

**Long-Range Planning Committee**  
**April 2, 2019**  
**4:30 p.m.–6:30 p.m.**  
**ESC Board Room**

**“To review the district physical plant, program capacity, enrollment boundaries, transportation routing, and major capital equipment requirements, and determine what improvements to efficiency, sustainability, and infrastructure needs may be required during the next five to ten years.”**

**Attendees:** Terry Davis, Diane Doney, Ralph Dergance, Lucie Stanish, Betty Timmer, Karen Johnson, Crysti Copp, Dana Wedlick, Brian Bostwick, Bill Canterbury, Brett Collins, Dave Culp

**Absent:** Chris Jobanputra, Erick Hartzell, Bob Colwell, Nicole Moyer

**Ad hoc attendees:** Mike Hush, Beth Martin, Jessica Gould, Melissa Cooper, Kathleen Ambron, Diane Leiker

**Consultant attendees:** Shannon Bingham

**Minutes:**

1. Welcome and review agenda
2. Review viable scenarios and total impact percentages
  - a. Look at viable scenarios after reviewing and combining committee’s work
  - b. Enrollment vs. capacity
  - c. There’s not a way to avoid out-parcels south of Dry Creek Rd.
  - d. K-8s
    - i. Symmetric: one big attendance area - all elementary and middle school kids attend the same school
    - ii. Asymmetric: 2 elementary schools feeding a middle school in the K-8; half of the elementary kids come from a partner elementary school nearby.
    - iii. Could consider a K-8 at Powell to fix the out-parcel problem south of Dry Creek Rd.
      1. This could be an asymmetric K-8.
    - iv. We need to have the K-8 discussion to ensure we’ve looked at every option on the table when we are looking at disrupting families.
    - v. To “sell” a K-8 in Littleton, you’d need to have a very strong reason WHY; i.e., this is what we’re going to focus on.
    - vi. Psychology of parents looking at middle school options: they like smaller middle school populations and therefore are attracted to K-8s (per

Shannon's informal interviews with ~1,500 middle school families over the past 5 years).

- e. How do we disrupt as few families as possible?
  - f. Looking at and working through discussions regarding viable scenarios in Shannon's presentation
  - g. Discussion about what members are hearing out in the community about new schools, school locations, etc.
  - h. E7 and M5 and H2 are the scenarios that committee members seemed to score highly, which will affect ~30% of the students at those schools.
    - i. Of the percentages affected, how many will be going to a newly built school vs. an old facility.
      - 1. Shannon will work on this for next time.
    - ii. Have to take at least a couple scenarios to open-house events
  - i. Question about whether having "broken feeder systems" is a deterrent to families choosing Littleton Public Schools
    - i. The only districts in Colorado that don't have some sort of broken feeder system are the rural and/or mountain districts that have one elementary, one middle, and one high school.
3. Suggest/review additional scenarios
    - a. Shannon will be more closely evaluating 5 of the scenarios he brought to the meeting for the next meeting, compiling additional data about what percentage of the affected students will be going to a new school vs. an old facility, what percentage will be going to a new school anyway because they're at a level change, etc.
  4. Criteria scoring exercise
  5. Discussion
  6. Upcoming meetings:
    - a. April 22
    - b. May 6
    - c. June 17
  7. Adjourn