

Meeting #4
Community-based Committee
First Phase of Implementation
Wednesday, June 16, 2010
Burnet Center, 5:30p.m.

Present

Mike Villarreal
Steve Lecholop
Andrea Pastrano
Celina Peña
Dr. Sylvia Reyna
Jessica Rae Sanchez
Armando Cadena
Linda Jackson
Dan Martinez
Bob Comeaux
Linda Tippins
John Wilkins
Rolando Ruvalcaba

Curis Bowers
Gene Garcia
Elizabeth "Liz" Riojas
Ted Guerra
Willie Mitchell
Felix Alvarez
Rachel Ponce
Patti Tanner
Jesse Tovar
Josette J. Gonzalez
Randy Sanchez
Sandra Ojeda-Medina

Absent

Dalia Puente
Gloria Parra
Paulo G. Aguilera
Cynthia Muñoz
Terri Vasquez
Andro Herrera-Mendoza
Nellie Shannon
Roger Perales
Paul Talamantez, Jr.

Celina Peña, Co-Chairperson, opened the fourth meeting of the Community-based Committee at 5:38 pm on June 16, 2010. She announced the following;

- A DVD of pictures and video taken at Ogden Elementary, Mission Academy and Lanier High School on Tuesday, June 15 will be shown
- Going to engage in a full committee discussion to talk about issues, thoughts and questions so that group is moving in the same direction
- Committee will be in breakout groups from 6:20 to 8:00
- Committee will come back together for each group to report to full committee

Chairman Mike Villarreal took the floor and announced the following;

- He understood that the group made great progress last week during his absence
- Opened up the discussion to the floor on the following:
 - how everyone was feeling about the progress being made by the committee
 - the direction the group is heading in terms of group discussion and getting questions answered
 - the working relationship; together as a group and with staff
 - if anybody had anything on their mind they wanted to share before moving forward
 - Sandra Ojeda-Medina shared that she felt the committee is doing well
 - Committee finally getting it together
 - Finding focus and direction

Mr. Villarreal thanked Ms. Ojeda-Medina for her comments and proceeded by informing group that the direction committee is heading by the end of the next meeting is to be able to answer the following three questions:

- Should we have a bond proposal go to the community?
- When should that election be held?
- What should be in the first proposal?

Mr. Villarreal continued to inform the committee that in order to answer the above questions by the end of next meeting the committee would have to do some work in both meetings. The following points were made to committee:

- Committee has covered a lot of ground in terms of receiving presentations from staff on facility needs
- Having a presentation by the superintendent early on the direction of school district
- Understanding the financial impact on tax payers if \$500M package proposed
- Understanding the survey and where public opinion is on different issues

Mr. Villarreal asked each committee group to come to a decision on bond amount by end of this meeting. Furthermore, consider conversation about going to public with not just one proposition but also more than one proposition.

Ms. Peña reminded the committee of resources available for each group's work including tax impact information.

Mr. Villarreal mentioned that a survey will be conducted in July. Committee groups might decide to wait until survey results are released in order to reach decision about the bond offer being in one or several proposals.

A DVD of pictures and video taken at Ogden Elementary, Mission Academy and Lanier High School was shown and presented by Ms. Peña and Kamal El Habr, Associate Superintendent for Facilities Services. Also condition of Alamo Stadium was shown.

In response to a question about the Existing Debt Allotment, Mr. Villarreal said it is an automatic application. He said the district's chief financial officer factored the Existing Debt Allotment into his presentation.

Bob Comeaux passed out a handout for his presentation on solar energy for a \$25M package.

Mr. El Habr reviewed a handout on the High School Facility Comparative Analysis that included the Conditional Assessment, the Long-Range Plan Conditional Assessment and Long-Range Plan Programmatic Assessment.

Mr. Villarreal announced the three questions small groups need to answer. Each color (Green, Gold, Red, and Blue) coded group was asked to work in their assigned group and report out on the following questions:

- What are the bond priorities? Place in three different categories:
 - Critical Needs
 - High Needs
 - Important Enhancement
- What amount will community accept?
- When should we have a bond?

Green group reported the following:

- Spokesperson for group was Sandra Ojeda-Medina
- The group placed the (seven district) priorities in the following order:
 - 1- Campus Safety, Security and Code Compliance
 - 6- Magnet Programs and Career Pathways
 - New and Improved programs

- 3- Address Physical Deficiencies
 - Building Infrastructure
 - State of the Art Facilities
- 2- Address changes in capacity
 - 4- Additions
 - 5- Renovations
 - 7- Replacements of schools
- One proposition proposed for approximately: \$450M - \$495M
- Bond recommended for November 2010

Gold group reported the following:

- Spokesperson for group was Steve Lecholop
- The group placed the seven district priorities in the following order:
 1. Safety, Security, Technology and Site Improvements
 2. Addition & Renovation Supporting Consolidation
 3. Physical/Infrastructure Improvements
 5. Student Capacity
 6. Career and Magnet Programs
 4. Replacement Additional Allowances
 7. Enhancements for Core Curriculum

Note: District priorities 2 and 3 tied in second place in order of priorities developed by Gold group.

