

March 13, 2009

Bill Hanson
Independent School District 709
215 North First Av. East
Duluth, MN 55402

Dear Mr. Hanson,

We are in receipt of your February 24, 2008 letter.

We are disappointed in the District's lack of legitimate and timely response to any of our petitions, and your unilateral decision to proceed with a review process without consulting with Let Duluth Vote (LDV) on our Plan B. This is only the latest step by the District in your myriad of blockages you have taken to disenfranchise the citizens of Duluth; and in its apparent desire to stop the required development of LDV's Plan B that was directed by the Attorney General.

On March 21, 2008, LDV submitted a petition for the District to consider our Plan B and to require a vote. This was nearly one year ago!

The District took legal action to declare the petition invalid with no consultation or informing LDV of their actions. About three month later, the District finally sent the petitions and their legal opinion that the petition was invalid to the Attorney General.

On August 20, the Attorney General submitted an opinion disagreeing with the District and stating that they could not conclude that the petition was invalid.

On August 27, the District stated:

“an election would probably occur early in 2009—certainly no later than Spring 2009”.

It took the District three more months, until October 20, to even communicate to LDV:

“I am writing to invite you to meet with us in the coming week, so that together we may begin addressing the procedural steps that need to be taken:

1. The hiring of an outside consultant chosen with the approval of Let Duluth Vote - to assist in the development of a detailed plan. The school district will assist in the process as you wish, and will also pay the consultant's fees.”

LDV met with the District on Nov. 18 and a procedure and format was agreed to on how to proceed.

On Dec. 4 LDV submitted to the District a suggested RFP in the proper format to proceed with addressing the proper review of the LDV Plan B plan. This plan would have hired professional by Dec. 16.

On December 18, the District said they would not use the LDV RFP because they claimed it was inconsistent with the LDV petition. Despite clear and concise documentation that the RFP submitted by LDV was in fact consistent with the petition, the District stopped any further discussion with LDV.

On February 24, the District sent LDV another letter where they stated that they are moving forward unilaterally with their “Plan B” which is different from what LDV petitioned for. LDV will not participate in developing that Plan.

But the District also stated that they would develop another “Plan D” that they claim will accommodate the LDV Plan. LDV will participate in this Plan.

But on March 9th, before the response deadline to your February 24th letter, the District again unilaterally moved forward with a very convoluted RFP’s and with no consultation with LDV.

Though such obstructionism of the District has been beyond believe, LDV will ignore that and participate in preparing a “Plan D” (LDV’s Plan B) in hopes that the District is genuine in its intent to move forward and improve the quality of the Schools. If the District is genuine, LDV must be a full partner in this endeavor; and that does not mean giving us 15 minutes of time to give a statement to the School Board as stated in the District letter. LDV looks forward to working with the District in developing what they are now calling Plan D (LDV’s Plan B), but there are three conditions that must be met:

1. LDV will need a representative appointed by LDV to be a fully participating member of your selection panel to hire professionals to develop Plan D (LDV’s Plan B);
2. The LDV representative must approve the selected professionals, and
3. The LDV representative will work as a fully participating member with the District on the resultant contract administration and with the selected design professionals to develop the Plan D (LDV’s Plan B).

As a start to outlining your Plan D (LDV’s Plan B), attached are LDV’s preliminary write-ups. You will recognize this as our Plan B RFP that we had submitted to the District on Dec. 4. In summary: this Plan is in two stages: Phase I will have nineteen school buildings being operated and repaired. Phase II will proceed in five to ten years and after an evaluation of the Phase I progress by a peer review Blue Ribbon panel.

Since Dec. 4, LDV has put together a LDV Plan B subcommittee to audit the JCI facility assessment and the JCI educational adequacy. Attached are their audit numbers as they reflect a more accurate estimate of what the LDV Plan B might cost. This will serve as better numbers to estimate the LDV Plan B than did the Dec.4 document. These numbers are only estimates for Phase I of Plan D (LDV Plan B). LDV has repeatedly requested sufficient information from the District in order to help them prepare the LDV Plan B, but the District has refused or has stated that there is no information. Professionals hired as part of this process must redo all the numbers.

While these attachments may not answer all of your questions, this is the extent of our ability to give more thorough answers because we have not been given any information nor do we have sufficient expertise. This is why we are looking forward to developing the Plan D (LDV Plan B) in conjunction with the District.

