Comprehensive Planning Committee
MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting:	March 2, 2026
Location:	Boardroom, JSSC, 2407 LaPorte Ave
Time:	7:00 – 9:00 a.m.

In Attendance – (* indicates new member)

- Traci Gile – Lead Asst. Supt., Co-chair
- Dave Montoya – Facilities/Operations
- Kristin Stolte - PASE
- Carey Christensen - Principal, High School
- Erin Coy – Integrated Services
- Krista Campbell – PEA
- Cris Fierro – PEA *
- Erik Eckhoff – PEA *
- Joni Baker - ACE
- Sandra Martinez Gurrola - LCE
- Kirk Samples – Principal, Elementary
- Josh Richey – Principal, Middle School *

- Brian Gustafson – Finance
- Starr Hill – Principal – Alternative/K-12
- Sarah Everley – Parent, FRHS Feeder
- Nikki Scalia – Parent, PHS Feeder
- Megan Kaliczak Edler – Parent, RMHS Feeder
- Sarabeth Lundquist – Parent, FCHS Feeder
- Brett Hansen, Parent, TMHS Feeder, Co-Chair
- Matt Liberati – Community Member
- Elliot Parks – Community Member *
- Kendra Neal – Parent, WMHS Feeder
- Becca Benedict – Early Childhood Admin *
- Sonja Ballstadt – Admin. Assistant, Recorder

Absent Committee Members:

- Brittany Pearce – Community Member

Special Guests:

- Jessica Zamora – President, BOE

Context/Intent of Committee

- Exists to support the district's long-range facilities planning efforts.
- A standing committee that will continually monitor and evaluate facility utilization, boundaries, and the possible need for new school facilities or large-scale renovations in the future.
- To study and evaluate how facilities are utilized in PSD and propose recommendations for effective and efficient plans for the future.

Desired Outcomes

- Alignment on data for current and future enrollment.
- Evaluation of current and future utilization.
- Factors that would define when a change to facility utilization may be warranted.
- Agreement on relevant facts.
- A process for designing and supporting a committee recommendation.

Agenda & Meeting Notes

- *Introduction of new committee members:*
  - Becca Benedict – early childhood admin (new).
  - Josh Richey – principal, middle school (filled open position for middle school).
  - Elliot Parks – community member (replaced Amanda Penley).
  - Cris Fierro – PEA (new).
  - Erik Eckhoff – PEA (new).

- *Review Committee Agreements:*
  - Review agreements with new committee members.

- *Goals:*
  - **The Comprehensive Planning Committee (CPC) aims to develop a district policy for Board of Education (BOE) review.**

  - Review other **external FCB policies** for primary criteria.
    - Definition
      1. **Primary** criteria – Identification/Process (facilities efficiency and policy).
      2. **Secondary** criteria – Execution/Implementation (desired future state).

  - **Plus/Delta** on external policy review.

  - **Understand and align on utilization approach.**
    - Summary of utilization approach and industry standards.
    - FCB data transparency dashboard example (Jeffco).
    - Strategic Regional Analysis (Denver Public Schools).

  - **April CPC Meeting:** Review draft district policy; review for changes and consensus.
    - Emphasize **collaboration** – BOE not "hands-off"; committee to apply criteria in recommendations.

  - **May 12 BOE Meeting:** Present the final draft to the BOE.

  - Establish a **clear, collaborative** district process that supports the BOE governance and Superintendent execution.

- *Tasks/Scope:*
  - o **Develop criteria** for the recommendation process.
  - o Committee will **apply** the criteria, **not** just name specific schools.

- *Policy FCB (Facilities):*
  - o **Policy types to mirror FC model:**
    - ▪ **Board Policies:** Includes the district ends, executive limitations, governance process, and board-superintendent relationship. These policies **provide the vision and direction** of the district for the superintendent to implement.
    - ▪ **District Policies:** Policies that are implemented under the board policies' **guiding principles**. About half of these policies are reviewed and approved by the BOE and half are reviewed and approved by the superintendent.
      1. **F Policies:** District policies governing facilities planning and development.
    - ▪ **District Regulations:** More **detailed procedures** to further explain district policies. These are generally updated by the superintendent (but there are a few that are approved by the Board).

  - o **District Policy Objectives:**
    - ▪ Applied, collaborative, inclusive process.
    - ▪ Involve others.
    - ▪ Put value in the policy – may not show up on matrix (example: programs).
    - ▪ Transparent.
    - ▪ Support BOE's efforts with clear timelines, definitions, and criteria.

