students deserve a clean, fully operational, safe school in which to learn. Secondly, Quality over Quantity. Expanding our secondary schools to accommodate growth is a better model than building another high school. Be faithful stewards of taxpayer dollars by creating world class school facilities!
- There is a huge need for capital improvement needs in our district. This is not just for the construction of new schools to accommodate growth. Excluding the new schools built with funds from the 2001 bond issue, all of our buildings (schools, maintenance facility and transportation) are in desperate need of repairs, updates and 21st century improvements. To be fiscally responsible to the D20 taxpayers we not only provide new buildings for our growth but we need to bring our older facilities up to date.
- It has been a pleasure serving on this committee, and especially getting to meet and know parents, students, staff and others throughout the district. Very good facilitation by Karin and Tom.
- In conclusion, after spending many hours in meaningful discussion, this committee respectfully recommends to our superintendent, board of education and community at large that this bond is needed first and foremost to maintain our current buildings and thereafter to address the continued growth within the district in order to keep this school district at the high level of distinction that we as community members have come to expect.
- ASD20 continues to be a top tier district in the State of Colorado despite the condition of its facilities. Existing facilities must be brought up to a minimum standard to continue to provide top class, safe education to our children. Concurrently, overcrowding at our schools also needs to be addressed to provide safe schools. It has been over 15 years since this district passed a bond and now every facility has needs, whether due to age or growth and development. Thank you for this opportunity to participate in keeping our district a top one in our state!
- I recommend the board takes a serious look at building new schools in addition to improving our older schools/outdated buildings. Take into consideration our prioritized list of improvements as we have spent countless hours discussing how they would benefit students, teachers and our D20 community as a whole.
- Sitting here all year has opened my eyes to the complex needs of schools. I feel we are behind in updating our older schools due to the Great Recession, but need to keep up with growth in new areas. I feel the Liberty area is in danger of getting “shut out” and

perceived as the less fortunate unable to draw quality families if some improvement isn't made – marketing all HS makes D20 strong. Bells and whistles are nice (pool/ice), but we have too many other items. I feel the board also has an inside track on the future priorities – closing small schools like High Plains if growth continues and as areas age. I hope the board considers all the recommendations but I recognize they have more expertise in their area. Thanks for letting me serve!

- ASD20 is a growing, high performing and dynamic large school district. It is clear that the BOE, when considering a new bond issue, must find equilibrium between the accommodation of inevitable enrollment growth and the upgrade of aging infrastructure. With respect to aging facilities, it is important to establish a minimum standard for each instructional environment in the district. Health, safety and keeping pace with technological advancements must be the district's highest priority.
- There are far more needs in our district than funds available. Rough choices will have to be made, but here must be a balance in fixing deferred problems with building new schools. Focus must be on the kids in the classrooms vs. on the field or in the water. Need increased focus on annual maintenance and repair.
- Committee was well managed and all members did their homework and took their jobs very seriously; lack of a facilities audit (up front) was a hindrance; lack of a defined set of priorities (evenly applied across all schools) led to unnecessary confusion.
- This committee worked to bring an acceptable level of safety, health and an improved learning environment that will continue to make Academy School District 20 one of the best districts in the state.
- It is apparent that there are great needs within our school district. Our old facilities need to be upgraded and we need new schools. It is vital that we balance both needs.
- District 20 is a forward-thinking community of educated and well rounded individuals who strive to ensure the future generations will thrive in leading the region in all areas, social, intelligence, health and industry.
- Our older facilities need to catch up to our new facilities codes. Front safety/hazard items to ADA ramps at some schools. Scheduled maintenance needs to take place accordingly. We have to rethink the open-enrollment program, not the choice, when it comes to overcrowding in our schools. I believe our recommendations were appropriate for this bond issuance.
- It was an enlightening experience to understand needs of the school district. Dire needs of older schools for upgrades related to health, safety & technology. The district is poised for significant growth. Careful planning for new schools, facilities is needed. Also critically important is the need to have a sustainable approach to maintain and upgrade new and existing facilities and infrastructure.
- On the order of priorities of what needs to get done with a limited budget: a) putting money into older schools (DVES, SITW, LHS, AAHS); b) building a new high school.

- This district has a history of educational excellence. Prioritizing/balancing the needs of new construction and existing facilities is a challenge the BOE will need to accept.
- It is important to focus on updating old schools and creating a standard for future schools. Many of the older schools are in need of serious remodeling/fixing. Though size and enrollment are important the older schools seem to be struggling more. Education becomes impossible without that basic structure and needs.
- Well thought out process. I have no changes to recommend. Tom and Karin were superb as facilitators.
- I would recommend to fix the current schools and make sure we have a standard level of acceptance for which each school operates. We will need new schools but fixing and improving our current schools must be one of the top-most priorities.
- In closing, I would like to affirm the work of the GCNC. We took this responsibility very seriously. In our opinion, we have provided you everything necessary to take the final steps of laying out exactly what will happen when this bond passes.
- The Growth and Capital Needs Committee gathered information from all schools, departments and outside sources. Actual site visits were conducted at all schools and facilities. All of the information was reviewed and evaluated. Recommendations were made to ensure that schools are brought up to acceptable standards. Also, recommendations were made to provide for growth that is already taking place in the district.
- The district has many needs. Developing a multipronged approach makes an attempt at relieving the most critical areas. Growth is coming and District 20 has a reputation of early preparation. Bringing our older schools up to match our newer ones was a strong wish of the GCNC. I wish the board the Wisdom of Solomon to make the difficult decisions facing the district.
- District 20 is a great school district, but is/or will face a great challenge with regards to future growth. I feel we need to address both growth and upkeep of our current schools in a manner that is beneficial to all.
- If the bond issue is floated and subsequently approved: new construction is critical. Without new schools, current schools become overcrowded and real estate values will decline; vision to meld cap reserve \$, annual building \$, and bond proceeds to accomplish the biggest bang; establishing the allocations among the five buckets to maximize potential of voter approval.