

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED

Study Session and Business Meeting (Tuesday, June 12, 2018)

Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Wednesday, June 13, 2018

Members present

Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Excused: Taz Murray

Staff members present (Executive Session)

Keith Rittel, Superintendent; Gary Wilson, Asst. Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, Exec. Director HR; Todd McKee, Executive Director Secondary Education; Doug Finch, Student Services Director

Staff members present (Study Session)

Keith Rittel, Superintendent; Gary Wilson, Asst. Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, Exec. Director HR; Todd McKee, Executive Director Secondary Education; Doug Finch, Student Services Director; Anne-Marie Harrison, Exec. Director Teaching & Learning; Shelley Shelton, Exec. Assistant; Mark Wheeler, Facilities Director; Morgan Anderson, Special Education Director; Caleb Price, Communications & PR; Tina Fluehe, Purchasing; Darin Loertscher & Kincade Brickey, Tech Support

Excused: Alex Judd, Exec. Director Elementary Education

Guests (Study Session)

Debbie Larson & Brenda Robinson, Provo Education Support Professionals; Christy Giblon & Kathy Giles, Provo Education Association Jennifer Partridge, FAC member; Jenny Thurston, PHS Asst. Principal; Fidel Montero, THS principal

1. 5:15 p.m. Closed Executive Session for the purpose of discussing negotiations. Utah Code 52.4.205

Procedural: A. Welcome: Pres. McKay Jensen

Procedural: B. Roll Call

Action: C. Motion to Convene Executive Session

I move we go into executive session for the purpose of discussing negotiations.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Shannon Poulsen.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Discussion, Information: D. Negotiations

Member Nielsen joined the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Action: E. Motion to Adjourn Executive Session

I move we adjourn the executive session and go into the study session.

Motion by Julie Rash, second by Jim Pettersson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Adjourned 5:30 p.m.

2. 5:30 - 7:00 p.m. Study Session

Procedural: A. Welcome: President McKay Jensen

Called to order 5:41 p.m.

Procedural: B. Roll Call

Discussion, Information: C. 2018-2019 High School Bell Schedule: Dr. Todd McKee, Exec. Director Secondary Education

Feedback is being sought from the board on the following proposals:

- PHS is planning to include two lunch periods as well as to increase pass time in the new building to accommodate the greater distances between classrooms.
- THS is proposing reducing consultation time on Mondays to provide more PLC/PD time; reducing advisory from 2 days a week to 1 day.

- Administrators worked with a researcher out of Brown University who helped them work through their advisory implementation. Brown University has developed a specialty in advisory.
- The focus of PLC at Timview is to increase teacher quality which in turn increases student achievement.

Information: D. Construction Update: Mark Wheeler, Facilities Director

Mark Wheeler shared the following updates:

Provost:

- Projected aerial views of Provost demolition that started yesterday, as well as a photo of a hallway where the new wall butts up against the old wall.
- District maintenance staff removed hallway murals which currently are in storage at Provo Peaks to protect until placements can be determined in the new school.
- Musical instruments were moved to different locations to protect them until they're moved to the new building.
- Artwork has been relocated to Grandview and Provo Peaks until it can be safely moved.
- Furniture will be delivered to Provost June 20.
- Teachers have access to classrooms July 25.
- Ribbon cutting scheduled for Aug. 6 at 9:30 a.m.

Provo High:

- Public open house scheduled for Aug. 7 from 6-9 p.m.
- Movers will move the totes teachers have packed next week. Teachers will unpack June 20-21.
- Teachers will set up classrooms Aug. 1.

Transportation

- Drivers were shifted to the new location previously; mechanics & equipment moved last week.
- The fire marshal has given final approval for the building.

Misc. Updates:

- Classroom carpet replacement at Amelia Earhart began June 4.
- Double lever hand-set locks, which in the event of a lock-down situation allow teachers to lock doors from the inside rather than having to step outside the classroom, were installed on all classroom doors at Wasatch and Dixon. Locks are next scheduled to be installed at Franklin.
- Wayne Manwaring in district maintenance department is retiring June 30 after 36 years.

Discussion: E. Policy Review

In the May 2018 Board study session, possible revisions to the Student Travel Policy (4006) were discussed, with several options suggested for consideration.