LDV is looking forward to meet with you in the next week to proceed with our selection panel.

Attachment 1



RFP # LDV 001

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR DATA ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION, AND SYNTHESIS REQUIRED FOR THE REVIEW AND COMMENT DOCUMENT OF
*LET DULUTH VOTE'S TEN-YR FACILITIES PLAN B:
AN EDUCATION-DRIVEN ALTERNATIVE TO THE RED PLAN***

All responses are due by 2:00 p.m., **December 16, 2008**

I. BACKGROUND:

It is the goal of all of our Duluth Public Schools to help every student succeed, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or income. We work to provide an environment where all children and adults involved in our schools feel safe and welcome. Our responsive classroom programs help our students develop the skills they need to be successful academically and socially. We work to create efficient and effective systems to maximize our human and financial resources, and to keep the majority of those resources focused on the classroom. Our school buildings and grounds play an important role in facilitating our overall education system goals.

Independent School District #709 (hereafter call the District) has approximately 2,400,000 square feet of building floor area. The District owns property at 24 different sites totaling approximately 360 acres, including some undeveloped land. The average age of our existing buildings range from the original section of Lincoln Park, built in 1889, to a media center addition to Homecroft Elementary School in 2005.

Since first developed in 1996, the School Board has annually updated a Ten-Years Capital Facilities Maintenance and Repair Plan (2006 Plan lists 414 deferred maintenance items). In 2007 the District underwent an extensive evaluation and the reports summarizing that work are listed on the www.duluth.k12.mn.us/ web site under Long Range Facilities Plan. Of particular interest are the 1600 items identified in the facilities assessment study, the demographics study, and the educational adequacy study. These reports form the informational data base on which plans for the Long Range Facilities Plan were based. Educational services required for ISD709 students have been recently evaluated and may require more detailed planning to meet specific objectives (Vision of Excellence 2012). Work has already been completed to up-grade Stowe and Lakewood Elementary schools to meet the present Long Range Facilities Plan adopted in 2007. A petition to revise the Long Range Facilities Plan has been accepted for review and comment, and for public vote by special election.

The District recognizes that to properly manage our school properties and buildings we must have strategic plans for how our buildings are constructed, updated, maintained and preserved.

Plans must be comprehensive on both a short and long term basis, and must recognize financial resources are limited. Plans must also consider and achieve reasonable equity with regard to facilities serving similar grade configurations from one area of our community to the other. The Duluth School District continually strives to improve and update its long-range facilities plans, and at this time is seeking the assistance of an outside group to work with and develop a Review and Comment report (as defined by 2008 MS 123B.71) supporting the Let Duluth Vote- Ten Year Facilities Plan, hereafter referred to as Plan B, copy attached.

Plan B was developed in response to a Let Duluth Vote petition that funding for an alternate plan to the Long Range Facilities plan (Red Plan Option) be voter approved. Plan B provides for an education-driven facilities plan for the Duluth Public Schools focusing on teacher and program funding being the highest priority, for the betterment of Duluth's students. A Plan B "review and comment" document must be prepared and submitted to Mn Dept of Education before a special election may be conducted.

II. SUBMITTAL SCHEDULE:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Request for Proposals issued | December 5, 2008 |
| 2. RFP due | December 16, 2008, 2pm |
| 3. Short list of firms notified | December 19, 2008 |
| 4. Oral Interviews | December 22, 2008 |
| 5. Firm Selected | December 23, 2008 |

Data and information requested in Plan B is to be made available on the date the firm selection is made or before scheduled for use in creating the draft final report.

III. SCOPE OF SERVICE:

A professional design consulting service proposal is requested to draft a Review and Comment Document for Plan B, Phases I and II, responsive to the Let Duluth Vote petition requesting a special election to approve funding. The consultant shall work closely with Let Duluth Vote, in developing the necessary informational data bases in fulfillment of Plan B for the purposes of creating the Review and Comment document required by Minnesota Statute 2008-123B.71 and associated case law.

The above referenced reports (Background) will be reviewed for accuracy. Access will be provided to all facilities for inspection. All ISD 709 data relevant to energy studies, previous and planned maintenance, savings studies, previous transportation studies, and other ISD 709 related data and information to be assessed and evaluated for relevance, completeness and accuracy.

