MEETING: Capital Planning Steering Committee Meeting #02

LOCATION: Hattie Mae White
4400 W 18th St.
Houston, TX 77092

DATE: December 07, 2021
TIME: 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC)
- Brian Barragy (District 5)
- Booker Gusta (District 4)
- Sarah Castro (District 6)
- Danny David (District 7)
- Tanya Debose (District 2)
- Marc Flores (District 1)
- Alana Holmes (District 1)
- Craig Johnson (District 9)
- Michael Lunceford (District 5)
- Allison Marshall (District 1)
- Josephine Rice (District 2)
- Abby Roberson (District 7)
- Sandra Rodriguez (District 6)
- Rob Wade (District 7)
- Josh Wallenstein (District 6)
- Timothy Williams (District 8)

Houston Independent School District (HISD)
- Andreas Peeples, Officer Construction Services
- Wanda Paul, Chief Operating Officer
- Alishia Jollivet, Officer Facility Services
- Eugene Salazar, Officer Business Operations
- Sizwe Lewis, Construction Services
- Eric Ford, Construction Services
- Miranda Perez, Communications
- Larry Leonard, Communications
- Alejandro Banegas, Communications
- Precilla Rivera, Construction Services
- Bridget Ward, Construction Services
- Jim Rice, Rice & Gardner
- Ian Powell, PBK Architects
- Amanda Andrus, Rice & Gardner
- Claude Yoas, Rice & Gardner
- Jorge Huerta, Rice & Gardner
- Ron Keller, Rice & Gardner
- Caroline Harris, PBK Architects

ABSENT: Marie Anstead (District 5)
- Janis Brackett (District 7)
- Rebecca Briscoe (District 5)
- Brittany Hyman (District 4)
- Roger Soto (District 5)

*Due to conflict of interest, Annette Van Brunt (District 5) is no longer a member.

** Please note Josephine Rice was in attendance during the initial first CPSC meeting November 2, 2021.

The general purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Capital Planning Steering Committee to a collaborative effort on developing a bond program for the 2022 Election. Related issues, questions, and activities were also discussed.
Item 1  Welcome and Introductions

Andreas Peeples, Officer of Construction Services, welcomed the Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) and other guests.

Mr. Peeples introduced the HISD team members who developed the Facilities Condition Assessment and Capital Planning Initiative. Following that, all the CPSC members introduced themselves.

- HISD team members
  - Eric Ford, Senior Manager of Facilities Design
  - Sizwe Lewis, Senior Manager of Construction Services
- Outside team members
  - Jim Rice, President – Rice & Gardner
  - Ian Powell, Principal – PBK Architects
- Present Steering committee members (by Trustee District)
  - District 1 - Marc Flores, Alana Holmes, Allison Marshall
  - District 2 - Tanya Debose, Josephine Rice
  - District 4 - Gusta Booker
  - District 5 - Brian Barragy, Michael Lunceford
  - District 6 - Sarah Castro, Sandra Rodriguez, Josh Wallenstein
  - District 7 - Danny David, Abbey Roberson, Rob Wade
  - District 8 - Timothy Williams
  - District 9 - Craig Johnson

Item 2  Roles and Member Expectations

- **Formal guidelines, procedures, and expectations:**
  - House meeting rules: punctual, be respectful, focus on solutions
  - Going thru each presentation and discussion of information
  - Taking the information over a series of meetings and assessing the data to form a consensus of potential projects that will be slated for the 2022 bond referendum program
    - Must Do: legally, safety reasons, critical replacements and growth
    - Should Do: Program Instructional Needs
    - Would Like to Do
    - Future Considerations
- **Discuss Selection of chairperson and cochair person**
  Mr. Peeples discussed the considerations of selecting a chairperson and co-chair with the following points.
  - Has experience managing or directing large groups
  - Can build a consensus
  - Can speak or present to a distinguished audience
In addition, an abbreviated bio of all CPSC members will be included with the handout material to assist committee members in their evaluations.

