

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE
FY 2027 CIP Application Review Work Session
Friday, May 31, 2024 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Virtual Meeting on Teams

Committee Members Present

Larry Morris, Chair
Randall (Randy) Williams
Kevin Lyon
Douglas Hayman
Branzon Anania
Dale Smythe

Staff

Michael Butikofer
Alex Bearden
Lori Weed
Sharol Roys

Additional Participants

Rachel Melina-Lodoen
George Vakalis
Alanna Blough

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

Meeting 2 for CIP Application Review

REVIEW PREVIOUS MEETINGS MINUTES

- BRGR Committee review of attendance
- Discussed point values for school.
- Review of current application and should we have multiple instead? Possibly 2 but not 3
- Section 4 needs less attention due to prior revisions
- 1-3 are just informational – needs less attention.
- Online application coupled with user accounts.
- Possibly use DEED's GMS (Grants Management System)
- Set tentative dates for future meetings.
- End of Meeting Comment - Request to review "Age of Facilities" in Section 3.

BRIEFING FROM DEED ON WHAT THE GMS PLATFORM WOULD LOOK LIKE

Use of GMS? Karen has not heard back from an email but it's looking like a good format to use. One issue is if it will allow for multiple applications for single district, need more info.

Slow step in process to online format for applications over multiple FY's is currently being considered. First, upload only then next CIP Cycle add text fields online to fill out and continue until it's all online.

More work using GMS requires an off-cycle budget approval.

Question (Williams)- Review of system to use? Yes, but need to make sure multiple apps per district is possible first. GMS is public domain so can be reviewed without access.

Question (Landis)- How would the system know who you were? How would access be granted to do work?

Need multiple entities to get in. Need multiple logins under 1 account in which people could sign in under and be assigned defined roles per position/need within system.

Question (MolinaLodoen)- Workflow notifications possible? Yes, it should be possible if roles are set in system.

Question (Morris)- Pricing/cost known? Not really. The basic package is possibly \$5K to upload only and grows from there based upon complexity.

Keep beginning of meetings to future of GMS prospects.

DISCUSS REARRANGING THE STRUCTURE OF THE CIP APPLICATION (ORDER OF SECTIONS)

Lyon- would require work on districts end to adjust formulas and spreadsheets if structure rearranged. "Not too big of deal."

Landis- "If there is a positive outcome would be happy to adapt."

Morris- If everyone is happy with order, I'm happy. Going online may not matter about changing structure anymore.

Question (Hayman)- "Does the flow of the structure follow logic to teach new people coming in?" "Is it teachable?"

Roys- I don't think it should affect it online.

Weed- Whatever works best for applicant users.

SECTION 5 REVIEW

5a. Ensures Dept. is accurately considering district space for those grade ranges.

5b. DEED is aware of local projects that may impact best option to assist with school, DEED may not be aware of all bonds.

5c. For districts with multiple facilities to ensure overview of entire district GSF calculations. Based on GSF calculation school, only good for smaller communities, bigger communities have to do a little more calculations.

A) Butikofer- If we go electronic may be best to use a statewide spreadsheet for every district for this.

B) Cannot have State data integrate with 3rd party GMS database but could be good to require districts to upload into database yearly.

5e. Comes from GMS spreadsheet we provide or alternative submission.

A) Question (Morris)- Should we fund for space that's not needed with negative population growth?

B) No way to reduce points if 70% under capacity for example.

C) Any changes on this scoring section should have public comment and be placed in regulations.

Smythe- Adjust 40 points from a-g to move away from unhoused students points as a major scoring to age of building, safety/emergency conditions and/or major operating cost savings.

Morris- If we increase age of building points could fully renovate and still score high.
Only 2 districts growing in population.

Williams- In support of reducing points. Some schools are moving 6th to elementary schools how does this affect this table in 5e?

Morris- They have to recalculate population size every year.

Smythe- Would like to see more points adjusted from section 5e. in fairness to aging schools in isolated communities.

Morris- 5e. is not applicable to Major Maintenance. This is based on new construction and pushes facilities with need for more room for capacity to top of list.

Smythe- I think the State has a different need from when section 5e. was point weighted in the past but now we have 2 issues with aging facilities and no growth in student population.

Weed-Weighted average age can be the difference between a renovation vs a new facility.

Desire for 5e? Reduce to 50 pts? Leave at 80 with unhoused students with post occupancy?

Smythe- wanted to level it out between 2 priorities to even potential into 2 highest point categories vs 1.

Morris- Comes down to our priorities. House student's w/o adequate facilities or does it come down to heating needs or too many students in classroom? Possibly reduce value of 7-8 year out student projections.

Hayman- "only from the educator's perspective, an over-crowded (unhoused) school is less educationally sound than a school that is in poor repair."

-Re-discuss adjustment based on state school needs change.

5j. Possibly adjust to 5a. so everyone fills out and then state “don’t go past here if you’re on the Major Maintenance list.” Move to 3? We Combine 5j into 3 “Cut and Paste”

Motion to move 5j. to appropriate spot (#3). 2nd with revision to note at beginning of 5 to no longer refer to “j.” **Motion Passed**

5h. Have to keep due to Statute.

5i. Helps justify constructing new space. Goals of school and what’s best to obtain them. If we apply points to this, we would need to come up with a matrix to judge them for those points. Not applicable to renovations unless space design is being changed. Currently District controlled DEED just ensures meets regs. *Will revisit in Section 3 where it’s tied into.*

PLAN FOR NEXT MEETINGS: Continue to review each meeting.

- **Section 6 – June 14, Friday 1:00-3:00 PM**
- Reschedule to 21st
- **Sections 3 & 4 – July 12, Friday 1:00-3:00 PM**
- **Section 7 – August 9, Friday 1:00-3:00 PM**
- **Section 8 – October 18, Friday 1:00-3:00 PM**
- **Sections 9, 10 & Attachments – TBD, Friday 1:00-3:00 PM**
-Leave section 9 where it is.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

No Comments

ADJOURNMENT

Until June 21st! Good Bye and Happy Weekend!!!!