It is expected that much of the required data is available in the above referenced reports or will be made available upon request. If significant data gaps are identified, or if up-dating of available studies is required, supplemental support requested for meeting these needs will be evaluated on an as-needed basis, and contract change-order supplements will be available and approved to provide the required new data or information.

The new Plan B utilizes existing building design capacity by reconfiguring grades in two phases. The first phase is between years 1-5 and a second phase in years 6-10. Buildings are to be maintained and kept up-to-date, providing a safe, welcoming, supportive environment which will be sustained with \$1.7 million per year using available funding for maintenance and repair. Nineteen school buildings will be operated during Phase 1.

During Phase I, Elementary Schools will house grades Pre-K through Sixth grade. Middle Schools will house grades 7-9, and existing high schools will house grades 10-12. Required repair/up-grade construction will proceed so as to minimally disrupt classroom teaching. New STC courses will be incorporated into remodeled high schools to meet present and future programming needs, as determined by and with community and regional inputs.

Phase II will begin with the reevaluation of building needs by the academic peer review, and Blue Ribbon community panels, conducted during years 1 -4 of Phase 1. Phase 2 , as presently planned, will integrate Middle School programming and functions into the existing three High School sites after remodeling and upgrading of the high schools is complete in Phase 1. At completion, High School grade configuration will be 9-12, and middle school wings, complete with aquatic centers, will be build at each of the three high school campuses, with separate entrances/exits for 7-8 grades of the middle school additions. Phases 1 and 2 are best implemented in serial sequence for planning and evaluation to occur but could be implemented in a shorter time period (during year 5 rather than during year 10) if alternate community uses were to be found for the existing three middle school buildings. Phase II work is to be planned so it could be conducted either serially or concurrently with Phase I.

Professional services shall be provided which include the requirements for submittal to the Commissioner of Education, per MN Statute 123B.71, Subd. 9, including the following:

- (1) the geographic area and population to be served, preschool through grade 12 student enrollments for the past five years, and student enrollment projections for the next five years;
- (2) a list of existing facilities by year constructed, their uses, and an assessment of the extent to which alternate facilities are available within the school district boundaries and in adjacent school districts;
- (3) a list of the specific deficiencies of the facility that demonstrate the need for a new or renovated facility to be provided, and a list of the specific benefits that the new or renovated facility will provide to the students, teachers, and community users served by the facility;
- (4) the relationship of the project to any priorities established by the school district, educational cooperatives that provide support services, or other public bodies in the service area;
- (5) a specification of how the project will increase community use of the facility and whether and how the project will increase collaboration with other governmental or nonprofit entities
- (6) a description of the project, including the specification of site and outdoor space acreage and square footage allocations for classrooms, laboratories, and support spaces;

estimated expenditures for the major portions of the project; and the dates the project will begin and be completed;

(7) a specification of the source of financing the project; the scheduled date for a bond issue or school board action; a schedule of payments, including debt service equalization aid; and the effect of a bond issue on local property taxes by the property class and valuation;

(8) an analysis of how the proposed new or remodeled facility will affect school district operational or administrative staffing costs, and how the district's operating budget will cover any increased operational or administrative staffing costs;

(9) a description of the consultation with local or state road and transportation officials on school site access and safety issues, and the ways that the project will address those issues;

(10) a description of how indoor air quality issues have been considered and a certification that the architects and engineers designing the facility will have professional liability insurance;

(11) as required under section 123B.72, for buildings coming into service after July 1, 2002, a certification that the plans and designs for the extensively renovated or new facility's heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems will meet or exceed code standards; will provide for the monitoring of outdoor airflow and total airflow of ventilation systems; and will provide an indoor air quality filtration system that meets ASHRAE standard 52.1;

(12) a specification of any desegregation requirements that cannot be met by any other reasonable means;

(13) a specification, if applicable, of how the facility will utilize environmentally sustainable school facility design concepts

(14) a description of how the architects and engineers have considered the American National Standards Institute Acoustical Performance Criteria, Design Requirements and Guidelines for Schools of the maximum background noise level and reverberation times.

Refer to the Governing Principles and Concepts section of Plan B for inputs into the required components, 1-14, above in the report chapters. A draft report containing all 14 chapters must be completed by March 31, and a revised final report by April 15, 2009 responsive to peer reviewers comments. Progress report meetings are to be scheduled every two weeks through out the time period of the project. LDV representatives will be invited to attend and participate in all meetings and inspections when consultants and ISD 709 staff meetings are held.

