



Meeting 9 Notes

Monday, December 12, 2016, 6:00 pm
Center for the Performing Arts

1. Welcome, Meeting 8 Recap & Agenda Review

Megan Smith, Huckabee, opened the meeting with welcoming the committee to their second to last scheduled meeting. She recapped the last meeting and reminded the committee of the information presented by the district's financial advisor on the district's bonding capacity. At tonight's meeting the committee will receive some updated budget information, complete their prioritization work in subcommittees and then wrap up with some large group discussion.

2. Project Budget Updates

Paul Thompson, Huckabee, presented the project budget updates. He explained that since last meeting the team has worked to further review the scope and budgets of each proposed project and did what it could to further tighten up the budget numbers. As reviewed at the last meeting, the project budgets are turnkey and account for construction, escalation, soft costs like fees and permits, furniture, fixture and equipment (FFE), and contingency. Mr. Thompson explained that by reducing the figures used for escalation, soft costs and FFE, they were able to reduce the overall project budgets. Each project budget was shown broken down by the total for escalated construction costs and soft costs and FFE.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the work done by the Facilities team to further prioritize the Aging items. The budget now reflects Priority 1A items, which reduced the total cost from approximately \$226 million to \$118 million. Approximately \$70 million of that is designated to the six areas of new playground equipment, LED lighting, safety and security, technology infrastructure, HVAC replacement and roof replacement.

Many of the 1B items that were removed from the aging list became new items for consideration by the committee. 1B items for Howard MS, Worley MS and Summit HS were added to their projects already being prioritized by the committee. Mr. Thompson reviewed the new items and their budgets for consideration by the committee.

Mr. Thompson noted that the City of Arlington confirmed that they would not interpret the code to mean that there would need to be a shelter included with the orchestra addition projects or the Howard and Worley addition projects.

Changes to scope also included expanding elementary science labs to all 23 campuses and including existing field house renovations to the multipurpose additions at each high school.

Question: What is the return on synthetic turf?

Answer: What we have seen on our existing football fields is that the turf pays for itself in six or seven years with savings to maintenance and operations.

Question: Have we looked at what the percentage of projects being considered is instructional, versus athletics or fine arts?

Answer: No, we have not run those numbers, but that is something we can do and provide.

Question: How many more years of use do we have of R.L. Anderson stadium?

Answer: We've actually done a great job of maintaining that facility and extending its lifecycle. We are completing phase one of that currently and phase two is what is proposed here. It's a solid facility that will continue to serve our community for a long time. And we need it. Just as many games – and big games – are played here as there are at Newsom Stadium.

3. Complete Prioritization Exercise

Mrs. Smith explained the prioritization exercise. Subcommittees worked to complete the prioritization from where they left off last meeting as well as rate the new projects presented.

4. Large Group Discussion on Prioritization Results & Forming Recommendations

Mrs. Smith reconvened the committee to share the results of the prioritization exercise. It was discussed that the 900 student elementary school was ranked higher than the 800 student elementary school. Noting the maximum bonding capacity is \$275 million, after the must-do growth items, and including the 900 elementary school, that leaves approximately \$120 million to address the aging and evolving items. The remaining items will go into the district's long-range facilities plan and considered for maintenance plans, fund balance use, and is a great starting point for future bond planning.

5. Closing

The prioritization results will be emailed out to the committee and be used to guide discussion next meeting. We will also provide the breakdown of the projects by driver and category for the committee's review. The next meeting is Monday, January 9, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at the Center for the Performing Arts. It is the last scheduled meeting and will be fully designated for large group discussion to finalize the committee's recommendation.