



Community Bond Oversight Committee

January 13, 2026 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

The Community Bond Oversight Committee met **January 13, 2026**, at **Austin ISD Central Office, 4000 S. IH-35 Frontage Rd., Austin, TX 78704** to consider, discuss and take action on the items of the agenda below. These meeting minutes are supplemented by meeting materials. More information can be found at the [2017 Bond Book & 2002 Bond Program Website](#).

Members in Attendance: Amber Welsh, Anna Valdez, Amy Moore, Barbara Spears-Corbett, Jennifer Carson, Kay Gooch, Lawrence Huang, Lisa Flores, Mark Grayson, Monty Exter, Paula Ohlendorf Bookidis, Richard Kelly, Ryan Pollock

Staff & Consultants in Attendance: Alleigh Gregson, Jada Simpson, Jaime Miller, Katrina Montgomery, Melissa Laursen, Michael Mann, Randall Sala, Ryan Marcum, Sonny Fletcher

Public Attendance: David Misko, Neil Jeffery, Lily McClure, Carolyn Kenny, Kristen Trout, Catherine R., Chase Kasaocostas

AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM	Notes
Call to Order	Mark Grayson called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.
Public Comment (2 mins per comment, max 10 mins)	Lily McClure and Carolyn Kenny provided public comment. In addition, twelve written public comments related to Hill ES were read aloud during the meeting. All public comments are included in the meeting addendum.
Approval of Minutes: December 9 (Voting Item)	The committee reviewed the minutes from the Dec. 9 meeting. Mark Grayson moved to approve, Amber Welsh seconded the motion.
CMD 2022 Modernization/Comprehensive Projects Updates including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hill ES 	<p>Staff provided an update on the Hill Elementary School modernization project in response to a proposal from a member of the school community requesting that the project be completed in a single phase. Bianca Medina-Leal explained that staff evaluated the proposal from a budget-neutral perspective and determined that, regardless of funding availability, significant site constraints limit the feasibility of completing the modernization in phase 2. These constraints include the size of the campus relative to the student population, the need for extensive swing space either on-site or off-site, requirements for more than twenty portable classrooms during construction, expanded stormwater detention pond requirements, and fire access and safety regulations associated with construction on an active campus serving more than 800 students. Michael Mann added that while staff explored whether the project could be delivered in one additional phase, the combined constraints created substantial uncertainty that prevented staff from confidently advancing a single-phase plan.</p> <p>Paula Ohlendorf Bookidis asked whether an off-site swing had been ruled out as a non-negotiable option. Michael Mann clarified that an off-site swing was initially explored but was ultimately determined to be cost-prohibitive and operationally disruptive, with estimated total project costs exceeding \$80 million. Jaime Miller noted that the Hill community had expressed a preference for on-site solutions. Lisa Flores asked how staff had communicated its response to community questions. Michael Mann stated that staff issued a written response prior to the winter break and confirmed that an in-person community meeting is scheduled for February 4 to review the analysis and respond to questions. Bianca Medina-Leal added that broader community meetings had been held earlier in the process but acknowledged the importance of additional direct communication.</p> <p>In response to questions from Lisa Flores regarding the relationship between site constraints and project phasing, Bianca Medina-Leal explained that the limited size of the site requires space for the permanent building footprint, construction staging, fire access, and a large number of portable classrooms simultaneously. She noted that City of Austin fire and permitting requirements further restrict sequencing options and that additional phasing allows</p>