Attached is a revised proposed policy 4006 per the discussion noted above. Also included in draft form are the following additional documents.

- 4006 P1 Field Trips. This was created to provide consistent guidance on Field Trips. Field Trips have been part of policy 4006 but no procedure has previously existed.
- 4006 P2 Overnight Trips. This has been substantially revised per 5 years of dealing with frequent and repeated problems.
- 4006 F1 This is the overnight student travel request form. Some changes have been made to align more cleanly with P2.
- A third procedure dealing with out of state trips and foreign travel has been eliminated due to redundancy.

Reviewed 6805 revision in council meeting yesterday; will present for board approval Aug. 14.

The superintendent requested approval of this revised policy. The board is aware that procedures used to enact policy are approved by District Council, but are included for the board to be aware of the revisions and the guidance provided.

Supt. Rittel reiterated the following points:

- Travel experiences can/may provide meaningful learning. Most important aspect is educational purpose. Tina shared some background on past issues and challenges with added hotel days, activities, transportation and additional costs to students, often with little or no educational value. Must consider sacrifices families make in order to send kids on trips. Processes must be run.
- The policy reaffirms three types of trips:
 - Non-overnight field trips
 - In-state overnight trips
 - Out-of-state overnight trips
- Cost of trips should be as low as possible rather than a specific dollar amount.

- Keep emphasis on educational value, which can extend to other curricular areas depending on the level of educational value.
- P2 - overnight trips: clarifies what the supt. or board can approve. Reviewed the sequence, process, and timelines for submitting a student travel request for approval.
- There will now be three, rather than two out-of-state approval times per year: Sept/Nov/Feb.
- Reviewed "Trip Organization and Planning"
- It was noted there are districts in the state that are curtailing or cutting out student travel altogether.
- Some advisors add activities to itineraries that are not included in the original, board-approved travel request. Teachers often plan trips without going through state travel. Any material changes following board approval need to be approved by the superintendent, who will seek board feedback.
- Procedures are approved following board approval of policy.

Pres. Jensen was excused at 6:15 p.m.

Discussion: F. Negotiated Agreements: Jason Cox, Exec. Director of Human Resources

The associations that represent the employees of Provo City School District met with district leadership in a process of negotiations to determine compensation for the coming contract year. The written agreements included in the board packet define the negotiations that have been presented to and ratified by employees.

- HR completed bargaining in one day for each group.
- At least 5% salary increase will be given to both groups.
- The district has a good relationship with both associations and appreciates the relationship with both groups.
- Both association members accepted the agreement very well.

Discussion, Information: G. Trustlands: Todd McKee, Exec. Director Secondary Education

- School Land Trust plans for the 2018-19 school year have been written by school community councils and reviewed by both the Provo School District and the Utah State Board of Education.
- There were no significant changes from the state to plans. The school councils have made the changes necessary to meet the board's expectations.
- Staff recommends approval of the plans.

Discussion, Information: H. FY18 Final Budget Updates

At the May 22, 2018 study session the final annual budget for FY18 was presented to the board for their review. Final approval of this budget will take place at the Business Meeting on June 12, 2018. As the year end comes to a close, there are a few adjustments that have been made to the previously presented budget. All but one of the adjustments result in no increase or decrease to the budgets, they are simply finalizing grant figures and adjustments to coding. The updates are:

FY18 Final Budget:

FUND 10

1. Title I Part D Neglected & Delinquent Grant @ Oak Springs & Slate Canyon: Revenue Increase of \$259,550.04, Expense Increase of \$259,550.04. This grant covers both locations' summer program as well as some supplementary funding for school year academics. Net budget increase \$0.
2. Native American Summer Prof Dev Grant: Revenue Increase of \$3,000, expense increase of \$3,000. Net budget increase \$0.
3. JAVITS Funding: Revenue Increase of \$12,000, Expense Increase of \$12,000. Pays for Gifted & talented supplies at Title I schools. Net budget increase \$0.
4. Title I shifts: Net \$0 change in program, but some object code level shifts between personnel, supplies, etc.

FUND 28

1. Redevelopment Fund: Presented budget at \$700k but need to increase in order to accommodate local replacement expense for Charter Schools which state wants us to code to Fund 28. Increased back up to \$1,250,000 Revenue & Expense.

