



FINAL REPORT

Jefferson County School District R-1

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

November 5, 2021

Moss Adams LLP
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 302-6500



MOSSADAMS

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	1
A. Background and Scope	1
B. Results	1
II. Background Information	6
A. Jefferson County Public School District Overview	6
B. Jefferson County Public School District Capital Improvement Program	6
III. Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	7
A. Objective	7
B. Scope	7
C. Methodology	8
IV. Evaluation Results	9
A. Expenditure Management and Controls	9
B. Master Planning and Project Estimating Controls	13
C. Adherence to Design and Construction Budget and Schedule Reporting	17
D. Bidding and Procurement Procedures	31
E. Change Order Reporting and Controls	36
Appendix A: Interviews Performed	41
Appendix B: Summary of Results	42
Appendix C: 2018 and 2021 Flipbook Budget and Scope Analysis	46
Appendix D: Flipbook and System Generated Budget Analysis	62
Appendix E: Districtwide Project Allocation	85
Appendix F: Sub-Project by Status	89
Appendix G: Project Timeline Analysis between 2018 and 2021 Flipbook	108
Appendix H: Construction Contractor Procurement	120
Appendix I: Architect Procurement	128



I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

Jefferson County (Jeffco) School District R-1 (the District) is one of the largest school districts in Colorado, and serves a geographic area of approximately 800 square miles with a current enrollment of approximately 86,000 students. In fall 2018, the District successfully passed Bond Ballot Measure 5B providing the District with \$567 million to invest in its Capital Improvement Program. These funds were earmarked for predetermined school construction, renovation, and improvement projects throughout District schools and facilities.

The District requested an evaluation of its 2018 Capital Improvement Program (Bond Program) at the chronological midpoint of the program. The intent of this evaluation is to inform the community and enhance confidence and trust in the Jeffco Public Schools 2018 Capital Improvement Program. Moss Adams conducted the Capital Improvement Program evaluation in accordance with the Standards of Consulting Services established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

This report presents the results of the Capital Improvement Program evaluation completed by Moss Adams LLP (Moss Adams) for the Jeffco Public School District R-1's 2018 Capital Improvement Program. Our evaluation addresses the questions specified within the request for proposals (RFP) for this evaluation, which are outlined below, include our recommendations, and cover the following areas:

- Expenditure Management and Controls
- Master Planning and Project Estimating Controls
- Adherence to Design and Construction Budgets
- Bidding and Procurement Procedures
- Change Order Reporting and Controls

B. RESULTS

Commendations

A number of successes in the Bond Program to date were noted in stakeholder interviews. Some of these items are captured below:

- **Project delivery:** Staff report that the District has an efficient process to deliver projects at a reasonable rate despite challenges that have arisen as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, including supply chain interruptions and labor shortages. In some cases, the District was able to take advantage of empty schools while students were learning remotely and complete projects sooner than anticipated.
- **Project reach:** District stakeholders report satisfaction in the Bond Program's reach across the Jeffco community—all schools were able to receive some type of upgrade that was funded by the program. School communities are reportedly pleased about improvements and how the improved facilities reflect the District in their local communities.



- **Parent engagement:** The District created community committees, typically comprised of parents, for each school site to help inform design and priorities. Additionally, school sites often conduct ribbon-cutting ceremonies when projects have been completed. Both of these activities present opportunities to effectively engage local communities in the 5B Bond Program.
- **Improved reporting:** CAAC and Board of Education members report that District staff have made enhancements to Bond Program reporting, which promotes greater clarity on project-specific information. For example, starting in 2021, CAAC reporting provided project-specific budget-to-actual information based on system data.
- **Economies of scale:** Because the Bond Program consisted of a number of similar projects (i.e., paving, reroofing) across school sites, the District was able to take advantage of economies of scale to get advantageous bids for these projects. This likely resulted in cost savings for the Bond Program as a whole.

Expenditure Management and Controls

For the fiscal years through June 30, 2021, bond proceeds were used only for listed purposes under Ballot Measure 5B. However, two of the 96 sampled program expenditures did not have the appropriate approval documentation. Additionally, the District did not have formalized policies and procedures related to its administrative cost allocation, including which salaries or other administrative costs are allowable as well as how that allocation is determined. Finally, the District has not required the completion of an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program, which contradicts the requirements set forth in the bond language.

Recommendation 1	The District should continue to evaluate all projects and expenditures for compliance with bond measure language as well as ensure the appropriate approvals are secured for all expenditures.
Recommendation 2	The District should consult with its bond counsel to determine what labor allocation components are allowable per bond measure language and incorporate the results of this consultation into Board-approved policies and procedures to support compliance.
Recommendation 3	<p>A. The District should commission and complete an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program.</p> <p>B. In addition, the District should consider completing an annual independent performance audit of the Bond Program to ensure funds were only spent on allowable uses and address any other concerns related to Bond Program efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency.</p>

Master Planning and Project Estimating Controls

District leadership reported that the 5B Bond Program was developed based on the 2016 Master Plan and an internally generated project list. However, the total facility deficiencies identified in these plans, as well as other planning documents provided by the District, were not commensurate with the budget for the Bond Program and did not align with the 2018 Flipbook, which was the primary communication tool to convey the approximate scope and budget of the Bond Program to voters. The 2018 Flipbook also did not reconcile to the total bond issuance or key documents that were deemed foundational to establish project scope and budget.



Recommendation 4	<p>A. To promote transparency and accountability, the District should ensure that all foundational documents and reporting align and can be reconciled; updates should be readily apparent in reporting documents through sufficiently detailed project descriptions.</p> <p>B. The District should define and document processes in place for master planning budgets and estimates, including when to utilize these procedures (e.g., thresholds), who is responsible for each activity, procedures for final approval, and stakeholder communications to report variances over time.</p>
Recommendation 5	<p>The District should ensure that there is clear and consistent reporting that provides stakeholders with accurate information on the budget, cost, duration, and scope of projects funded through the Bond Program, with clear reconciliation the total bond issuance value and other funding sources such as general fund transfers and bond premiums.</p>

Adherence to Design and Construction Budget and Schedule Reporting

The CAAC relies on Board Policy GP-13 to understand its role, responsibility, and authority. Additional guidance related to Bond Program oversight or reporting expectations should be provided to the Committee to support its role in Bond Program oversight.

Using District system-generated information, we compared the total project budget by each site to the 2018 and 2021 Flipbooks. This analysis revealed two primary issues: a) 14 projects were included in the system but not identified in either Flipbook; and b) the system-generated budgets exceeded the site-specific budgets included in the Flipbooks by between \$109,757,271.17 and \$136,488,124.17.

When assessing system-generated original and actual budget data, we found the following:

- Completed projects had a variance of \$46,903,796. Of all completed projects, 52.1% exceeded their original budget and 18.8% exceeded their original budget by \$500,000 or more.
- In-progress projects have a variance of \$45,618,624, 53.3% of all in-progress projects are expected to exceed their original budget and 19% are expected to exceed their original budget by \$500,00 or more.

Based on Bond Program and District system records through June 30, 2021, there is adequate capital to cover planned projects; however, this will require spending \$27,476,798 in bond premium.



Recommendation 6	<p>A. The District should establish committee bylaws and a handbook to provide guidance related to authority, expectations, and reporting practices to the Board of Education.</p> <p>B. In addition, as a best practice, the District should consider adding officer (chair and vice chair) positions to the CAAC to support accountability, set agendas, and serve as a primary liaison with District leadership.</p>
Recommendation 7	<p>A. The District should develop policies and procedures surrounding design and construction budgets to ensure consistent estimating, reporting, effective controls, accountability, and communication of the Bond Program.</p> <p>B. Bond Program and management reporting to stakeholders, including the CAAC, Board of Education, and community, should be updated to accurately provide details on all projects as well as changes to project budget and scope from original expectations communicated to the voters.</p>
Recommendation 8	<p>In addition to <u>Recommendation No. 7</u>, the District should develop and provide specific reporting to help stakeholders understand budget and scope variances.</p>
Recommendation 9	<p>In addition to <u>Recommendation No. 7</u>, the District should report schedule information for each project that includes the original schedule, project milestones, current schedule, recovery schedule (if applicable), and a documented rationale for any material schedule delays to key stakeholders including the CAAC and the Board of Education.</p>
Recommendation 10	<p>A. The District should separate the contingency and premium funds into two separate accounts and establish policies and procedures related to when funds can be pulled from either contingency or premium fund balances, including approval authority.</p> <p>B. With community involvement, the District should develop a prioritized list of capital projects that could be funded with remaining bond funds.</p>

Bidding and Procurement Procedures

The District selected contractors utilizing a prequalified list of contractors; however, bid tabulations or evaluations for the selection and award of the projects were not available. Additionally, documentation was not available to demonstrate the selection process and awarding of professional services from the prequalified list of consultants. While the District awarded all construction projects to local construction contractors, as defined by District staff, the District does not currently have Board of Education-approved policies and procedures that define what constitutes a “local” construction contractor or objective, weighted criteria for giving preference to local contractors during the selection process.

Recommendation 11	<p>As a best practice, the District should maintain bid tabulation and evaluation documentation to support the bid evaluation, selection, and award process.</p>
Recommendation 12	<p>As a best practice, the District should establish and incorporate definitions, objective criteria, and weighted scoring for local construction contractors within approved bidding and procurement policies and procedures.</p>



Change Order Reporting and Controls

While amendments and change orders over \$500,000 were approved by the Board of Education, the District does not have policies and procedures specific to the change order process (i.e., review process, thresholds, approval process, approval levels, etc.). The District defaults to the generic FEG-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure. Additionally, it appears that two change orders were not approved at the appropriate level, and we were unable to identify itemized supporting documentation for nine change orders. The change order reporting provided did not include many of the components identified as a best practice including change reason, description, original contract amount, change amount, percent of change, revised amount, budget and schedule impact, and revised completion date. Additionally, we were unable to verify comprehensive change order reporting is being provided to the CAAC, Superintendent, or the Board of Education.

Recommendation 13	As a best practice, the District should consider formalizing change order policies and procedures to define the process for receiving a change order, the minimum elements to be included within change order documentation, the review process to be followed, the approval process with approval thresholds, and change order tracking and reporting to key stakeholders.
Recommendation 14	As a best practice, the District should establish Board-approved policies and procedures that define the components of change order reporting to key stakeholders.



II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT OVERVIEW

Jefferson County (Jeffco) School District R-1 (District) is one of the largest school districts in Colorado, and serves a geographic area of approximately 800 square miles with a current enrollment of approximately 86,000 students. The District employs more than 14,000 full-time, part-time, and casual staff members. Employees include teachers, bus drivers, food service workers, custodians, support staff, office personnel, and administrators. The District has 84 elementary schools, six K-8 schools, 17 middle schools, 17 high schools, 12 option schools, 15 charter schools, one online school, one career/tech ed school, and two outdoor laboratory schools. Jeffco has a total of 155 schools and many programs on 168 campuses.

B. JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

In Fall 2018, the District successfully passed bond Ballot Measure 5B providing the District with \$567 million to invest in its Capital Improvement Program. These funds were earmarked for predetermined school construction, renovation, and improvement projects throughout District schools and facilities. Specifically, Jeffco Public School District intended to use these funds to:

- Add and expand career/technical education facilities
- Upgrade safety and security equipment in school buildings
- Repair, renovate, equip, and reconstruct buildings to ensure our schools are safe, efficient, and accessible to all students, including those with disabilities
- Construct, furnish, equip, and support needs in buildings and classrooms at all schools in the District, including charters

Specific projects included in the Bond Program included:

- Build three new schools
- Replace three existing schools with new buildings (demolition of an older facility and construction of a new building on the current site)
- Complete 23 major additions to existing school facilities

As of June 2021, approximately \$461 million has been invested or committed through near term contracts in these improvements. By the end of the 2020-21 school year, the District will have invested over \$325 million in school renovations, new buildings, and numerous improvement projects. Completed work includes:

- Renovation and installation of 14 turf fields and all-weather tracks
- One brand new elementary school building
- Four school additions
- Replacement of playground equipment at 18 schools
- Building renovation projects at 24 schools
- Replacement of furniture, fixtures, and equipment at 16 schools



III. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

A. OBJECTIVE

The Jeffco Public School District requested an evaluation of its 2018 Capital Improvement Program at the chronological midpoint of the program. The intent of this evaluation is to inform the community and enhance confidence and trust in the Jeffco Public Schools 2018 Capital Improvement Program.

Moss Adams conducted a financial and management evaluation of the Capital Improvement Program to identify opportunities for improvement in the process, policy, or communication related to project scopes and budgets, project identification, and oversight. This engagement was performed in accordance with the Standards for Consulting Services established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Those standards require that we develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on the mutually agreed upon scope of work for the exclusive use of Jeffco Public School District R-1. We believe sufficient relevant data has been discovered to support our basis for conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation objectives, scope, methodology, and a summary of the findings are included as part of this report.

B. SCOPE

Moss Adams conducted a financial and management evaluation of the 2018 Capital Improvement Program, focusing our analysis on addressing the following questions specified within the RFP for the engagement:

1. Did Jeffco spend the money on the projects as promised within the parameters of the ballot question?
2. How and when were projects identified and how and when was that communicated to voters?
3. What projects have been completed as of June 30, 2021?
4. How did the District establish project scopes and budgets?
5. What procurement processes did the District use? Did procurement processes align with District Policy?
6. Did completed projects adhere to predetermined budgets, and if not, how were those variances accounted for? Are in-process projects proceeding on budget and timeframe plans?
7. Does Jeffco have processes to evaluate and approve change orders, increases in cost or scope, release of contingency funds and other construction process issues?
8. How were project changes communicated through or authorized by the organization to ensure appropriate oversight by the Capital Asset Advisory Committee (CAAC), the Superintendent, and/or the Board?
9. What projects are planned to be initiated, bid, and completed in fiscal year 2022? Is there adequate capital to cover those improvements?
10. Did the District fulfill its commitment to a preference for local construction contractors?



11. How did the District accomplish this commitment in the bidding process?
12. Did such commitment impact the cost of District projects?
13. Did the District limit the bond proceeds to capital improvement projects? Are there any extraordinary expenses to be explained (i.e. salaries or other)?
14. How has the program been monitored by the CAAC? How was the CAAC tasked with “monitoring” the program? What direction was given to them? What role do they play in reviewing and approving projects or project changes? Do they make recommendations or report out to the Superintendent and/or Board? If so, when?
15. The bond program is discussed in the District CAFR. Should there be an independent audit of the bond program by an external consultant.
16. What are the greatest successes of the program so far?
17. What improvements or modifications can be made to the program implementation as it moves forward?

The results for each of these questions is included in [Appendix B](#).

C. METHODOLOGY

Our approach to the evaluation of the Jeffco Public School District 2018 Capital Improvement Program included planning, fieldwork, interviews, documentation of evidence to support findings, analysis of options, recommendations, and high-impact reporting.

Activities unique to our evaluation of the Capital Improvement Program are provided below. Our project approach was conducted in the following four major phases:

- **Start-Up and Management.** This phase concentrated on comprehensive planning and project management, including determining who will be interviewed, what documents will be reviewed, what on-site observations and walk-throughs will be performed, when results will be shared, and how we'll report on project status.
- **Fieldwork.** This phase included documentation review, transaction testing, walk-throughs, observations, and interviews. We obtained the most current information available and powerful insights from the District's personnel.
- **Analysis.** Based on firsthand input gained during fieldwork, we evaluated the importance, impact, and scope of our assessment findings in order to develop solution options and recommendations.
- **Reporting.** This phase concludes the project by communicating findings and recommendations in both draft and final reports.



IV. EVALUATION RESULTS

A. EXPENDITURE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROLS

Expenditure management places its focus on outcomes and sees expenditures as a means to produce outputs which are needed to achieve desired outcomes. Due to this orientation, expenditure management highlights the importance of having the right processes lead to the desired outcomes. This requires a balance between autonomy, flexibility, and accountability. Agency must be given to those completing the work for them to produce the outputs needed to achieve the target outcomes. However, organizations must be held accountable for completing the work within budget and to the predetermined specifications.

We verified District compliance with its policies and procedures related to expenditures and payments for the period. We documented the use of Bond funds and segregation of these funds for Capital Improvement Program purposes, reconciled amounts received with amounts expended, and verified that these funds were expended for allowable Capital Improvement Program purposes. We gathered and tested data to determine compliance and measure the effectiveness of payment controls.

Bond Expenditure Management and Controls

1.	Observation	Based on procedures performed, we conclude that for the fiscal years through June 30, 2021, bond proceeds were used only for listed purposes under Ballot Measure 5B, with the potential exception of administrative allocation charges to the program including certain administrative salaries (see Observation No. 2). Additionally, we were unable to identify documentation of appropriate approvals for two of the 96 sampled program expenditures.
	Recommendation	The District should continue to evaluate all projects and expenditures for compliance with bond measure language as well as ensure the appropriate approvals are secured for all expenditures.

To review the compliance of bond funds for District projects, we selected 96 bond expenditure samples (120 samples including the administrative labor – See [Observation No. 2](#) for further information), and reconciled the cost against both the bond language, and the 2018 Flipbook (see [Observation No. 5](#) for further information). Bond language from Measure 5B states that the proceeds will be used “for the purpose of providing District students, teachers, and staff with a safe learning environment that prepares district students for college and the workforce by:

- Adding and expanding career/technical education facilities;
- Upgrading safety and security in school buildings;
- Repairing, renovating, equipping or reconstructing school buildings to ensure all schools are more safe, efficient, and accessible to all students, including those with disabilities;
- Constructing, furnishing, equipping and supporting needed school buildings and classrooms at all types of schools, including schools chartered by the District;
- And also acquiring, purchasing, constructing, equipping, improving, expanding, repairing, remodeling and furnishing District school buildings, facilities and grounds, with the District to have a preference for hiring local construction contracts, and to spend the proceeds of such debt only for capital improvements and not for salaries of senior District administration...”



Within our sample, all bond proceeds were used only for the purposes outlined in the bond measure language, resulting in no exceptions. However, during our review of the 96 sampled bond expenditures, we were unable to identify appropriate approvals for two expenditures, or 2% of the sampled expenditures.

Expenditure Population	Project	Line_Descr	Jrnl_Date	Journal_ID	Amount	Authorized Signer – Greater than \$250,000	Notes
2020 CP19A	H54600 C01	NEW AMERICA SITE PURCHASE	10/31/2019	0001535 427	\$3,146,962.22	No	Purchase approved by the Charter Board on 6/18/2019 – No approvals on the actual expenditure documentation
2019 CP19A	H94845 N01	PURCHASE OF JOYCE ST	5/31/2019	0001507 437	\$6,925,600.00	No	Purchase approved by BOE – No approvals on the actual expenditure documentation

Recommendation

The District should continue to evaluate all projects and expenditures for compliance with bond measure language. Additionally, the District should continue to ensure the appropriate approvals are secured for all expenditures.

Non-Capital Bond Expenditures

2.	Observation	The District allocated administrative costs to the Bond Program; however, the District does not have formalized policies and procedures that define what positions constitute senior District administration, which is not an allowable expense, and what amount or what percentage of administration can be allocated to the Bond Program. Additionally, the District potentially included non-salary or payroll costs within the detailed administrative support.
	Recommendation	The District should consult with its bond counsel to determine what labor allocation components are allowable per bond measure language and incorporate the results of this consultation into Board-approved policies and procedures to support compliance.

During our review of the bond expenditures from program inception through June 30, 2021, totaling \$181,643,470.17, we identified management expenditures (identified as Allocate Admin Costs and Admin to close) totaling \$4,992,818.96. According to District management, 2 to 4% of administrative



costs are allocated to the bond when the costs are incurred. Facilities management staff provided two files titled “97-120 2019 Detailed Admin” and “97-120 2020 Detailed Admin” to support the total administrative costs incurred by the department. Per the reports provided, the total administrative costs incurred by the department from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020 was \$20,408,565.69. Therefore, more administrative costs were incurred than were allocated to the Bond Program.

The bond language states that the bond proceeds will not be used for “salaries of senior District administration.” Based on our experience, bond funds can typically be used for District employee salaries to the extent that they perform administrative oversight work on the construction projects authorized by the voter-approved bond measure. However, during our review, we were unable to identify policies and procedures for the use of bond funds for administrative costs, and we identified administrative costs that don’t appear to be salary or payroll costs included within the detailed administrative support provided.

The detailed administrative cost support included salary or payroll for 31 District employees with the following positions:

- Executive Director
- Director
- Senior Project Manager
- Project Manager III
- Project Manager I
- GIS Manager
- Accounting – Supervisor
- Accounting – Lead
- Cost/Project Scheduler
- Buyer
- GIS Analyst
- Commissioning Engineer
- Bond Communications
- GIS Coordinator
- Archives
- Office Support

However, the District currently does not have policies and procedures that define what positions and at what amount or percentage of those positions can be allocated to Bond Program costs. Per District staff, senior District administration consists of chief operating officers and above. Based on the definition provided by District staff, the labor positions allocated to the Bond Program are compliant, but absent additional information including Board-approved policies and procedures, we are unable to determine what positions constitute senior District administration, and how much District administration labor costs can be allocated to the Bond Program.

We also identified administrative costs that don’t appear to be salary or payroll in nature included within the detailed administrative support provided. Cost descriptions included cell phone costs, computers/laptops and computer peripherals, access/key cards, furniture, office supplies, business cards, copier/printing billing, permits, airfare, meals/food, software licenses, legal costs, meeting costs, and loan payoffs. For example, the loan payoff costs included within the detailed administrative support totaled \$5,646,667.72. As mentioned previously, absent Board-approved policies and procedures, we are unable to determine what costs are allowed to be included within administrative costs.



Recommendation

The District should consult with its bond counsel to determine if the labor positions, labor amounts or percentages, and cost types included within labor costs allocated to the projects are allowable per best practice and bond measure language. The District should report the results of this consultation to the appropriate personnel (i.e., relevant District management, the Board, relevant District employees, the CAAC, etc.) to ensure transparency and remediation, as necessary. Additionally, the District should formalize the results of the consultation into Board-approved policies and procedures for key stakeholders to reference when managing the Bond Program to support compliance.

Independent Bond Program Audit

3.	Observation	The District has not required the completion of an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program, which contradicts the requirements set forth in the bond language.
	Recommendations	<p>A. The District should commission and complete an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program.</p> <p>B. In addition, the District should consider completing an annual independent performance audit of the Bond Program to ensure funds were only spent on allowable uses and address any other concerns related to Bond Program efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency.</p>

The bond language states that the Bond Program will be subject to an annual independent audit. However, the District to date has not performed an annual independent audit and instead has only subjected the Bond Program to the Districtwide financial statement audit. This audit does not validate the compliance of expenditures per the bond language or closely evaluate the Bond Program.

At a minimum, the bond language requires the completion of an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all the proceeds have been expended for the school facilities projects. Additionally, best practice suggests that an annual independent performance audit should be performed to ensure that funds are expended only on the specific projects listed in the bond measure. Within a performance audit, other objectives can be added to ensure the District is leveraging available funds efficiently, effectively, and transparently to support community accountability.

Recommendation

The District should commission and complete an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program. In addition, the District should consider completing an annual independent performance audit of the Bond Program to ensure funds were only spent on allowable uses and address any other concerns related to Bond Program efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency.



B. MASTER PLANNING AND PROJECT ESTIMATING CONTROLS

A full understanding of the budget planning and preparation system is essential, not just to derive expenditure projections but to be able to advise policymakers on the feasibility and desirability of specific budget proposals from several different perspectives. It is much easier to control expenditures at the "upstream" point of budget preparation than later, during the execution of the budget.

We compared the District's Master Planning documents to the projects included in the Bond Program to evaluate the Bond Program development. We reviewed several documents reported as foundational to the Bond Program in order to evaluate how projects were scoped and identified. Finally, we evaluated communication materials developed to communicate Bond Program impact to stakeholders, including voters.

