

**Tomball Independent School District**  
**Student Growth & New Facilities Sub-Committee**

**November 8, 2012**

**Minutes**

Chairperson SueAnne Wake called the meeting to order promptly at 6:30 p.m. She stated the minutes from the November 1 meeting had been posted on the website and emailed to members. The minutes were approved.

The chairperson introduced Mr. David Schuelke, Assistant Superintendent for Ancillary Services, to address specific information requests from last week's meeting. The first item centered on the location of special programs at each campus. Dr. Blair provided a list of both elementary and secondary campuses that designated the programs for Bilingual students, prekindergarten students and special education students. Acronyms for special education programs are: SLL (Structured Learning Lab), PPCD (Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities), PALS (Practical Application of Life Skills), and PASS (Positive Approach to Student Success).

Mr. Schuelke provided a handout to committee members that included the slides he referenced in his Power Point presentation. He described the present feeder patterns of the district and noted the proposed campuses were not yet included, explaining that rezoning does not occur until the new schools are built. A question was posed as to whether or not the split that occurs where some Tomball Intermediate students go to Willow Wood and some go to Tomball Junior High would be fixed. He indicated that he planned for it to be addressed during the next rezoning.

Mr. Gary Hutton, the Director of Construction, reviewed enrollment projections and explained the building order of the proposed campuses. He also reviewed the construction schedule, referring to a power point slide. He indicated the various phases of construction, noting that an elementary usually takes a little over a year, but a junior high takes 19 to 20 months. Construction timelines are tight and are affected by many variables. The construction schedule is available on-line.

Mr. Hutton also reviewed the schematics indicating the location of the portable buildings that will be moved to Northpointe, Canyon Pointe, and Creekside Forest. Portables will have a canopy and a ramp. Approval of the moving of the portable buildings will go to the school board next week. After approval is granted, the portables will be moved as early as December but definitely by early spring.

A member asked how many classrooms each portable provided. Each portable provides two classrooms. Another member asked what happens to portables when they are no longer needed. Mr. Hutton explained they are usually left in place and used for storage, but in some areas where regulations dictate, they are removed. He also mentioned the ones at Canyon Pointe were already stubbed in for data.

Mr. Hutton indicated the building capacity information is also posted on-line. He explained the difference between design capacity and operational capacity. A member asked if there was a chance of moving up the construction date of the school to relieve Canyon Pointe since its capacity was expected to exceed 900 shortly. Mr. Schuelke answered the projected numbers in the southern part of the district were not as clear, development was planned but had not started to occur. On the other hand, in the Creekside area, homes were being built and projections from The Woodlands had been very dependable. He also stated the district would not want to open a school in the middle of the year, nor could the district afford to build all of the proposed new campuses at one time. A member stated a concern about the safety and security of portable buildings. Mr. Hutton answered that the district uses site fencing to limit access and security cameras are in place. Mr. Schuelke shared that portable buildings are temporary and it is the desire of the district to get the students into the main building classrooms as soon as possible. The question was posed in regard to the operational capacity at Canyon Pointe being able to handle 1,000 students when enrollment exceeds that number and the example of the cafeteria was given. It was indicated that it would be snug, but that areas (i.e. stage) could be utilized.

A question was asked regarding school finance and how much revenue that we bring in actually goes back to the state. In response to this question, Mr. Neubauer stated that the state does not take any of our money. From the Maintenance and Operation side we do not necessarily get to keep all of the money, but we do keep the money from the taxes and as taxes increase the funding we receive from the state goes down. The exception is on the debt service and that is taxed separately and used to pay our debt from previous bonds. There is a .50 capacity on that and the district will not go over that because it would leave no room for future growth. He shared that right now our revenue increased by 13%, more than any other district around us. All of the debt service taxes stay in the district and keep us from having to raise the tax rate as much in order to pay off the debt. He stated that as the custodian of the tax payers dollars he would not allow it to go straight up and straight down but only have small increases if necessary. He shared that it would be extremely difficult to start all four schools simultaneously as it would require front loading the bond. He explained that building new schools would be first priority and the other things would be pieced out over a 5 year period in order to control the tax rate.

A committee member asked why we would not use the grade 5-6/7-8 model in CFES. Mr. Hutton explained that in order to accommodate future growth, a 6-8 model would prevent the need for adding a fourth K-6 campus.

Sue Ann Wake asked the committee if they were satisfied with the requests for information and the members acknowledged they were. She stated that last week the committee had come to a consensus that 4 buildings were needed and the committee agreed that they were still good with that decision. She explained that the final goal of the committee is to submit a report to the Steering Committee. She shared a draft that she created and asked for the committee to add any additional concerns they would like to see addressed. Issues included zoning and the need for it to all be done at the same time, flexibility in design to accommodate future growth and renovations, security issues for portable buildings and keeping grade levels separated in the grades 6-8 campus. She shared that she would

compile the report and since the committee has already come to a consensus no further meetings would be necessary. She will email the report to the committee members and make any needed additions or changes and attach the November 8<sup>th</sup> sign-in sheet as documentation. It was asked that each member reply saying they received the report to be sure that all reviewed and approved it so that the report could be finalized by Thursday, November 15<sup>th</sup>. The meeting was adjourned.