  - o **Study External Policies as a Table Group – Generate Plus/Delta:**
    - ▪ **Douglas County School District**
      1. FCB – Douglas County.
      2. FCB-R – Douglas County.
      3. Douglas County Pairing Matrix.

Plus	Delta
● Clear **timeline** (e.g., 240 days), **step-by-step,** and required **public comment** (min. two BOE meetings).	● **Phase** clarity: specify "what happens when" within timeline.
● Process for **public outreach**.	● Is there enough **opportunity**?
● Attempts to **address the big picture** (people first, emotional connection).	● Consider a **longer runway** (e.g., 600 days) for major decisions.
● Comprehensive, **not ranked** criteria; **matrix-based analysis** (incl. feeder, programs (center-based, ELL, Newcomers, transportation).	● Add detail on **evaluating outcomes** post consolidation.
● **Naming, defining** the data being considered.	● Improve specificity in **data definitions** and handling **alternative schools**.
● **Multiple** considerations beyond utilization. **Future-focused** criteria.	● What does **"accommodation of program"** needed mean? ▪ Integrated services, center-based programs, ELD, McKinney, Preschool.

	● Clarify **boundary adjustments, qualitative data use,** and alignment between **BOE policy** and **Supt. procedures**.
● **Criteria**: holistic approach.	
● **Quantifying** occurs within their policy FCB-R	● Distinguish **school closure vs. consolidation** process.
● **Glossary**; definitions for closure vs. consolidation.	● More **definition** around **evaluation of consolidation results**
● Emphasis on **feeder continuity, cohorts, walkability, safety, local resources,** and **financials.**	● Reassess whether **utilization** should be the **first**/primary metric.
● **Boundaries and transportation** are vital pieces to the puzzle.	● **Order of criteria** in FCB-R.
● Considering **grade configurations** (K-8, K-6).	● **Collaboration** with city/county officials.
● Assigns **responsibility to Superintendent** for application; includes **benefits of consolidation** and **community focus**.	
In the Middle	
● Transportation cost/engagement; student diversity/cultural/emotional needs.	

- **Thompson School District**
  1. FC – Thompson School District – School Utilization Process.
  2. FCA – Thompson School District School Closure.
  3. FC-R – Thompson School District School Closure Requirements.

Plus	Delta
● Clear **utilization and inclusive capacity** language; calls out **under & over** capacity.	● Over-focus on **metrics** and **utilization only;** needs broader criteria.

● **Visual timeline**; regular check-ins; **Oct. 1 rolling check** for underutilization for next year, describes what goes into **each phase. Ongoing.**	● Clarify **permanent structure** (modulars?), **classroom definition, instructional program** scope.
	  ▪ Is Early Childhood a program or level?
	  ▪ CTE, Integrated Services, Newcomer.

● **Suspension** of closure timeline.	● Reconsider **thresholds**; add **demographic bubbles;** avoid punitive tone in **suspension criteria**.
● Names **groups/collaborators**; highlights **transportation**, **inventory, ripple effects** (choice-in vs. zoned).	● **School closures vs. ranges** – tone/voice. Would like something more applicable over time (possibilities, closure).
● Calls out a process for the move and **operations planning** (objects, classrooms, specialized spaces).	● Spell out **over-capacity** handling; including **boundary** adjustments.

● **Metrics in BOE policy**; repeatable, long-term; defines **ideal services levels**; includes **move plan**.	● Clarify **decision authority** (Supt. vs. BOE) and end-to-end process gate from **consideration to closure**.
● **Defining** underutilized.	● **Staff meetings** – who is leading these meetings – decision makers need to be present.
● **Utilization levels** – percent vs. building capacity, number of classroom tracks.	● Improve **community engagement**, address **timeline sweet spot**.
● **Informing** community at large and named cohorts.	● **School closure** – principal at new consolidation should be given the year to **prepare** for the next school year.
● Immediate criteria **accessible**.	● Ideal **service level** should be 75-85%.
● Initial evaluation – any **specific programs** in place at the identified school need to be accounted for.	● **Question** the percentages on if they are the right ones – don't have a feel for this either way.
● How want to **use** buildings.	● **Collaboration** with city/county officials.
In the Middle	
● Transportation cost/engagement; student diversity/cultural/emotional needs.	

- *Consensus Check on Criteria* (22 members present + one BOE member who voted, excludes Carey C. & recorder = 23 total):
  - **Ideal Utilization targets** (examples from other school districts):
    - 90% or greater (Denver Public Schools).
    - 75% or greater (Thompson School District).
    - 70% or greater (National Standard).
    - 60% or greater (Boulder Valley).
      1. **Note:** The Cost of "Empty Seats": Current 2026 estimates suggest it costs approximately $6.00 to $8.00 per square foot annually to maintain, heat, and cool school space.