Bond Program Project Scope and Budget Establishment

4.	Observation	District leadership reported that the 5B Bond Program was developed based on the 2016 Master Plan and an internally generated project list. However, the total facility deficiencies identified in these plans, as well as other planning documents provided by the District, were not commensurate with the budget for the Bond Program and did not align with the 2018 Flipbook, which was the primary communication tool to convey the approximate scope and budget of the Bond Program to voters.
	Recommendations	<p>A. To promote transparency and accountability, the District should ensure that all foundational documents and reporting align and can be reconciled; updates should be readily apparent in reporting documents through sufficiently detailed project descriptions.</p> <p>B. The District should define and document processes in place for master planning budgets and estimates, including when to utilize these procedures (e.g., thresholds), who is responsible for each activity, procedures for final approval, and stakeholder communications to report variances over time.</p>

Based on inquiry and documentation provided by the District, the 2016 District Wide Facilities Master Plan (2016 Master Plan) and the "20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb" were foundational to the establishment of project scope and budget. District staff report that the 2016 Master Plan identified the basic scope of the Capital Improvement Program, while the cash flow spreadsheet provided more detailed scope, estimated soft and hard costs, proposed schedule, and when the proceeds would be spent. In order to provide initial estimates for project budgets, the District used RSMeans, an industry-wide database that provides estimates for different types of construction projects, to assess what the cost of the project may be. Both the 2016 Master Plan and the 20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb provided insufficient information to support the suite of projects included in the Bond Program, as detailed below:

- **2016 Master Plan:** In June 2016, the District published a Districtwide Facilities Master Plan that outlined a short and long-term plan to meet the District facility needs over a 5 to 7-year period. The Master Plan identified 45 school sites (excluding Charter and Option schools) that required upgrades with an estimated cost of \$298,650,000; however, it did not provide a prioritized project



implementation list with cost estimates. According to the Colorado Department of Education, “relevant information regarding an implementation plan, phased if needed, should be included with the master plan.”¹ District staff report that this information was available internally on a spreadsheet; however, it was not included in the published 2016 Master Plan. This information would have provided additional transparency during the Bond Program development phase.

- **20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb:** The District provided an Excel workbook, which was reportedly used to scope and estimate project budgets and timelines by sub-project (i.e., Technology Upgrades, Roofing, Building Safety, Window Replacement, ADA Packages). This workbook identified 908 sub-projects with a total cost estimate of \$321,481,807 based on Excel worksheet “frmBondProjects,” \$537,015,812 based on Excel worksheet “H Bond Scope,” and summary level reporting totaling \$649,086,012 based on Excel worksheet “Sched&CashFlow.” It was unclear how the estimate worksheets reconciled to the summary level reporting. The workbook was last updated on January 10, 2019, after the bond was passed, and therefore its fidelity in accurately representing which projects were initially intended to be included within the Bond Program cannot be verified. Based on the information provided, it is unclear who reviewed and approved this file and the project listing and when or how this information was communicated to key stakeholders.

In addition to these inputs, District staff also report that every school site and option schools were included in the 2018 Bond Program to support community buy-in. This may contribute to the cost differentials between the 2016 Master Plan, 2018 Capital Improvement Program, and proposed 5B Bond Program. However, the 2016 Master Plan and 20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb documents described above did not reconcile to the 2018 Flipbook, which was the primary communication tool to convey the approximate scope of the Capital Improvement Program to key stakeholders (see [Observation No. 5](#) for further information).

Based on a review of Board of Education meeting minutes, we identified additional materials that appeared to be critical to Bond Program development and approval:

- **2018 Capital Improvement Plan:** On April 5, 2018, District staff presented the Proposed 2018 Capital Improvement Program to the Board of Education. According to this presentation, the Summary of Findings for 2017-19 identified \$588,177,919 in condition assessment needs across District facilities. The presentation describes the District’s Capital Improvement Program goals, including efficiency and modernization, parity among facilities, programmatic needs, growth areas, replacements, and specialties. However, detail on school-specific information or priority projects was not included; therefore, we were not able to perform analysis on how this Capital Improvement Program potentially informed the Bond Program.
- **Community Climate Survey:** At the June 11, 2018 Board of Education meeting, the former Superintendent presented the results of the District’s Community Climate survey to the Board. According to meeting minutes, the survey showed support for additional funding to support school construction and operations, with specific discussion around safety and security as well as building costs (efficiency, future readiness, and reinvestment). Following this discussion, the Board directed the Superintendent to prepare facility bond options.

¹ Colorado Department of Education: Public School Facilities Master Plan Guidelines
<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdefinance/publicschoolfacilitiesmasterplanguidelinespdf>



- **Proposed Facility Bond Program:** At the August 23, 2018 Board of Education meeting, the former Superintendent presented the proposed Bond Program, which reported that the District had \$647,000,000 in needed facility improvements. This figure differs from the Capital Improvement Program presented in April 2018, which identified \$588,177,919 in facility needs. The presentation notes that the District reduced its bond proposal to \$567,000,000, which was ultimately approved to be placed on the November 6, 2018 ballot.

Although these documents were presented to the Board of Education at a public meeting, the total budgets among the 2016 Master Plan, 20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb, 2018 Capital Improvement Program, Proposed Facility Bond Program, and 2018 Community Flipbook do not reconcile to one another. The table below summarizes the project budget estimates provided in each of these foundational documents.

Document	Total Project Estimates	Detailed Project Listing Included?
2016 Master Plan	\$298,650,000	No
20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb	\$649,086,012	Yes
2018 Capital Improvement Program	\$588,177,919	No
Proposed Facility Bond Program	\$647,000,000	No
2018 Community Flipbook	\$604,982,377	Yes

Recommendation

To promote transparency and accountability, the District should ensure that foundational documents and reporting align and can be reconciled; where discrepancies occur, the rationale behind these variances should be reported. While changes to facility needs and project budgets evolve over time, these updates should be readily apparent in reporting documents through sufficiently detailed project descriptions.

Additionally, the District should define and document processes in place for master planning budgets and estimates, including when to utilize these procedures (e.g., thresholds), who is responsible for each activity, and procedures for final approval. Documentation requirements for any Master Plan changes from the original approved documents should include, but not be limited to, information surrounding the proposed change, basis for change, estimated cost impact, estimated schedule impact and associated cash flow timelines, and change initiator and approver. Reporting that establishes Bond Program project scope and budgets should reconcile to the total bond issuance premium and committed general fund transfer considerations. Master Plan reporting should include summary level reporting with dates of key milestones achieved and estimated dates of key milestones to be achieved. Appropriate and relevant narratives should be maintained and reported to key stakeholders on a regular basis. Deviations should be discussed with District management and documented accordingly within monthly reporting. Responsibilities should be assigned, and appropriateness of the policies and procedures should be evaluated on an ongoing basis. A current Master Plan with defined policies and procedures will allow for greater transparency with key stakeholders, more efficient communication of the work being done, and compliance with the ballot language.



Project Identification and Voter Transparency

5. Observation	The District developed the 2018 Flipbook to inform parents and community members of the improvements that could occur at their local schools if the ballot passed. However, the 2018 Flipbook did not reconcile to the total bond issuance or key documents that were deemed foundational to establish project scope and budget.
Recommendation	The District should ensure that there is clear and consistent reporting that provides stakeholders with accurate information on the budget, cost, duration, and scope of projects funded through the Bond Program, with clear reconciliation the total bond issuance value and other funding sources such as general fund transfers and bond premiums.

According to interviews with District staff and key stakeholders, the 2018 Flipbook was the key communication tool to convey the approximate scope of the Capital Improvement Program that would be performed at the various schools within the county, both District managed and charters. Each page within the Flipbook identified the proposed work at each school site, and noted the estimated scope, cost, and schedule for projects. However, as noted previously, the 2018 Flipbook did not reconcile to the 2016 Master Plan, 20190110 H Bond Cash Flow (version 1).xlsb, and 2018 Capital Improvement Plan, which were considered the foundational documents to establish project scopes and budgets (see [Observation No. 4](#) for further information). The 2018 Flipbook totaled \$604,982,377, whereas the 5B Bond Program totaled \$567,000,000, and the committed general fund transfer totaled \$138,000,000 resulting in a discrepancy in the amount of \$100,017,623 (\$567,000,000 5B Bond + \$138,0000 Committed General Fund Transfer – \$604,982,377 2018 Flipbook project budget).

Based on inquiry with the District, the Flipbook was developed by the District's Communications Department and illustrated the Capital Improvement Program in a manner that would inform community members of the improvements that could occur at their neighborhood schools if the ballot measure passed and the Program was implemented. District staff report that there were other projects planned that were Districtwide, benefiting all schools, as well as administrative or athletic in nature (see [Observation No. 7](#) for additional detail). Those types of projects were one of the reasons that an annual capital transfer from the General Fund was added to the Bond Program. Staff report that the Flipbook did not include projects that did not directly impact individual schools, even though the program scope identified that additional work and appeared to be consistent with the 2018 5B ballot language.

Additionally, a District-sponsored review of the bond program budgets ("2018 Bond Report") noted errors in the 2018 Flipbook, which was subsequently updated at some point in 2019, after the bond had been approved by voters. No documentation of when this error was discovered or communication of the Flipbook update was available on the District website or provided to the Moss Adams team. At the January 2021 CAAC meeting, the Committee received the "2018 Bond Report," which was requested by the Board of Education and prepared by the District's former Chief Financial Officer. This report found that the 2018 Community Flipbook contained errors and incorrect estimates. The following findings were reported:



- The Flipbook was a separately created document, not linked to actual planning schedules
- Projects from the 2019 Capital Transfer Program (19M Program) equaling \$9.5 million were moved into the Bond Program budget
- The original Bond Program budget increased \$70 million as of September 30, 2020; variances over \$500,000 represented the majority of the budget increase

The “2018 Bond Report” noted discrepancies between the original Flipbook that was presented to the community prior to the election and the actual project scopes, budgets, and schedules. However, this report does not appear to have been presented to the Board of Education. [Observation No. 7](#) provides a comparison of the 2018 Flipbook and April 2021 Flipbook, details of which can be found in [Appendix D](#).

Recommendation

A best practice in developing a successful bond campaign is to provide specific information on projects, budget, and timeline, while also building in contingencies and flexibility to manage unexpected changes that may arise. The District should ensure that there is clear and consistent reporting that provides stakeholders with accurate information on the budget, cost, duration, and scope of projects funded through the Bond Program. These figures should reconcile to value of the total bond issuance and other funding sources such as general fund transfers and bond premiums. General fund transfers and bond premiums secured and utilized by the Bond Program should be clearly reported to promote transparency and accountability of fund usage.

To encourage community buy-in and demonstrate that they are a reliable steward of public funds, it is critical that the District provides accurate information to voters on how funds will be used including bond issuances, general fund transfers, and bond premiums. Reporting should be developed with input from various groups within the organization (management, finance, facilities, etc.) to ensure that information presented to voters is complete and accurate. Based on best practice, minimum reporting requirements include:

- List of projects accompanied by measurements of their status in terms of budgets and timelines
- Any alterations to project budgets or timelines with adequate explanations for these changes
- Comparison of current status of projects in terms of budgets and timelines to the original budget and timeline estimates of the project

Consistent and timely reporting to the public is essential for demonstrating accountability and transparency. The District website should be updated frequently to reflect the most accurate information for the Bond Program as a whole, as well as site-specific project details.

C. ADHERENCE TO DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION BUDGET AND SCHEDULE REPORTING

We compared design and construction budget management practices to measure the effectiveness of controls and transparency of bond-funded projects. We reviewed the reporting of adopted budget, budget-to-actual, and budget-to-projected expenditures and revenue as a means to track Capital Improvement Program progress and financial standing (e.g., narratives, graphs, charts). We analyzed



the design of budgetary management controls for documentation and explanation of deviations from the original budget by key construction component for user reference. We also reviewed the reconciliation of actual projects for which Bond funds were expended.

Use of District means to reach Bond Program stakeholders was compared to leading practices at other school districts and best practices. We evaluated the overall transparency of the Bond Program, including but not limited to evaluation of the bond website information and Bond Program progress reports, and availability and access to information regarding program status and expenditures. Current, accurate, and complete Bond Program reporting was assessed. Project progress, impact to Bond Program stakeholders, and delivery in accordance with Bond Program requirements were given specific consideration.

CAAC Oversight

6.	Observation	The CAAC relies on Board Policy GP-13 to understand its role, responsibility, and authority. No additional guidance related to Bond Program oversight or reporting expectations has been provided to the Committee.
	Recommendations	<p>A. The District should establish committee bylaws and a handbook to provide guidance related to authority, expectations, and reporting practices to the Board of Education.</p> <p>B. In addition, as a best practice, the District should consider adding officer (chair and vice chair) positions to the CAAC to support accountability, set agendas, and serve as a primary liaison with District leadership.</p>

The 2018 Bond language states that the Bond Program will be monitored by the Citizens’ Capital Asset Advisory Committee (CAAC). Board Policy GP-13 authorizes the CAAC and defines its authority as “advisory to the Board through the superintendent.” According to this policy, the purpose of the CAAC is to:

- Review the evaluation criteria of District facilities, including facility condition index, educational adequacy index, utilization based on enrollment to capacity ratio, demographic predictions, financial stewardship, etc.
- Monitor the development of an annual Districtwide facility master plan that may include school replacements, school consolidations, school closures, grade level reconfigurations, and boundary and transportation changes
- Monitor the planning of capital needs and the implementation of capital programs, which may include future Bond Programs
- Assist in the development of a potential future Bond Program
- Promote sound, long-term decisions that are consistent with the needs of the District and in support of the District’s strategic plan
- Encourage that decisions be made through active involvement in communications with the community
- Provide an annual written report to the Board of Education on the ongoing responsibilities of the committee
- Report on ongoing capital projects as directed by the Board



Beyond this policy, the CAAC does not have any additional guidance such as bylaws or supplemental policies and procedures to support their work and clarify expectations. At the November 7, 2020 Committee Meeting, the CAAC expressed the perception that its role is to understand a) factors that impact the District's ability to execute projects on time and on budget, b) whether the committed scope is being accomplished on time and on budget, and c) significant changes in cost. The CAAC also determined that the Committee should have greater community involvement and bring potential facility solutions to the Board of Education. However, these clarifications were not documented, formalized, or approved by the Board of Education following the meeting discussion.

Board policy authorizes up to 13 CAAC members and requires that they possess familiarity with facility design and/or construction processes, business management expertise for organization of a similar size, and independence from relationships that would interfere with objective judgment. The Board policy does not require the establishment of officer positions, such as chair and vice chair, to hold responsibility for liaising with the Superintendent and the Board of Education. These positions often help direct the work of a committee by establishing responsibility for agenda setting and providing a primary point of contact to support advisory recommendations with District staff and the Board of Education. Currently, there are 10 committee members and the CAAC is staffed by several District employees including:

- Superintendent
- Chief Operating Officer
- Chief Financial Officer
- Executive Director, Facilities and Construction Management
- Director, Planning and Property
- Director, Construction Management
- Director, Finance
- Director, Budget and Treasury
- Supervisor, Construction Accounting
- Communications Specialist
- Executive Administrative Assistant, Facilities Management

The CAAC manages its oversight responsibilities through monthly Committee meetings that include reviews of contracts in place as well as construction developments to monitor budgets and funding status. Monthly Committee meetings include a financial status update, construction project updates, and a communications update on community/public outreach activities. These reports providing summary-level information in 2019 or 2020, although more detailed project-specific information was available starting in 2021. However, this information did not include all Capital Improvement Projects and did align to other reporting materials, such as the 2018 or 2021 Flipbook. Any project that exceeds the construction budget by \$500,000 or more is reviewed by the Committee; however, smaller changes are not reviewed or approved by the CAAC. As of the November 7, 2020 CAAC meeting, the Committee takes a vote on whether to recommend actions to the Board, which is responsible for approving any adjustments that meet or exceed \$500,000 in additional cost (i.e., whether to approve a contract change order for a specific purpose). Best practices suggest that committees with oversight responsibility for a Bond Program review and comment upon major changes, defined as the smaller of 10% of a specific project budget allocation or \$1 million.



The CAAC reports to the Board on a quarterly, annual, and ad-hoc basis:

- **Quarterly reporting:** Since March 7, 2019, the Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management and a member of the CAAC have provided quarterly reports on the Bond program to the Board of Education. Based on a review of Board Meeting Live Stream videos and meeting agendas, these updates typically center on spend to date, anticipated future spend, and a high-level review of project status. These quarterly reports were often accompanied by PowerPoint presentations that included Gantt-style project charts that detail project status. Planned budget and timeline in comparison to actual budget and timeline were not typically noted.
- **Annual reporting:** Annual reporting to the Board was typically presented by either the Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management or the Chief Operating Officer, accompanied by a member of the CAAC. Similar to the quarterly reports, these presentations include the Bond Program's financial status in terms of total spend to date and total encumbered or spent. Additionally, projects were again presented in a Gantt-style chart to show status and progress to completion. Individual budgets for each project were not noted within these reports until January 2021, at which point the information included within the annual report was revised to include project-specific summaries. These summaries included the phase of the project, percent complete, original budget, current budget, variance, HAZMAT funding, and reason for budgetary variances where applicable.
- **Ad-hoc reporting:** According to Board of Education meeting minutes, the Superintendent Report as far back as 2019 notes that verbal updates on the 5B project were provided to Board members; however, they were not accompanied by documentation to describe what information was shared. Because Board of Education approval is required for all expenditures over \$500,000, change orders and the authorization for contracts were included on consent agendas. Additionally, the Board requested an interim report on the Bond Program on October 9, 2020, which resulted in the development of the 2018 Bond Report.

Despite these reporting practices, changes in project scope or budget are typically provided for in the consent agenda and passed by the Board of Education without ample discussion or explanation as to the changes. To strengthen reporting practices, the Board should clearly define what information is expected to be shared at a summary and detail level in the quarterly and annual reports. These reporting standards should be incorporated into the Committee's bylaws to provide additional clarity.

Recommendation

The District should establish separate bylaws that provide additional specificity and guidance to the CAAC on its purpose, function, responsibilities, structure, membership, limitations, and reporting. To ensure the CAAC is fulfilling its role as desired and expected by the Community and Board of Education, the Board must provide the Committee with a well-defined charge and clear expectations. For example, typically CAAC members are involved in the process of screening auditors to complete the financial and performance audit for Bond Programs (for additional information, please see [Observation No. 3](#)), as well as receiving and reviewing the final reports prior to Board presentation. The District should develop additional documentation to help the CAAC understand its role, responsibility, and authority for general capital projects and bond-specific projects in order to effectively carry out its duties.

In addition, as a best practice, the District should consider adding officer (chair and vice chair) positions to the CAAC to support accountability, set agendas, and serve as a primary liaison with District leadership.



Flipbook and System Data Comparison

7. Observation	Using District system-generated information, we compared the total project budget by each site to the 2018 and 2021 Flipbooks. This analysis revealed two primary issues: a) 14 projects were included in the system but not identified in either Flipbook; and b) the system-generated budgets exceeded the site-specific budgets included in the Flipbooks by between \$109,757,271.17 and \$136,488,124.17.
Recommendation	<p>A. The District should develop policies and procedures surrounding design and construction budgets to ensure consistent estimating, reporting, effective controls, accountability, and communication of the Bond Program.</p> <p>B. Bond Program and management reporting to stakeholders, including the CAAC, Board of Education, and community, should be updated to accurately provide details on all projects as well as changes to project budget and scope from original expectations communicated to the voters.</p>

As noted previously, the Flipbook was the primary communication tool of the Bond Program to voters and interested stakeholders. The 2018 Flipbook identified 159 capital improvement projects totaling \$604,982,377. However, the Flipbook published in April 2021 identified 160 projects totaling \$631,713,230, representing an increase of \$26,730,853. In order to understand these budget differences, we evaluated scope changes noted in each Flipbook and the potential budget impact of those scope changes (see [Appendix C](#) for site-specific details). As summarized in the table below, 28.8% of projects listed in the 2018 Flipbook had an increased scope in the 2021 Flipbook, which contributed to \$9,241,171.00 in budget variances; however, the bulk of budget variances (\$16,263,707) appear to be related to projects that did not change in scope.

	# of Projects	% of Projects	Total Budget Variance between 2018 and 2021 Flipbook (\$)
Projects increased scope	46	28.8%	\$9,241,171.00
Projects decreased scope	9	5.6%	\$798,244.00
Projects mixed scope change	4	2.5%	\$427,731.00
Projects unchanged scope	101	63.1%	\$16,263,707.00
Total	160	100.0%	\$26,730,853.00

Although the 2021 Flipbook was updated in April 2021, the project budget information contained within this external communications tool did not reconcile with project budget information recorded in the District's project management system as of June 30, 2021. The system-generated information includes highly detailed information related to each sub-project, or scope area (i.e., Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment; Roofing, Safety) at a site. Using District-provided information, we were able to compile the total budget recorded in the system for each school site, inclusive of all sub-projects, in order to compare the total project budget by each site to the 2018 and 2021 Flipbooks. This analysis revealed two primary issues: a) 14 projects were included in the system but not identified in either Flipbook; and b) the system-generated budgets significantly exceeded the site-specific budgets included in the Flipbooks.



Projects Not Identified in 2018 and/or 2021 Flipbook

The District's system-generated Bond Program budgets included 13 projects totaling \$22,491,629.23 that were not located in either version of the Flipbook. The table below shows each of these projects and their budget according to the District's project management system.

Project	System-Generated Budget through June 30, 2021
Irwin Preschool	\$62,381.11
Litz Preschool	\$87,858.02
Mount Evans OELS	\$3,210,190.20
North Area Transportation Center	\$7,554,793.48
Patterson Cottages	\$305,435.43
Trailblazer Stadium	\$4,275,887.58
Windy Peaks OELS	\$3,340,982.40
581 Conference Place	\$506,698.44
809 Quail	\$472,067.72
Districtwide*	\$2,380,372.77
Anderson Preschool	\$126,219.45
Ed Center	\$166,290.56
Education Services Center	\$2,451.87
Total	\$22,491,629.03

**The District provided a breakdown of how these Districtwide funds were allocated to different school sites. For details please see [Appendix E](#).*

District staff report that these projects were incorporated into the original Bond Program despite not being included in the Flipbook for voters to evaluate, noting that the projects were an impetus for including the capital transfers from the District's general fund into the Capital Improvement Program.

Adherence to Originally Reported Budgets (2018 Flipbook Compared to System-Generated Data through June 30, 2021)

We also evaluated the budget difference between the 2018 Flipbook and current budgets recorded in the District's project management system ([Appendix D](#) includes complete analysis details). The table below summarizes this analysis and demonstrates an increased budget of \$110,645,457.52 in project budgets for projects included in the 2018 Flipbook. When comparing the total Bond Program budget (including projects that were not noted in the 2018 Flipbook), we found a total variance of \$136,488,124.17.



	Total Budgeted Projects per Flipbook [A]	System Budget through June 30, 2021 of Projects in Flipbook [B]	Variance for Projects Reported in Flipbook [C] (A-B)	Total System Budget through June 30, 2021 [D]	Total Variance [E] (D-A)
2018 FB	\$604,982,377.00	\$718,978,872.14	\$113,996,495.14	\$741,470,501.17	\$136,488,124.17

In order to gain a better understanding of project variances, we evaluated each school site and identified whether the system-generated budget was in excess or below the reported 2018 Flipbook budget, and by how much. The table below summarizes this analysis. Overall, we found that 89.3% of system-generated project budgets exceeded the budgets reported for the same school site in the 2018 Flipbook, and 30.8% of all projects were over budget by more than \$500,000.