Additional Services: As a separate line item in the proposal, responders to this RFP shall include architectural services in the role of the representative for ISD #709 during design phases and construction if Plan B is approved and implemented. The design professional shall represent the Owner as an agent who will review designs, meet with architects and other consultants, review change orders, meet with contractors during construction. The architect shall act as construction advisor to ISD #709 for the entirety of Plan B. Costs for these services are to be provided in sufficient detail for comparison and evaluation purposes.

IV. STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS:

1. The cover sheet should contain: the date submitted, title: **RFP # LDV 001 for Professional Services Relating to LET DULUTH VOTE'S TEN-YR FACILITIES PLAN B: AN**

EDUCATION-DRIVEN ALTERNATIVE TO THE RED PLAN, your firm's name, address and telephone number of the firm making the proposal, and the name of the contact person responsible for the proposal.

2. Identify the team who will be assigned to perform services required for various aspects of the project. Include the education, degrees, professional registration, license number, and resume of experience for all principle team members. If multiple firms or individuals are joining for this project, please indicate the name of a person who is the most likely to perform the role of lead project manager (the person who will be directly responsible for organizing the major elements of the work and serve as the District's primary contact).
3. State your firm's or individual experience in performing this type of service, with special emphasis on governmental and school district projects. Include the name, address and telephone numbers of school districts for which you have performed similar services.
4. State all direct or indirect relationships with any individual or firm presently contracting with or having other connections to ISD 709, that may be seen as a conflict of interest, or may give the appearance of a conflict of interest. List all personnel and their possible conflict(s) of interest or appearance of a conflict of interest with ISD 709 or firms connected with ISD 709 or other organizations where conflicts exist or may arise.
5. State the Fee your firm believes will be reasonable for providing the services outlined above in Section III for each of the 1-14 items, individually, and separately, for "Additional Services." If any of the 1-14 are not included, state how the omitted work would be done to complete the report by March 31, 2009.

V. ANTICIPATED PROJECT APPROCH:

1. Provide a maximum five (5)-page statement to describe the approach your firm will take in completing this project. Please summarize all phases, organization, and basic processes needed for each of the 1-14 items/chapters required.

VI. SELECTION PROCESS:

Please include six (6) copies of all documents submitted in response to this RFP. Your responses should consider that the District has established the following Evaluation Criteria:

- a. Related project experience, with emphasis in the Duluth area..
- b. Firm's ability and capacity to perform the work.
- c. Anticipated approach to completing this project.
- d. Consultants or specialty in-house staff resources.
- e. Proposed time schedule for proposed service.
- f. Fee for providing the services outlined in Section III.

A selection committee will review Statements of Qualification and Anticipated Project Approach statements and evaluate them based on the stated criteria to determine a short list of firms. The selection committee will further investigate references, samples of other projects, local offices,

and may invite firms on the short list for interviews. In ranking the firms, the District intends to place greater emphasis on a firm's experience, qualifications and project approach.

VII. STATEMENT RESPONSE CONSIDERATION:

The District reserves the right to accept or reject any or all statements or proposals received if such action is deemed in the best interest of the District.

VIII. QUESTIONS:

Submit written questions to:
B. Anderson c/o Kerry Leider,
Property and Risk Manager, ISD #709
215 North First Avenue East
Duluth, MN 55802

IX. STATEMENT/PROPOSAL DELIVERY by 2:00 PM Dec. 16, 2008:

Submit All Responses in Writing to:
Purchasing Supervisor, ISD 709, Rm 317
215 North First Avenue East
Duluth, MN 55802

ATTACHMENT - RFP LDV #001

LET DULUTH VOTE'S TEN-YR FACILITIES PLAN B: AN EDUCATION-DRIVEN ALTERNATIVE TO THE RED PLAN

Copyright © 2008 All Rights Reserved LDV

Review and Comment Draft 12.01.08

A Ten-Year Facilities Plan designed for quality education in three traditional Duluth School District corridors, featuring one high school campus in each, with an integrated middle school on the same site, and the retention of four existing, neighborhood elementary schools in each corridor. Grade configurations will be changed to match educational programs promote efficiency and provide subject choices for students.