  - **Primary Criteria (Identification):**
    - **Utilization** *(Yes=21; No=2; 23 total votes;* *91% consensus**)*
      1. Requires clearer **definition** and **threshold**.
      2. Should prompt **boundary change recommendations** when appropriate.
      3. Recommendation in **draft** policy.

    - **Building Condition** *(Yes=21; No=2; 23 total votes;* *91% consensus**)*

    - **Enrollment Trends – Current/Future** *(Yes=23 total votes;* *100% consensus**)*
      1. Include buildable lots and housing turnover dynamics in preparing projections.

    - **Enrollment Trends – Historical** *(Yes=6, No=17; 23 total votes; consensus is 26% Yes and 74% No)*

- o **Secondary Criteria (Execution/Implementation):**
  - ▪ **Proximity to Other Buildings** *(Yes=23 total votes; 100% consensus)*

  - ▪ **Cohorting – Preservation** *(Yes=23 total votes; 100% consensus)*
    1. Keep school communities intact as much as possible (whole-to-whole).
    2. Ensure receiving school can handle 100% of additional students (or define a threshold).
    3. Consider ripple effects for **School Choice**.
    4. **Feeder** integrity.
        - ➢ Some elementary schools split feeder middle schools.
    5. Ensure we provide **Federally mandated programs** to achieve graduation goals.

- o **Additional Criteria (to be revisited in April):**
  - ▪ **Programming:** Center-based programs; ELL/Newcomer; Integrated Services; Early Childhood.
  - ▪ **Equity:** Adopt a definition; clarity measurement and application.
  - ▪ **Safety/Access/Traffic:** Walkability and transportation implications.
  - ▪ **Feasible Timeline:** e.g., 240-600 days; phase clarify; principal input for move planning.
  - ▪ **Feeder**
  - ▪ **Class Sizes – ranges (value):** Title vs. non-Title schools, difference at middle schools, hard to have strict numbers.

- ● *Thresholds:*
  - o Principals are reviewing **school maps** to update capacity/utilization.
    - ▪ Updated numbers are expected for **April** meeting.

  - o Should we use **% utilization, student count bands** (e.g., 400-700), or **tracks** of classrooms?
    - ▪ Definitions, something in district policy?
    - ▪ Early Childhood considered?
    - ▪ Programs count?
    - ▪ Has a school ever been at 100%?
      1. Yes.
      2. How many more than 4 track? It depends on how the school was built by design.

  - o **School Choice:** Schools not offering seats for school choice when at 95% utilization.
    - ▪ Manage how utilized.
    - ▪ Something to add in the district policy if needed.
    - ▪ Choice in/choice out – does come into projections and inform the future.

- *Roadmap & Process Notes:*
  - General agreement that the road **map makes sense**, but there's **disconnect** between some groups – more alignment needed.
  - Emphasize **transparent, phased community feedback** (public BOE meetings, district communications, principal/school newsletters, FAQ's, mailbox, survey consideration).
  - Share progress and artifacts: **Update BOE regularly**, share **project plan**, consider **sharing principal survey** results.

- *CPC Project Plan – Community Engagement*
  - Reviewed chart with committee on what has been completed and still in progress for community engagement.

- *Action Steps (Next Steps):*
  - **Draft District Policy:**
    - Include criteria.
    - Community feedback.
    - District website FAQ's from BOE and social media.
    - Survey?

  - **Share out?**
    - Update to BOE.
    - Share project plan?
    - Principal survey – can this be shared?
    - The more communication, the better:
      1. District newsletters.
      2. Every BOE meeting.
      3. Principals communicate with their communities via school newsletters.
      4. Appreciate level of transparency from Supt.

- *Next Meeting:*
  - Monday, April 6, 2026, 7:00 – 9:00 a.m.

Comprehensive Planning Committee Meeting Dates (* added meeting dates)

Date	Time
April 7, 2025	7:30 – 9:00 a.m.
June 13, 2025	7:30 – 9:00 a.m.
August 25, 2025	7:30 - 9:00 a.m.
October 13, 2025	7:30 - 9:00 a.m.
December 8, 2025	7:30 - 9:00 a.m.
February 2, 2026	7:30 - 9:00 a.m.
March 2, 2026 *	7:00 – 9:00 a.m.
April 6, 2026	7:00 - 9:00 a.m.
May 4, 2026 *	7:00 – 9:00 a.m.
June 8, 2026	7:00 - 9:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.
# # #