2018 FB		
	#	%
Projects Over Budget	142	89.3%
>\$100k	38	23.9%
>\$250k	19	11.9%
>\$500k	36	22.6%
\$500k+	49	30.8%
Projects Under Budget	18	11.3%
>\$100k	4	2.5%
>\$250k	6	3.8%
>\$500k	2	1.3%
\$500k+	6	3.8%

Budget Differentials Between 2021 Flipbook and System-Generated Data through June 30, 2021

We also evaluated the budget difference between the 2021 Flipbook and the current budgets recorded in the District's project management system ([Appendix D](#) includes complete analysis details). The table below summarizes this analysis and demonstrates an increased budget of \$87,265,642.14 in project budgets for projects included in the Flipbook. When comparing the total Bond Program budget (including projects that were not noted in the Flipbooks), we found a total variance of \$109,757,271.17.



	Total Budgeted Projects per Flipbook [A]	System Budget through June 30, 2021 of Projects in Flipbook [B]	Variance for Projects Reported in Flipbook [C] (A-B)	Total System Budget through June 30, 2021 [D]	Total Variance [E] (D-A)
2021 FB	\$631,713,230.00	\$718,978,872.14	\$87,265,642.14	\$741,470,501.17	\$109,757,271.17

In addition, we evaluated each school site and identified whether the system-generated budgets were in excess or below the reported 2021 Flipbook budget, and by how much.

2021 FB		
	#	%
Project Budgets in Excess of 2021 Flipbook Reported Budget Amounts	114	71.3%
>\$100k	30	18.8%
>\$250k	23	14.4%
>\$500k	20	12.5%
\$500k+	41	25.6%
Project Budgets Under 2021 Flipbook Reported Budget Amounts	46	28.8%
>\$100k	31	19.4%
>\$250k	5	3.1%
>\$500k	4	2.5%
\$500k+	6	3.8%

Although some discrepancies may be a result of timing variances, these two assessments potentially suggest that there are opportunities to improve project estimating, master planning, budgetary, and/or reporting controls. Budget increases were not pre-emptively communicated or approved by the CAAC or the Board of Education and system-generated budgets do not reconcile to key stakeholder reports and communications.

Recommendation

The District should develop policies and procedures surrounding design and construction budgets to ensure consistent estimating, reporting, effective controls, accountability, and communication of the Bond Program. Bond Program and management reporting to stakeholders should be updated to accurately provide details on changes to project budget and scope from original expectations communicated to the voters. All projects funded through the community-funded Bond Program should



be included in stakeholder reporting. Bond Program and management reporting should be reconciled, reviewed, and approved by key departmental personnel (e.g., District project management, District accounting, and Construction Manager) to ensure completeness and accuracy. Both summary and detailed information and appropriate narrative is necessary to allow key stakeholders to monitor budgetary performance against committed contract values. Budget alterations to project budgets or timelines should be approved by appropriate parties including adequate explanations for these changes. Additionally, the sum of actual spending and project invoice commitments should be presented to enable decision-makers to have visibility over the project's financial progress in relation to the committed contract values. This reporting can also assist decision-makers in evaluating actions that may be needed if major deviations in budget-to-forecast results become evident.

Completed Project Budget Analysis

8.	Observation	Based on system-generated original and actual budget data, completed projects had a variance of \$46,903,796. Of all completed projects, 52.1% exceeded their original budget and 18.8% exceeded their original budget by \$500,000 or more.
	Recommendation	In addition to Recommendation No. 7 , the District should develop and provide specific reporting to help stakeholders understand budget and scope variances.

Based on District system-generated records, the District completed 96 sub-projects totaling \$214,706,512.85 as of June 30, 2021. As noted previously, the Flipbooks only provide site-level detail related to project scopes, budgets, and timelines. No sub-project detail is included. Sub-projects are often grouped together in Districtwide contracts to take advantage of economies of scale across the District, as noted in the Commendations section of the report. In our assessment of the District's system-generated data, we noted differences between school site project budgets in the 2018 Flipbook, 2021 Flipbook, and system-generated data (see [Observation No.7](#)). However, due to the budget variances and insufficient sub-project detail within the Flipbooks, we could not compare the system-generated original budget to Flipbook budgets for individual sub-projects. Therefore, this analysis relies on system-generated information for both original budgets and actual budgets.

[Appendix F](#) includes a listing of all completed sub-projects, including the school site where work occurred, system-generated original budget, system-generated final budget, and variances between these two budgets. The table below summarizes the system-generated original and current budgets for completed projects, which had a variance of \$46,903,795.62.

Completed Projects	Value
Total Original Budget	\$167,802,717.23
Total Current Budget	\$214,706,512.85
Total Variance	\$46,903,795.62

In order to gain an understanding of how project cost variances affected completed projects, we assessed which projects had no original budget, were over budget, or were under budget. As the table below demonstrates, 52.1% of all completed projects exceeded the system-generated original



budget and 18.8% of all completed projects exceeded the system-generated original budget by at least \$500,000. Conversely, 29.2% of completed projects were under budget.

	# of Completed Projects	% of All Completed Projects	Total Value of Variance
Projects with No Original Budget	16	16.7%	\$6,573,239.82
Projects Over Budget	50	52.1%	\$48,096,892.03
>\$100k	14	14.6%	\$587,309.33
>\$250	10	10.4%	\$1,708,483.01
>\$500k	8	8.3%	\$2,809,523.45
\$500k+	18	18.8%	\$42,991,576.24
Projects Under Budget	28	29.2%	\$(7,766,366.23)
>\$100k	9	9.4%	\$(429,160.33)
>\$250k	9	9.4%	\$(1,489,172.38)
>\$500k	7	7.3%	\$(2,321,857.28)
\$500k+	3	3.1%	\$(3,526,146.24)
Budget to Actual Match	2	2.1%	\$0
Total Completed Projects	96		\$46,903,795.62

Based on inquiry and District-provided information, program contingency, premium, and general fund commitments addressed the budget overages (see [Observation No. 10](#) for further information). However, reporting and approvals surrounding usage of program contingency and bond premiums were not available upon request (see [Observation No. 5](#) for further information).

Recommendation

In addition to [Recommendation No. 7](#), the District should develop and provide specific reporting to help stakeholders understand budget and scope variances. For example, if a scope was expanded due to unknown risks (i.e. asbestos abatement) or in response to site-specific design requests from the parent committee, these details should be noted in reporting to stakeholders to support transparency and accountability.



In Progress Project Budget Analysis

9. Observation	Based on system-generated original and current budget data, in-progress projects have a variance of \$45,618,624, 53.3% of all in-progress projects are expected to exceed their original budget and 19% are expected to exceed their original budget by \$500,00 or more.
Recommendation	In addition to Recommendation No. 7 , the District should report schedule information for each project that includes the original schedule, project milestones, current schedule, recovery schedule (if applicable), and a documented rationale for any material schedule delays to key stakeholders including the CAAC and the Board of Education.

As of June 30, 2021, the District had 105 sub-projects in-progress with a current budget of \$339,182,942.48. As noted previously, the Flipbooks only provide site-level detail related to project scopes, budgets, and timelines. No sub-project detail is included. In our assessment of the District's system-generated data, we noted differences between school site project budgets in the 2018 Flipbook, 2021 Flipbook, and system-generated data (see [Observation No.7](#)). However, due to the budget variances and insufficient sub-project detail within the Flipbooks, we could not compare the system-generated original budget to Flipbook budgets for individual sub-projects.

Similarly, we were unable to compare timelines for in-progress projects between the Flipbooks and the system-generated information provided. However, we were able to compare and summarize timeline changes for all site-level projects between the 2018 and 2021 Flipbook, which is included in [Appendix G](#). Additionally, to determine whether the system-generated timeline data aligned with actual project timelines, as well as the timelines set forth in the 2018 and 2021 Flipbooks, we evaluated the timelines for the projects included in our sample. As summarized in the table below, there were variances between the completion date listed in the Flipbooks, the District's contract management system, and the actual estimated completion per the contract for the project.

Project	2018 Flipbook Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Flipbook Estimated Project Timeline	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	System Completion Date through June 30, 2021
H71000A01 – Alameda High School Addition & General Upgrades	11/2018 – 8/2021	12/2018 – 8/2021	12/31/2021	7/14/2022
H73500A01 – Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2019 – 8/2021	1/2019 – 8/2021	7/30/2021	8/12/2021
H49000A01 – Wilmot Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	8/3/2021	10/15/2020



Project	2018 Flipbook Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Flipbook Estimated Project Timeline	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	System Completion Date through June 30, 2021
H78000A01 – Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	11/2020 – 8/2022	5/2020 – 9/2022	12/18/2021	1/27/2022

As noted previously, this budget analysis for in-progress projects relies on system-generated information for both original budgets and actual budgets due to limitations in the information provided in the Flipbooks. [Appendix F](#) includes a listing of all in-progress sub-projects, including the school site where work occurred, system-generated original budget, system-generated final budget projection, and variances between these two budgets. The table below summarizes the system-generated original and current budgets, which had a variance of \$45,618,623.48.

Totals for In-Progress Projects	\$
Sum of Original Budget	\$293,564,319.00
Sum of Current Budget	\$339,182,942.48
Total Variance	\$45,618,623.48

In order to gain an understanding of how project cost variances affected completed projects, we assessed which projects had no original budget, were over budget, or were under budget. As the table below demonstrates, 53.3% of all in-progress projects will exceed the system-generated original budget and 19% of all in-progress projects will exceed the system-generated original budget by at least \$500,000. Conversely, 19% of in-progress projects are expected to be delivered under budget and 21.9% of projects are expected to be delivered on budget.

Analysis	# of Projects	% of All In-Progress Projects	Total Value of Variance
In-Progress Projects with No Original Budget	6	5.7%	\$2,066,614.04
In-Progress Projects Over Budget	56	53.3%	\$49,538,482.74
>\$100k	16	15.2%	\$846,046.02
>\$250	14	13.3%	\$2,326,908.92
>\$500k	6	5.7%	\$2,127,372.29
\$500k+	20	19.0%	\$44,238,155.51
In-Progress Projects Under Budget	20	19.0%	\$(5,986,473.30)



Analysis	# of Projects	% of All In-Progress Projects	Total Value of Variance
>\$100k	7	6.7%	\$(294,741.27)
>\$250k	6	5.7%	\$(1,068,631.98)
>\$500k	5	4.8%	\$(1,869,205.93)
\$500k+	2	1.9%	\$(2,753,894.20)
Budget to Actual Match	23	21.9%	\$0
Total in-Progress Projects	105		\$45,618,623.48

Recommendation

The District should maintain schedule information for each project that includes the original schedule, project milestones, current schedule, recovery schedule (if applicable), and a documented rationale for any material schedule delays. This should be communicated within the monthly 5B Bond Program reporting to inform key stakeholders, including the CAAC. Additionally, project schedules should reflect master plan project priorities. Change order impacts on critical path items should be specifically addressed.

Upcoming Project and Affordability Analysis

10.	Observation	Based on Bond Program and District system records through June 30, 2021, there is adequate capital to cover planned projects; however, this will require spending \$27,476,798 in bond premium.
	Recommendations	<p>A. The District should separate the contingency and premium funds into two separate accounts and establish policies and procedures related to when funds can be pulled from either contingency or premium fund balances, including approval authority.</p> <p>B. With community involvement, the District should develop a prioritized list of capital projects that could be funded with remaining bond funds.</p>

There are 133 projects that are planned to be initiated in fiscal year 2022. The total valuation for these projects is currently budgeted to be \$187,581,045.84, including \$3,352,669.24 in budget increases made within the system as of June 30, 2021. A full listing of these projects is included in [Appendix F](#).

To understand whether the District has adequate capital to cover its total current budgeted projects, we evaluated Bond Program revenues and project budgets. Below, we summarize the Bond Program and District system records through June 30, 2021 as provided by the District to determine whether there is adequate capital to cover improvements:



Description	Amount (\$)
Bond Proceeds	\$567,000,000.00
Premium Revenue	\$187,474,497
Earned Interest	\$12,089,253.86
Capital Transfers	\$123,955,106.00
Subtotal of Bond Revenues	\$832,468,200.23
<i>Project Budgets per System Data</i>	<i>\$741,470,501.17</i>
Proceeds in Excess of Bond Program Budget	\$90,997,699.06

The analysis was reviewed and confirmed by the District for appropriateness. This analysis suggests that there is likely to be sufficient capital to fund the remaining projects, depending on the District's ability to limit budget increases. Using current budget projections, there is an excess of \$90,997,699.06 in Bond Program revenues. However, when compared to the total bond premium revenue earned (\$187,474,497), it appears that \$27,476,797.94 of the bond premium revenue has already been, or is planned to be, spent by the District. Below, we provide additional details on the categories, source documentation, and methodology agreed upon with the District to address this question.

The table below shows the Measure 5B bond revenues, including bond proceeds, interest earned, and premium revenue. Measure 5B authorized \$567,000,000 in general obligation bonds; however, the District was able to take advantage of the market at the time of bond issuance and received an additional \$187,474,497 in premium revenue. Bond premiums result when a bond offers a coupon rate in excess of prevailing interest rates; therefore, investors will pay an additional cost for the higher overall yield. Additionally, the District earned interest on unspent bond proceeds, resulting in an additional \$12,089,253.86 in revenues generated from the bond.

Type of Bond Revenue	Date	Amount
Bond Proceeds 2018	1/9/2019	\$326,490,000.00
Premium Revenue 2018	1/9/2019	\$50,165,348.70
CY2019 Interest	12/31/2019	\$7,897,560.09
CY2020 Interest	12/31/2020	\$3,990,758.10
Bond Proceeds 2020	1/8/2021	\$240,510,000.00
Premium Revenue 2020	1/8/2021	\$68,309,148.30
Interest Earned 1/1/2021 – 6/30/2021	6/30/2021	\$200,935.67
Total Bond Revenue		\$697,563,750.90



In addition to the general obligation bonds, the District promised voters that it would contribute \$138 million in capital transfers to help fund its capital improvement program. According to District records, the District has provided \$123,955,106 in capital transfers as of June 30, 2021. Therefore, the total revenues available to support the capital improvement program equals \$832,468,200.23.

Based on the budget analysis performed using system-generated data for bond projects, we identified a total valuation of \$741,470,501.17 for completed, in-progress, and upcoming projects.

Project Status	Value (\$)
Completed	\$214,706,512.85
In-Progress	\$339,182,942.48
Upcoming	\$187,581,045.84
Total Budget	\$741,470,501.17

Based on system data, the District had encumbered \$424,742,432, which was less than the total program budget as of June 30, 2021.

Recommendation

Typically, premiums are set aside as separate funds and used for a designated purpose as intended by the Board of Education and in compliance with regulatory agencies. For example, in the State of California, any premiums must be deposited into a special fund and applied to pay debt service; that is, the premium must be used to pay down the bond itself. The State of Colorado does not have similar restrictions on the use of bond premium revenues. However, best practices suggest that premium funds should be kept in a separate account and the Jefferson County community should have input into prioritizing the utilization of these funds in excess of the bond issuance. Therefore, the District should separate the contingency and premium funds into two separate accounts to enable improved tracking and monitoring on the utilization of these different revenue sources. Additionally, the District should establish policies and procedures related to when funds can be pulled from either contingency or premium fund balances, including approval authority.

Finally, the District should develop a prioritized list of capital projects that could be funded with remaining bond funds. This effort should involve community engagement and may be informed by the District's 2021 Facility Master Plan.

D. BIDDING AND PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES

Monitoring and evaluating procurement procedures is an integral part of the management of an organization. The procurement process often requires a high level of attention from management to ensure that it does not become the source of fraud and corruption. Procurement procedures need to include effective controls to achieve accountability and transparency. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of the procurement process establishes integrity and compliance with laws and ethical standards.



We verified that District bidding and awarding of Bond-funded construction projects complies with the requirements of the Colorado State school construction requirements, Public Contract Code, and State and other relevant laws and regulations. Procurement controls were evaluated for application of competitive, compliant, and fair contracting practices. We conducted interviews and reviewed relevant policies, bids, and contractor selection files. We selected a sample of contracts and assessed implementation of the controls needed to achieve competitive contracting practices that are consistent with school construction program requirements and best practices. Change order and amendment documentation was reviewed for compliance with District's policies and procedures, Public Contract Code, Colorado State school construction requirements, and other regulations. Controls and activities to manage change orders were evaluated. We also reviewed policies and procedures to verify whether documentation existed prior to approval of change orders and amendments and verified that required approvals were applied.

Procurement Selection Process

11. Observation	The District selected contractors utilizing a prequalified list of contractors; however, bid tabulations or evaluations for the selection and award of the projects were not available. Additionally, documentation was not available to demonstrate the selection process and awarding of professional services from the prequalified list of consultants. We were unable to determine whether or how the selection and award process for District projects included the factors outlined in the District's policies and procedures.
Recommendation	As a best practice, the District should maintain bid tabulation and evaluation documentation to support the bid evaluation, selection, and award process.

Per the District's FEG- R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure, we were unable to identify defined procedures for the evaluation, selection, and award of construction projects. Additionally, parameters to determine how projects would be awarded are not defined (i.e., best value, lowest bidder, etc.). Upon inquiry with District staff, the District currently selects contractors from their prequalified contractors list and sends the selected contractors a request for proposal. From the proposals received, District staff conduct interviews and select and award the project to a contractor. However, per the policies and procedures, the following criteria should be considered during the qualification and selection process:

- History of firm's performance and management capabilities
- Geographic location of firm's office
- Length of time firm has been in business
- Length of time firm has worked in Denver metro area
- Qualifications and experience of staff
- Type, complexity, and value of projects completed by firm
- Reputation of performance with owners, architects/engineers, and the local construction industry
- Experience in work with the District and other school districts
- Financial strength and responsibility as reflected in financial statements, working capital, and timely disbursements of payments



- Bonding ability and bonding company
- Responses from references
- Claims history

Documentation of the procurement process was not available upon request. Upon further inquiry with the District, the District provided screen shots of procurement policies and procedures. However, with additional review, we were unable to identify the additional procurement policies and procedures from the screenshots within the District current 'FEG- R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure'. Per the screenshots, the procedures were drafts from 2005 and 2007. We are unable to verify if the additional policies and procedures provided in the screen shots are current, board approved, procurement policies and procedures.

Monitoring controls should be improved to ensure each step is performed and approved by appropriate personnel (see [Appendix H](#) for further information). Monitoring and evaluating procurement procedures is an integral part of the management of an organization. The procurement process often requires a high level of attention from management to ensure that it does not become a potential source of fraud.

Additionally, the selection of professional service providers like architects and landscape designers appears to have been a sole source procurement (see [Appendix I](#) for further information). Per inquiry, the District established a list of prequalified professional service providers, and then selected a vendor from the prequalified list to provide architectural or design services. However, per the District's FEB Architect/Engineer/Construction Manager policy and procedure, "the following applicable criteria shall be considered in selecting design consultants;" In addition, "such services shall be obtained at fair and reasonable costs."

Criteria	Required per Policies and Procedure?	Included in Evaluation?
General experience and competence of the firm and its principles	Yes	No
Experience and competence of the firm and its principals in educational facility design	Yes	No
Experience of the firm and its principals in performing work for the District	Yes	No
Geographic location of the firm's office	Yes	Yes
Adequacy of personnel and office facilities for a specific job	Yes	Yes
Current workload of the firm	Yes	Yes
Past performance of the firm in completing projects within the approved schedule	Yes	No
Past performance of the firm in completing projects within the approved budget.	Yes	No
Design quality of previous work	Yes	No



Criteria	Required per Policies and Procedure?	Included in Evaluation?
Familiarity with local construction conditions, building codes, District design standards, and other pertinent knowledge for a specific job	Yes	No
Proven track record in construction contract administration	Yes	No
Any special qualifications for a specific job	Yes	Yes
Sign Jeffco Consultant agreement without modification	No	Yes

Upon review of the professional service bid tabulations provided by the District, we were unable to identify all the criteria defined within the District's FEB Architect/Engineer/Construction Manager policy and procedure were included within the District's evaluation of the professional service providers. The bid tabulations or evaluations provided by the District included the following criteria: sign Jeffco consultant agreement without modification (10%).

Since current District policy does not require awarding projects to the lowest bidder, the existing methodology relies on a subjective evaluation of the bidders according to the defined criteria above. By developing a scorecard, the District can evaluate bids in an objective, repeatable, and transparent manner. Furthermore, the District can communicate this supportable data to key stakeholders including but not limited to the Board of Education, the CAAC, the public, and bidders.

Recommendation

As a best practice, the District should maintain bid tabulation and evaluation documentation to support the bid evaluation, selection, and award process. The District's bid tabulation and evaluation process should include the qualification and selection process factors defined with the District's FEB-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards and FEB Architect/Engineer/Construction Manager policy and procedure. As provided by the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) contracts established by the District, the District should formalize a plan to conduct construction audits or review procedures to ensure any potential non-compliant charges are not billed to the District and to support transparency of the projects.

There are two primary approaches to consider when developing a scorecard:

- **Simple Scoring.** In this approach, each question is evaluated on a set scale, often from one to five. Evaluators assign the score based on the bidder response using established scoring criteria. The totals are tallied at the end.
- **Weighted Scoring.** The weighted scoring approach prioritizes different elements of the RFP response based on importance to the District. This scoring model enables a clearer picture of which bidder offers the best long-term value. The District would prioritize each category, then assign a weight to the category.

For example, category weights may be assigned as follows:

- Qualifications and experience of staff: 25%
- Type, complexity, and value of projects completed by firm: 25%



- Experience in work with the District and other school districts: 15%
- Geographic location of firm's office: 10%
- Claims history: 5%
- History: 5%
- Reputation of performance with owners, architects/engineers, and the local construction industry: 5%
- Length of time firm has been in business: 2%
- Length of time firm has worked in Denver metro area: 2%
- Financial strength and responsibility as reflected in financial statements, working capital and timely disbursements of payments: 2%
- Bonding ability and bonding company: 2%
- Responses from references: 2%

Making decisions based on RFP scoring data offers many advantages. Namely, scoring data transforms a subjective process into an objective one. Procurement procedures need to include effective controls to achieve accountability and transparency. Continuous monitoring and evaluating of the procurement process can help Jeffco establish integrity and compliance with policy and ethical standards.

Local Contractor Preference and Selection

12. Observation	While the District awarded all construction projects to local construction contractors, as defined by District staff, the District does not currently have Board of Education-approved policies and procedures that define what constitutes a “local” construction contractor or objective, weighted criteria for giving preference to local contractors during the selection process.
Recommendation	As a best practice, the District should establish and incorporate definitions, objective criteria, and weighted scoring for local construction contractors within approved bidding and procurement policies and procedures.

During our procurement review of the sampled District construction projects, it appears that the District awarded all construction projects to local construction contractors as defined by District staff. Per District construction management staff, “Construction Management considers ‘local’ contractors those with offices from Fort Collins to Colorado Springs.” The District noted local contractor preference included both local Colorado offices or those with Colorado headquarters. In order to review the District’s commitment to a preference for local construction contractors, we reviewed the addresses provided by each contractor who submitted bids for District construction projects and verified the address provided met the definition of local as defined by District staff; all contractors reviewed provided a local address (see [Appendix H](#) for further information). Per inquiry with District staff, only local contractors from the prequalified contractor list were invited to submit proposals on District projects. However, upon inquiry, the District did not include the definition of what constitutes a local construction contractor within Board of Education-approved bidding and procurement policies and procedures. Furthermore, we were unable to identify objective criteria with weighted scoring for local preference within Board of Education-approved bidding and procurement policies and procedures.



Additionally, during review of the sampled District construction projects, it appears that no non-local construction contractors submitted bids to the District for construction projects. Absent additional information, and non-local contractors participating in the District’s construction bidding process, we are unable to evaluate the impact of the District’s commitment to “a preference for hiring local construction contractors” on District project costs.