Teacher and program funding is the highest priority. Existing schools will be updated to:

1. Complete all deferred maintenance (based upon an existing but updated 2006-08 “Ten year Facilities Plan”),
2. Implement safety, health and ADA (Americans with Disability) requirements,
3. Meet Minnesota educational standards, and
4. Purchase city park land easements for site access/green space (and to prevent it from potential sale for development).

Plan B contemplates the building of three middle school additions (including aquatic centers) on each high school campus, two new elementary schools, and up-grades to all other elementary schools, and secondary technical classes to be housed in each of the high schools. One consequence of the plan will be the freeing up of current Red Plan building funds for classroom operations and/or a property tax reduction from the District’s facilities tax levy by 2019. Savings in transportation and energy costs are anticipated by revising the current Long Range Facilities Plan.

GOVERNING PRINCIPLES AND CONCEPTS:

1. Funding Priority – Rather than build first and determine afterwards what education to provide as is the case with the current LTFP (Long Term Facilities Plan) the LDV Ten-Year Facilities plan will maximize funding for teacher support and educational programs to benefit students. The financial needs of the community will be considered while meeting the educational needs of students and do so by a responsible allocation of resources. Additional teachers and smaller class sizes are needed, and changes will be made so as to minimize disruption of students during building repairs and upgrades. The following is a list of priorities to be funded by the Ten-Year Facilities Plan:

- A. Promote parent involvement, responsibility, and community involvement by maintaining neighborhood schools.
- B. Implement early childhood education and close achievement gaps for disadvantaged learners by providing all-day, every-day Kindergarten programming in all elementary schools.
- C. Discourage bullying and encourage civility by adopting programs such as the *Responsive Classroom*, *Second Step*, and *Restorative Learning* from K-12 in all schools.
- D. Retain and continue zero-hour, seven-periods at all Jr. and Sr. high schools.

E. Implement secondary technical programming in all three city corridors at Jr.-Sr. High Schools with community input for selection of courses offered, and lower travel costs, safety and convenience. Include "small learning communities" and magnet opportunities to expand choice.

F. Extend and intensify magnet and immersion programming for K-6 to include music, math/technology, and reading/languages and to reduce segregation and foster multi-cultural understanding. Consider auto, aeronautical, marine, environmental, health, business, internet technology, and life skills service related educational needs for secondary level programming.

G. Intensify involvement of students with co- and extra curricular programs. Each high school would maintain its own varsity teams. Also broaden opportunities for families and encourage school buildings use for community activities.

H. Maintain average class sizes at 23, 27, and 29 students for K-6, 7-9, and 10-12 grades, respectively. Better integrate state and federal programs. Promote staff hiring/training for dual licensing in both general and specialty subject areas.

I. Implement and maintain peer review of all programs and curricula needs bi-annually, to assure best practices and cost effectiveness. Bring in reviewers with no conflict of interest in evaluations (like for instance the Education Dept., UW-Eau Claire); also conduct a local "blue ribbon" panel to regularly review the community's educational needs and student outcomes.

J. Enhance the Educational Programs by: Implementing the Bill & Melinda Gates Program Objectives found in "Rethink High Schools" which demonstrate that 1. "Smaller is better." Set high school enrollment at the most desirable enrollment level of 600-800 students, and 2. Increase the emphasis on early childhood education.

K. Maintaining three city corridors with neighborhood schools will minimize travel distances for students and parents, and help justify the building of walkways and bicycle paths while promoting healthy exercise. Encouraging the use of the DTA (public busses) will assure student access to zero hour, and co-, and extra-curricular activities and parent's access to and participation in student conferences.

L. Peer review and blue ribbon panels will constantly monitor student achievement during the construction of Plan B. Report findings and recommendations for program needs and facility upgrades and changes needed to close achievement gaps and increase student achievement.

2. Time Lines for Transition - The new Plan B reconfigures grades in two phases the first between years 1-5 and a second phase in years 6-10. Buildings are to be maintained and kept up-to-date, providing a safe, welcoming, supportive environment which will be sustained with \$1.7 million per year using available funding. Nineteen school buildings being operated during Phase I. It is anticipated that at a minimum the first phase of Plan B will require \$85 million leading to a maximum expenditure for the first ten years of \$128 million. This compares favorably with the cost estimates of \$205 million by Johnson Controls for basic repair and upgrade to state standards.

