

**MINUTES
JOINT MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 28, 2014
ICCSO EDUCATIONAL SERVICES CENTER – ROOM 142 A**

Present: Chris Lynch (ICCSO), Jim Throgmorton (IC), Rod Sullivan (JC), Coleen Chipman (NL), Terry Dickens (IC), Matt Hayek (IC), Louise From (UH), Laurie Goodrich (C), Michon Jackson (T), Gerry Kuehl (NL), Pat Harney (JC), Tim Kemp (H), Susan Mims (IC), Tuyet Dorau (ICCSO), Janelle Rettig (JC), Mitch Gross (C), Stephen Murley (ICCSO)

(IC = Iowa City; NL = North Liberty; C = Coralville; JC = Johnson County; NL = North Liberty; C = Coralville; JC = Johnson County; H = Hills; ICCSO = Iowa City Community School District; O = Oxford; S = Solon; UH = University Heights; T = Tiffin; CCA – Clear Creek Amana Schools)

Call to Order

Marla Swesey called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

Due to the inclement weather conditions Stephen Murley instructed those in attendance where to seek cover in the event of inclement weather.

Welcome and Introductions

Marla Swesey welcomed everyone and asked elected officials at the table introduce themselves. Pat Harney noted that Supervisors Terry Neuzil and John Etheredge were unable to attend as they were attending an open house.

Attendance Area Development

ICCSO – Superintendent Stephen Murley gave a process update on the attendance area development. Prior to spring break an all community meeting was held to do two things; review the diversity policy and review Board Policies Appendix 5. Appendix 5 talks about parameters to consider when looking at attendance zones and those in attendance were asked to help prioritize those parameters as high, medium, or low. Cluster meetings started after spring break with two clusters; one to look at elementary schools in the northwest quadrant, and one to look at elementary schools in the southeast quadrant. Both clusters followed the same format where there were three meetings. At the first meeting individual tables took the parameters that were prioritized as high and rank ordered them 1-7. They were then given a blank map and asked to use the diversity policy mandates and the ranked parameters from Appendix 5 to draft changes to current attendance zones. The maps were brought back to the group and through an iterative process they looked at two successive maps and made suggestions for changes. The last meeting for both clusters was last week. Changes have been made on input through both of those meetings in addition to input received electronically either through email or on Engage Iowa City website. Administration met with principals today to look at maps to make certain they were accurate based on the feedback received. The new maps will be posted online either Tuesday or Wednesday. When the maps are online there will be a message sent out to parents and staff as well as a post on the website encouraging them to go online and look at the maps and use either email or Engage Iowa City website to provide additional feedback. That will be open for about a week. The next Board meeting is May 13, 2014 so the opportunity for feedback will be closed next Wednesday to allow time for any needed changes so the maps can be included in the Board packet. The Board will consider them at their meeting on May 13, 2014.

Administration was also working on secondary schools and had the first meeting for that. At the first meeting community members suggested that the second and third meetings be held off until after there were more finalized maps for the northwest and southeast elementary quadrants as articulation patterns were being looked at. The second and third meetings were postponed a week and will now be held on May 12, 2014 and May 21, 2014. The hope is to

bring the secondary map to the Board on May 27, 2014. Most people are interested in having elementary schools feed junior high schools and junior high schools feed high schools and not splitting them up.

Tuyet Dorau (ICCSA) stated that the May 13, 2014 Board meeting is also a meeting where the Board is going to decide on its process and although they are going to see the maps it does not necessarily mean the Board will be approving any boundary changes at that time.

Matt Hayek (IC) asked how elementary would be integrated with secondary, if an elementary approach would be locked in, and if the secondary would bring cause to look at the elementary again. Murley stated at the secondary meeting their concern was they were working with current attendance zones and the elementary zones may change. They were not interested in splitting up an elementary school in terms of where it went. Given that sentiment they wanted to see what the new attendance zones looked like before they decided where they would be sending those elementary schools to junior high or high school.

Murley stated all of the information for the entire process is on the district website. Mitch Gross (C) inquired if the attendance area development is a result of the diversity policy or the facilities master plan. Murley stated it is both. Murley stated there is the diversity policy and the facilities master plan and administration went to the Board in October to look at one potential draft for doing attendance zones. The Board determined there were too many instances of rezoning so administration went back and developed larger clusters and that is where the five sets of clusters came from. That transpires over the course of the next six years and they tried to align it as close as possible with the facilities master plan.

Murley stated the next round of elementary schools is Horn, Borlaug, and Weber and then two new elementary schools, north and east, coming on line in 2019 so the northeast and the northwest cluster will go through redistricting as those new schools come on line.