Recommendation

As a best practice, District policies and procedures should define what constitutes a local construction contractor. For example, is it a certain mileage from the District, is it just a local office, or does it need to be headquartered in Colorado, etc. Additionally, best practices suggest that District policy and procedure should include objective criteria and a weighted score to use when evaluating bids to ensure local contractors are receiving preference. While the District did award all construction projects to local construction contractors, District policies and procedures do not include definitions, objective criteria, and weighted scoring considerations to provide consistency in the commitment to local construction contractors in the District’s bidding and procurement process.

E. CHANGE ORDER REPORTING AND CONTROLS

Processes to review and approve contractor charges were analyzed to prevent excessive charges and overpayments, and payment applications were reviewed to assess the adequacy of supporting documentation. Change order and amendment documentation was reviewed for compliance with stated policies and procedures. Controls and activities to manage change orders were also evaluated. Specific emphasis was placed on the implementation of change order policies, procedures, and practices needed to ensure project deliverables, scope prioritization, fund sources, and approvals were documented and aligned with best practices.

Change Order Approvals

13. Observation	While amendments and change orders over \$500,000 were approved by the Board of Education, the District does not have policies and procedures specific to the change order process (i.e., review process, thresholds, approval process, approval levels, etc.). The District defaults to the generic FEG-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure. Additionally, it appears that two change orders were not approved at the appropriate level, and we were unable to identify itemized supporting documentation for nine change orders.
Recommendation	As a best practice, the District should consider formalizing change order policies and procedures to define the process for receiving a change order, the minimum elements to be included within change order documentation, the review process to be followed, the approval process with approval thresholds, and change order tracking and reporting to key stakeholders.

Upon review of the sampled contractors' change orders, we were unable to identify itemized supporting documentation for nine change orders:



Project ID	Project Name	Contractor	SCO #	CO \$Amt	Itemized Supporting Documentation Provided?
H71000 A01	Alameda High School Addition & General Upgrades	Wold Architects & Engineers	1	\$415,500.00	No
H73500 A01	Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	EIDOS Architects, PC (1035)	1	\$311,987.00	No
H73500 A01	Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	EIDOS Architects, PC (1108)	2	\$14,430.00	No
H73500 A01	Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	Swinerton Builders	2	-\$77,565.00	No
H78000 A01	Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	Sy-Bazz Architecture, LLC	1	\$843,440.00	No
H78000 A01	Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	Sy-Bazz Architecture, LLC	2	\$8,692.00	No
H78000 A01	Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	Sy-Bazz Architecture, LLC	3	\$7,900.00	No
H91700 U18	Districtwide Field Improvements	ECI Site Construction Management	1	\$17,815,755.45	No
H91700 U18	Districtwide Field Improvements	Hord Coplan Macht, Inc.	1	\$44,974.50	No

Change order reporting should include information such as itemized change amounts, percentages, descriptions, change responsibilities, schedule impacts, dates of approval, subtotals, and totals for easy end user reference. Change order documentation should be available at the project and program level and include both detailed and summary level information. Summary and detailed change reporting is necessary for understanding change order cause, responsibility, pricing, and compliance as well as identifying potential duplicated work scopes and/or redundancies caused by unclear scope objectives and/or expectations within the project. Because change orders can have a substantial impact on a construction project's costs and profitability, all concerned parties should follow a standardized change order process to support accountability and transparency. Fully supported change orders ensure there are no hidden costs and validate that the profit margin of an order doesn't exceed that of the contract requirements.



While change order documentation appeared to be available upon request and the District provided guidance on how to process a change order within its system, we were unable to identify change order specific policies and procedures that define what information should be included within a change order, the process to review a change order, who should review and approve change orders, and the thresholds for change order approvals. Upon inquiry, the District uses the same approval thresholds for expenditures, contract approvals, and change orders. However, the policy and procedure does not specifically include change orders within its approval thresholds. Per the FEG-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy, the following approval thresholds were defined:

Category	Value	Required Approval
Contract Award	Less than \$250,000	Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management or designee
Contract Award	\$250,000 to \$500,000	Chief Operating Officer or designee
Contract Award	Over \$500,000	Board of Education
Payment	Less than \$250,000	Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management or designee
Payment	Over \$250,000	Chief Operating Officer

Recommendation

As a best practice, change order policies and procedures should define the process for receiving a change order, the minimum elements to be included within change order documentation, the review process to be followed, the approval process with approval thresholds, and change order tracking and reporting to key stakeholders. For example, as discussed above, change order documentation and reporting should contain the following information at a minimum:

- Name and address of the project
- Owner's name
- Name and phone number of the person requesting the change
- Complete description of the planned work, including change order responsibility such as owner initiated, additional scope and associated approvals, design error, and unforeseen condition
- Price and percentage of the change, including a breakdown of the costs as well as the total change orders to date
- Schedule impact, if applicable
- Signatures of all necessary representatives
- Date on which all necessary representatives (and other relevant third parties) signed the change order
- Revised project completion date



Change order policies and procedures should be formalized and approved by the Board of Education. Formalized policies and procedures ensure fair and competitive pricing, prevent excessive charges, mitigate the risk of potential fraud, and increase accountability and transparency.

Change Order Reporting

14. Observation	The District was able to provide change order reporting; however, it did not include many of the components identified as a best practice including change reason, description, original contract amount, change amount, percent of change, revised amount, budget and schedule impact, and revised completion date. Additionally, we were unable to verify comprehensive change order reporting is being provided to the CAAC, Superintendent, or the Board of Education.
Recommendation	As a best practice, the District should establish Board-approved policies and procedures that define the components of change order reporting to key stakeholders.

The District does not have policies and procedures that detail the required minimum components and process of reporting change order information to key stakeholders responsible for the oversight of the Bond Program. Upon request for change order reporting, District staff provided an Excel report titled “Contract Change Order Summary Data;” however, the report provided did not include information essential to evaluating the change order costs. As a best practice, change order reporting should include the following information at a minimum:

- Change reason (owner-initiated, scope changes, design errors, contract errors, and unforeseen conditions)
- Complete description of the planned work
- Original contract amount
- Change order amount and percentage of the change
- Revised contract amount
- Budget impacts
- Schedule impact, if applicable
- Revised project completion date, if applicable

Without this level of information, responsibility for change orders and associated cost will not be evident to key decision-makers. The District’s current report does include some of the above components, but the components it does have did not appear to be applied consistently. For example, of the 921 change orders included in the report, 527 did not include the change reason (owner-initiated, scope changes, design errors, contract errors, or unforeseen conditions). The report also did not include original contract amount, percent of the contract, revised amount, budget impact, additional days, or current status. Without this information, key stakeholders may find it difficult to understand the nature and necessity of the change order.

As noted in [Observation No. 13](#), it does appear that key stakeholders were involved in the approval process as appropriate; however, documentation of the reporting and transparency of change orders to the key stakeholders was not readily identifiable. For example, in the Board of Education meetings



reviewed, it appears that all change orders for Board approval were included within the consent agenda, unless pulled for further discussion, and did not include detailed change order reporting for consideration of the overall impact.

Recommendation

As a best practice, the District should establish Board-approved policies and procedures that define the components of change order reporting to key stakeholders. This should also include the frequency of detailed reporting to key stakeholders. The District should update its current change order reporting to include all the components identified as a best practice to ensure proper oversight and transparency.



APPENDIX A: INTERVIEWS PERFORMED

The following individuals were interviewed for this evaluation:

- Stephanie Schooley: Board of Education member
- Rick Rush: Board of Education member
- Susan Miller: Board of Education member
- Brad Rupert: Board of Education Member
- Susan Harmon: Board of Education Member
- Jeff Wilhite: Former CAAC member
- Tim Murray: CAAC member
- Tracy Dorland: Superintendent
- Steven Bell: Chief Operating Officer
- Renee Nicothodes: Chief of Schools for Elementary/Charter Schools
- Tim Reed: Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management
- Bruce Huxley: Director, Property and Planning
- Berry Jones: Director, Design and Construction
- Bill Claveau: Cost/Scheduler
- Heather Frizzell: Supervisor, Program Accounting
- Ted Hagan: Senior Project Manager
- Ed Huszcza: Senior Project Manager
- Sam Miller: Senior Project Manager
- Tammy Schiff: Chief Communications Officer
- Maureen Wolsborn: Bond Communications
- Robert Greenwalt: Community member



APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The table below summarizes the results of this analysis, including responses to question posed in the District's RFP for the engagement as well as references to specific report sections for additional details.

QUESTION FROM RFP	ANSWER	RELATED REPORT SECTIONS
1. Did Jeffco spend the money on the projects as promised within the parameters of the ballot question?	Based on procedures performed, we conclude that for the fiscal years through June 30, 2021, bond proceeds were used only for listed purposes under Ballot Measure 5B, with the potential exception of administrative allocation charges to the program including certain administrative salaries. Additionally, we were unable to identify documentation of appropriate approvals for two of the 96 sampled program expenditures.	Observation No. 1
2. How and when were projects identified and how and when was that communicated to voters?	The District developed the 2018 Flipbook to inform parents and community members of the improvements that could occur at their local schools if the ballot passed; however, this Flipbook did not reconcile to the total bond issuance and or key documents that were deemed foundational to establish project scope and budget.	Observation No. 5
3. What projects have been completed as of June 30, 2021?	Based on District system-generated records, the District completed 96 sub-projects totaling \$214,706,512.85 as of June 30, 2021.	Appendix E
4. How did the District establish project scopes and budgets?	District leadership reported that the 5B Bond Program was developed based on the 2016 Master Plan and an internally generated project list. However, the total facility deficiencies identified in these plans, as well as other planning documents provided by the District, were not commensurate with the budget for the Bond Program and did not align with the 2018 Flipbook, which was the primary communication tool to convey the approximate scope and budget of the Bond Program to voters.	Observation No. 4
5. What procurement process did the District use? Did procurement processes align with District Policy?	The District selected contractors utilizing a prequalified list of contractors; however, bid tabulations or evaluations for the selection and award of the projects was not available. Additionally, documentation was not available to demonstrate the selection process and awarding of professional services from the prequalified list of consultants. We were unable to determine whether or how the selection and award process for District projects included the factors outlined in the District's policies and procedures.	Observation No. 11



QUESTION FROM RFP	ANSWER	RELATED REPORT SECTIONS
6. Did completed projects adhere to predetermined budgets, and if not how were those variances accounted for? Are in-process projects proceeding on budget and timeframe plans?	<p>Total project budgets recorded in the District's project management system exceeded what was listed in the Flipbook by between \$109,757,271 and \$136,488,124. Between 71.3 and 89.3% of all projects had a system budget that exceeded its Flipbook budget. Additionally, the system data included 13 projects totaling \$22,491,629 that are not noted in either the original 2018 Flipbook or the updated 2021 version.</p> <p>Based on system-generated original and actual budget data, completed projects had a variance of \$46,903,796. Of all completed projects, 52.1% exceeded their original budget and 18.8% exceeded their original budget by \$500,00 or more. However, it is unclear how budget overages were accounted for.</p> <p>Based on system-generated original and current budget data, in-progress projects have a variance of \$45,618,624, 53.3% of all in-progress projects are expected to exceed their original budget, and 19% are expected to exceed their original budget by \$500,00 or more.</p>	<p>Observation No. 7</p> <p>Observation No. 8</p> <p>Observation No. 9</p> <p>Appendix E</p>
7. Does Jeffco have processes to evaluate and approve change orders, increases in cost of scope, release of contingency funds and other construction process issues?	While amendments and change orders over \$500,000 were approved by the Board of Education, the District does not have policies and procedures specific to the change order process (i.e., review process, thresholds, approval process, approval levels, etc.). The District defaults to the generic FEG-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure. Additionally, it appears that two change orders were not approved at the appropriate level, and we were unable to identify itemized supporting documentation for nine change orders.	<p>Observation No. 13</p>
8. How were project changes communicated through or authorized by the organization to ensure appropriate oversight by the Capital Asset Advisory Committee, the Superintendent, and/or the Board?	The District was able to provide change order reporting; however, it did not include many of the components identified as a best practice including change reasons, description of work, percent of change, budget impact, schedule impact, etc. Additionally, we were unable to verify whether comprehensive change order reporting is provided to the Citizens' Capital Asset Advisory Committee (CAAC), Superintendent, or the Board of Education.	<p>Observation No. 14</p>
9. What projects are planned to be initiated, bid, and completed in FY 2022? Is there adequate capital to cover those improvements?	There are 133 projects that are planned to be initiated in fiscal year 2022. The total valuation for these projects is currently budgeted to be 187,581,045.84 and \$3,352,669.24 in budget increases were made within the system as of June 30, 2021.	<p>Observation No. 10</p> <p>Appendix E</p>



QUESTION FROM RFP	ANSWER	RELATED REPORT SECTIONS
	Based on Bond Program and District system records through June 30, 2021, there is adequate capital to cover planned projects. Using current budget projections, there is an excess of \$90,997,699.06 in Bond Program revenues. However, when compared to the total bond premium revenue earned (\$118,474,497), it appears that \$27,476,797.94 of the bond premium revenue has already been, or is planned to be, spent by the District.	
10. Did the District fulfill its commitment to a preference for local construction contractors?	The District awarded all construction projects to local construction contractors, as defined by District staff. However, the District does not currently have Board of Education approved policies and procedures that define what a local construction contractor is or objective, weighted criteria for giving preference to local construction contractors during the selection process.	Observation No. 12 Appendix G
11. How did the District accomplish this commitment in the bidding process?	Contractors with local Colorado offices and/or Colorado headquartered offices were selected for all sampled construction projects; however, bid tabulation or evaluations and policies and procedures including definitions and criteria for identifying local contractors was unavailable.	Observation No. 12 Appendix G
12. Did such commitment impact the cost of District projects?	As defined by District staff, all construction contractors who bid on District projects were considered local. We are unable to evaluate the impact the commitment to giving preference to local contractors had on the cost of District projects because no non-local contractors were included within the bidding process.	Observation No. 12 Appendix G
13. Did the District limit the bond proceeds to capital improvement projects? Are there any extraordinary expenses to be explained (i.e. salaries or other)?	The District allocated administrative costs to the Bond Program; however, the District does not have formalized policies and procedures that define what positions constitute senior District administration, which is not an allowable expense, and what amount or percentage of administration can be allocated to the Bond Program. Additionally, the District potentially included non-salary or payroll costs within the detailed administrative support charged to the Bond Program.	Observation No. 2



QUESTION FROM RFP	ANSWER	RELATED REPORT SECTIONS
14. How has the program been monitored by the CAAC? How was the CAAC tasked with “monitoring” the program? What direction was given to them? What role do they plan in reviewing and approving projects or project changes? Do they make recommendations or report out to the Superintendent and/or the Board? If so, when?	The CAAC’s sole guidance related to Bond Program monitoring is included within Board Policy, which established the Committee prior to the 2018 Bond Program approval. Bond oversight is reliant on District staff, including the Superintendent, COO, CFO, and Executive Director of Facilities and Construction Management, to create agendas and reports for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee reviews the overall financial status of the Bond Program as well as high-level project status reports. The CAAC provides quarterly and annual reports to the Board of Education. The ability for the CAAC to vote on recommended changes to the Bond Program that would then be forwarded to the Board of Education was put into place on November 7, 2020.	<u>Observation No. 6</u>
15. The bond program is discussed in the District CAFR. Should there be an independent audit of the bond program by an external consultant?	The District has not required the completion of an annual independent financial audit of the Bond Program, which contradicts the requirements set forth in the bond language.	<u>Observation No. 3</u>
16. What are the greatest successes of the program so far?	Interviewed stakeholders noted several areas of program strengths, including project delivery, project reach, parent engagement, improved reporting, and economies of scale.	<u>Commendations</u>
17. What improvements or modifications can be made to the program implementation as it moves forward?	Overall, the District should establish and institutionalize bond-specific policies and procedures for expenditures, local vendor preference, vendor selection processes, and change order management. Reporting to key stakeholders (including the CAAC, Board of Education, and community members) should be improved to align with actual budget and timelines for projects, as well as explain any variances. Please refer to all recommendations contained within this report, which are designed to improve the overall administration and transparency of the Bond Program.	All recommendations



APPENDIX C: 2018 AND 2021 FLIPBOOK BUDGET AND SCOPE ANALYSIS

The following table summarizes the original site-specific project scope and budget in the 2018 Flipbook compared to the 2021 Flipbook.

Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Alameda Articulation Area	Alameda International Jr./ Sr. High	\$18,003,098	\$19,434,000	\$1,430,902.00	7.9%	Increased	Replace worn roofing
Alameda Articulation Area	Deane Elementary	\$1,041,370	\$1,065,000	\$23,630.00	2.3%	Decreased	New, more secure exterior doors; More secure & energy-efficient windows
Alameda Articulation Area	Emory Elementary	\$3,011,705	\$3,187,000	\$175,295.00	5.8%	Decreased	Replace old furniture
Alameda Articulation Area	Lasley Elementary	\$1,497,502	\$1,582,000	\$84,498.00	5.6%	Increased	New, more secure exterior doors; More secure & energy-efficient windows
Alameda Articulation Area	Patterson International Elementary	\$2,119,131	\$2,232,000	\$112,869.00	5.3%	Increased	Replace old furniture; Replace old carpet & floor tile; Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving
Alameda Articulation Area	Rose Stein International Elementary	\$463,102	\$180,000	-\$283,102.00	-61.1%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada High	\$14,765,828	\$15,536,000	\$770,172.00	5.2%	Increased	Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada K-8	\$2,397,906	\$2,169,000	-\$228,906.00	-9.5%	Increased	Replace old furniture



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Arvada Articulation Area	Fitzmorris Elementary	\$1,891,794	\$1,993,000	\$101,206.00	5.3%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Foster Elementary	\$5,949,807	\$5,952,000	\$2,193.00	0.0%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Hackberry Hill Elementary	\$1,075,477	\$1,128,000	\$52,523.00	4.9%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Lawrence Elementary	\$2,831,578	\$2,976,000	\$144,422.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	North Arvada Middle	\$3,324,436	\$3,501,000	\$176,564.00	5.3%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Peck Elementary	\$2,385,520	\$2,508,000	\$122,480.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Secrest Elementary	\$1,485,500	\$1,566,000	\$80,500.00	5.4%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Swanson Elementary	\$3,273,650	\$3,445,000	\$171,350.00	5.2%	Unchanged	
Arvada Articulation Area	Thomson Elementary	\$2,074,473	\$2,185,000	\$110,527.00	5.3%	Unchanged	
Arvada West Articulation Area	Allendale Elementary	\$1,259,382	\$1,357,000	\$97,618.00	7.8%	Increased	Replace old furniture



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Arvada West Articulation Area	Arvada West High	\$1,567,998	\$1,671,230	\$103,232.00	6.6%	Increased	Landscaping & field improvements; Replace old carpet & floor tile
Arvada West Articulation Area	Campbell Elementary	\$2,514,071	\$2,285,000	-\$229,071.00	-9.1%	Unchanged	
Arvada West Articulation Area	Drake Middle School	\$1,010,260	\$1,036,000	\$25,740.00	2.5%	Increased	Replace old furniture
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fairmount Elementary	\$2,111,708	\$2,226,000	\$114,292.00	5.4%	Decreased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fremont Elementary	\$1,214,621	\$1,289,000	\$74,379.00	6.1%	Unchanged	
Arvada West Articulation Area	Stott Elementary	\$1,243,613	\$1,312,000	\$68,387.00	5.5%	Unchanged	
Arvada West Articulation Area	Vanderhoof Elementary	\$1,995,235	\$2,113,000	\$117,765.00	5.9%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek High	\$1,196,747	\$1,257,000	\$60,253.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek K-8	\$515,481	\$531,000	\$15,519.00	3.0%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Carmody Middle	\$2,123,880	\$2,230,000	\$106,120.00	5.0%	Increased	Repair & update Exterior finish; Replace old ceilings



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Green Gables Elementary	\$2,463,767	\$2,589,000	\$125,233.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendallvue Elementary	\$1,577,970	\$1,658,000	\$80,030.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendrick Lakes Elementary	\$22,287,576	\$23,400,000	\$1,112,424.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Peiffer Elementary	\$1,844,963	\$1,937,000	\$92,037.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old furniture; Replace old carpet & floor tile; Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving; Replace old ceilings
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Red Rocks Elementary	\$2,071,031	\$2,175,000	\$103,969.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Westgate Elementary	\$2,336,484	\$2,455,000	\$118,516.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Addenbrooke Classical Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Collegiate Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Compass Montessori Golden	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Compass Montessori Wheat Ridge	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Doral Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Charter Schools	Excel Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Great Work Montessori	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Jefferson Academy Elementary	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Jefferson Academy Secondary	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Lincoln Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Montessori Peaks Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Mountain Phoenix Community School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Rocky Mountain Deaf School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	The New America School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Two Roads Charter School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	
Charter Schools	Woodrow Wilson Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	0.0%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 North	\$452,758	\$475,000	\$22,242.00	4.9%	Unchanged	
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 South	\$1,522,904	\$1,599,000	\$76,096.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Chatfield Articulation Area	Chatfield High	\$4,887,763	\$5,027,000	\$139,237.00	2.8%	Unchanged	
Chatfield Articulation Area	Coronado Elementary	\$2,854,490	\$2,997,000	\$142,510.00	5.0%	Increased	More secure & energy-efficient windows
Chatfield Articulation Area	Deer Creek Middle	\$1,402,297	\$1,472,000	\$69,703.00	5.0%	Increased	New, more secure exterior doors
Chatfield Articulation Area	Falcon Bluffs Middle	\$1,484,505	\$1,559,000	\$74,495.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old furniture
Chatfield Articulation Area	Mortensen Elementary	\$611,995	\$643,000	\$31,005.00	5.1%	Increased	Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping
Chatfield Articulation Area	Shaffer Elementary	\$924,001	\$970,000	\$45,999.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old ceilings
Chatfield Articulation Area	Stony Creek Elementary	\$1,352,382	\$1,420,000	\$67,618.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Chatfield Articulation Area	Ute Meadows Elementary	\$1,009,038	\$1,059,000	\$49,962.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine High	\$14,129,966	\$14,836,000	\$706,034.00	5.0%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine Hills Elementary	\$1,730,679	\$1,812,000	\$81,321.00	4.7%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Dutch Creek Elementary	\$1,723,226	\$1,809,000	\$85,774.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Governor's Ranch Elementary	\$921,597	\$968,000	\$46,403.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Ken Caryl Middle	\$1,797,006	\$1,887,000	\$89,994.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Leawood Elementary	\$955,138	\$1,003,000	\$47,862.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Columbine Articulation Area	Normandy Elementary	\$1,443,121	\$1,513,000	\$69,879.00	4.8%	Unchanged	
Conifer Articulation Area	Conifer High	\$9,820,651	\$10,297,000	\$476,349.00	4.9%	Unchanged	
Conifer Articulation Area	Elk Creek Elementary	\$950,302	\$998,000	\$47,698.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Conifer Articulation Area	Marshdale Elementary	\$19,986,323	\$21,000,000	\$1,013,677.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Elementary	\$688,499	\$723,000	\$34,501.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Middle	\$2,323,535	\$3,700,000	\$1,376,465.00	59.2%	Increased	Landscaping & field improvements