A. During Phase I elementary schools will be Pre-K through Sixth grade. Middle Schools will be for grades 7-9 while existing high schools will be for grades 10-12. Construction will proceed so as to minimally disrupt the classroom. New STC courses will be developed and space is assigned in remodeled high schools.

B. Phase II will begin with the reevaluation of building needs by peer reviewed, blue ribbon panels. Phase II could proceed to build two new middle schools at both the Denfeld and East High School sites for grades 7-8. These additions could include aquatic centers. At the Central High School campus site, the existing STC space would be remodeled into a 7-8 grade

middle school also with an aquatics center. STC programs would be relocated to all three high school campuses thereby avoiding the inefficient use of time to transport time to shuttle students to a centralized site.

C. In phase two, 7th and 8th grades could be integrated into existing high schools so that these students could make use of integrated into high school buildings to take advantage of richer programs including STC courses and athletic facilities.

D. Each Integrated High School campus would have a new middle School wing (with separate entrance/exit for younger students) complete with an aquatics center for water related courses, sports and activities. Younger students will be kept separated from older senior high students, where needed.

F. Build two new elementary schools at MacArthur and Lincoln Park, on existing sites. The school campus would be expanded by purchasing easements for adjacent city-owned land (requiring up to \$5 million by 2019) thus guaranteeing additional green space by taking the land of the market.

G. Expand partnership with UMD and establish a partnership with the Medical/Health Research Industry to sponsor joint teaching-intern programs utilizing excess capacity at Woodland, Ordean, and Morgan Park school buildings, and keeping all facilities open for community activities and neighborhood use. Sixteen school buildings will be operated at the end of Phase II, and unused space in three or four buildings will be assigned to alternate uses, per review panel recommendations.

3. MDE review and comment; data needs - A single Review and Comment document in envisaged containing the work needed to achieve both Phases I and II. If serial rather than concurrent implementation is chosen by the review panels for Phase II, then, a separate Review and Comment document may be needed, at that time, to implement Phase II, for the new buildings.

Data and related information is to be obtained from MDE (Minnesota Department of Education) reporting from ISD 709, and other research available from MDE and ISD 709. This is a request for government data and information and is submitted in support the LDV petition for special election in the production of the required review and comment document.

In addition, this request is made under the legal mandate of Minnesota Data Practices statutes, and MS 13.03, which provide for full and complete access to government data and information. A complete viewing of the requested information is requested before any costs are incurred in copying the requested information, data, or documents.

The following specific ISD 709 government information, data, reports and data compilations are requested:

A. Provide staffing information, suggested scheduling and training information and costs estimates achieve the 5-yr programmatic objectives outlined in No. 1 of the Governing Principles and Concepts section, A thru K (above), and separately, for achieving the Vision of Excellence 2012 goals and objectives. Detail the number of students in each specialized program and the cost per student per specialty offered.

B. Provide all corrected and additional information submitted in support of the Aug. 8, 2007 ISD709 Review and Comment document, in electronic format. Include all financial data, and highlight changes in funding authorizations and explicit reasons for those changes.

C. Provide a complete physical description of each school building site, and all itemized use and unit cost data for each building listed on pg 3 of Facilities Assessment (Overview, Dec. 2006, JCI) in electronic format. Separate water cost from natural gas cost used for heating water. Expand table to show units of specific utilities used, and cost per unit of individual utility type used. Show assumptions used for calculating utility savings in making specific improvements to each building, including increased numbers of students to maximum building capacity.

D. Provide information necessary to update 2006 Ten-Yr Facilities Report with new surveys from Inspec Inc. for roofing and all other water problem and leakage areas, and those studies contributing to potential energy decrease that could lead to guaranteed cost savings, if improvements were preformed by the successful competitive bidder, all in electronic format.

E. Show student enrollment for each building by grade, gender, special ed, pre-K, all-day K, early childhood, head-start, and individual minority type (as defined by MAR 3535.0110 for "protected students") for school years for the past 5-yrs: years 2003-4, 2004-5, 2005-6, 2006-7, 2007-8, and projections, by year, to 2013-14, all in electronic format.

F. Show transportation costs for the same years as in E. for students for each school building, itemized showing quantity of fuel used, cost per unit of fuel, number of busses and drivers, and numbers of driver hours paid, and their rate of pay, and overtime. Show time schedule for each school for arrival and departure for all students, by individual school. Show savings if buildings were staffed from 6:30 AM to 5:30 PM to permit parent transportation options. All information to be provided in electronic format.