Facilities Master Plan Update

ICCSA – Superintendent Murley reported that South Elementary is slated to open in fall 2015 with a building capacity of 500. The design work is ready to go, dirt is ready to be moved, and work is taking place to extend the road Daniel Place so parent traffic comes in off of south Sycamore. The District is also working with the City to build an additional gym at South. One of the things learned through partnerships with the cities is that there needs to be better segregation between community space and school space for a utilization of safety standpoint. The design creates the ability to lock down the instruction area and leave the facility open for community use. Matt Hayek (IC) stated facility use involves heavy staff interaction and expressed appreciation for the ongoing communication. Murley reported the District has worked to create a standardized 28E agreement so there is a synchronized template that standardizes the process.

Jim Throgmorton (IC) asked Murley to talk about the building naming process. Murley stated the Board has a naming policy and there may be one joint process that allows multiple people to participate to name all three schools simultaneously.

Murley reviewed the timing of the rest of the schools stating East Elementary will open in 2017 but will have no name at that time as it will in serve a transitional role to house students for Lincoln, Longfellow, and Mann as work is done on those schools. Lincoln and Mann will move together to East Elementary for one year while work is done on their buildings and then Longfellow will move to the site for one year to allow work at their building. East Elementary will open for students in fall of 2019 at the same and North Elementary construction is completed. The High school is slated to open in 2017.

Budget Adjustment Update

ICCSA – Superintendent Murley stated there is a Board requirement of administration to maintain an unspent balance of 5% and the District will fall below that this fiscal year. In order to maintain that same unspent balance at the end of the next fiscal year requires a budget adjustment of \$3.6 million. The District will still be below that unspent balance

requirement and through discussions with the Board at a work session in January it was proposed that we ladder back up to that 5% unspent balance over time by FY2019. This is similar process to what was done in the 2010-2011 school year. The opening of the new schools was built into the budget plan. One of the challenges is setting allowable growth in a timely manner. Another challenge we have as a state is funding education and right now we rate 37th in the country in per pupil expenditures which presents a challenge. We have lobbied for use of excess dollars available to help play catch up and get some of the funding dollars put back into education. We are fortunate in the greater Johnson County to have legislators who understand that and we are fortunate that we are a growing school district and are expected to grow by 300 students per year for the next ten years. In Iowa schools are funded on a per pupil basis so as the student population grows income grows. We are looking at a one-time budget adjustment to maintain and get back to the 5% unspent balance.

Coleen Chipman (NL) inquired what the excuse was of legislators not in favor of funding allowable growth when state revenues and reserves have been high. Murley stated they said it is too hard to predict future income. Tuyet Dorau (ICCSA) stated that by law if they don't have reserves allocated it goes back to property tax relief.

Jim Throgmorton (IC) asked for clarification of how the District is spending money building and yet cutting programs. Murley stated that Iowa has a very progressive funding model for public education. Most states get all of their money in one bucket however in Iowa money comes in many discrete buckets. We get money from one-cent sales tax, money from SAVE and PPEL, money from instructional support levy, and money into the general fund. Each fund has specific parameters of where you can spend the money. The money shortfall for the District is in the general fund which funds the instructional programs. The money for infrastructure needs come from SAVE or PPEL and cannot be used to hire teachers and pay for instructional costs.

Gerry Kuehl (NL) stated one of the questions he gets from the community is how the shortfall in the general fund happened in a growing district. Murley stated in Iowa there is spending authority where the state says this is how much money you can spend per pupil and then based on whether you are a property rich or a property poor district they will provide you state aid and then you levy the rest of it against your local property taxpayers. Regardless of how much property value you have in your community you can only spend a certain amount of money. Coupled with that is the allowable growth piece and in the last decade there have been two years where the allowable growth hasn't been at least 2%. One year it was 0% and another year it was 1%. If in those two years they would have just set it at 2% we would have \$12 million more in spending authority than we have right now which would allow us to collect more state aid or levy additional tax dollars. We will never get those dollars back and although we are a growing school district we are limited by spending authority. Tuyet Dorau (ICCSA) stated that in 2010 there was a 10% across the Board cut and the District received federal stimulus dollars and Ed jobs dollars, which are one-time dollars, and decided to use a large portion of those dollars for continuing costs.