Mr. Peeples discussed the purpose and background of the Facilities Condition Assessment conducted by Rice & Gardner. The assessment was based on these three conditions:

1. Facilities Condition Index (FCI)
2. Educational Adequacy Index (EAI)
3. Demographics

Item 3   HISD Facilities Assessment

Mr. Jim Rice, Rice & Gardner, introduced his team (Ron Keller, Claude Yoas) along with Ian Powell of PBK Architects. In 2015, Rice & Gardner was contracted by HISD to conduct a Facilities Condition Assessment. In 2020, the request was to implement/refresh the Facilities Assessment with a long-range capital planning tool, the MOCAPLAN.

To complete the Facilities Condition Assessment, all HISD facilities were visited for an assessment of roofs, foundations, windows, AC and heating systems (HVAC), bathrooms, and kitchens. Then the FCA team assigned a life cycle to each system. The collection of all data was entered into the MOCAPLAN database, which will be a great working tool for 2022 through 2027. For planning purposes, 85% of the maintenance and operational budget of school districts go to salaries and benefits. Due to the lack of funding to fix large capital replacement items, the passing of a bond is required. The three major categories identified in the database were:

1. Facility Condition Index (FCI) – Jim Rice
   a. An analytical tool to see how much money is required for the replacement of the aging systems compared to how much money is required to replace the entire school and then apply a coefficient.
   b. The condition of the actual school.
   c. The higher the percentage, the worse the facility. For example:
      i. 65% or higher is a good candidate for replacement
      ii. 50% - 65% is major renovation or replacement
      iii. 30%-50% is major systems require replacement or repair
      iv. 0%- 30% is facility is well maintained or new
   d. As seen below, there are an estimated eight schools that would be recommended to be replaced.
Please see the chart below for HISD’s current FCI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All HISD Schools</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>ECC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%-50%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%-50%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher than 65%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (T-Bldg. Campus)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Rice then introduced Ian Powell to speak about the utilization of the three components, which is the Educational Adequacy Index. Mr. Powell stated that he is a managing partner with PBK Architects. PBK specializes in the building of educational facilities. When you analyze something, analyze it for its purpose. What is its fitness of purpose to distribute education to the students? This information comes from a legislative budget report that all districts receive. All the feedback from the report wasn’t popular, but it helped sharpen the approach to obtain the EAI. The EAI approach was more rigorous, and it was based on the absolute requirements for the enrollment law for the TEA rolled into facilities.

2. Educational Adequacy Index (EAI) – Ian Powell (PBK Architects)
   a. An index that measures the adequacy of the facility as it relates to the instructional program of the students.
   b. The lower the percentage, the worse the facility.
   c. As seen below, there are 38 schools identified as having poor EAI percentages.

Please see the chart below for HISD’s current EAI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All HISD Schools</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>ECC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: 100%-90%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: 90%-80%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: 80%-70%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: 70%-60%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: 60% and below</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Demographics (Enrollment information)
   a. For research, Population and Survey Analysts (PASA), the largest demographic firm in Texas, was used to determine the demographics portion.
   b. If the FCI is really high and the EAI is really low, along with enrollment, difficult decisions have to be made.
   c. Student population in HISD has declined each year since Fall 2014.
   d. Enrollment growths are expected in the Orem/Almeda Genoa corridor, along with the Westheimer corridor and pockets in the northeast.
   e. Annual births within HISD-zoned population declined by 10% for the same period.
   f. The 10-year enrollment projections are expected to both increase and decrease (throughout any given school year).
   g. The utilization of campuses with less than 50% utilization are expected to continue declining in population.

Mr. Rice turned his attention to the CPSC Timeline. As stated, the CPSC is scheduled to meet the first Tuesday of the month. Mr. Peeples said there is a possibility of a few added meetings before going to board. We are hoping to go to the board in May 2022, which will require that the proposed listing of projects will be submitted for the April 2022 Agenda. Please see the CPSC timeline below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021: Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2nd, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7th, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022: Quarter 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11th, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1st, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1st, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022: Quarter 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 5th, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions and concerns were stated during the meeting:

- How long until a roof needs to be replaced and how much would it cost?
- Have there been an evaluation being done on the Teledyne or old Arabic Immersion School that could possibly be used as office space or an early childhood center?
- New Schools vs Refurbish Schools: How could we ensure the students of the neighborhood could enroll into a new school and not stay in the current refurbish school.

Please refer to the email address below for specific questions and answers that will be answered prior to the next meeting.

CPSC@houstonisd.org

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:48pm