- Proposed amount of bond: \$500M with a small dissent
- Split decision on whether one proposition or multiple
- Bond recommended for November 2010

Additional comments made by Gold group:

- Group came to a consensus that Athletics should be separated from the Academics and Infrastructure if included at all.
- All members tallied seven district priorities. They are all of high need.

Red group reported the following:

- Spokesperson for group was Gene Garcia
- District seven priorities are all Critical Needs.
- Group presented three bond scenarios. They are:
 - Scenario 1- Bond proposal at \$502M which includes the Critical Needs + Academic Achievement
 - Scenario 2- Bond proposal at \$542M which Critical Needs + Academic Achievement + Physical Health Development, which includes Sports Complexes
 - Scenario 3- Bond proposal at \$600M which includes Critical Needs + Academic Achievement + Physical Health Development, which includes Sports Complexes + Additional Enhancements.
- Bond recommended for November 2010

Blue group reported the following:

- Spokesperson for group was Bob Comeaux

- Placed the district seven priorities in three categories:
 - Critical Need:
 - 2. Addition & Renovation Supporting Consolidation
 - 1. Security – a must at high and middle school level
 - High Need:
 - 3. Physical/Infrastructure Improvements
 - 6. Career and Magnet Programs
 - 7. Enhancements for Core Curriculum
 - Important Enhancement
 - 8. Includes Alamo Stadium Enhancement Renovation
 - 1. Elementary playground, High School Track and Lighting is to be considered as Physical Health and Community Development
- One proposition proposed: \$500M
- Bond recommended for November 2010

Note: District priorities 4 and 5 not placed on chart because they are considered by the group and work in progress.

Once all groups completed reporting, the agenda called for a full committee discussion led by Mr. Villarreal and Ms. Peña. The following points were discussed:

- Possible to offer voters a cumulative proposition
- All groups gave the amount of bond around \$500M
- If committee decides to go with the multiple proposition bond strategy, then marketing will need to be done to understand what each proposition entails.
- Committee decided to have bond on November 2, 2010
- Committee made a general consensus to set bond at approximately \$500M
- Two groups prioritized seven district priorities while two did not.

Mr. Villarreal posed the following question to the entire committee, “Do you think it would be of value to take to the board a set of priorities?”

Curtis Bowers stated, “That proposition would become so political and so begin fighting between that board. We as a group, we as a committee, and those of us that have been on this thing for a year and something now, we need something to pass. We need something to go through and clear this log jam. And Kamal has put a ton of effort into coming up with a solid number that everyone here has backed up (clapping begins). Everyone has backed up the \$500M and if we start piece milling \$500M into this or this, etc...Then they’re (the board) going to rip into everything he has put into it and then we are not going to get anything done.....so I hear you Mike, I really hear you. It looked like a good idea, but I really think it will just be torn apart.”

Mr. Villarreal asked, “Is there any dissenting view?”

Briefly, Bob Comeaux responded by stating, “If there is not a component for something like solar energy to help reduce our energy cost, I think we would be missing the boat on that.”

Mr. Villarreal summarized the conversation:

- Important worked that committee has accomplished
- Amount of bond: \$500M
- November election date
- When offer to board, we should also send other recommendations, such as:
 - Energy efficiency investments
 - maximize incentives that CPS offers
 - find a way to do outside of \$500M through revenue bonds
 - O & M tax notes

Mr. El Habr stated that although solar energy was not included in the bond package other items included in the bond package are as follows:

- Auto recycling
- High efficiency lighting
- Energy efficient buildings like the walls, ceilings, roof, windows, doors
- If committee would like to agree with what we have it would be fine, but if committee would like to add solar, it would be in addition to what is in bond package

Before adjourning, the committee was given information on next week's assignments by Mr. Villarreal. Any recommendations in addition to how the committee members answered the critical questions above and that the committee would like to include in the report to trustees is to be discussed as a group. Therefore ensuring that the committee comes to an agreement on what other qualitative recommendations and directives would be included in their final report to board.

Mr. El Habr inserted that he had failed to mention in previous response on solar energy question that SAISD:

- Received \$600,000 in rebates this year from CPS by doing lighting retrofits.
- This month he is going to the board to authorize for our district to proceed with the other \$600,000 for next year also for lighting replacements.
- In addition, the district has for the last three to four years maximized \$50,000 in replacing air conditioning units.
- The district will continue to take advantage of that rebate also.
- SAWS replaced all toilets in SAISD with low-flush toilets free of charge
- SAWS does not provide specific rebates for water conservation
- However, SAWS does provide ways in which school districts can conserve water

Ms. Peña concluded that the time was 8:30 pm. She congratulated the committee for putting their best voice and thought process forward. Committee will be meeting next week.