The general purpose of the meeting is 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  
Financial $3.5B Refresh

Andreas Peeples, Officer of Construction Services, welcomed the Capital Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) and outlined the agenda for the evening which would include the following:

- Reviewing February’s CPSC budget workshop
  - $5M in deferred maintenance
  - $3.5B is the target/starting point for capital planning deliberations
- Making decisions on the four findings groups
- How the superintendent’s strategic initiatives will factor into the bond program
- Districtwide replacements
  - Roofs, chillers, parking lots, control systems, transportation
  - How will these replacements affect the FCI
- How to incorporate infrastructure that is not included in the proposed projects (athletic improvements, technology improvements, special education)

Item 2  
Overview of Groups

Jim Rice and Ian Powell, of Rice & Gardner and PBK Architects respectively, invited committee members to offer their thoughts on the five findings groups and vote on the schools that would unanimously be approved for renovation of replacement based on their FCI, EAI, and utilization demographics.

Mr. Rice presented a spreadsheet of the findings groups and asked that the committee members identify the schools that they would like to either remove from the groups or reposition in terms of priority.

The schools within each group, represented the following:

Group 1
- All eight (8) campuses within this grouping had red in each grading category.
  - Red FCI, Red EAI, and Red Utilization

Group 2
- The seven (7) campuses within this grouping had red in two categories and orange in the third.

Group 3
- The four (4) campuses within this grouping had red in one category and orange in another.

Group 4
The six (6) campuses within this grouping were placed together due to their site restrictions.

Each campus would require additional design, phasing, and funds to account for the need to relocate students while each campus is rebuilt.

A committee member raised a question regarding site constraints. Mr. Rice explained that site constraints refer to an area that is not large enough to accommodate a school replacement without relocating students to a different campus during construction.

Mr. Rice and Mr. Powell explained that the findings groups are presented the way they are not to indicate priority, but for the sake of clarity; all campuses listed are under equal consideration unless the committee decides to remove them.

A committee member inquired as to whether the cost of relocating students while renovating or replacing schools with site constraints is included in the bond proposal. Mr. Rice confirmed that there are funds built into the bond for transportation and swing place during each campuses rebuild and replacement.

Chief Wanda Paul stressed that the most important factor when considering these proposals is the option that is the least disruptive to the students and their education.

A committee member raised a question about construction costs and sought to clarify whether large disparities in construction costs are due to site constraints. Mr. Rice explained that construction cost is calculated based on the square footage of the campus and whether it is in a flood plain.

A discussion was raised regarding how equity is considered when it comes to the constructions of schools and why some schools are more popular than others and have students attending from outside of their district zone. Mr. Rice pointed out that the goal of the CPSC is to make sure that the facilities are equitable, and that the superintendent’s initiatives with address the programs in the schools that add to their popularity.

Another member suggested that those concerned with equity within the school district should follow the board workshops wherein the superintendent discusses his vision for equitable schools.

**Item 3**  
**Group 5 Financial Worksheet**

Mr. Rice and Mr. Powell asked the committee members to break into two groups to discuss the FCI, EAI and utilization of the campuses in groups 1-4 and determine how (if at all) they would make changes to those groups. Whether to not they agreed with the proposed campus replacements or felt another campus would better fit within the next capital improvement plan.
Additionally, they were asked to brainstorm changes for group 5.

Chief Paul reminded the committee that as of 2022, there was a bond cycle missed (between 2012 and now) as a new bond must be considered every five to six years for a district the size of HISD. The continuous cycle must be maintained to avoid rising FCIs and ensure the cost of maintenance of a campus would remain low and lessen the impact to the O&M Budget.

The committee broke into two groups and then reassembled to discuss their findings.

**Group A**

Group A was in agreed on all the schools listed in groups 1-4 except for one elementary campus that had lower FCI than others within each group. Group A recommended to consider renovating a MS within the original list, instead of replacing it, and to add one MS, one HS, and two “Other” campuses.

Group A did not have time to look at campuses within group 5.

**Group B**

Group B agreed on the campuses presented within groups 1-3. In group 4, they proposed adding a wing to an ES that is projected to have an increase in enrollment over the next several years, instead of replacing the school. They also prosed moving the location of one ES across from its current location. The reasoning given was to give better access to the student on the East side of the major thoroughfare. Also recommended that two other elementary schools be removed from this program.

They also considered adding two other elementary campuses, two additional middle schools, and one “other” campus.

Group B also voiced their support of historic preservations.

**Item 4**

**Closing Statements**

Mr. Peeples closed out the meeting by saying that during HISD’s weekly meeting, their team would discuss next steps for how to approach group 5, districtwide initiatives, athletic improvements, and technology improvements. Additionally put together how both Group A & Bs proposals would impact the cost of the bond.