FY19 Proposed Budget:

FUND 10

1. Transportation: Increase the budget \$210,000 to include the purchase of new security cameras for the buses. This is a one-time funding need.

FUND 32

1. Capital Projects: Split Master Planning project (\$180,000) into 2 separate projects as below -
2. Building Re-valuation (Architecture/Engineering) : \$80,000
3. Plan Digitization, work order system long-term planning software, tools: \$100,000

District administration recommended the Board approve the FY18 Final and FY19 Proposed budgets including the above updates.

Pres. Jensen rejoined the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Discussion, Information: I. Planning for June 26 Study Session: Supt. Rittel

- Supt. Rittel and Board President McKay Jensen had a discussion regarding how to continue improving the state of the district.
- The June 26 study session has been expanded to three hours to do a visioning activity with board members, principals and district council and directors.
- Dr. Gary Wall will facilitate the visioning activity centered on how to identify and remove barriers to making the district a great rather than just a good district.
- Discuss will take place regarding Truth in Taxation hearing that will be included in the Aug 14 board business meeting.

Discussion: J. Consent Calendar Review and Questions

Discussion, Information: K. Upcoming Google Calendar Items

Action: L. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the study session.

Motion by Melanie Hall, second by Rebecca Nielsen.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Adjourned 6:49 p.m.

3. 7:00 p.m. Business Meeting

Procedural: A. Welcome: President McKay Jensen

Called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Procedural: B. Roll Call

Procedural: C. Opening Remarks: Vice Pres. Jim Pettersson

As the school year just ended, board members attended high school graduations. It was impressive to hear of accomplishments of graduates. Member Pettersson has been a professional educator for 39 years. What has he learned during his years of teaching? He has worked with students from South America, Europe, the Middle East, and other regions of the world. When we strip away culture and language, skin color, etc., when we get down to the core of who we are, we realize we're all similar. We have same hopes, desires, needs, and sometimes the same wants. We want to provide opportunities for all PCSD students. It's been a privilege to serve the students, patrons, and employees. Appreciation was expressed for employees, members of the Facilities Advisory Committee for the work done this year.

Procedural: D. Pledge of Allegiance: Gary Wilson, Asst. Supt.

4. Community Connections

Recognition: A. Employee Recognition: Teri Davis, Adapted PE Educator of the Year; Presented by Morgan Anderson, Special Education Director

- The recognition of Ms. Davis will take place during the August 14 business meeting.

Recognition: B. Recognition: Provo Way Award Recipients: Jason Cox, Exec. Director HR

Mr. Jason Cox recognized the following individuals:

Sherri Davis- Bus Driver

Tarnue Ali - Behavior Specialist- Provo Peaks

Karolyn Davis - Custodian - Spring Creek

Elizabeth Bowns - 3rd grade teacher - Amelia Earhart

Desiree Olsen - Kindergarten teacher - Sunset View

Action, Presentation: C. FAC Report to the Board: Jennifer Partridge, Julie Nelson, Dirk Astle, Paul Calderella

A Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) comprised of approximately 40 members of the community from around the district was convened under the direction of the Board of Education. The group met nine times from early March through late May. Reviews were held regarding the schools next on the list for reconstruction, and tours were taken to a number of locations throughout the district.

The FAC selected four members to be spokespersons for the entire FAC in making the recommendations to the Board. They are, in alphabetical order,

- Dirk Astle
- Paul Calderella
- Julie Nelson
- Jennifer Partridge

Lively, extensive, and detailed discussions were had by the FAC members. The FAC understands that they are a study and recommending body to the Board, and that the Board may choose to respond to the recommendations in a variety of ways following tonight's report.

The FAC report and recommendations were presented to the Board for consideration. The names of FAC members are also included in the report.

Upon receiving the recommendations, the Board should

1. Reassure the audience and community that no immediate decisions will be made regarding this information,
2. Ask for any clarification the board feels necessary,
3. Thank and recognize the committee,
4. Direct the superintendent to develop a schedule for the board to begin discussions about the recommendations and strategies.