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Blue Heron Elementary	\$569,931	\$599,000	\$29,069.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Colorow Elementary	\$1,867,313	\$1,966,000	\$98,687.00	5.3%	Decreased	Replace old furniture; Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Dakota Ridge High	\$5,000,847	\$5,283,000	\$282,153.00	5.6%	Unchanged	
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Mount Carbon Elementary	\$832,680	\$874,000	\$41,320.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Powderhorn Elementary	\$5,756,358	\$6,100,000	\$343,642.00	6.0%	Unchanged	
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Summit Ridge Middle	\$2,464,889	\$2,667,000	\$202,111.00	8.2%	Increased	Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving; Replace old ceilings
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Westridge Elementary	\$1,878,659	\$1,973,000	\$94,341.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Meadow Elementary	\$5,320,270	\$5,586,000	\$265,730.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Valley Intermediate	\$355,429	\$374,000	\$18,571.00	5.2%	Unchanged	
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen High	\$11,552,175	\$12,197,000	\$644,825.00	5.6%	Unchanged	
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen Middle	\$7,111,914	\$7,746,000	\$634,086.00	8.9%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Evergreen Articulation Area	Parmalee Elementary	\$3,566,148	\$3,744,000	\$177,852.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Evergreen Articulation Area	Wilmot Elementary	\$3,894,141	\$4,089,000	\$194,859.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Golden Articulation Area	Bell Middle	\$7,041,686	\$7,365,000	\$323,314.00	4.6%	Unchanged	
Golden Articulation Area	Golden High	\$1,333,040	\$1,403,000	\$69,960.00	5.2%	Increased	New, more secure exterior doors; Landscaping & field improvements
Golden Articulation Area	Kyffin Elementary	\$4,656,340	\$4,886,000	\$229,660.00	4.9%	Mixed	Added: New, more secure exterior doors Removed: More secure & energy- efficient windows; Replace old carpet & floor tile; Replace movable partitions
Golden Articulation Area	Mitchell Elementary	\$855,531	\$898,000	\$42,469.00	5.0%	Mixed	Added: New, more secure exterior doors; Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping; Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving Removed: More secure & energy- efficient windows; Replace old furniture; Replace old carpet & floor tile
Golden Articulation Area	Ralston Elementary	\$959,329	\$1,007,000	\$47,671.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Golden Articulation Area	Shelton Elementary	\$1,397,841	\$1,468,000	\$70,159.00	5.0%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Golden Articulation Area	Welchester Elementary	\$1,871,160	\$1,966,000	\$94,840.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Devinny Elementary	\$1,208,704	\$1,266,000	\$57,296.00	4.7%	Decreased	Replace worn roofing
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Dunstan Middle	\$608,884	\$639,000	\$30,116.00	4.9%	Increased	Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Foothills Elementary	\$1,313,600	\$1,367,000	\$53,400.00	4.1%	Increased	Replace movable partitions; Replace old ceilings
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain Elementary	\$1,267,243	\$1,328,000	\$60,757.00	4.8%	Mixed	Added: Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping Removed: Replace old playground equipment
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain High	\$13,606,922	\$14,361,000	\$754,078.00	5.5%	Unchanged	
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Hutchinson Elementary	\$2,269,596	\$2,283,000	\$13,404.00	0.6%	Increased	Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Rooney Ranch Elementary	\$442,367	\$446,000	\$3,633.00	0.8%	Decreased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Jefferson Articulation Area	Edgewater Elementary	\$5,188,317	\$5,456,000	\$267,683.00	5.2%	Increased	Update interior paint, wall- coverings; Replace old playground equipment
Jefferson Articulation Area	Jefferson Jr./Sr. High	\$13,456,190	\$14,129,000	\$672,810.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Jefferson Articulation Area	Lumberg Elementary	\$7,610,659	\$7,992,000	\$381,341.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Jefferson Articulation Area	Molholm Elementary	\$6,104,205	\$6,409,000	\$304,795.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Lakewood Articulation Area	Belmar Elementary	\$1,016,991	\$1,068,000	\$51,009.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Lakewood Articulation Area	Creighton Middle	\$1,212,764	\$1,273,000	\$60,236.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Lakewood Articulation Area	Eiber Elementary	\$2,258,107	\$2,371,000	\$112,893.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Lakewood Articulation Area	Glennon Heights Elementary	\$1,657,919	\$1,741,000	\$83,081.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Lakewood Articulation Area	Lakewood High	\$3,127,890	\$3,287,000	\$159,110.00	5.1%	Increased	Landscaping & field improvements
Lakewood Articulation Area	Slater Elementary	\$1,248,488	\$1,311,000	\$62,512.00	5.0%	Increased	New, more secure exterior doors; Commercial kitchen improvements
Lakewood Articulation Area	South Lakewood Elementary	\$1,339,635	\$1,407,000	\$67,365.00	5.0%	Increased	New, more secure exterior doors
Option Schools	Brady Exploration School	\$1,745,123	\$1,832,000	\$86,877.00	5.0%	Increased	
Option Schools	Connections Learning Center	\$252,445	\$265,000	\$12,555.00	5.0%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Option Schools	D'Evelyn Jr./Sr. High School	\$912,508	\$1,483,000	\$570,492.00	62.5%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Dennison Elementary	\$1,122,733	\$1,789,000	\$666,267.00	59.3%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Fletcher Miller Special School	\$2,097,643	\$2,203,000	\$105,357.00	5.0%	Decreased	Update HVAC, plumbing, & piping
Option Schools	Free Horizon Montessori	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0.00	0.0%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Jeffco Open School	\$9,307,490	\$9,773,000	\$465,510.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Long View High School	\$361,970	\$380,000	\$18,030.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Manning Option School	\$6,673,553	\$6,482,000	-\$191,553.00	-2.9%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	McLain High School	\$735,640	\$772,000	\$36,360.00	4.9%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Sobesky Academy	\$1,261,431	\$1,325,000	\$63,569.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Option Schools	Warren Tech Central	\$3,170,881	\$3,329,000	\$158,119.00	5.0%	Decreased	New paint to protect exterior
Option Schools	Warren Tech North	\$416,953	\$438,000	\$21,047.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Pomona Articulation Area	Little Elementary	\$2,858,749	\$3,002,000	\$143,251.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements; Replace old playground equipment
Pomona Articulation Area	Moore Middle	\$2,163,362	\$2,727,000	\$563,638.00	26.1%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements; Replace old furniture



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Pomona Articulation Area	Parr Elementary	\$1,119,772	\$1,176,000	\$56,228.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old playground equipment
Pomona Articulation Area	Pomona High	\$12,798,591	\$12,389,000	-\$409,591.00	-3.2%	Unchanged	
Pomona Articulation Area	Warder Elementary	\$1,020,410	\$1,071,000	\$50,590.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements; Replace old playground equipment
Pomona Articulation Area	Weber Elementary	\$772,128	\$811,000	\$38,872.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Coal Creek Canyon K-8	\$1,064,126	\$1,117,000	\$52,874.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Meiklejohn Elementary	\$398,650	\$419,000	\$20,350.00	5.1%	Unchanged	
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Oberon Middle	\$8,055,552	\$7,933,000	-\$122,552.00	-1.5%	Unchanged	
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Ralston Valley High	\$9,397,456	\$10,392,000	\$994,544.00	10.6%	Unchanged	
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Sierra Elementary	0	\$707,000	\$707,000.00	Cost was labeled N/A in 2018	Increased	Security camera & lock updates; Update existing technology
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Three Creek K-8	\$4,697,000	\$4,932,000	\$235,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Van Arsdale Elementary	\$3,773,128	\$3,962,000	\$188,872.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	West Woods Elementary	\$2,214,671	\$2,325,000	\$110,329.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Adams Elementary	\$1,352,437	\$1,420,000	\$67,563.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old furniture
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Lukas Elementary	\$1,238,065	\$1,300,000	\$61,935.00	5.0%	Decreased	Replace old playground equipment
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Mandalay Middle	\$1,780,216	\$1,869,000	\$88,784.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Ryan Elementary	\$2,827,425	\$2,969,000	\$141,575.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace movable partitions; Replace old ceilings; Replace worn roofing
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Semper Elementary	\$1,510,587	\$1,586,000	\$75,413.00	5.0%	Increased	Parking lot & sidewalk improvements; Replace old carpet & floor tile; Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving; Replace worn roofing
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Sheridan Green Elementary	\$1,521,946	\$1,598,000	\$76,054.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old ceilings
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Standley Lake High	\$10,810,512	\$11,351,000	\$540,488.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace worn roofing



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Wayne Carle Middle	\$5,188,425	\$5,448,000	\$259,575.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Witt Elementary	\$1,890,155	\$1,985,000	\$94,845.00	5.0%	Mixed	Added: Replace old sinks, cabinets, & shelving Removed: Replace old playground equipment
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Everitt Middle	\$3,725,125	\$3,911,000	\$185,875.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements; Replace old furniture; Replace old ceilings
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Kullerstrand Elementary	\$1,784,963	\$1,874,000	\$89,037.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Maple Grove Elementary	\$1,185,357	\$1,245,000	\$59,643.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Peak Expeditionary School at Pennington	\$1,624,271	\$1,705,000	\$80,729.00	5.0%	Increased	Commercial kitchen improvements
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Prospect Valley Elementary	\$22,179,045	\$20,400,000	-\$1,779,045.00	-8.0%	Unchanged	
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stevens Elementary	\$2,042,079	\$2,144,000	\$101,921.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace old carpet & floor tile
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stober Elementary	\$3,431,037	\$3,602,000	\$170,963.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Vivian Elementary	\$1,586,539	\$1,666,000	\$79,461.00	5.0%	Increased	Replace worn roofing



Articulation Area / Option Schools / Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Cost Estimate	2021 Cost Estimate	Estimated Cost Difference	% Estimated Cost Difference	Project Scope Increased / Decreased / Mixed / Unchanged	Project Scope Changes
				Shaded = Budget Decreased			
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wheat Ridge High	\$13,287,468	\$14,477,000	\$1,189,532.00	9.0%	Unchanged	
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wilmore-Davis Elementary	\$1,501,758	\$1,577,000	\$75,242.00	5.0%	Increased	Parking lot & sidewalk improvements
	Warren Tech (CTE) South	\$10,000,000.00	\$10,500,000.00	\$500,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
	Leyden Rock Site Elementary School	\$28,000,000.00	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	
	Table Rock/Coyote Gulch Elementary School	\$28,000,000.00	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	



APPENDIX D: FLIPBOOK AND SYSTEM GENERATED BUDGET ANALYSIS

The following table summarizes the project budgets according to the 2018 Flipbook, 2021 Flipbook, and System-generated budgets at the school site level.

Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Alameda Articulation Area	Alameda International Jr./ Sr. High	\$18,003,098	\$19,434,000	\$1,430,902.00	7.9%	Increased	\$34,333,884.52	\$16,330,786.52	91%	\$14,899,884.52	77%
Alameda Articulation Area	Deane Elementary	\$1,041,370	\$1,065,000	\$23,630.00	2.3%	Decreased	\$1,091,171.19	\$49,801.19	5%	\$26,171.19	2%
Alameda Articulation Area	Emory Elementary	\$3,011,705	\$3,187,000	\$175,295.00	5.8%	Decreased	\$3,275,651.65	\$263,946.65	9%	\$88,651.65	3%
Alameda Articulation Area	Lasley Elementary	\$1,497,502	\$1,582,000	\$84,498.00	5.6%	Increased	\$1,740,659.73	\$243,157.73	16%	\$158,659.73	10%
Alameda Articulation Area	Patterson International Elementary	\$2,119,131	\$2,232,000	\$112,869.00	5.3%	Increased	\$2,381,818.35	\$262,687.35	12%	\$149,818.35	7%
Alameda Articulation Area	Rose Stein International Elementary	\$463,102	\$180,000	-\$283,102.00	-61.1%	Unchanged	\$177,788.32	\$(285,313.68)	-62%	\$(2,211.68)	-1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada High	\$14,765,828	\$15,536,000	\$770,172.00	5.2%	Increased	\$18,983,306.59	\$4,217,478.59	29%	\$3,447,306.59	22%
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada K-8	\$2,397,906	\$2,169,000	-\$228,906.00	-9.5%	Increased	\$2,992,397.11	\$594,491.11	25%	\$823,397.11	38%
Arvada Articulation Area	Fitzmorris Elementary	\$1,891,794	\$1,993,000	\$101,206.00	5.3%	Unchanged	\$2,334,333.10	\$442,539.10	23%	\$341,333.10	17%
Arvada Articulation Area	Foster Elementary	\$5,949,807	\$5,952,000	\$2,193.00	0.0%	Unchanged	\$5,947,498.94	\$(2,308.06)	0%	\$(4,501.06)	0%
Arvada Articulation Area	Hackberry Hill Elementary	\$1,075,477	\$1,128,000	\$52,523.00	4.9%	Unchanged	\$1,041,150.25	\$(34,326.75)	-3%	\$(86,849.75)	-8%
Arvada Articulation Area	Lawrence Elementary	\$2,831,578	\$2,976,000	\$144,422.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$2,917,366.28	\$85,788.28	3%	\$(58,633.72)	-2%
Arvada Articulation Area	North Arvada Middle	\$3,324,436	\$3,501,000	\$176,564.00	5.3%	Unchanged	\$4,201,903.27	\$877,467.27	26%	\$700,903.27	20%
Arvada Articulation Area	Peck Elementary	\$2,385,520	\$2,508,000	\$122,480.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$2,742,486.87	\$356,966.87	15%	\$234,486.87	9%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Arvada Articulation Area	Secrest Elementary	\$1,485,500	\$1,566,000	\$80,500.00	5.4%	Unchanged	\$2,056,707.22	\$571,207.22	38%	\$490,707.22	31%
Arvada Articulation Area	Swanson Elementary	\$3,273,650	\$3,445,000	\$171,350.00	5.2%	Unchanged	\$3,283,273.19	\$9,623.19	0%	\$(161,726.81)	-5%
Arvada Articulation Area	Thomson Elementary	\$2,074,473	\$2,185,000	\$110,527.00	5.3%	Unchanged	\$2,443,837.37	\$369,364.37	18%	\$258,837.37	12%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Allendale Elementary	\$1,259,382	\$1,357,000	\$97,618.00	7.8%	Increased	\$405,917.22	\$(853,464.78)	-68%	\$(951,082.78)	-70%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Arvada West High	\$1,567,998	\$1,671,230	\$103,232.00	6.6%	Increased	\$3,741,122.07	\$2,173,124.07	139%	\$2,069,892.07	124%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Campbell Elementary	\$2,514,071	\$2,285,000	-\$229,071.00	-9.1%	Unchanged	\$2,307,071.76	\$(206,999.24)	-8%	\$22,071.76	1%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Drake Middle School	\$1,010,260	\$1,036,000	\$25,740.00	2.5%	Increased	\$1,575,860.94	\$565,600.94	56%	\$539,860.94	52%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fairmount Elementary	\$2,111,708	\$2,226,000	\$114,292.00	5.4%	Decreased	\$2,210,817.50	\$99,109.50	5%	\$(15,182.50)	-1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fremont Elementary	\$1,214,621	\$1,289,000	\$74,379.00	6.1%	Unchanged	\$1,636,216.59	\$421,595.59	35%	\$347,216.59	27%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Stott Elementary	\$1,243,613	\$1,312,000	\$68,387.00	5.5%	Unchanged	\$1,676,701.41	\$433,088.41	35%	\$364,701.41	28%
Arvada West Articulation Area	Vanderhoof Elementary	\$1,995,235	\$2,113,000	\$117,765.00	5.9%	Unchanged	\$2,583,012.83	\$587,777.83	29%	\$470,012.83	22%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek High	\$1,196,747	\$1,257,000	\$60,253.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,266,611.75	\$69,864.75	6%	\$9,611.75	1%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek K-8	\$515,481	\$531,000	\$15,519.00	3.0%	Unchanged	\$530,816.09	\$15,335.09	3%	\$(183.91)	0%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Carmody Middle	\$2,123,880	\$2,230,000	\$106,120.00	5.0%	Increased	\$2,412,010.41	\$288,130.41	14%	\$182,010.41	8%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Green Gables Elementary	\$2,463,767	\$2,589,000	\$125,233.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$2,612,898.67	\$149,131.67	6%	\$23,898.67	1%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendallvue Elementary	\$1,577,970	\$1,658,000	\$80,030.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$1,721,903.06	\$143,933.06	9%	\$63,903.06	4%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendrick Lakes Elementary	\$22,287,576	\$23,400,000	\$1,112,424.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$21,165,126.30	\$(1,122,449.70)	-5%	\$(2,234,873.70)	-10%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Peiffer Elementary	\$1,844,963	\$1,937,000	\$92,037.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,986,914.90	\$141,951.90	8%	\$49,914.90	3%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Red Rocks Elementary	\$2,071,031	\$2,175,000	\$103,969.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$2,346,426.16	\$275,395.16	13%	\$171,426.16	8%
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Westgate Elementary	\$2,336,484	\$2,455,000	\$118,516.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$2,558,732.09	\$222,248.09	10%	\$103,732.09	4%
Charter Schools	Addenbrooke Classical Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,828,962.80	\$534,845.15	16%	\$534,845.15	16%
Charter Schools	Collegiate Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,831,451.24	\$537,333.59	16%	\$537,333.59	16%
Charter Schools	Compass Montessori Golden	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$4,887,183.66	\$1,593,066.01	48%	\$1,593,066.01	48%
Charter Schools	Compass Montessori Wheat Ridge	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$2,651,098.54	\$(643,019.11)	-20%	\$(643,019.11)	-20%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Charter Schools	Doral Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,730,804.41	\$436,686.76	13%	\$436,686.76	13%
Charter Schools	Excel Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,831,104.39	\$536,986.74	16%	\$536,986.74	16%
Charter Schools	Great Work Montessori	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,730,804.41	\$436,686.76	13%	\$436,686.76	13%
Charter Schools	Jefferson Academy Elementary	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$-	\$(3,294,117.65)	-100%	\$(3,294,117.65)	-100%
Charter Schools	Jefferson Academy Secondary	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$7,495,834.76	\$4,201,717.11	128%	\$4,201,717.11	128%
Charter Schools	Lincoln Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,827,477.68	\$533,360.03	16%	\$533,360.03	16%
Charter Schools	Montessori Peaks Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,832,042.81	\$537,925.16	16%	\$537,925.16	16%
Charter Schools	Mountain Phoenix Community School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,826,667.09	\$532,549.44	16%	\$532,549.44	16%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Charter Schools	Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,742,545.71	\$448,428.06	14%	\$448,428.06	14%
Charter Schools	Rocky Mountain Deaf School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,828,327.89	\$534,210.24	16%	\$534,210.24	16%
Charter Schools	The New America School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,787,644.37	\$493,526.72	15%	\$493,526.72	15%
Charter Schools	Two Roads Charter School	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	N/A	Unchanged	\$3,745,058.05	\$450,940.40	14%	\$450,940.40	14%
Charter Schools	Woodrow Wilson Academy	\$3,294,117.65	\$3,294,117.65	\$0.00	0.0%	Unchanged	\$3,742,450.12	\$448,332.47	14%	\$448,332.47	14%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 North	\$452,758	\$475,000	\$22,242.00	4.9%	Unchanged	\$475,227.37	\$22,469.37	5%	\$227.37	0%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 South	\$1,522,904	\$1,599,000	\$76,096.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,586,077.25	\$63,173.25	4%	\$(12,922.75)	-1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Chatfield Articulation Area	Chatfield High	\$4,887,763	\$5,027,000	\$139,237.00	2.8%	Unchanged	\$5,928,838.49	\$1,041,075.49	21%	\$901,838.49	18%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Coronado Elementary	\$2,854,490	\$2,997,000	\$142,510.00	5.0%	Increased	\$2,508,155.89	\$(346,334.11)	-12%	\$(488,844.11)	-16%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Deer Creek Middle	\$1,402,297	\$1,472,000	\$69,703.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,462,127.26	\$59,830.26	4%	\$(9,872.74)	-1%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Falcon Bluffs Middle	\$1,484,505	\$1,559,000	\$74,495.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,531,725.59	\$47,220.59	3%	\$(27,274.41)	-2%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Mortensen Elementary	\$611,995	\$643,000	\$31,005.00	5.1%	Increased	\$641,937.48	\$29,942.48	5%	\$(1,062.52)	0%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Shaffer Elementary	\$924,001	\$970,000	\$45,999.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,073,814.78	\$149,813.78	16%	\$103,814.78	11%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Stony Creek Elementary	\$1,352,382	\$1,420,000	\$67,618.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,647,272.02	\$294,890.02	22%	\$227,272.02	16%
Chatfield Articulation Area	Ute Meadows Elementary	\$1,009,038	\$1,059,000	\$49,962.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,059,399.83	\$50,361.83	5%	\$399.83	0%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine High	\$14,129,966	\$14,836,000	\$706,034.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$23,158,797.57	\$9,028,831.57	64%	\$8,322,797.57	56%
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine Hills Elementary	\$1,730,679	\$1,812,000	\$81,321.00	4.7%	Unchanged	\$1,758,586.04	\$27,907.04	2%	\$(53,413.96)	-3%
Columbine Articulation Area	Dutch Creek Elementary	\$1,723,226	\$1,809,000	\$85,774.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,534,600.91	\$(188,625.09)	-11%	\$(274,399.09)	-15%
Columbine Articulation Area	Governor's Ranch Elementary	\$921,597	\$968,000	\$46,403.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$967,833.89	\$46,236.89	5%	\$(166.11)	0%
Columbine Articulation Area	Ken Caryl Middle	\$1,797,006	\$1,887,000	\$89,994.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$2,177,657.15	\$380,651.15	21%	\$290,657.15	15%
Columbine Articulation Area	Leawood Elementary	\$955,138	\$1,003,000	\$47,862.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,004,154.27	\$49,016.27	5%	\$1,154.27	0%
Columbine Articulation Area	Normandy Elementary	\$1,443,121	\$1,513,000	\$69,879.00	4.8%	Unchanged	\$1,770,672.81	\$327,551.81	23%	\$257,672.81	17%
Conifer Articulation Area	Conifer High	\$9,820,651	\$10,297,000	\$476,349.00	4.9%	Unchanged	\$16,283,730.27	\$6,463,079.27	66%	\$5,986,730.27	58%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Conifer Articulation Area	Elk Creek Elementary	\$950,302	\$998,000	\$47,698.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,833,640.03	\$883,338.03	93%	\$835,640.03	84%
Conifer Articulation Area	Marshdale Elementary	\$19,986,323	\$21,000,000	\$1,013,677.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$18,949,994.68	\$(1,036,328.32)	-5%	\$(2,050,005.32)	-10%
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Elementary	\$688,499	\$723,000	\$34,501.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$725,190.45	\$36,691.45	5%	\$2,190.45	0%
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Middle	\$2,323,535	\$3,700,000	\$1,376,465.00	59.2%	Increased	\$3,980,226.22	\$1,656,691.22	71%	\$280,226.22	8%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Blue Heron Elementary	\$569,931	\$599,000	\$29,069.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$597,150.01	\$27,219.01	5%	\$(1,849.99)	0%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Colorow Elementary	\$1,867,313	\$1,966,000	\$98,687.00	5.3%	Decreased	\$2,213,195.34	\$345,882.34	19%	\$247,195.34	13%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Dakota Ridge High	\$5,000,847	\$5,283,000	\$282,153.00	5.6%	Unchanged	\$6,035,525.57	\$1,034,678.57	21%	\$752,525.57	14%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Mount Carbon Elementary	\$832,680	\$874,000	\$41,320.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$874,632.47	\$41,952.47	5%	\$632.47	0%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Powderhorn Elementary	\$5,756,358	\$6,100,000	\$343,642.00	6.0%	Unchanged	\$6,240,928.75	\$484,570.75	8%	\$140,928.75	2%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Summit Ridge Middle	\$2,464,889	\$2,667,000	\$202,111.00	8.2%	Increased	\$2,859,874.48	\$394,985.48	16%	\$192,874.48	7%
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Westridge Elementary	\$1,878,659	\$1,973,000	\$94,341.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$2,958,474.37	\$1,079,815.37	57%	\$985,474.37	50%
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Meadow Elementary	\$5,320,270	\$5,586,000	\$265,730.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$5,678,983.27	\$358,713.27	7%	\$92,983.27	2%
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Valley Intermediate	\$355,429	\$374,000	\$18,571.00	5.2%	Unchanged	\$371,151.87	\$15,722.87	4%	\$(2,848.13)	-1%
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen High	\$11,552,175	\$12,197,000	\$644,825.00	5.6%	Unchanged	\$13,231,276.22	\$1,679,101.22	15%	\$1,034,276.22	8%
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen Middle	\$7,111,914	\$7,746,000	\$634,086.00	8.9%	Unchanged	\$7,168,511.67	\$56,597.67	1%	\$(577,488.33)	-7%
Evergreen Articulation Area	Parmalee Elementary	\$3,566,148	\$3,744,000	\$177,852.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$4,358,809.01	\$792,661.01	22%	\$614,809.01	16%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Evergreen Articulation Area	Wilmot Elementary	\$3,894,141	\$4,089,000	\$194,859.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$9,065,235.95	\$5,171,094.95	133%	\$4,976,235.95	122%
Golden Articulation Area	Bell Middle	\$7,041,686	\$7,365,000	\$323,314.00	4.6%	Unchanged	\$9,014,062.23	\$1,972,376.23	28%	\$1,649,062.23	22%
Golden Articulation Area	Golden High	\$1,333,040	\$1,403,000	\$69,960.00	5.2%	Increased	\$3,280,857.87	\$1,947,817.87	146%	\$1,877,857.87	134%
Golden Articulation Area	Kyffin Elementary	\$4,656,340	\$4,886,000	\$229,660.00	4.9%	Mixed	\$4,937,643.04	\$281,303.04	6%	\$51,643.04	1%
Golden Articulation Area	Mitchell Elementary	\$855,531	\$898,000	\$42,469.00	5.0%	Mixed	\$691,111.79	\$(164,419.21)	-19%	\$(206,888.21)	-23%
Golden Articulation Area	Ralston Elementary	\$959,329	\$1,007,000	\$47,671.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,273,802.55	\$314,473.55	33%	\$266,802.55	26%
Golden Articulation Area	Shelton Elementary	\$1,397,841	\$1,468,000	\$70,159.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,400,197.56	\$2,356.56	0%	\$(67,802.44)	-5%
Golden Articulation Area	Welchester Elementary	\$1,871,160	\$1,966,000	\$94,840.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$2,149,236.44	\$278,076.44	15%	\$183,236.44	9%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Devinny Elementary	\$1,208,704	\$1,266,000	\$57,296.00	4.7%	Decreased	\$2,005,212.42	\$796,508.42	66%	\$739,212.42	58%
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Dunstan Middle	\$608,884	\$639,000	\$30,116.00	4.9%	Increased	\$638,952.30	\$30,068.30	5%	\$(47.70)	0%
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Foothills Elementary	\$1,313,600	\$1,367,000	\$53,400.00	4.1%	Increased	\$1,426,688.44	\$113,088.44	9%	\$59,688.44	4%
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain Elementary	\$1,267,243	\$1,328,000	\$60,757.00	4.8%	Mixed	\$1,957,216.27	\$689,973.27	54%	\$629,216.27	47%
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain High	\$13,606,922	\$14,361,000	\$754,078.00	5.5%	Unchanged	\$17,759,092.90	\$4,152,170.90	31%	\$3,398,092.90	24%
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Hutchinson Elementary	\$2,269,596	\$2,283,000	\$13,404.00	0.6%	Increased	\$2,105,771.46	\$(163,824.54)	-7%	\$(177,228.54)	-8%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Rooney Ranch Elementary	\$442,367	\$446,000	\$3,633.00	0.8%	Decreased	\$443,535.12	\$1,168.12	0%	\$(2,464.88)	-1%
Jefferson Articulation Area	Edgewater Elementary	\$5,188,317	\$5,456,000	\$267,683.00	5.2%	Increased	\$6,176,264.15	\$987,947.15	19%	\$720,264.15	13%
Jefferson Articulation Area	Jefferson Jr./Sr. High	\$13,456,190	\$14,129,000	\$672,810.00	5.0%	Increased	\$16,376,973.84	\$2,920,783.84	22%	\$2,247,973.84	16%
Jefferson Articulation Area	Lumberg Elementary	\$7,610,659	\$7,992,000	\$381,341.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$8,477,408.87	\$866,749.87	11%	\$485,408.87	6%
Jefferson Articulation Area	Molholm Elementary	\$6,104,205	\$6,409,000	\$304,795.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$6,402,843.80	\$298,638.80	5%	\$(6,156.20)	0%
Lakewood Articulation Area	Belmar Elementary	\$1,016,991	\$1,068,000	\$51,009.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,693,020.04	\$676,029.04	66%	\$625,020.04	59%
Lakewood Articulation Area	Creighton Middle	\$1,212,764	\$1,273,000	\$60,236.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,435,616.91	\$222,852.91	18%	\$162,616.91	13%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Lakewood Articulation Area	Eiber Elementary	\$2,258,107	\$2,371,000	\$112,893.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$3,223,363.10	\$965,256.10	43%	\$852,363.10	36%
Lakewood Articulation Area	Glennon Heights Elementary	\$1,657,919	\$1,741,000	\$83,081.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,745,392.03	\$87,473.03	5%	\$4,392.03	0%
Lakewood Articulation Area	Lakewood High	\$3,127,890	\$3,287,000	\$159,110.00	5.1%	Increased	\$6,212,617.98	\$3,084,727.98	99%	\$2,925,617.98	89%
Lakewood Articulation Area	Slater Elementary	\$1,248,488	\$1,311,000	\$62,512.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,316,369.10	\$67,881.10	5%	\$5,369.10	0%
Lakewood Articulation Area	South Lakewood Elementary	\$1,339,635	\$1,407,000	\$67,365.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,406,254.07	\$66,619.07	5%	\$(745.93)	0%
Option Schools	Brady Exploration School	\$1,745,123	\$1,832,000	\$86,877.00	5.0%	Unclear, Elevator not listed in 2021	\$1,936,307.80	\$191,184.80	11%	\$104,307.80	6%
Option Schools	Connections Learning Center	\$252,445	\$265,000	\$12,555.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$263,124.40	\$10,679.40	4%	\$(1,875.60)	-1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Option Schools	D'Evelyn Jr./Sr. High School	\$912,508	\$1,483,000	\$570,492.00	62.5%	Unchanged	\$9,146,196.69	\$8,233,688.69	902%	\$7,663,196.69	517%
Option Schools	Dennison Elementary	\$1,122,733	\$1,789,000	\$666,267.00	59.3%	Unchanged	\$1,768,419.70	\$645,686.70	58%	\$(20,580.30)	-1%
Option Schools	Fletcher Miller Special School	\$2,097,643	\$2,203,000	\$105,357.00	5.0%	Decreased	\$2,343,382.57	\$245,739.57	12%	\$140,382.57	6%
Option Schools	Free Horizon Montessori	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0.00	0.0%	Unchanged	\$956,938.54	\$(43,061.46)	-4%	\$(43,061.46)	-4%
Option Schools	Jeffco Open School	\$9,307,490	\$9,773,000	\$465,510.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$9,813,999.03	\$506,509.03	5%	\$40,999.03	0%
Option Schools	Long View High School	\$361,970	\$380,000	\$18,030.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$389,023.97	\$27,053.97	7%	\$9,023.97	2%
Option Schools	Manning Option School	\$6,673,553	\$6,482,000	-\$191,553.00	-2.9%	Unchanged	\$6,994,968.18	\$321,415.18	5%	\$512,968.18	8%
Option Schools	McLain High School	\$735,640	\$772,000	\$36,360.00	4.9%	Unchanged	\$770,423.05	\$34,783.05	5%	\$(1,576.95)	0%
Option Schools	Sobesky Academy	\$1,261,431	\$1,325,000	\$63,569.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,324,502.55	\$63,071.55	5%	\$(497.45)	0%
Option Schools	Warren Tech Central	\$3,170,881	\$3,329,000	\$158,119.00	5.0%	Decreased	\$3,351,037.62	\$180,156.62	6%	\$22,037.62	1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Option Schools	Warren Tech North	\$416,953	\$438,000	\$21,047.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$438,468.89	\$21,515.89	5%	\$468.89	0%
Pomona Articulation Area	Little Elementary	\$2,858,749	\$3,002,000	\$143,251.00	5.0%	Increased	\$2,948,806.44	\$90,057.44	3%	\$(53,193.56)	-2%
Pomona Articulation Area	Moore Middle	\$2,163,362	\$2,727,000	\$563,638.00	26.1%	Increased	\$2,271,531.15	\$108,169.15	5%	\$(455,468.85)	-17%
Pomona Articulation Area	Parr Elementary	\$1,119,772	\$1,176,000	\$56,228.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,147,087.64	\$27,315.64	2%	\$(28,912.36)	-2%
Pomona Articulation Area	Pomona High	\$12,798,591	\$12,389,000	-\$409,591.00	-3.2%	Unchanged	\$13,399,695.67	\$601,104.67	5%	\$1,010,695.67	8%
Pomona Articulation Area	Warder Elementary	\$1,020,410	\$1,071,000	\$50,590.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,283,308.74	\$262,898.74	26%	\$212,308.74	20%
Pomona Articulation Area	Weber Elementary	\$772,128	\$811,000	\$38,872.00	5.0%	Increased	\$810,734.40	\$38,606.40	5%	\$(265.60)	0%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Coal Creek Canyon K-8	\$1,064,126	\$1,117,000	\$52,874.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$1,128,017.22	\$63,891.22	6%	\$11,017.22	1%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Meiklejohn Elementary	\$398,650	\$419,000	\$20,350.00	5.1%	Unchanged	\$419,228.70	\$20,578.70	5%	\$228.70	0%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Oberon Middle	\$8,055,552	\$7,933,000	-\$122,552.00	-1.5%	Unchanged	\$7,974,390.95	\$(81,161.05)	-1%	\$41,390.95	1%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Ralston Valley High	\$9,397,456	\$10,392,000	\$994,544.00	10.6%	Unchanged	\$12,524,604.61	\$3,127,148.61	33%	\$2,132,604.61	21%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Sierra Elementary	0	\$707,000	\$707,000.00	Cost was labeled N/A in 2018	Increased	\$707,332.50	\$707,332.50	100%	\$332.50	0%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Three Creek K-8	\$4,697,000	\$4,932,000	\$235,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$5,871,269.74	\$1,174,269.74	25%	\$939,269.74	19%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Van Arsdale Elementary	\$3,773,128	\$3,962,000	\$188,872.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$3,960,093.17	\$186,965.17	5%	\$(1,906.83)	0%
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	West Woods Elementary	\$2,214,671	\$2,325,000	\$110,329.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$2,321,696.91	\$107,025.91	5%	\$(3,303.09)	0%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Adams Elementary	\$1,352,437	\$1,420,000	\$67,563.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,219,536.71	\$(132,900.29)	-10%	\$(200,463.29)	-14%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Lukas Elementary	\$1,238,065	\$1,300,000	\$61,935.00	5.0%	Decreased	\$1,275,632.44	\$37,567.44	3%	\$(24,367.56)	-2%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Mandalay Middle	\$1,780,216	\$1,869,000	\$88,784.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,982,214.34	\$201,998.34	11%	\$113,214.34	6%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Ryan Elementary	\$2,827,425	\$2,969,000	\$141,575.00	5.0%	Increased	\$3,174,973.01	\$347,548.01	12%	\$205,973.01	7%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Semper Elementary	\$1,510,587	\$1,586,000	\$75,413.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,627,098.31	\$116,511.31	8%	\$41,098.31	3%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Sheridan Green Elementary	\$1,521,946	\$1,598,000	\$76,054.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,747,066.84	\$225,120.84	15%	\$149,066.84	9%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Standley Lake High	\$10,810,512	\$11,351,000	\$540,488.00	5.0%	Increased	\$12,666,932.70	\$1,856,420.70	17%	\$1,315,932.70	12%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Wayne Carle Middle	\$5,188,425	\$5,448,000	\$259,575.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$5,080,210.75	\$(108,214.25)	-2%	\$(367,789.25)	-7%
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Witt Elementary	\$1,890,155	\$1,985,000	\$94,845.00	5.0%	Mixed	\$2,267,948.70	\$377,793.70	20%	\$282,948.70	14%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Everitt Middle	\$3,725,125	\$3,911,000	\$185,875.00	5.0%	Increased	\$4,070,101.33	\$344,976.33	9%	\$159,101.33	4%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Kullerstrand Elementary	\$1,784,963	\$1,874,000	\$89,037.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,990,038.53	\$205,075.53	11%	\$116,038.53	6%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Maple Grove Elementary	\$1,185,357	\$1,245,000	\$59,643.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,571,275.66	\$385,918.66	33%	\$326,275.66	26%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Peak Expeditionary School at Pennington	\$1,624,271	\$1,705,000	\$80,729.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,704,121.76	\$79,850.76	5%	\$(878.24)	0%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Prospect Valley Elementary	\$22,179,045	\$20,400,000	-\$1,779,045.00	-8.0%	Unchanged	\$20,401,408.65	\$(1,777,636.35)	-8%	\$1,408.65	0%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stevens Elementary	\$2,042,079	\$2,144,000	\$101,921.00	5.0%	Increased	\$2,210,302.87	\$168,223.87	8%	\$66,302.87	3%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stober Elementary	\$3,431,037	\$3,602,000	\$170,963.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$3,778,212.02	\$347,175.02	10%	\$176,212.02	5%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Vivian Elementary	\$1,586,539	\$1,666,000	\$79,461.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,992,643.76	\$406,104.76	26%	\$326,643.76	20%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wheat Ridge High	\$13,287,468	\$14,477,000	\$1,189,532.00	9.0%	Unchanged	\$16,698,094.02	\$3,410,626.02	26%	\$2,221,094.02	15%
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wilmore-Davis Elementary	\$1,501,758	\$1,577,000	\$75,242.00	5.0%	Increased	\$1,796,805.20	\$295,047.20	20%	\$219,805.20	14%
	Warren Tech (CTE) South	\$10,000,000.00	\$10,500,000.00	\$500,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$10,393,898.57	\$393,898.57	4%	\$(106,101.43)	-1%
	Leyden Rock Site Elementary School	\$28,000,000.00	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5%	\$-	0%
	Table Rock/Coyote Gulch Elementary School	\$28,000,000.00	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5.0%	Unchanged	\$29,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	5%	\$-	0%
	Irwin Preschool*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$62,381.11	\$62,381.11	100%	\$62,381.11	100%
	Litz Preschool*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$87,858.02	\$87,858.02	100%	\$87,858.02	100%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
	Mount Evans OELS*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$3,210,190.20	\$3,210,190.20	100%	\$3,210,190.20	100%
	North Area Transportation Center*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$7,554,793.48	\$7,554,793.48	100%	\$7,554,793.48	100%
	Patterson Cottages*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$305,435.43	\$305,435.43	100%	\$305,435.43	100%
	Trailblazer Stadium*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$4,275,887.58	\$4,275,887.58	100%	\$4,275,887.58	100%
	Windy Peaks OELS*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$3,340,982.40	\$3,340,982.40	100%	\$3,340,982.40	100%
	581 Conference Place*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$506,698.44	\$506,698.44	100%	\$506,698.44	100%
	809 Quail*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$472,067.72	\$472,067.72	100%	\$472,067.72	100%
	Districtwide**	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$2,380,372.77	\$2,380,372.77	100%	\$2,380,372.77	100%
	Anderson Preschool*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$126,219.45	\$126,219.45	100%	\$126,219.45	100%
	Ed Center*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$166,290.56	\$166,290.56	100%	\$166,290.56	100%



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/ School	Cost Estimate per 2018 Flipbook	Cost Estimate per 2021 Flipbook	Cost Variance between Flipbooks	% Variance between Flipbooks	Project Scope Changes between Flipbooks	Current Project Budget per the District System	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2018 Flipbook	% Variance between 2018 Flipbook and System Data	Cost Variance in Comparison to 2021 Flipbook	% Variance between 2021 Flipbook and System Data
	Education Services Center*	\$0.00	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	Not listed	\$2,451.87	\$2,451.87	100%	\$2,451.87	100%
Total		\$604,982,377	\$631,713,230	\$26,730,853			\$741,470,501	\$136,488,124		\$109,757,271.17	

*Projects with a \$0.00 cost estimate in the 2018 or 2021 Flipbook were not listed in the Flipbook.

**The District provided the allocation for this Districtwide project; please see [Appendix D](#) for the breakdown.



APPENDIX E: DISTRICTWIDE PROJECT ALLOCATION

The following table summarizes the allocation of a project labeled as “Districtwide” in the system-generated data.

H91700U31– Districtwide Flooring 2020-II	
Allendale	\$30,750.90
Thompson	\$27,795.90
Total	\$58,546.80
Districtwide Security Glass 2020-I	
Edgewater Elementary School	\$84.74
Elk Creek Elementary School	\$978.55
Green Mtn Elementary School	\$410.97
Kyffin Elementary School	\$311.24
Mitchell Elementary School	\$664.12
Peck Elementary School	\$365.51
Secrest Elementary School	\$552.72
Shaffer Elementary School	\$1,107.00
Shelton Elementary School	\$517.31
Slater Elementary School	\$764.39
Stevens Elementary School	\$614.51
Thompson Elementary School	\$837.09
Warder Elementary School	\$620.96
Total	\$7,829.11
G91700X01 – Districtwide Modular Bldg Removal 2021	
Kendallvue	\$78,839.50
Kullerstrand	\$45,573.40
Lawrence	\$35,140.30
Slater	\$44,873.40
Vivian	\$45,573.40
Total	\$250,000.00
G91700U04 – Districtwide Mechanical 2021	
Thompson	\$81,479.64
Total	\$81,479.64



G91700U02 – Districtwide Flooring 2021	
Peck	\$162,400.10
Red Rocks	\$69,897.10
Westgate	\$75,704.10
Total	\$308,001.30
H91700U27 – Districtwide Flooring 2020-I	
Fitzmorris	\$17,074.44
Fletcher Miller	\$12,484.35
Free Horizon	\$13,319.35
Lasley	\$4,374.35
Total	\$47,252.49
H91700U19 – Districtwide HVAC 2020	
Patterson International	\$35,165.00
H91700U17 – Districtwide LED Lighting Interior	
Patterson International	\$31,521.61
H91700U38 – Districtwide Elevator Upgrades 2021	
Alameda	\$2,067.66
Bear Creek K-8	\$2,145.66
Bear Creek K-8	\$3,685.77
Carmody	\$135,912.21
Chatfield	\$2,144.66
Creighton	\$2,204.66
D'Evelyn	\$3,683.72
Dunstan	\$2,145.66
Emory	\$1,849.65
Falcon Bluff	\$2,067.66
Golden	\$2,067.66
Jefferson	\$4,955.99
Lakewood	\$2,145.65
Lawrence	\$2,042.65
Meiklejohn	\$2,145.65
North Arvada	\$2,051.65
Peck	\$2,204.66
Pleasant View	\$2,135.66
Ralston	\$2,204.66
Stevens	\$1,877.66



Summit Ridge	\$1,877.66
Warren Tech	\$2,067.66
Warren Tech North	\$116,597.50
Wayne Carle	\$2,045.66
Wheat Ridge	\$4,151.66
Wilmot	\$2,574.66
Total	\$311,054.00
G91700U11 – Districtwide Elevator Upgrades 2022	
Contract not yet in place	\$350,000.00
G91700X02 – Districtwide Modular Bldg Removal 2022	
Contract not yet in place	\$350,000.00
H91700U09 – Districtwide Flooring	
Belmar	\$1,456.00
Bergen Meadow	\$7,950.00
Eiber	\$1,456.00
Foothills	\$1,185.60
Free Horizon	\$86,134.00
Green Mountain Elementary School	\$25,510.00
Hutchinson	\$16,920.00
Kullerstrand	\$12,480.00
Sheridan Green	\$5,730.40
Vivian	\$27,680.00
Welchester	\$19,680.00
Westridge	\$5,730.40
Wilmore Davis	\$109,949.00
Total	\$321,861.40
H91700F01 – Districtwide Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	
Belmar	\$8,093.68
Dutch Creek	\$7,851.68
Green Gables	\$7,609.68
Lukas	\$8,093.68
Maple Grove	\$7,609.68
Wilmot	\$8,093.67
Witt	\$8,093.67
Total	\$55,445.74



H91700U18 – Districtwide Field Improvements	
Arvada West	\$23,347.16
Columbine	\$29,136.41
Golden	\$21,495.56
Green Mountain High School	\$41,544.25
Pomona	\$28,168.04
Standley Lake	\$28,524.26
Total	\$172,215.68
Grand Total	\$2,380,372.77



APPENDIX F: SUB-PROJECT BY STATUS

The data presented below are generated through the District’s contract management system and show the status of projects included in the 5B Bond Program, including start and finish dates as well as budget variances.

Completed Projects

The District has completed 96 sub-projects as of June 30, 2021. The total expenditure for completed projects was \$214,706,521.85.