Janelle Rettig (JC) inquired what the schools funding would be at this point if they would have set allowable growth for 2016 at 2%. Murley stated that as a school district in Iowa your fund balance cannot be below zero. The District determined that they don't want next year's fund balance to be below this year's fund balance predicated on 2% allowable growth. Had they set allowable growth at 4% or 6% that would have been guaranteed income and we might have been able to go to the Board and say there is a little more wiggle room. There is no guarantee that there is even the 2% and the legislature can come back and zero us out. Janelle Rettig (JC) inquired if it comes in higher would the District be able to reinstate programs. Murley stated there are a couple of options with that. It would give the opportunity to grow back towards that 5% unspent balance sooner and it could also give the opportunity to look at programming.

Chris Lynch (ICCSA) stated he believes the facilities master plan is more important now given the current budget challenge simply because we have local control over PPEL and SAVE funds and with that money as we renovate our schools and use the PPEL dollars to make them more efficient, we can get rebates that can go into the general fund.

Citizen Concerns – Re: Roads in the vicinity of the new high school

County – Pat Harney (JC) stated they have been getting a lot of feedback from residence in the area about increase in traffic, increased road capacity, and who will improve the roads, pay for it, etc.

Murley stated MPO did their traffic analysis in January so there is some idea of what the road load would need to be. The MPO did the analysis as the district got ready to look at that parcel of property so the District could look at it from a standpoint of making sure that as they go through the design for that, they can take in to account what anticipated traffic would be from students and extra-curricular activities that take place after hours and on the weekends.

Pat Harney (JC) inquired if the analysis also looks at possible traffic going into the Iowa City/Coralville area vs. just what the school would generate? Murley stated it does.

Gerry Kuehl (NL) stated the North Liberty City Administrator, the Coralville City Administrator, and some individuals from the county and secondary roads department are meeting on a regular basis so the road situation is resolved. He knows there is also an agreement with the City of North Liberty as to who will pay for those roads as that area develops. He asked Ryan Haier if it was correct that it is going to be developer driven for those off roads. Ryan Haier (NL) stated the City of North Liberty is working on a 28E agreement with the County as to who will maintain what roads into the future.

Jim Throgmorton (IC) encouraged all municipalities, including Iowa City, to think about land development patterns around all new schools because there is nothing inevitable about the growth in traffic as traffic volume depends on land development trends.

Nancy Goeken expressed concern that there would be serious accidents unless North Dubuque Street is upgraded to make it safer and stated she and those who live in the area would like to see concrete plans as to what is going to happen with the traffic flow.

Janelle Rettig (JC) stated she was on the MPO website and saw the 2012 update and is not aware of the January update. Kent Ralston, MPO, stated the current study is in final draft format and basically what that means is it is based on assumptions that came from the school district. Once it is in final version it will be posted to the site. Rettig stated that previously she was in on the first meeting with Coralville and North Liberty and the shock about where the schools were going and that the county was not consulted about the high school going on a rock road. What was also talked about was it was not known at that time where the population of students would come from. She inquired if it was correct that what MPO has is mostly a draft and they are waiting on the school district to provide more information. Ralston stated that is mostly correct but said he would call it final draft as they have not received any more information that would keep them working on it. He stated the study was based on best assumptions and until it is know where the traffic will come from it cannot be finalized. He stated that at the request of North Liberty they added information of what the area around the school would look like in 2040 and the crux of the study is that there are definitely spot improvements necessary. Rettig stated she would like to see the analysis on the website now and that what Ms. Goeken expressed is that people who live in that area aren't residents of Coralville, Iowa City, or North Liberty and they feel like the growth of urban area is all the sudden in their back door. Rettig stated the county does not have a nickel budgeted for any of the roads and in fact they aren't even in the ten-year road plan. The county has been realtively clear that the problems of urban growth on those roads is an urban city issue and will have to be driven by development. She stated the residents have every right to be wondering these questions and she sees no harm in posting the draft the website now.

Colleen Chipman (NL) stated the cities, schools district, and county need to work together to find a way to address the problem including identifying potential federal and state funding sources.

Daryl Graner stated those who live in that area understand these roads and stated that in their view it is unconscionable to put a high school out there with novice drivers on the roads they way they are. He stated that in opening a high school in 2017 they are several years behind in this process and the road situation should be in line. He further stated that if the

school is open and the roads aren't done something bad is going to happen and if it is because of inertia, the people in this room are responsible for that.

Other Business

Marla Swesey (ICCSA) stated that today's agenda was mostly regarding ICCSD and with the redistricting, diversity policy, and growth of the schools she thought it was a good opportunity to share a copy of an article about communities taking a role in their housing development plans. She distributed the article.

The next joint meeting will be held on July 28, 2014 at the new city hall in Tiffin.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.