Paul Calderella presented the board's recommendation, which included the following:

Facilities Priority Recommendations to the School Board Provo School District Facilities Advisory Committee June 12, 2018

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- We had a very engaged and diverse Facilities Advisory Committee comprised of individuals representing all of the schools in the district: AMELIA EARHART - Merrilee Jarvis , Kari Lillico , Kayleen Dewey CANYON CREST- Alison Parker, Kellie Hawkins, Marci LeMonnier EDGEMONT - Christine Giles, Julia Doxey FRANKLIN - Michelle Wages, Tawn Henrie LAKEVIEW - Katie Lott, Talara Allphin, Becky Paulsen PROVO PEAKS - Julie Nelson PROVOST - Bryce Bunting, Jennifer Partridge ROCK CANYON - Katherine Barrus, Kari Kawa SPRING CREEK - Katie Hopoate, Yi Song SUNSET VIEW - Krystal Walch, Sabrina Barry, Phil Uhl TIMPANOGOS - Shannon Bingham TIMPVIEW - Clay Bingham WASATCH - Paul Caldarella, Momi Tu'ua, Pam Smalley WESTRIDGE - Dirk Astle, Alicia Gee UNAFFILIATED - Herb Stoddard.
- In addition we had regular attendance from the following individuals who helped provide information and answer questions: PROVO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT - Keith Rittel , Doug Finch, Todd McKee, Stefanie Bryant, Iri Lara, Caleb Price, Alex Judd, Jason Cox, Mitch Swenson, Anne-Marie Harrison PROVO CITY SCHOOL BOARD - McKay Jensen, Melanie Hall, Shannon Poulsen, Rebecca Nielsen, Julie Rash

PROCESS

The FAC met each week for 1.5 to 2 hours on Tuesdays from March through May 2018 (with two weeks off for Spring Break). The FAC toured Wasatch Elementary, Timpview High School, and Dixon Middle School to see first-hand the condition they are in, and visited possible rebuild sites if Dixon is moved (i.e., Grandview and Footprinters areas). The FAC was also able to tour the new Provo High School. FAC meetings included presentations and reports from Superintendent Keith Rittel, KMA architects, the district Director of Facilities Mark Wheeler, and the district Business Administrator Stefanie Bryant. Time was also allocated for question/answer and discussion sessions regarding the current bond recommendations. The last several weeks were devoted almost entirely to discussion among group members.

VISION

Five years ago, the first Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) was convened for the purpose of evaluating the condition of the buildings throughout Provo City School District. In June of 2013 they made a recommendation to the school board, detailing seven schools that needed to be rebuilt. They advised the school board and the citizens of Provo to address all seven schools as soon as possible. At that time, the FAC recognized that it was not possible to rebuild all seven schools with the funding from one bond. Ultimately, the school board chose to rebuild five schools from the 2014 bond: Rock Canyon, Sunset View, Provo High, Edgemont, and Provost. This leaves Dixon and Wasatch as the other two schools that need to be rebuilt as soon as possible. In 2013 the FAC also mentioned that some money would need to be spent to help Timpview. Since that time, the physical conditions of the Timpview building have changed, and it needs more urgent attention than previously thought.

The 2018 FAC came together with the vision that it is time to finish the job that began in 2013-2014. Our vision extends to our community -- that everyone in Provo has the opportunity to send their students to schools that are safe, efficient, and best meet the needs of education today. As we do so, we not only improve the situation for our students, but we increase the quality of life for all Provo residents.

PRIORITIES

Student safety and security was our main concern as we studied the buildings and decided what to recommend to the school board. We also spent a great deal of time studying and weighing the numbers and financial data.

- Does it make sense to rebuild or should we renovate?
- How does it affect the taxpayers to take care of all of the schools' needs in one bond versus two?

BOND PROPOSAL

We propose that the Provo School Board ask the public to bond to rebuild Wasatch Elementary, Dixon Middle School, and Timpview High School, and to put an addition onto Westridge Elementary. The FAC quickly came to a consensus regarding Wasatch, Dixon, and Westridge. The only significant question as a group was regarding Timpview. If money were not a consideration, it wouldn't be an issue, but a minority of group members hesitated about placing it on this next bond due to the large cost. However, during our last FAC meeting we asked Mark Wheeler, district Director of Facilities, a series of "what if" questions. Once we realized that the situation at Timpview could worsen dramatically over the next few years if Mother Nature sends

us harsh winters, we realized that it was not wise to take the chance -- we all felt it important to rebuild Timpview as soon as possible for student safety.

