

**Meeting:** ECASD Referendum Committee

**Date:** July 20, 2022

**Time:** 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Administration Building 137

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marquell Johnson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lori Bica	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil Lyons*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abby Johnson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Johnson
<input type="checkbox"/> Kay Marks	<input type="checkbox"/> Kaying Xiong	<input type="checkbox"/> Kim Koller	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandy Van Vleet	<input type="checkbox"/>

\* Committee Chair

**Guests:** Jason Plante, Ben Holmen, Peter Lacy, Jeff Nestor

The regular meeting of the Referendum Committee was called to order by Phil Lyons at 8:39 a.m. on July 20, 2022.

Quorum was met.

**Notes:** Marisa Pomplun

- **Public Comment**
  - No public present.
- **Approval of Previous Minutes**
  - The minutes from June 23<sup>rd</sup> were reviewed.

Marquell Johnson made a motion to approve the June 23, 2022 Budget Development Committee minutes. The motion was seconded by Lori Bica. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- **Referendum Next Steps**
  - Abby noted that the Facility work group met on Monday and have additional information to share. Slides were shared with the group from the Baker Tilly Survey results from June 23.
  - ATSR provided updated models and options for \$50M, \$70M, \$90M that touch Putnam Heights, Memorial, North, and South. All scenarios include the mandatory and high priority items that need to be done.
  - Question was raised about re-imagining commons area at Memorial High School as something more than just an eating space. What are the other options for use in that space? There are socioeconomic dynamics at play that should be considered when making additional decisions.
  - The additional space at North helps with the capacity issues that will be significant in 2022-23 and beyond.
  - South is a large portion of the budget and making an impactful change the amount would need \$40M in renovations.
  - It was brought to the attention of the group that there is a possibility that we could do two questions. One that is what we need, and the other is the co-curricular options. This election will be a lot about getting people to the polls. There is a potential that question 2 will pass and 1 will not. Could we add even more to the second question to entice other voters? Is it possible to say question two will only pass if question one does?
  - Abby talked to Baird to see what the District could feasibly do. They showed the debt drop in 2031 and shared information on how we could keep our levy flat and how the District could get more money up front for more projects. We would need to do a two-step question.
  - The needs of the District are so significant, and it has snowballed where we can only touch a minimal number of buildings because the needs are so great. How does the District have blue and green caught up so that future referendums can be the purple aspiration items only? Is the target approach better than touching all buildings?
  - The idea of 2 questions for \$70M and \$20M is very intriguing. With \$20M we can elevate our co-curriculars to this level. We are focusing on our must haves.

### Action Items

- If using dollars/cents slide for Board Meeting add a % for survey tolerance
- Send ATSR email to BDC
- Add information to show spaces that address mental health and additional learning (study hall/small group instruction/intervention space)
- WASB Support for referendum moving forward
- Ask Baird for clear interpretation of the table to account for the level tax levy
- Any facility things that could touch Northstar and DeLong for “public” co-curricular spaces
- **Wrap-up Meeting**
  - A future agenda item could be
    - Continuing the referendum work
    - Budget for 5 years flat and 5/10 years for where we anticipate salary and benefits to go
    - Budget with and without ESSER funds so the community can see the deficit of funds

Phil Lyons moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Lori Bica. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.