



## Long Range Planning Committee Meeting Notes

### Meeting 6: Tuesday, December 13, 2016

- **Welcome**

Tim McClure, District Architect & Planner, opened the meeting with welcoming the committee members and reviewing the agenda for the evening. Tonight the committee will get to hear the results of a community survey and work in subgroups to go through a project prioritization exercise.

- **Meeting 5 Review**

Mr. McClure reviewed the items covered in meeting 5. The committee's last meeting covered Long Range Plan discussions, which included school size standards, the district's feeder plan model and future facility forecast. Meeting 5 also included an overview of the prioritization process going to be used by the committee and committee members ranked four factors to use in their prioritization tool. The meeting concluded with a summary of potential projects and small group brainstorm to add any potential projects wanted for consideration.

- **Community Survey Results – Matt Gamble**

Mr. McClure introduced Matt Gamble with Baselice and Associates, who was commissioned by the school district to complete a voter opinion survey to gauge support for potential projects and bond election. Baselice & Associates also completed a similar survey for NISD in planning for the 2012 bond.

Mr. Gamble reviewed the process, methodology and results of the voter opinion survey. The survey was completed November 28-December 1 and interviewed 400 respondents. The respondents were a representative sample of NISD voters. Baselice looks at gender, age, race, geography, partisanship and more when making sure to get a representative sample. It also looked at parents versus non-parents, and made sure to get the correct sample size from Tarrant, Denton and Wise County.

The survey began with some general questions about the district. Respondents gave the district very high marks on their opinion of how the district manages money, their satisfaction of district leadership and their perceived need for more classrooms and schools. Mr. Gamble noted that 67% of the respondents think the district needs more classrooms and schools, which is one of the highest responses he has seen for this question.

Mr. Gamble explained that the survey asked respondents very early before informing them on the potential projects of a bond election, how they would vote if an election were held today. This is called the initial ballot or uninformed ballot. 50% said they would vote for a bond of \$275 million and 32% said they would vote against, with the intense voters being split. The survey also tested three different bond amounts and their associated tax impact. When voters heard the largest amount first, 53% were in favor. This demonstrates that a bond higher than \$275 million has a strong chance of passing and the committee should feel comfortable doing what they feel is best to do to meet the needs of the district.

The respondent was then read a series of bond elements or potential projects and asked if that element makes them favor, strongly favor, oppose or strongly oppose the potential bond. All of the elements read to the respondents received a majority favor.

The respondent was asked at the end of the survey after being educated on the potential projects an informed ballot – now knowing more about it, would they vote for or against \$275 million in bonds. Support rose to 68% in favor, with 27% against. The strongly favor went up to 45%. Mr. Gamble noted that all subgroups were in favor of the bond at the end of the survey, which he often does not see happen. The survey tested support for a second district stadium and natatorium as a separate proposition. There was support for this, but it showed that there was more support for these projects as part of a comprehensive bond package.

Mr. Gamble concluded his presentation by showing which elements of the bond correlated the most with support of the bond. Regression analysis is used to score all the elements. All elements showed to be positive, but he highlighted the top three elements that would be best in communicating the bond package. The top three for the total sample included two elements discussing growth statistics and the projects proposed to accommodate the coming growth. The third element was related to improvements occurring at existing campuses for fine arts programs.

Mr. Gamble summarized his presentation and told the committee that this is one of the best survey results he has presented and they should feel comfortable making decisions moving forward. There were no questions for Mr. Gamble.

- **Deficiency Prioritization**

Mr. McClure then reviewed with the committee the work completed by the district's facilities team, the Huckabee team and the campus principals to define the greatest deficiency needs at each campus using the facility assessment reports as their guide. The teams identified eight key areas of deficiencies for the committee to consider in their project prioritization. The areas include roofing, code compliance, water intrusion, kitchen equipment, MEP systems, flooring, fire alarms and paving repair. Mr. McClure noted that the committee did not need to worry about campus level decisions. The appropriate work needed at each campus will be included based on the areas that the committee prioritizes.

- **Small Group Prioritization**

Prior to the subgroups beginning their prioritization, Mr. McClure reviewed with the committee all the items submitted for consideration last meeting by committee members. He confirmed which items were already addressed in another project or added to the prioritization list for consideration. The committee will see those items on their sheets noted with a "C" for a committee added item.

Mr. McClure then reviewed the instructions for the project prioritization exercise. Each subgroup has a table monitor who will help enter the committee's ratings into the online matrix.

Mr. McClure told the committee they are free to leave upon completion of the exercise and reminded them that the next committee meeting will be upon our return from the holidays on Tuesday, January 10 where we will discuss bonding capacity and tax impact scenarios, project budgets and discuss the results from the committee prioritization.

Committee members spent the remaining time working in subgroups to discuss and evaluate each project for consideration. Project ratings were decided upon as a subgroup and entered digitally by table monitors. Project ratings will be averaged and ranked for discussion next meeting.

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.**