Project Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Original Budget	Ending Budget	Variance	% Variance
Kendrick Lakes Elementary School Replace School	2/26/2019	6/30/2021	\$22,743,114.80	\$20,550,026.30	\$(2,193,088.50)	-10%
Allendale Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	4/30/2021	\$752,627.50	\$60,251.91	\$(692,375.59)	-92%
Jefferson Acad. Elementary Charter	6/1/2021	6/1/2021	\$640,682.15	\$-	\$(640,682.15)	-100%
Districtwide Roofing 2020-II	10/14/2019	8/21/2020	\$1,398,951.75	\$1,032,485.96	\$(366,465.79)	-26%
Arvada High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	8/30/2019	10/16/2020	\$1,417,500.00	\$1,064,134.81	\$(353,365.19)	-25%
Eiber Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/31/2020	3/26/2021	\$598,500.00	\$248,332.04	\$(350,167.96)	-59%
Coronado Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	11/23/2020	\$525,000.00	\$192,989.82	\$(332,010.18)	-63%
Dutch Creek Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	9/25/2020	\$472,500.00	\$146,847.29	\$(325,652.71)	-69%
Green Gables Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	9/25/2020	\$399,000.00	\$99,268.16	\$(299,731.84)	-75%
Allendale Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	4/30/2021	\$365,872.50	\$71,408.89	\$(294,463.61)	-80%
Foothills Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	10/30/2020	\$378,000.00	\$137,254.03	\$(240,745.97)	-64%
Welchester Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	10/16/2020	\$288,750.00	\$80,358.39	\$(208,391.61)	-72%



Project Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Original Budget	Ending Budget	Variance	% Variance
Hutchinson Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/1/2019	7/31/2020	\$288,750.00	\$93,707.53	\$(195,042.47)	-68%
Adams Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/16/2019	1/29/2021	\$324,450.00	\$155,778.92	\$(168,671.08)	-52%
Hackberry Hill Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/14/2019	10/2/2020	\$708,508.25	\$551,787.03	\$(156,721.22)	-22%
Coronado Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/16/2019	10/20/2020	\$2,377,700.00	\$2,222,260.13	\$(155,439.87)	-7%
Trailblazer Stadium Efficiency & Future Ready	9/3/2019	2/5/2021	\$4,415,250.00	\$4,275,887.58	\$(139,362.42)	-3%
West Jefferson Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/16/2019	8/14/2020	\$1,809,680.25	\$1,693,835.25	\$(115,845.00)	-6%
Districtwide IT Cameras Allocation	1/2/2019	2/25/2020	\$774,304.13	\$665,351.39	\$(108,952.74)	-14%
Hutchinson Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/7/2019	1/7/2021	\$1,954,477.40	\$1,859,813.20	\$(94,664.20)	-5%
Witt Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/16/2019	10/30/2020	\$220,350.00	\$129,990.68	\$(90,359.32)	-41%
Lukas Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/16/2019	10/30/2020	\$151,450.00	\$86,577.08	\$(64,872.92)	-43%
Adams Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/6/2019	11/20/2020	\$1,053,713.80	\$991,490.68	\$(62,223.12)	-6%
Kendrick Lakes Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	4/20/2020	6/30/2021	\$658,840.00	\$615,100.00	\$(43,740.00)	-7%
Districtwide Security Glass 2020-I	9/3/2019	8/31/2020	\$88,000.00	\$59,954.33	\$(28,045.67)	-32%
Districtwide Security Glass	4/1/2019	9/13/2019	\$67,997.00	\$49,806.96	\$(18,190.04)	-27%
Districtwide IT Cameras 2020	10/1/2019	4/30/2021	\$878,600.00	\$862,397.97	\$(16,202.03)	-2%
Districtwide Fire Sprinklers Replacement	3/2/2020	12/7/2020	\$139,252.51	\$128,389.48	\$(10,863.03)	-8%
Everitt Middle School Library Renovation	3/19/2019	10/2/2019	\$545,789.34	\$545,789.34	\$-	0%
North Transportation-Joyce Site Acquisition	4/1/2019	6/11/2019	\$7,000,600.00	\$7,000,600.00	\$-	0%



Project Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Original Budget	Ending Budget	Variance	% Variance
West Jefferson Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/2/2019	6/30/2021	\$395,000.00	\$395,225.21	\$225.21	0%
Woodrow Wilson Academy Charter	3/1/2019	7/31/2019	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,101,767.97	\$11,616.03	0%
Rocky Mtn Acad. Evergreen Charter	3/1/2019	7/31/2019	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,101,863.56	\$11,711.62	0%
Two Roads Arvada Charter Debt Repay	3/1/2019	7/31/2019	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,104,375.90	\$14,223.96	0%
Districtwide Paving 2020-II	11/11/2019	8/17/2020	\$509,250.00	\$532,621.10	\$23,371.10	5%
Lukas Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/6/2019	11/20/2020	\$1,106,650.25	\$1,147,494.92	\$40,844.67	4%
Semper Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/6/2019	11/20/2020	\$1,540,562.40	\$1,582,812.98	\$42,250.58	3%
Wilmot Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/31/2020	1/4/2021	\$304,500.00	\$347,176.48	\$42,676.48	14%
Districtwide Flooring 2020-II	1/6/2020	12/17/2020	\$411,604.00	\$454,339.57	\$42,735.57	10%
Ken Caryl Middle School FACS CR + Bldg Signage	12/2/2019	8/28/2020	\$343,200.00	\$397,054.89	\$53,854.89	16%
Stober Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/28/2019	1/15/2021	\$3,492,084.85	\$3,555,261.22	\$63,176.37	2%
Green Gables Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/7/2019	11/19/2020	\$1,477,970.30	\$1,542,766.17	\$64,795.87	4%
Districtwide Paving 2020-I	10/22/2019	8/31/2020	\$225,750.00	\$311,774.99	\$86,024.99	38%
Districtwide Flooring 2020-I	11/1/2019	11/20/2020	\$600,430.00	\$690,231.99	\$89,801.99	15%
Arvada K-8 Efficiency & Future Ready	10/14/2019	10/2/2020	\$2,094,863.60	\$2,203,535.92	\$108,672.32	5%
Stober Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/31/2020	10/30/2020	\$78,750.00	\$190,522.24	\$111,772.24	142%
Districtwide Fire Alarms	1/16/2019	10/7/2019	\$64,876.57	\$177,130.32	\$112,253.75	173%
Fremont Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/26/2019	10/16/2020	\$1,038,912.15	\$1,189,886.55	\$150,974.40	15%



Project Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Original Budget	Ending Budget	Variance	% Variance
Dutch Creek Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	11/1/2019	12/11/2020	\$1,101,360.65	\$1,276,988.78	\$175,628.13	16%
Fremont Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/31/2020	3/1/2021	\$157,500.00	\$334,083.36	\$176,583.36	112%
Ralston Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/25/2019	8/17/2020	\$827,236.40	\$1,019,051.70	\$191,815.30	23%
Districtwide Roofing 2020-I	9/12/2019	9/10/2020	\$2,182,195.01	\$2,390,300.00	\$208,104.99	10%
Columbine Hills Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/16/2019	10/20/2020	\$820,607.55	\$1,049,215.53	\$228,607.98	28%
Belmar Elementary School Efficiency/Future + Paving	9/23/2019	11/5/2020	\$690,209.50	\$934,280.04	\$244,070.54	35%
Foothills Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/25/2019	9/2/2020	\$883,658.00	\$1,179,084.24	\$295,426.24	33%
Belmar School of Integrated Arts Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/31/2020	1/29/2021	\$78,750.00	\$382,201.51	\$303,451.51	385%
Districtwide Elevator Upgrades	10/1/2019	8/3/2020	\$58,568.18	\$370,907.72	\$312,339.54	533%
Districtwide Playgrounds 2020	9/12/2019	9/2/2020	\$1,051,742.30	\$1,372,625.10	\$320,882.80	31%
Vivian Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/25/2019	10/22/2020	\$1,506,672.95	\$1,872,351.78	\$365,678.83	24%
Witt Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/6/2019	2/24/2021	\$1,737,129.75	\$2,110,775.02	\$373,645.27	22%
Welchester Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/25/2019	8/21/2020	\$1,407,615.20	\$1,786,933.39	\$379,318.19	27%
Districtwide LED Lighting – Interior	9/4/2019	12/30/2020	\$2,781,920.40	\$3,240,701.47	\$458,781.07	16%
Eiber Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/23/2019	1/25/2021	\$1,016,501.70	\$1,552,219.71	\$535,718.01	53%
Districtwide Building Lighting	9/28/2018	9/24/2019	\$299,775.00	\$946,486.61	\$646,711.61	216%
Districtwide Site Lighting	2/6/2019	10/31/2019	\$130,000.00	\$807,114.42	\$677,114.42	521%
Districtwide Playgrounds	1/2/2019	12/20/2019	\$873,810.00	\$1,566,807.34	\$692,997.34	79%



Project Name	Start Date	Finish Date	Original Budget	Ending Budget	Variance	% Variance
Three Creeks K-8 Addition & General Upgrades	12/3/2018	6/26/2020	\$4,931,850.00	\$5,664,653.46	\$732,803.46	15%
Westridge Elementary School HVAC	10/7/2019	3/12/2021	\$780,720.00	\$1,536,383.16	\$755,663.16	97%
Districtwide Paving	1/2/2019	12/20/2019	\$799,050.00	\$1,645,758.88	\$846,708.88	106%
Districtwide Flooring	1/2/2019	12/16/2019	\$886,851.00	\$1,885,207.84	\$998,356.84	113%
Green Mountain High School Addition & General Upgrades	12/14/2018	6/24/2021	\$11,105,728.20	\$12,230,786.11	\$1,125,057.91	10%
Compass Montessori Golden Charter Debt	3/1/2019	5/28/2019	\$3,090,151.94	\$4,246,501.51	\$1,156,349.57	37%
Districtwide HVAC	12/12/2018	10/4/2019	\$185,912.95	\$1,500,353.66	\$1,314,440.71	707%
Jefferson Acad. Secondary Charter	2/1/2019	6/18/2021	\$6,180,303.88	\$7,495,834.76	\$1,315,530.88	21%
Districtwide Roofing	1/2/2019	11/20/2019	\$2,504,597.55	\$4,139,926.57	\$1,635,329.02	65%
Conifer High School Addition & General Upgrades	9/16/2019	6/30/2021	\$7,550,788.80	\$10,565,641.00	\$3,014,852.20	40%
Arvada High School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2/2019	10/20/2020	\$12,018,096.00	\$15,463,197.57	\$3,445,101.57	29%
Wilmot Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	2/1/2019	10/15/2020	\$3,212,843.00	\$8,270,668.20	\$5,057,825.20	157%
Districtwide Site Improvements	1/2/2019	4/1/2020	\$12,157,500.00	\$20,327,403.45	\$8,169,903.45	67%
Districtwide Field Improvements	10/14/2019	1/4/2021	\$8,400,000.00	\$19,271,112.01	\$10,871,112.01	129%
Completed Project Totals			\$167,802,717.23	\$214,706,512.85	\$46,903,795.62	



In-Progress Projects

The District has 105 sub-projects in-progress as of June 30, 2021. The total expenditure for in-progress projects was \$339,182,942.48. All of the data presented below are generated through the District's contract management system.

Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Alameda High School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2/2019	7/14/2022	\$19,055,745.00	\$30,250,147.30	\$11,194,402.30	59%
Alameda High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	2/28/2022	\$378,000.00	\$893,750.00	\$515,750.00	136%
Bell Middle School Addition & General Upgrades	10/3/2019	8/31/2021	\$6,877,348.40	\$7,007,348.40	\$130,000.00	2%
Bell Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	9/12/2022	\$225,000.00	\$940,625.00	\$715,625.00	318%
Brady Exploration School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/6/2019	11/2/2021	\$1,752,517.15	\$1,859,730.73	\$107,213.58	6%
Carmody Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,589,108.40	\$1,610,650.80	\$21,542.40	1%
Carmody Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/5/2021	\$94,500.00	\$416,730.26	\$322,230.26	341%
Charter Addenbrooke Classical Academy General Upgrades	3/1/2019	9/30/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,828,962.80	\$738,810.86	24%
Charter Collegiate Academy of Colorado General Upgrades	3/1/2019	10/29/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,831,451.24	\$741,299.30	24%
Charter Compass Montessori Wheat Ridge General Upgrades	3/1/2019	10/29/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$2,651,098.54	\$(439,053.40)	-14%
Charter Excel Academy Charter School General Upgrades	3/1/2019	10/29/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,831,104.39	\$740,952.45	24%
Charter Lincoln Academy Charter School General Upgrades	3/1/2019	9/30/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,827,477.68	\$737,325.74	24%
Charter Montessori Peaks Academy General Upgrades	3/1/2019	9/30/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,832,042.81	\$741,890.87	24%
Charter Mountain Phoenix Community School General Upgrades	3/1/2019	11/19/2021	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,826,667.09	\$736,515.15	24%
Charter New America School General Upgrades	3/1/2019	12/30/2022	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,787,644.37	\$697,492.43	23%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Charter Rocky Mountain Deaf School General Upgrades	3/1/2019	9/30/2022	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,828,327.89	\$738,175.95	24%
Chatfield High School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$2,721,352.65	\$2,926,747.92	\$205,395.27	8%
Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2/2019	8/12/2021	\$11,482,013.00	\$18,440,300.06	\$6,958,287.06	61%
Columbine High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/16/2020	11/30/2021	\$1,470,000.00	\$1,396,250.00	\$(73,750.00)	-5%
Compass Montessori Golden Charter	5/3/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$640,682.15	\$640,682.15	100%
Conifer High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	1/16/2020	9/30/2021	\$892,500.00	\$965,625.00	\$73,125.00	8%
CTE South New School	9/10/2019	9/7/2021	\$10,000,000.00	\$10,071,100.19	\$71,100.19	1%
CTE South New School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/5/2021	\$500,000.00	\$322,798.38	\$(177,201.62)	-35%
Dakota Ridge High School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$3,162,502.15	\$3,162,502.15	\$-	0%
Deane Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$847,878.20	\$629,556.38	\$(218,321.82)	-26%
Dennison Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$966,488.10	\$1,032,433.10	\$65,945.00	7%
Dennison Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/6/2021	\$42,840.00	\$548,918.27	\$506,078.27	1181%
D'Evelyn Jr-Sr High School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/3/2020	9/14/2022	\$870,082.35	\$6,262,085.28	\$5,392,002.93	620%
Devinny Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$745,596.50	\$991,019.36	\$245,422.86	33%
Devinny Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/30/2020	10/5/2021	\$105,000.00	\$342,668.27	\$237,668.27	226%
Dunstan Technology Upgrades	5/3/2021	8/31/2021	\$18,000.00	\$18,000.00	\$-	0%
Districtwide Elevator Upgrades 2021	1/4/2021	7/30/2021	\$-	\$311,054.00	\$311,054.00	100%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Districtwide Field Improvements 2021	9/1/2020	12/15/2021	\$2,887,500.00	\$11,613,954.60	\$8,726,454.60	302%
Districtwide Flooring 2021	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,306,266.00	\$1,666,949.07	\$360,683.07	28%
Districtwide Flooring 2022-I	6/15/2021	9/16/2022	\$939,000.00	\$939,000.00	\$-	0%
Districtwide H Bond Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment Allocation	6/3/2019	12/3/2024	\$-	\$55,445.74	\$55,445.74	100%
Districtwide HVAC 2020	10/1/2019	8/31/2021	\$1,926,540.00	\$2,128,897.48	\$202,357.48	11%
Districtwide LED Lighting 2021	9/1/2020	10/19/2021	\$1,835,700.00	\$1,861,360.74	\$25,660.74	1%
Districtwide Mechanical 2021	9/1/2020	10/22/2021	\$2,924,250.00	\$4,343,058.00	\$1,418,808.00	49%
Districtwide Modular Bldg Removal 2021	5/3/2021	8/6/2021	\$-	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	100%
Districtwide Paving 2021	9/1/2020	9/8/2021	\$682,500.00	\$682,500.00	\$-	0%
Districtwide Playgrounds 2021	10/20/2020	9/20/2021	\$692,475.00	\$2,011,919.20	\$1,319,444.20	191%
Districtwide Roofing 2021	9/1/2020	8/31/2021	\$1,887,928.85	\$1,831,266.18	\$(56,662.67)	-3%
Districtwide Security Glass 2021	12/1/2020	9/30/2021	\$96,000.00	\$96,000.00	\$-	0%
Districtwide Security Glass 2022	6/15/2021	6/14/2022	\$88,000.00	\$88,000.00	\$-	0%
Evergreen High School Renovation & General Upgrades	10/8/2020	9/7/2022	\$10,136,692.50	\$10,499,792.50	\$363,100.00	4%
Evergreen Middle School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2020	9/15/2022	\$7,720,755.00	\$7,016,866.12	\$(703,888.88)	-9%
Everitt Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/7/2020	9/30/2021	\$3,000,920.91	\$3,090,619.71	\$89,698.80	3%
Everitt Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	8/10/2021	\$297,500.00	\$297,500.00	\$-	0%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Fitzmorris Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	8/31/2021	\$1,059,436.10	\$1,072,402.35	\$12,966.25	1%
Fitzmorris Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/5/2021	\$110,250.00	\$329,111.54	\$218,861.54	199%
Foster Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	1/2/2020	9/22/2021	\$5,364,815.15	\$5,528,892.77	\$164,077.62	3%
Foster Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/5/2021	\$498,750.00	\$329,807.69	\$(168,942.31)	-34%
G Wayne Carle Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/9/2020	10/26/2021	\$182,000.00	\$165,000.00	\$(17,000.00)	-9%
Golden High School Doors Replacement	9/1/2020	8/6/2021	\$263,485.68	\$258,536.34	\$(4,949.34)	-2%
Green Mountain Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/30/2022	\$634,628.65	\$634,628.65	\$-	0%
Green Mountain Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/2/2020	9/30/2021	\$38,663.20	\$135,740.55	\$97,077.35	251%
Green Mountain High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/28/2019	9/30/2021	\$1,417,500.00	\$1,066,350.08	\$(351,149.92)	-25%
Jeffco Net Upgrade	6/22/2020	4/15/2022	\$7,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00	\$-	0%
Jeffco Open School Efficiency & Future Ready	2/8/2021	9/2/2022	\$9,700,287.45	\$9,700,287.45	\$-	0%
Jefferson High School Addition & General Upgrades	9/23/2019	10/20/2021	\$12,225,139.00	\$12,497,752.86	\$272,613.86	2%
Jefferson High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/5/2021	\$-	\$168,750.00	\$168,750.00	100%
Kullerstrand Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/8/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,143,044.85	\$1,269,831.92	\$126,787.07	11%
Kullerstrand Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/4/2021	\$147,000.00	\$267,668.27	\$120,668.27	82%
Kyffin Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/30/2021	\$4,144,305.00	\$4,020,739.02	\$(123,565.98)	-3%
Kyffin Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/13/2021	\$341,250.00	\$432,932.69	\$91,682.69	27%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Lasley Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	8/31/2021	\$632,858.90	\$661,860.66	\$29,001.76	5%
Lasley Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/6/2021	\$441,000.00	\$192,668.27	\$(248,331.73)	-56%
Lawrence Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	11/30/2021	\$2,443,566.00	\$2,311,297.56	\$(132,268.44)	-5%
Lumberg Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	10/7/2019	9/27/2021	\$7,397,619.70	\$7,936,167.29	\$538,547.59	7%
Lumberg Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	10/5/2021	\$551,250.00	\$502,884.62	\$(48,365.38)	-9%
Manning School Addition & General Upgrades	8/26/2019	9/28/2021	\$6,403,970.65	\$6,468,782.47	\$64,811.82	1%
Manning School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/2/2020	9/12/2022	\$21,105.00	\$432,812.50	\$411,707.50	1951%
Maple Grove Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/15/2021	\$807,121.40	\$816,069.77	\$8,948.37	1%
Maple Grove Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	11/18/2020	10/5/2021	\$194,250.00	\$299,543.27	\$105,293.27	54%
Marshdale Elementary School Replace School	9/1/2020	9/12/2022	\$20,000,000.00	\$17,949,994.68	\$(2,050,005.32)	-10%
Miller Special School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/8/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,616,366.00	\$1,713,667.49	\$97,301.49	6%
Mount Evans OELS Efficiency & Future Ready	6/7/2021	10/7/2022	\$3,210,190.20	\$3,210,190.20	\$-	0%
North Arvada Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/12/2022	\$2,392,923.10	\$2,392,923.10	\$-	0%
North Transportation-Joyce Renovation	7/15/2019	9/2/2022	\$349,400.00	\$554,193.48	\$204,793.48	59%
Parmalee Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	10/23/2019	9/27/2021	\$3,571,422.55	\$4,146,989.60	\$575,567.05	16%
Parmalee Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/8/2021	\$168,000.00	\$207,980.77	\$39,980.77	24%
Patterson Cottages Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	8/31/2021	\$360,591.00	\$305,435.43	\$(55,155.57)	-15%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Patterson Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	8/31/2021	\$526,229.09	\$636,262.34	\$110,033.25	21%
Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	5/1/2020	1/27/2022	\$9,368,603.50	\$9,368,603.50	\$-	0%
Pomona High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment Phase 2	1/4/2021	10/4/2021	\$1,050,000.00	\$622,500.00	\$(427,500.00)	-41%
Powderhorn Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2020	9/12/2022	\$5,876,860.10	\$5,892,460.10	\$15,600.00	0%
Prospect Valley Elementary School Replace School	10/1/2020	2/15/2023	\$20,000,000.00	\$20,000,000.00	\$-	0%
Ralston Valley High School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2020	8/25/2022	\$7,625,512.80	\$7,625,512.80	\$-	0%
Ryan Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,213,833.36	\$1,213,833.36	\$-	0%
Ryan Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	10/5/2021	\$362,250.00	\$323,391.69	\$(38,858.31)	-11%
Sheridan Green Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$851,757.90	\$1,248,795.50	\$397,037.60	47%
Sheridan Green Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	10/1/2020	8/10/2021	\$473,550.00	\$172,682.69	\$(300,867.31)	-64%
Slater Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/12/2022	\$1,262,059.35	\$1,262,059.35	\$-	0%
Standley Lake High School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2020	9/14/2022	\$8,033,019.60	\$8,033,019.60	\$-	0%
Stevens Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/30/2022	\$624,688.00	\$624,688.00	\$-	0%
Stott Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$826,579.55	\$974,916.51	\$148,336.96	18%
Swanson Playground Upgrades	5/3/2021	9/30/2021	\$175,000.00	\$175,000.00	\$-	0%
Thomson Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/30/2022	\$664,089.85	\$664,089.85	\$-	0%
Two Roads Arvada Charter	5/3/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$640,682.15	\$640,682.15	100%



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget	Variance	Variance %
Vanderhoof Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2020	9/13/2021	\$1,707,667.50	\$2,212,393.26	\$504,725.76	30%
Wayne Carle Middle School Addition & General Upgrades	9/6/2019	9/27/2021	\$5,201,180.05	\$4,850,544.75	\$(350,635.30)	-7%
Westridge Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	10/7/2020	9/13/2021	\$418,173.85	\$459,777.24	\$41,603.39	10%
Wilmore-Davis Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	6/14/2021	9/12/2022	\$1,100,224.90	\$1,100,224.90	\$-	0%
Windy Peak OELS Efficiency & Future Ready	6/7/2021	10/7/2022	\$3,340,982.40	\$3,340,982.40	\$-	0%

Upcoming Projects

There are 133 projects that are planned to be initiated in fiscal year 2022. The total valuation for these projects is currently budgeted to be 187,581,045.84; \$3,352,669.24 in budget increases were made within the system as of June 30, 2021.

Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Anderson Preschool Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	8/31/2023	\$117,794.45	\$117,794.45
Arvada West High School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/29/2022	\$1,038,715.40	\$1,038,715.40
Bear Creek High School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,138,341.25	\$1,138,341.25
Bear Creek K-8 Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$418,215.97	\$418,215.97
Bergen Meadow Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	10/2/2023	\$5,410,741.70	\$5,410,741.70
Bergen Meadow Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/2/2023	\$3,463.20	\$3,463.20
Bergen Valley Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$277,505.95	\$277,505.95
Bergen Valley Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$78,750.00	\$78,750.00



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Blue Heron Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	11/1/2022	\$489,888.85	\$489,888.85
Bradford K-8 North Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$224,002.70	\$224,002.70
Bradford K-8 South Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$1,468,004.15	\$1,468,004.15
Campbell Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	10/27/2023	\$419,654.85	\$419,654.85
Campbell Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	8/30/2023	\$341,250.00	\$341,250.00
Chatfield High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	10/3/2022	\$52,500.00	\$52,500.00
Coal Creek Canyon K-8 Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	11/1/2023	\$1,089,185.30	\$1,089,185.30
Coal Creek Canyon K-8 Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	2/1/2024	\$-	\$-
Colorow Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	11/1/2022	\$1,876,114.65	\$1,876,114.65
Connections Learning Center Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$239,900.25	\$239,900.25
Creighton Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$876,001.40	\$876,001.40
Deer Creek Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$1,168,291.17	\$1,168,291.17
Drake Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$841,473.15	\$841,473.15
Drake Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	11/14/2023	\$126,000.00	\$126,000.00
Dunstan Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$543,922.30	\$543,922.30
Districtwide Elevator Upgrades 2022	9/1/2021	6/30/2022	\$-	\$350,000.00
Districtwide Flooring 2022-II	9/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$840,000.00	\$840,000.00
Districtwide LED Lighting 2022	9/1/2021	12/30/2022	\$2,144,166.00	\$2,144,166.00



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Districtwide Mechanical 2022	9/1/2021	9/29/2022	\$4,597,740.00	\$4,597,740.00
Districtwide Modular Bldg Removal 2022	9/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$-	\$350,000.00
Districtwide Paving 2022	9/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$1,135,050.00	\$1,135,050.00
Districtwide Playground 2022-I	9/1/2021	9/29/2022	\$514,500.00	\$514,500.00
Districtwide Playground 2022-II	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$147,000.00	\$147,000.00
Districtwide Roofing 2022	9/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$2,850,745.80	\$2,850,745.80
Edgewater Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2022	10/31/2024	\$4,647,983.90	\$4,647,983.90
Edgewater Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$504,000.00	\$504,000.00
Elk Creek Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$590,685.85	\$590,685.85
Emory Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/1/2022	\$2,261,030.75	\$2,261,030.75
Evergreen High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,260,000.00	\$1,260,000.00
Fairmount Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$265,655.30	\$265,655.30
Fairmount Mechanical and LED Upgrades	9/1/2021	9/29/2022	\$1,277,409.00	\$1,277,409.00
Falcon Bluffs Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$1,097,827.75	\$1,097,827.75
Falcon Bluffs Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/2/2023	\$136,500.00	\$136,500.00
Free Horizon Montessori (formerly Pleasant View Elementary School) Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$174,681.65	\$174,681.65
Glennon Heights Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$1,202,442.95	\$1,202,442.95



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Glennon Heights Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$294,000.00	\$294,000.00
Golden High School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$535,812.42	\$535,812.42
Governor's Ranch Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$624,532.65	\$624,532.65
Great Work Montessori Charter General Upgrades	9/1/2022	9/1/2023	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,730,804.41
Irwin Preschool Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$52,535.20	\$52,535.20
Jeffco Open School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$9,660.00	\$9,660.00
Ken Caryl Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$1,481,690.05	\$1,481,690.05
Kendallvue Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$1,456,006.00	\$1,456,006.00
Lakewood High School Efficiency & Future Ready	8/2/2021	8/30/2022	\$2,046,140.65	\$2,046,140.65
Leawood Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	8/15/2024	\$769,639.15	\$769,639.15
Leyden Rock New School	9/1/2022	11/29/2024	\$29,400,000.00	\$29,400,000.00
Little Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$551,105.85	\$551,105.85
Little Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/2/2023	\$361,200.00	\$361,200.00
Litz Preschool Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$77,479.35	\$77,479.35
Long View High School Efficiency & Future Ready	8/16/2021	9/14/2022	\$240,710.50	\$240,710.50
Long View High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$136,500.00	\$136,500.00
Mandalay Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,011,516.60	\$1,011,516.60
Mandalay Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$725,550.00	\$725,550.00



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Marshdale Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	12/30/2022	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
McLain Community High School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$737,211.05	\$737,211.05
Meiklejohn Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$200,300.35	\$200,300.35
Mitchell Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$558,433.65	\$558,433.65
Molholm Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2022	10/31/2024	\$6,295,273.40	\$6,295,273.40
Molholm Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$68,250.00	\$68,250.00
Moore Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$1,246,643.00	\$1,246,643.00
Moore Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$710,850.00	\$710,850.00
Mortensen Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$538,996.70	\$538,996.70
Mount Carbon Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	11/1/2023	\$407,158.35	\$407,158.35
Mount Evans OELS Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$-
Normandy Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	8/15/2024	\$796,345.35	\$796,345.35
Normandy Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$393,750.00	\$393,750.00
North Arvada Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$735,000.00	\$735,000.00
Oberon Middle School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2022	9/30/2024	\$7,856,041.65	\$7,856,041.65
Parr Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$333,985.50	\$333,985.50
Peck Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$276,140.40	\$276,140.40
Peck Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$483,000.00	\$483,000.00



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Peiffer Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$779,652.35	\$779,652.35
Peiffer Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$651,000.00	\$651,000.00
Pennington Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$735,126.35	\$735,126.35
Pennington Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	8/30/2023	\$68,250.00	\$68,250.00
Powderhorn Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$90,000.00
Prospect Valley Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	12/30/2022	\$401,408.65	\$401,408.65
Red Rocks Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,260,561.63	\$1,260,561.63
Red Rocks Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$231,000.00	\$231,000.00
Rocky Mtn Acad. Evergreen Charter	7/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$640,682.15
Rooney Ranch Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	8/30/2024	\$118,679.62	\$118,679.62
Rose Stein International Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$161,200.00	\$161,200.00
Secrest Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$382,338.45	\$382,338.45
Secrest Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$357,000.00	\$357,000.00
Shaffer Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$434,372.20	\$434,372.20
Shelton Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,309,323.40	\$1,309,323.40
Sierra Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$670,441.50	\$670,441.50
Sobesky Academy Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$1,291,567.55	\$1,291,567.55
South Lakewood Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$437,988.50	\$437,988.50



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
South Lakewood Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$89,250.00	\$89,250.00
Standley Lake High School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/1/2022	\$1,377,600.00	\$1,377,600.00
Stevens Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$79,800.00	\$79,800.00
Stony Creek Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$736,203.60	\$736,203.60
Stony Creek Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$420,000.00	\$420,000.00
Summit Ridge Middle School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	11/1/2023	\$1,366,042.45	\$1,366,042.45
Swanson Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$2,297,579.75	\$2,297,579.75
Swanson Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	10/3/2023	\$498,750.00	\$498,750.00
Thomson Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	10/3/2022	\$84,000.00	\$84,000.00
Ute Meadows Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$794,083.50	\$794,083.50
Ute Meadows Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$52,500.00	\$52,500.00
Van Arsdale Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$1,076,532.49	\$1,076,532.49
Van Arsdale Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	8/30/2023	\$444,150.00	\$444,150.00
Warder Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$481,101.50	\$481,101.50
Warder Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	10/3/2022	\$432,600.00	\$432,600.00
Warren Tech Central Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2022	9/29/2023	\$3,203,519.95	\$3,203,519.95
Warren Tech Central Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	9/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$-	\$-
Warren Tech North Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$425,201.70	\$425,201.70



Project Name	Min of Start	Max of Finish	Sum of Original Budget	Sum of Current Budget
Weber Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$647,295.90	\$647,295.90
Weber Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2022	8/15/2023	\$-	\$-
West Jefferson Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$178,130.25	\$178,130.25
West Jefferson Middle School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment Phase II	12/1/2021	8/2/2022	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00
West Lakewood School New School	1/3/2023	8/15/2025	\$29,400,000.00	\$29,400,000.00
West Woods Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2023	10/1/2024	\$2,039,978.97	\$2,039,978.97
West Woods Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2023	9/3/2024	\$39,375.00	\$39,375.00
Westgate Elementary School Efficiency & Future Ready	9/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$1,094,042.00	\$1,094,042.00
Westgate Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$509,250.00	\$509,250.00
Westridge Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	11/14/2022	\$525,000.00	\$525,000.00
Wheat Ridge High School Addition & General Upgrades	7/1/2021	10/26/2023	\$13,848,732.40	\$13,848,732.40
Wilmore-Davis Elementary School Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	12/1/2021	8/31/2022	\$218,849.60	\$218,849.60
Woodrow Wilson Academy Charter	7/1/2021	9/30/2022	\$-	\$640,682.15
Zerger Elementary School (Doral Academy) Charter General Upgrades	9/1/2021	9/1/2022	\$3,090,151.94	\$3,730,804.41
Upcoming Projects Totals			\$184,228,376.60	\$187,581,045.84



APPENDIX G: PROJECT TIMELINE ANALYSIS BETWEEN 2018 AND 2021 FLIPBOOK

The following table summarizes the site-level project timelines listed in the 2018 and 2021 Flipbooks. Charter school projects were not accompanied by a schedule in either Flipbook and were not included in the table.

Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Alameda Articulation Area	Alameda International Jr./ Sr. High	11/2018 – 8/2021	12/18-8/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month shorter
Alameda Articulation Area	Deane Elementary	9/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020 – 8/2021	N/A
Alameda Articulation Area	Emory Elementary	9/2020 – 8/2021	9/2021 – 8/2022	Began 12 months later
Alameda Articulation Area	Lasley Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 9/2021	Began 12 months earlier Total Timeline 1 month longer
Alameda Articulation Area	Patterson International Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 9/2021	Began 12 months earlier Total Timeline 1 month longer
Alameda Articulation Area	Rose Stein International Elementary	9/2022 – 8/2023	9/2023 – 9/2024	Scheduled to begin 12 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada High	5/2019 – 12/2021	Completed Nov. '20	Completed 13 months early
Arvada Articulation Area	Arvada K-8	8/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Arvada Articulation Area	Fitzmorris Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	Foster Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	1/2020 – 3/2020	Began 12 months later Total timeline 17 months shorter (Typo?)



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Arvada Articulation Area	Hackberry Hill Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2021	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 10 months early
Arvada Articulation Area	Lawrence Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 11 months early Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	North Arvada Middle	1/2019 – 8/2020	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 32 months later Total timeline 6 months shorter
Arvada Articulation Area	Peck Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months early Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	Secrest Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months early Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	Swanson Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada Articulation Area	Thomson Elementary	9/2021 -8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Total timeline 2 months longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Allendale Elementary	9/2020 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2021	Total timeline 10 months shorter
Arvada West Articulation Area	Arvada West High	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 12 months later Total timeline 2 months longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Campbell Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Drake Middle School	8/2023 – 8/2024	8/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 12 months earlier Total timeline 2 months longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fairmount Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Fremont Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Arvada West Articulation Area	Stott Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Arvada West Articulation Area	Vanderhoof Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek High	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 37 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Bear Creek K-8	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Carmody Middle	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Green Gables Elementary	1/2020 – 8/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 22 months early
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendallvue Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Kendrick Lakes Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2021	2/2019 – 7/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 2 months shorter
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Peiffer Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Red Rocks Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Bear Creek Articulation Area	Westgate Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 North	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 49 months later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Chatfield Articulation Area	Bradford K-8 South	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 49 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Chatfield High	8/2020 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2022	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Coronado Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 22 months early
Chatfield Articulation Area	Deer Creek Middle	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 12 months later Total timeline 2 months longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Falcon Bluffs Middle	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Mortensen Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Shaffer Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Stony Creek Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Chatfield Articulation Area	Ute Meadows Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine High	1/2019 – 8/2021	1/2019 – 8/2021	N/A
Columbine Articulation Area	Columbine Hills Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 22 months early
Columbine Articulation Area	Dutch Creek Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 22 months early



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Columbine Articulation Area	Governor's Ranch Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Columbine Articulation Area	Ken Caryl Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Columbine Articulation Area	Leawood Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Columbine Articulation Area	Normandy Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Conifer Articulation Area	Conifer High	5/2020 – 12/2022	9/2019 – 12/2021	Began 8 months earlier Total timeline 4 months shorter
Conifer Articulation Area	Elk Creek Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 9/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier
Conifer Articulation Area	Marshdale Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2022	7/2022 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 23 months later Total timeline 3 months longer
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Conifer Articulation Area	West Jefferson Middle	8/2020 – 8/2021	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 10 months early
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Blue Heron Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Colorow Elementary	8/2023- 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Dakota Ridge High	8/2020 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2022	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Mount Carbon Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Powderhorn Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2022	9/2019 – 10/2021	Began 11 months early Total timeline 1 month longer
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Summit Ridge Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Dakota Ridge Articulation Area	Westridge Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Meadow Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Total timeline 10 months shorter
Evergreen Articulation Area	Bergen Valley Intermediate	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Total timeline 2 months longer
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen High	5/2020 – 12/2022	6/2020 – 10/2022	Began 1 month later Total timeline 7 months longer
Evergreen Articulation Area	Evergreen Middle	8/2020 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 1/2023	Began 1 month later Total timeline 4 months longer
Evergreen Articulation Area	Parmalee Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	2/2020 – 7/2021	Began 13 months later Total timeline 2 months shorter
Evergreen Articulation Area	Wilmot Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Golden Articulation Area	Bell Middle	5/2019 – 8/2021	6/2019 -10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Golden Articulation Area	Golden High	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Golden Articulation Area	Kyffin Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2023	1/2021 – 5/2023	Began 8 months earlier Total timeline 5 months shorter
Golden Articulation Area	Mitchell Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Golden Articulation Area	Ralston Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Golden Articulation Area	Shelton Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Golden Articulation Area	Welchester Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Devinny Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 12 months earlier Total timeline 2 months longer
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Dunstan Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Foothills Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months early
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain Elementary	9/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Total timeline 2 months longer
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Green Mountain High Area	11/2018 – 1/2022	1/2019 – 5/2021	Began 2 months later Total timeline 10 months shorter
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Hutchinson Elementary	8/2020 – 1/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 15 months early
Green Mountain Articulation Area	Rooney Ranch Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Jefferson Articulation Area	Edgewater Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Jefferson Articulation Area	Jefferson Jr./Sr. High	1/2020 – 8/2022	9/2019 – 1/2022	Began 4 months earlier Total timeline 3 months shorter
Jefferson Articulation Area	Lumberg Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2021	9/2019 – 10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month later
Jefferson Articulation Area	Molholm Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2021	9/2021 – 11/2023	Scheduled to begin 25 months later total timeline 2 months longer
Lakewood Articulation Area	Belmar Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Lakewood Articulation Area	Creighton Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Lakewood Articulation Area	Eiber Elementary	1/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Lakewood Articulation Area	Glennon Heights Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Lakewood Articulation Area	Lakewood High	8/2022 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 11 months shorter
Lakewood Articulation Area	Slater Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Lakewood Articulation Area	South Lakewood Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Brady Exploration School	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020-10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Option Schools	Connections Learning Center	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2020-10/2021	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	D'Evelyn Jr./Sr. High School	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020-10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Dennison Elementary	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020-10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Fletcher Miller Special School	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2020-10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Free Horizon Montessori	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022-9/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier
Option Schools	Jeffco Open School	8/2022 – 8/2024	7/2020-12/2022	Began 25 months earlier Total timeline 5 months longer
Option Schools	Long View High School	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2021-10/2022	Scheduled to begin 23 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Manning Option School	8/2019 – 8/2021	9/2019-12/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 3 months longer
Option Schools	McLain High School	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023-10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Sobesky Academy	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023-10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Option Schools	Warren Tech Central	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2022-10/2023	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Option Schools	Warren Tech North	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021-10/2022	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Little Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Moore Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Parr Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Pomona High	11/2020 – 8/2022	5/2020 – 9/2022	Began 6 months earlier Total timeline 7 months longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Warder Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Pomona Articulation Area	Weber Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Coal Creek Canyon K-8 Area	8/2022 – 8/2021	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 25 months longer
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Meiklejohn Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2023	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Oberon Middle	8/2021 – 8/2023	9/2021 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Ralston Valley High	11/2020 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 11/2022	Began 2 months earlier Total timeline 5 months longer



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Sierra Elementary	0	6/2024 – 7/2025	Original timeline labeled N/A in Flipbook
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Three Creek K-8	1/2020 – 8/2021	Completed May '20	Completed 15 months early
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	Van Arsdale Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Ralston Valley Articulation Area	West Woods Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2023 – 10/2024	Scheduled to begin 1 month earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Adams Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Lukas Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Mandalay Middle	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Ryan Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 13 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Semper Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Sheridan Green Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 11 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Standley Lake High	11/2022 – 8/2024	9/2020 – 1/2023	Began 26 months early Total timeline 7 months longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Wayne Carle Middle	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2019 – 10/2021	Began 1 month later Total timeline 13 months longer
Standley Lake Articulation Area	Witt Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 22 months early



Articulation Area / Option Schools/ Charter Schools	Project/School	2018 Estimated Project Timeline	2021 Estimated Project Timeline	Timeline Difference
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Everitt Middle	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 35 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Kullerstrand Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 35 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Maple Grove Elementary	8/2023 – 8/2024	9/2020 – 10/2021	Began 35 months earlier Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Peak Expeditionary School at Pennington	8/2020 – 8/2021	9/2022 – 10/2023	Scheduled to begin 25 months later Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Prospect Valley Elementary	8/2022 – 8/2024	9/2021 – 12/2024	Scheduled to begin 11 months earlier Total timeline 15 months longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stevens Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Stober Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	9/2019 – 10/2020	Began 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Vivian Elementary	8/2019 – 8/2020	Completed Oct.'20	Completed 2 months late
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wheat Ridge High	1/2022 – 8/2024	7/2021 – 11/2023	Began 6 months earlier Total timeline 3 months earlier
Wheat Ridge Articulation Area	Wilmore-Davis Elementary	8/2021 – 8/2022	9/2021 – 10/2022	Scheduled to begin 1 month later Total timeline 1 month longer



APPENDIX H: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR PROCUREMENT

The following table summarizes the procurement of construction contractors for sampled projects.

Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
H49000 A01	Wilmot Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	CM/GC	Himmelman Construction, Inc.	\$465,100.00	Yes	August 3, 2020	12560 W. Cedar Dr. Lakewood, CO 80228	Yes	\$100.00	\$6,876,834.00	\$6,876,934.00	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: \$100 Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: \$115,000 NTE General Conditions: \$350,000
			FCI Constructors, Inc.	\$427,086.00	No	N/A	4015 Coriolis Way Frederick, CO 80504	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			W.E. O'Neil	\$520,945.00	No	N/A	229 Vallejo Street Denver, CO 80223	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
H71000 A01	Alameda High School Addition & General Upgrades	CM/GC	GH Phipps Construction Companies	\$1,037,778.00	Yes	December 31, 2021	5995 Greenwood Plaza Blvd, Suite 100 Greenwood Village, CO 80111	Yes	\$35,000.00	\$25,970,779.00	\$26,005,779.00	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: \$35,000 Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: \$445,000 NTE General Conditions: \$557,778
			Adolfson & Peterson Construction	\$1,640,441.00	No	N/A	797 Ventura St Aurora, CO 80011	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			GE Johnson Construction Company	\$1,296,321.00	No	N/A	5613 DTC Parkway, Suite 450 Greenwood Village, CO 80111	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Haselden Construction	\$1,632,361.00	No	N/A	6950 S Potomac St Centennial, CO 80112	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Saunders Construction Inc.	\$726,025.00	No	N/A	86 Inverness PI N Englewood, CO 80112	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
			Swinerton Builders	\$1,286,858.00	No	N/A	6890 West 52nd Avenue Arvada, CO 80002	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	
H73500 A01	Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	CM/GC	Swinerton Builders	\$1,056,872.00	Yes	July 30, 2021	6890 West 52nd Avenue Arvada, CO 80002	No	\$20,000.00	\$15,608,313.00	\$15,628,313.00	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: \$20,000 Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: \$282,000 NTE General Conditions: \$754,872
			GH Phipps Construction Companies	\$794,671.00	No	N/A	5995 Greenwood Plaza Blvd, Suite 100 Greenwood Village, CO 80111	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Adolfson & Peterson Construction	\$1,551,582.00	No	N/A	797 Ventura St Aurora, CO 80011	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
			GE Johnson Construction Company	\$1,197,378.00	No	N/A	5613 DTC Parkway, Suite 450 Greenwood Village, CO 80111	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Haselden Construction	\$1,144,255.00	No	N/A	6950 S Potomac St Centennial, CO 80112	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Saunders Construction Inc.	\$746,918.00	No	N/A	86 Inverness PI N Englewood, CO 80112	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
H78000 A01	Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	CM/GC	Saunders Construction Inc.	\$540,500.00	Yes	December 18, 2021	86 Inverness PI N Englewood, CO 80112	Yes	\$25,000.00	\$7,546,500.00	\$7,571,500.00	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: \$25,000 Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: \$216,000 NTE General Conditions: \$299,500
			FCI Constructors, Inc.	\$704,382.00	No	N/A	4015 Coriolis Way Frederick, CO 80504	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
			GE Johnson Construction Company	\$598,536.00	No	N/A	5613 DTC Parkway, Suite 450 Greenwood Village, CO 80111	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Swinerton Builders	\$752,964.00	No	N/A	6890 West 52nd Avenue Arvada, CO 80002	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	
H91700 U18	Districtwide Field Improvements	CM/GC	ECI Site Construction Management	\$1,149,183.20	Yes	August 1, 2020	2526 14th St. SE Loveland, CO 80537	Yes	\$28,320.00	\$17,815,755.45	\$17,844,075.45	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: See bid note Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: See bid note NTE General Conditions: See bid note
			American Civil Constructors	\$1,117,006.00	No	N/A	4901 S Windermere Street Littleton, CO 80112	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
G91700 U01	Districtwide Field Improvements 2021	CM/GC	Saunders Construction Inc.	\$487,366.00	Yes	October 15, 2021	86 Inverness PI N Englewood, CO 80112	Yes	\$14,000.00	\$10,794,555.00	\$10,808,555.00	Lump Sum Design Phase Fee: \$14,000 Lump Sum Construction Phase Fee: \$225,000 NTE General Conditions: \$248,366
			ECI Site Construction Management	\$751,455.50	No	N/A	2526 14th St. SE Loveland, CO 80537	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Frensen Pittman	\$554,000.00	No	N/A	9563 S. Kingston Court Englewood, CO 80112	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
G91700 U06	Districtwide Play-grounds 2021	CM/GC	Arrow-J Landscape & Design, Inc.	\$1,535,205.00	Yes	August 31, 2021	909 E 68th Ave. Denver, CO	Yes	\$567,006.00	\$0.00	\$567,006.00	Group 1: Kyffin, Peck, Red Rocks Elementary School – \$583,463 Group 1 Alternates (Base + Alts) – \$754,310 Group 2:



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
												Secrest, Thomson, Warder Elementary School – \$686,111 Group 2 Alternates (Base + Alts) – \$780,895
			T 2 Construction Inc.	\$1,260,768.00	Yes	August 6, 2021	5435 W. 59th Ave., Unit H Arvada, CO 80003	Yes	\$1,081,117.00	\$0.00	\$1,081,117.00	Group 1: Kyffin, Peck, Red Rocks Elementary School – \$531,712 Group 1 Alternates (Base + Alts) – \$645,496 Group 2: Secrest, Thomson, Warder Elementary School – \$549,405 Group 2 Alternates (Base + Alts) – \$615,272



Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount	Awarded Project? [1]	Estimated Completion per Agreement or Most Recent Change Order	Contractor Address [2]	Head-quartered in CO? (Yes/No)	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum	Notes
			Colorado Designscales Inc.	\$1,525,600.00	No	N/A	15440 E. Fremont Drive Centennial, CO	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			Goodland Construction, Inc.	\$801,510.00	No	N/A	760 Nile St. Golden, CO	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Did not propose for Group 2
			Richdell Construction, Inc.	\$1,504,600.00	No	N/A	7905 W. 120th Ave. Broomfield, CO 80020	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Notes:

1 – During our review, we were unable to identify bid tabulations or evaluations to demonstrate the method used to select and award contracts to the proposal selected. Per the FEG-R Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards policy and procedure, the following factors should be considered in the qualification/selection process:

- History of firm's performance and management capabilities
- Geographic location of firm's office
- Length of time firm has been in business
- Length of time firm has worked in Denver metro area
- Qualifications and experience of staff
- Type, complexity, and value of projects completed by firm
- Reputation of performance with owners, architects/engineers, and the local construction industry
- Experience in work with the District and other school districts
- Financial strength and responsibility as reflected in financial statements, working capital and timely disbursements of payments
- Bonding ability and bonding company
- Responses from references
- Claims history

We are unable to determine if the factors identified in the policies and procedures were used in the qualification/selection process.

2 – We were unable to identify District Policies and Procedures to define the process of the District giving preference to local contractors. This includes how local contractors are defined (i.e., locally owned and operated, headquartered in Colorado, head quartered elsewhere with a local office, etc.) Additionally, it was unclear how local contractors were evaluated within the bid selection and award (see footnote 1 for additional information). It was unclear if there was a defined policy and procedure that outlined who qualified as a local contractor or the weighted, objective criteria used during the bid tabulation or evaluation and award.



APPENDIX I: ARCHITECT PROCUREMENT

The following table summarizes the procurement of architect professional services for sampled projects. See [Observation No. 11](#) for further information.

Project No.	Project Name	Original Scope	Contractor	Bid Amount [1]	Awarded Project?	Original Contract Value	CO Value	Total Contract Sum
H49000A01	Wilmot Elementary School Addition & General Upgrades	Architect	DLR Group	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$550,387.00	\$580,387.00
H71000A01	Alameda High School Addition & General Upgrades	Architect	Wold Architects & Engineers, Inc.	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$50,000.00	\$1,923,900.00	\$1,973,900.00
H73500A01	Columbine High School Addition & General Upgrades	Architect	EIDOS Architects, PC (1035)	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$64,855.00	\$311,987.00	\$376,842.00
		Architect	EIDOS Architects, PC (1108)	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$950,200.00	\$403,230.00	\$1,353,430.00
H78000A01	Pomona High School Addition & General Upgrades	Architect	Sy-Bazz Architecture, LLC	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$142,545.00	\$860,032.00	\$1,002,577.00
H91700U18	Districtwide Field Improvements	Architect	Hord Coplan Macht, Inc.	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$470,031.00	\$44,974.50	\$515,005.50
G91700U01	Districtwide Field Improvements 2021	Architect	Hord Coplan Macht, Inc.	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$398,425.00	\$15,050.00	\$413,475.00
G91700U06	Districtwide Playgrounds 2021	Architect	Lime Green Design	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$7,078.00	\$60,368.00	\$67,446.00
			Design Concepts	No Proposal Provided	Yes	\$23,285.00	\$112,590.00	\$135,875.00

Note:

1 – During our review, we were unable to identify bidding documentation for architectural professional services. It appears that architects were selected and awarded directly from a prequalified list.