Based on estimates presented to the FAC, the bond would be approximately \$192 million:

- Wasatch -- \$25 million
- Dixon -- \$45 million
- Timpview -- \$115 million
- Westridge addition -- \$7 million

Wasatch Elementary School

The FAC unanimously agrees that Wasatch Elementary School should be included on the new bond and rebuilt on its current site. There were several reasons for this decision:

1. Significant safety and maintenance concerns related to the age of a school built in 1949 (69 years old)
 - a. Does not meet current school safety and building standards
 - b. Significant roof, plumbing, and electrical (HVAC) upgrades needed
 - c. Lack of fire suppression sprinklers in most of the school
 - d. Seismic instability of the structure increasing the likelihood of structural collapse during an earthquake
 - e. Significant security concerns with multiple entrances and exits (making line of sight and supervision of visitors problematic), no magnetic locks or safety glass, and location near a public park
 - f. The current student population exceeds the usable size of the cafeteria and gym
 - g. This elementary is the largest in the school district in the oldest elementary building with the greatest safety and security risks
2. Cost of ongoing maintenance, seismic upgrades, and needed renovations (est. \$15 million) approaches the cost to rebuild the school (est. \$25 million)
 - a. A new Wasatch will be built to accommodate the large number of students (nearly 900) who currently attend the school
 - b. The rebuild will address the significant safety and security concerns related to the age of the school
 - c. The rebuild will allow the school to vacate the aging Wasatch 2 building and to accommodate future growth
 - d. Significant traffic flow and student drop off/pick-up concerns related to the current school configuration would also be addressed in the rebuild
3. Wasatch was on the 2014 list of seven schools recommended to be rebuilt

Dixon Middle School

The FAC unanimously recommends that Dixon Middle School be rebuilt as soon as possible:

1. Student Safety is a significant concern in the current building that is approaching 90 years old (constructed in 1931).
 - a. Most of the building is wood or unreinforced block construction which is seismically unsafe.
 - b. The gym has a concrete double-T ceiling that sits on unreinforced walls.
 - c. There is no fire sprinkler system in the building.
2. Many systems are approaching or are already at the end of their lives and need replacement. It makes financial sense to instead put the money towards building a new structure that is more efficient and serves our students better.
 - a. The boiler is 49 years old. It has been leaking recently and is in poor condition.

- b. The majority of the roofing needs replacement in 0-4 years.
 - c. The galvanized steel piping throughout the building is in poor condition and needs to be replaced.
3. It is estimated that seismically updating the existing building and doing needed renovations would cost over \$28 million. This does not include any costs for portables to house students during such a renovation. We agree that it makes more sense to spend \$40-45 million on a brand new building that can also be better designed to meet the needs of a 21st century middle school.

Dixon Location

The big question and hard decision with Dixon is where to rebuild it. The school currently sits on 8.25 acres. It is generally recommended (although not required) that a middle school have 15-20 acres. The FAC looked at different options and sees pros and cons with each:

1. Rebuild at current site

Pros: Dixon is an anchor in the neighborhood and many residents want to see it stay; there is value in having the school in walking distance to an at-risk demographic; if we could keep the original 1931 historical part of the building, there is value in saving that history

Cons: The current site is very small with inadequate parking; construction would be very tight on existing property; acquiring more land would be difficult and costs would be relatively high since there are existing homes

2. Rebuild Dixon at Footprinter's Park site - If Dixon needs to be rebuilt in a new location, this is the site the FAC overwhelmingly prefers.

Pros: This is open space that would be relatively easy to build on; although in a different neighborhood, the school remains on the east side of the boundary and is also in a neighborhood with walking access for an at-risk population; this would put the middle school on the south end of the boundary while the high school is in the north end, providing everyone in the boundary with the chance to have proximity to one of their secondary schools; there is relatively easy access on 1100 W and near the Lakeview Parkway; it is near where the majority of population growth will be happening; more students can walk to this location than if the school were at the Grandview site

Cons: We may need to acquire some land -- although that is a con to all 3 options and we felt this site was the easiest one to acquire more land

3. Rebuild Dixon at Grandview site - The FAC agrees unanimously that this site is not ideal.

Pros: We already own the property

Cons: It is situated on an odd corner that makes managing the traffic difficult; some land would need to be purchased for more access points (currently homes are on that property); both secondary schools would be located in the northwest corner of Provo; there would be added costs of demolishing the old Grandview buildings; a middle school would increase the traffic in front of nearby Westridge Elementary.

