



Little Elm ISD Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee
Zellers Center for Learning & Leadership
300 Lobo Lane
Little Elm, TX 75068

Meeting 6 Summary Notes: Monday, June 5, 2017
5:30 p.m. Dinner; 6:00 p.m. Meeting Start

1. Welcome - Ed Griffin

Mr. Ed Griffin welcomed the committee to meeting number 6, the final scheduled meeting. He applauded the committee for their vested interest in the school district, and for the time commitment that has been made to continue to make it better. He acknowledged the hard work that has gone into the process to make this the best recommendation possible.

2. Meeting 5 Recap & Agenda Review - Dr. Strike

Dr. Strike reviewed the content of an email he sent committee members between meetings 5 and 6 that included updates on options for the multipurpose facility as well as the District's bonding capacity. Dr. Strike told the committee after further discussions with the athletic department, he would like the committee to consider the option of a multipurpose facility with an 80-yard indoor field instead of a 100-yard field, with the full scope of additional amenities to be built on the high school site where the baseball and softball fields are currently located. If committee members prioritize this project as part of their ideal bond package scenario, then they must include the construction of new baseball and softball fields across Waterside Drive. This would be the most ideal location for both facilities for the master plan of the high school. The District feels strongly that if we build the multipurpose facility it should be the most ideal long-term solution for the best use of taxpayer money and in order to best serve the students of the District.

Dr. Strike also expanded on the bonding capacity discussion. As presented in meeting 5, after bonds are authorized by voters, they are sold overtime as they are needed to fund building projects. The district will not complete everything at once and the District's capacity to sell additional bonds will grow as Taxable Assessed Values in the District grow. Based on conservative assumptions, the District could issue approximately \$195 million in bonds in five years with a maximum increase of 10 cents to the tax rate. If the committee plans longer-term in this bond, the District can issue approximately \$230 million in bonds in possibly 7 years for the same 10-cent increase. The District would like to keep the tax rate increase at a maximum of 10 cents, leaving 3 cents capacity. The \$230 million scenario will be studied further by the District's financial advisor.

3. Continue Small Group Exercise - Build Your Ideal Bond Package Scenario

Members then spent the next hour of the committee meeting continuing to discuss the project listing and build their ideal bond package scenarios at their tables.

4. Large Group Share Out & Discussion – Building Consensus – Ed Griffin

Mr. Griffin then facilitated large group share out and discussion. He had each table's spokesperson report to the group the results of their discussion and the projects they would include in their ideal bond package scenario in order of priority.

Each table's scenario was recorded on the master spreadsheet for review and comparison. All groups were comfortable recommending a total recommendation up to \$230,000,000 knowing that the district would maintain a maximum tax rate increase of 10 cents. The scenarios ranged from \$221-\$229 million.

5. Finalize Recommendations to the Board – Ed Griffin

Ed Griffin then led the committee in building consensus around a final list of recommendations to move forward to the Board of Trustees. The committee discussed the items the groups had in common and those they differed on.

The committee agreed that any projects that were not prioritized by any groups were removed for consideration in the recommendations. Any projects prioritized by only one group were identified and a spokesperson from that table could justify to the committee why they prioritized that project. There was discussion by the committee on STEM renovations at the elementary campuses. Groups that did not include this project commented that many teachers are already doing this type of work with the students and at the elementary level the curriculum and teacher focus was more important than a designated space. It was decided that it was not a necessary investment to create designated STEM spaces within the elementary schools. Through this process, it was the committee's consensus to eliminate any projects prioritized by only one group from the committee's recommendation.

The committee worked down the list of projects. Any projects that had unanimous approval from all groups, were agreed upon as consensus items for the recommendation. Those items included a New Middle School, Lakeside Middle School replacement, capital improvement projects, converting Prestwick and Powell to K-5 campuses, a multipurpose facility, new baseball and softball facilities, renovation for a school store, engineering lab and health science lab at the high school, renovations to the Athletic Complex, and safety and security.

A committee member raised the question if the committee should be concerned for the number of athletic-related projects being recommended. Committee members discussed how athletics had not been addressed since its construction and in the most recent high school projects both CTE and Fine Arts received a lot of new and expanded spaces. It was the consensus of the committee that the current athletic spaces had been overlooked long enough and that with the growth and ultimate buildout of that campus, these athletic improvements are critical for our students to stay competitive. The committee was also reminded that much of the renovation work to the existing high school athletic spaces could include converting that space to academic uses since much of that space could be vacated with the construction of the multipurpose facility.

There was further discussion on High School CTE projects. Three out of five groups had prioritized a welding shop expansion to be included in their recommendation; one group had chosen the mechanical/electrical/plumbing lab, and one the horticulture lab. A committee member commented that they thought it would be best to provide a new space for several new programs, and that's why they prioritized the MEP lab. Dr. Tipton was asked

to share his opinion. He discussed the strength and popularity of the welding program and it being one of the high-demand employable programs they offer. He felt it is best to provide the space for programs they need today and wait to start and grow demand for other programs before we invest in permanent spaces for them. Through this discussion it was the consensus of the committee to include a welding shop expansion in their final recommendation to the Board.

After some discussion on why they were critical items with a minor price tag relative to the entire bond package, fiber backbone upgrades and HVAC to MDF rooms were added to the final list with consensus of the committee.

After finalizing the committee's consensus on the recommended projects, there was further discussion on defining priority levels for the recommendations. The committee agreed its top priority projects were the New Middle School, Lakeside Middle School replacement, capital improvement projects and converting Prestwick and Powell to K-5 campuses. Their second priority projects are the multipurpose facility, baseball and softball fields, athletic renovations to the existing high school, welding shop expansion and renovation for school store, engineering lab and health science lab. The committee's third priority projects are the renovations to the Athletic Complex, safety and security, fiber backbone upgrades and HVAC to MDF rooms.

6. Next Steps & Closing – Dr. Strike & Megan Smith

Recommendations are set for the Regular June Board Meeting, Monday, July 19 at 6:30 pm. Ed Griffin will present on behalf of the committee. The committee was encouraged to attend and be recognized for their hard work and show their support for the recommendation.

Should the Board choose to move forward with calling a bond election for November 2017, then they must do so by Monday, August 21. Following the committee's recommendation, the Board will be scheduling a workshop to discuss the recommendation further. The committee asked if it could reconvene as a committee once the Board makes a final decision so that they may discuss their involvement moving forward.

7. Closing – Ed Griffin

Mr. Griffin and Dr. Strike expressed their gratitude to the committee for their commitment to the process and thanked them for their hard work in reaching consensus on a very important recommendation to the Board of Trustees.