G. Show optimized transportation cost and schedule changes to F. that would result from changing grade configurations to elementary to K-6, middle schools to 7-9, and high schools to 10-12 for Phase I. Show the proposed changes for Phase II where elementary schools are K-6, and middle and high schools are integrated to grade configuration 7-12, for three destination sites, Denfeld, Central, and East Jr-Sr High Schools. All in electronic format.

H. Provide a list of school buildings that were studied for all or part of environmental testing data (including but not limited to: water, air, temperature, humidity, particulate, asbestos, mold, bacteria, viruses, toxic substances, food contaminants, and any other data relevant to student hygiene) and for other ISD709 buildings. Copies of original test data are requested on original data forms, if used. Summary and synthesis of data is requested as well and all data and reports are to be in electronic format.

I. Provide a list of items and electronic copies of all information synthesized and developed in accordance with the JCI-ISD709 Master Agreement, dated Jan. 29, 2007, (and list subsequent contracts and reports received) and provided to ISD 709 in electronic format as stated in the Master Agreement. Include itemized lists of community meetings, attendance records, inputs resulting from each meeting, and summary and data synthesis of all meetings, all in electronic format.

Attachment 2

Plan B Estimated Costs Based on the auditing of "Major Capital Expenses" that were used by JCI and ISD 709

Building	Plan B Facilities Defects List. Audited JCI, 2006 Phase I	Plan B Educational Inadequacies, Audited Gibbs	Plan B Total Estimated Costs
Central HS*	\$ 4,146,806	\$ 6,299,384	\$ 10,446,190
Congdon Park	\$ 3,425,395	\$ 1,564,340	\$ 4,989,735
Denfeld HS	\$ 10,614,866	\$ 4,582,928	\$ 15,197,794
East HS	\$ 6,077,723	\$ 4,630,841	\$ 10,708,564
Facilities Mgmt.	\$ 2,327,979	\$ -	\$ 2,327,979
Garfield	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grant	\$ 1,879,541	\$ 470,390	\$ 2,349,931
HOCHS	\$ 3,543,335	\$ -	\$ 3,543,335
Homecroft	\$ 3,334,327	\$ 694,535	\$ 4,028,862
Kenwood	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lakewood	\$ 1,329,319	\$ -	\$ 1,329,319
Laura MacArthur	\$ 5,759,328	\$ 860,370	\$ 6,619,698
Lester Park	\$ 4,090,139	\$ 1,735,360	\$ 5,825,499
Lincoln Park	\$ 5,273,707	\$ 840,140	\$ 6,113,847
Lowell	\$ 1,363,484	\$ -	\$ 1,363,484
Morgan Park	\$ 3,471,083	\$ 1,951,430	\$ 5,422,513
Nettleton	\$ 1,604,874	\$ 179,010	\$ 1,783,884
Ordean	\$ 3,667,326	\$ 2,111,186	\$ 5,778,512
Piedmont	\$ 1,463,959	\$ 102,000	\$ 1,565,959
Rockridge	\$ 700,363	\$ -	\$ 700,363
Stowe	\$ 1,798,773	\$ -	\$ 1,798,773
Transport.	\$ 874,093	\$ -	\$ 874,093
Woodland	\$ 3,997,471	\$ 2,186,506	\$ 6,183,977
Totals**	\$ 70,743,892	\$ 28,208,420	\$ 98,952,312
*includes STC	Legitimate building defects per LDV. Includes HVAC repair, heath and safety, accessibility, Code compliance, structural, food prep	These audited "Educational Adequacy" numbers were originally computed by an unlicensed architect in violation of MDE Guidelines and Minnesota law and thus must be redone by qualified architects.	Plan B audited facility defects plus audited Gibbs' Educational Adequacy (yet to be verified).

These numbers are based on a preliminary review, by the citizen's group, Let Duluth Vote, of the JCI and ISD 709 "Facilities Assessment Report" dated December 2006. This has been undertaken to show the need for an independent facilities assessment, and due to refusal of the ISD 709 to verify and supply any engineering analysis or documentation. Such an independent assessment of facilities is required to fully develop the Plan B. Though thought to be accurate, a thorough independent engineering analysis must be done to verify these and the JCI numbers.