Westridge Elementary School

The FAC unanimously agrees that Westridge Elementary School should be included on the new bond to have permanent classrooms added to its current site. There were several reasons for this decision:

1. Significant safety concerns for the 150+ students who are currently housed in detached portable units.

a. The portables do not have bathroom facilities so the 6 classrooms full of students must walk outside and then into the school to use the restroom.

i. This leaves the children unsupervised in an outdoor, unsecured space which is adjacent to a large city park.

ii. The lack of convenient restroom facilities creates significant delays in teaching for the children making the journey inside.

iii. The teacher must stop teaching and delay learning for the entire class if they are to step outside with a student and make sure they are secure as they traverse the space into the school building to use the restrooms. The alternative is for the students to make the trip unsupervised.

iv. To allow for portable student entry, the external doors to the school near the portable units must be left unlocked which creates a security issue for the entire school.

2. The timing is right to build classrooms at Westridge. The portable units have exceeded their useful life and will be replaced. The replacement should be in the form of additional internal classrooms.

a. The portable units at Westridge are approximately 20 years old and cannot be considered temporary. In fact, they have exceeded their useful lifespan. Replacing them has to happen, but it doesn't make sense to replace with more portables since they have become a permanent solution.

b. Spending money on an asset which rapidly depreciates in comparison to a safer, more effective solution is not fiscally responsible.

c. The demand for classroom space has not relented and Westridge projects to maintain high levels of enrollment (currently the highest non-language magnet elementary school in Provo School District). The space is needed, and internal rooms are the responsible way to meet that need.

- d. The addition to Westridge will only get more expensive as time passes. Construction costs continue to rise, the portable units need replacing, and the sooner it can be built, the more cost effective it will be.
- e. The addition will be easily accommodated on land owned by the school district. There will be minimal capital outlay for demolition and no outlay for real estate. No other build will have a lower cost per student than this comparatively low-dollar project.

Timpview High School

The FAC recommends that a rebuild of Timpview High School be on this bond, though there were some concerns raised as noted below.

Reasons to include Timpview on this bond:

1. The ground under the southwest part of Timpview is shifting/sliding because the school was built on a clay soil slope and is not fully anchored to bedrock. If we have another harsh winter like the 2016-17 winter it will shift more. The shifting foundations cause stress on the rest of the building. Cracks and separations are already visible.
2. North and South gyms are seismically unsafe.
3. Fire sprinkler system is old and failing—causing periodic flooding.
4. There are issues with water runoff during storms.
5. East parking lot is unsafe during winter as parked cars can slide and collide.
6. Many doors into the school create too many access points for student safety.
7. Built in 1975, the school is over 43 years old, approaching the end of its 50 year lifespan. Rebuilding it now will have the school completed by approximately 2024. Waiting until the next bond pushes it out until approximately 2030, at least 5 years beyond its lifespan and increasing safety risks due to shifting and sliding that is already occurring.
8. In the rebuild it may be possible to keep some of the newer structures, like the Thunderdome.
9. Timpview sliding is the primary reason the FAC recommended including it on the new bond.
10. Utah County population is expected to grow exponentially. The rebuild of Timpview can help keep up with the coming growth and replace an aging building.

Concerns and other things to consider

1. Cost — expensive. However, it is cheaper to address it now than doing it in two bond phases (part now another part in 5-10 years) or than putting off a rebuild until poor condition of building escalates dramatically.
2. We just bonded a few years ago. Need to explain that we are coming back to the public sooner than originally planned because the circumstances changed (Timpview sliding).
3. Some in the community will say, “The school looks fine.” We will need to highly advertise the problems with pictures and tours.
4. Difficult for the students who will have to go to school while the school is being rebuilt.
5. There may be west-side resentment— “We had to make do for years; why can’t the east side?”

Situations & alternatives the FAC considered

1. Moving the school to new site — however, no land is available.
2. Moving to the park south of Timpview — land is unfit for building on due to water under it and also a promise to neighbors not to build there, etc.
3. Moving students into old Provo High building while school is rebuilt in one go -- BYU wants to take immediate occupancy.
4. Holding off for five years (not putting on this bond) — no guarantee the land will be stable. Since it has already started shifting it is more likely to continue to shift. Costs are also expected to increase — construction inflation is high. There are also worries about bonding fatigue.
5. Doing the rebuild in bonding phases, part now and the rest in five years, increases the cost, is inefficient, and could result in a less-cohesive school building.

GETTING PUBLIC SUPPORT

At first glance, a \$192 million bond sounds large, but given the scope of the needs in these four schools the FAC decided it is what is needed. Currently, the public is not fully informed about the conditions of these buildings and may not see the need for this size of bond. We feel that if we can educate the public, they will stand behind the bond and vote for it!

The School District and those helping with the 2014 bond campaign utilized some wonderful strategies to inform the public and get their support. We recommend a similar approach, especially and additionally:

1. “Town Hall” meetings in each school to inform & involve the public: “people will support that which they help to create”
2. Share the numbers in a way that they understand and can support
3. Acknowledge that this bond is coming earlier than expected and explain WHY!! Circumstances have changed!!
4. Explain that even though the district knows schools need rebuilding/renovating, the district CANNOT save for it, by law!

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. We did not rank the schools in order of importance. Wasatch is listed first simply because we know it needs to be rebuilt and did not have any other considerations. In our minds, Dixon is in just as much need, but we listed it second since there is more to determine regarding HOW/WHERE to rebuild it. Both Wasatch and Dixon were on the original 2013 list of seven schools that needed to be rebuilt. They are definitely a top priority over other schools that were not on that original list.
2. We strongly recommend that the Board do a study regarding Dixon before rebuilding. We love the history of the original facade, but we must evaluate if it is worth the money to save it. Can we get funding from historical groups? The current site is about ½-½ the size recommended for middle schools – is it best to rebuild Dixon at its current site, or would it be better to find a new location? What is the non-monetary value of keeping the school on its current site? Does that outweigh the financial costs and sacrifices in site space?
3. Could the current Dixon building be repurposed as a District Office and Community Center? We feel strongly that some type of community center should stay at Dixon's current site if the school cannot be rebuilt there. The neighborhood will benefit from continuing to have resources and a gathering place nearby.
4. For the Westridge classroom addition, we recommend that you include a multi-purpose room in the new wing. Westridge has a large student population, and currently has no space besides the library kiva and the gym/stage for collaboration areas. These common spaces are already used for scheduled library and P.E. times, and we feel that there should be another space where grade levels can congregate and collaborate together.
5. As you make your final decision, keep in mind that we are not approaching the public from the same situation we were in 5 years ago. It was easy to get public support then because we had 7 schools that needed to be rebuilt and it had been a very long time since the taxpayers were asked to increase their financial support of the school buildings. There will be many in the public now who see the need for rebuilding these schools as soon as possible, but there will also be plenty of people who are hesitant due to the last bond being so recent. We think it is a good idea to hold some information-gathering public meetings before you decide on the final bond amount.
6. A minority of group members (9 people, which is just under ⅓ of the FAC) were concerned about the financial impact of the bond. Ultimately, with the condition of Timpview being at the mercy of the weather, they decided to support having Timpview on the bond, but previous to that they spent a great deal of time discussing the numbers and evaluating how the taxpayer will be affected by the bond. We feel it is important for our community to support our schools and provide safe learning environments -- doing so increases the quality of life for all residents. However, we ask as you make your final decision that you weigh the impact of this bond in a larger context. Provo City is also needing to replace old facilities which will result in other taxes and fees being raised around the same time. How do we balance our need for safe schools with the need to watch out for those who are highly-impacted by tax increases?
7. The members of the FAC are eager to help in the process of getting public support. Please keep us informed of your progress in making your decision, and in what we can do to be of help to the process.

Board member/staff comments:

- Vice Pres. Pettersson: It is important to remember decisions have been made; just at the beginning of the process.
- Julie Rash: There was a little bit of discussion about the timeline for rebuilding THS and what's happening in the construction market right now. Construction costs continue to rise and are not expected to slow. Safer, newer buildings are where parents want to send their kids. The education received is perceived to be in correlation with the condition of the building.

In response to questions from board members, Facilities Director Mark Wheeler shared the following information:

- There have been recent fire sprinkler incidents at THS with 3-4 failed sprinkler sections.
- Water main breaks resulting in flooding: 2 recent incidents due to sub-grade soil shifting.
- There are 37 acres at the Timpview site; 30 are buildable acres. Will lose parking immediately and disrupt the community regardless. Building in three phases would take 3.5 years. To build piece by piece would span 7-8 years.
- We will approach the 50-year mark even with the 5-year timeline.
- We will be managing aggressive annual construction cost increases of 6-8%.
- A "do nothing" option:
 - Replacing the current fire sprinkler system has a \$450,000 price tag that would be wasted with an eventual rebuild.
- Mark is most nervous about the soil condition. Clay will continue to expand in harsh wet winter months.
- Wasatch - 50% unsupported masonry walls are a major concern. Significant number of entrances create a major security concern.
- Dixon was built in 1931. Replacement cost of the boiler is \$300,000 with all accessory equipment. Unsupported masonry walls are major seismic and safety concern. Roof sections built in 1960s are also a major seismic concern. Part of the building from the 1960s is more dangerous than oldest part of the school. Design concept in 1960 was to build very heavy concrete roofs and set on unsupported masonry walls. 1930 sections have slightly better seismic rating from structural engineers. The challenge with Dixon is that it would be so expensive to move and reinforce walls; would be a full architectural facelift.

The price tag to rebuild on Dixon would depend on acquiring new land. To acquire more land at the current site would add costs. To build up on current site is more expensive after a certain level. Estimate given to the board does not include purchasing new land.

President McKay Jensen concluded by stating to ask the public for more money is a trust issue; to build trust, we must build things together.

Procedural: D. Public Input

There was no public input.

5. Business Items

Action: A. Approve 2018-2019 High School Bell Schedule

I move we approve the 2018-2019 high school bell schedules.

Motion by Taz Murray, second by Melanie Hall.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action: B. Approve Policy 4006 Student Travel: Field Trips and Overnight Trips

I move we approve revised policy 4006 Student Travel: Field Trips and Overnight Trips.

Motion by Julie Rash, second by Rebecca Nielsen.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action: C. Approve Negotiated Agreements

I move we approve the 2018-2019 negotiated agreements.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Julie Rash.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action: D. Approve Trustlands Plans

I move we approve the 2018-2019 School Land Trust plans.

Motion by Melanie Hall, second by Julie Rash.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action: E. Budget Hearing: Approve Final FY18 Budgets, Proposed FY19 Budgets

I move we approve the FY18 Final and FY19 Proposed budgets as presented at the May 22nd study session, including capital project budget shifts, fund balance transfers and the budget adjustments made as discussed in study session, and subject to the truth in taxation process.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Jim Pettersson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

6. Consent Calendar

Action (Consent), Minutes: A. Board Minutes as Part of the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the board minutes as part of the consent calendar.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Minutes: B. May 8 Study Session and Business Meeting

Minutes: C. May 10 Joint Meeting

Minutes: D. May 22 Study Session

Action (Consent), Report: E. Personnel Report as Part of the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the personnel report as part of the consent calendar.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action (Consent), Report: F. Home School, School Choice, eSchool Report as Part of the Consent Calendar
Resolution: I move we approve the home school and school choice reports as part of the consent calendar.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action (Consent), Report: G. Financial Reports as Part of the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the financial reports as part of the consent calendar.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Action (Consent): H. Approve the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the consent calendar.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Rebecca Nielsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

7. Board Member Reports

Report: A. Member Taz Murray

Member Murray appreciates the diversity on the board. Board duty is to give the superintendent room to do his job; the board does that well. It's been an honor to serve with other board members. If you don't like what board members are doing, please vote in November.

8. Superintendent's Report

Report: A. Approved Student Travel

Supt. Rittel approved three out-of-state and two in-state student travel requests from Provo High School.

Report: B. Misc. Items

Supt. Rittel thanked the administration team for a good year.

9. Adjourn

Action: A. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the business meeting.

Motion by Shannon Poulsen, second by Taz Murray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray, Rebecca Nielsen, Melanie Hall

Adjourned 8:15 p.m.