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

	<p>portions of the work to proceed while maintaining safety and operations. Mark Grayson observed that some materials referenced fewer portables, and Bianca Medina-Leal clarified that the total need during construction could exceed twenty portables depending on sequencing.</p> <p>Richard Kelly asked staff to clarify references to an accounting or estimating error described as unique to the Hill project. Michael Mann explained that the project experienced a significant estimating error related primarily to construction cost escalation, which staff acknowledged and took responsibility for correcting. He emphasized that while this error affected the project budget, the need for a third phase is driven by both financial and site-specific constraints. Amy Moore asked when site constraints were identified and communicated to the community. Michael Mann stated that these issues were discussed during an October 15, 2025, community meeting and that off-site swing options were explored for approximately a year before being ruled out.</p> <p>Jaime Miller noted that the original bond estimate for Hill Elementary was approximately \$30.7 million and that the current budget reflects escalation to approximately \$43.2 million, with funding previously allocated for what was anticipated to be a second phase. Monty Exter asked whether the district would still pursue a phased approach even if full funding were available. Michael Mann and Bianca Medina-Leal confirmed that phasing would remain necessary due to site limitations and regulatory requirements. Michael Mann further explained that early bond planning assumptions regarding swing space were developed at a high level and did not include detailed feasibility analysis, as Hill Elementary was scheduled to enter design later in the bond program.</p> <p>Ryan Pollock asked about changes to stormwater detention requirements. Michael Mann explained that requirements have changed significantly since the campus was originally constructed in 1960, necessitating additional detention capacity and further limiting available site area. Larry Huang asked whether near-site swing options, including use of nearby campuses, had been evaluated. Michael Mann stated that several potential locations were considered but found to be infeasible due to scheduling conflicts, space limitations, and concerns related to mixing elementary and secondary school uses. He added that staff will present the full range of options evaluated at the upcoming community meeting.</p> <p>Amber Welsh asked how the committee should approach its role given the concerns raised by the community. Mark Grayson stated that the committee’s bylaws provide for oversight and inquiry but do not authorize the committee to direct project decisions. He noted that the committee had been informed of the significant change and that staff is responsible for determining next steps and communicating with the school community. Jennifer Carson asked whether the committee should consider a formal response to the Board of Trustees. Richard Kelly noted that such a discussion would require careful consideration of the committee’s role, and Anna Valdez confirmed that any formal communication would be directed to the Board rather than the community.</p> <p>Staff will provide the committee with updates following the February 4 Hill Elementary community meeting and will continue to keep the committee informed as the project progresses.</p>
<p>CBOC Committee Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Survey Update ● Consolidation Impacts ● 2025 Lessons Learned 	<p>Melissa Laursen provided an update on the committee survey. Mark Grayson noted that the data provides helpful baseline information for committee discussions and future planning.</p> <p>Mark Grayson then reviewed consolidated financial information related to campus consolidations, clarifying that total expenditures associated with campuses scheduled for closure are approximately \$41 million rather than \$100 million. He explained how actual expenditures, contracted costs, and anticipated future expenses are reflected in the financial summaries and noted that determining the precise bond shortfall at any given point remains complex. Michael Mann confirmed that the figures presented were drawn from current financials, with some amounts rounded to whole numbers, and clarified that a portion of the \$41 million reflects work that is contracted but not yet completed. Mark Grayson emphasized that even with reduced spending at certain campuses, the bond program continues to face a significant overall shortfall.</p> <p>Michael Mann noted that while some investments may no longer directly serve students at closed campuses, funds already spent have provided meaningful benefits, including safety upgrades, HVAC replacements, and roofing improvements. Monty Exter asked how the district plans to derive future value from these investments. Michael Mann explained that campuses such as Martin Middle School and Bedichek Middle School may be repurposed for future educational or community use, allowing infrastructure improvements to retain long-term</p>

	<p>value. Jaime Miller added that staff will salvage and reuse equipment where possible, including cameras, HVAC components, and water bottle filling stations, and noted that Barrington Elementary School and Winn Elementary School are being utilized as swing sites. Ryan Marcum added that some facilities will continue to serve students through interim uses.</p> <p>Katrina Montgomery recommended that future financial summaries include narrative explanations highlighting the benefits of prior investments to avoid the perception that funds were wasted. She stated that staff will share updated consolidated financial information that includes these contextual details. Anna Valdez thanked staff for preparing and presenting the financial materials at the committee’s request.</p> <p>Committee members discussed community perceptions related to consolidation messaging, particularly statements that “money will follow the students.” Larry Huang and Jaime Miller noted that while the intent of this message reflects a focus on supporting receiving campuses, the district continues to face a substantial funding gap. Ryan Marcum observed that investments at high schools and middle schools will benefit students affected by consolidation over time. Amber Welsh and Lisa Flores expressed concern that families often interpret the message to mean that bond dollars will transfer directly and proportionally, which has contributed to confusion and frustration. Katrina Montgomery clarified that references to funds following students often include general operating funds in addition to bond funds and acknowledged that this distinction has not always been clearly communicated. Amy Moore and Anna Valdez emphasized that many community members continue to believe that bond funds will follow students dollar-for-dollar and that clearer, more consistent messaging is needed to explain both limitations and ongoing facility maintenance obligations at closed campuses.</p> <p>Monty Exter asked about the challenges of initiating bond-funded projects at receiving campuses that were not included in the current bond. Michael Mann explained that bond counsel advises that bond funds must adhere strictly to voter-approved bond language and that reallocating funds requires careful planning to ensure equity rather than simple per-student distribution. Mark Grayson noted that the district has struggled to clearly distinguish between general operating funds and bond funds in public communications. Amber Welsh emphasized the need to refine messaging to better align district statements with community understanding, and Monty Exter stated that if inaccurate information has been shared, the district should acknowledge and correct it. Michael Mann and Katrina Montgomery noted that the magnitude and timing of consolidations were not fully known during earlier communications and that staff intends to reengage with communities to provide clearer explanations.</p> <p>Larry Huang motioned that the committee continue discussion of consolidation impacts for an additional ten minutes, with the motion seconded by Mark Grayson and approved by consensus. During the extended discussion, Michael Mann reiterated that consolidation decisions evolved late in the process, contributing to messaging challenges. Katrina Montgomery stated that staff plans to resume direct community engagement focused on explaining financial impacts and constraints.</p> <p>The committee then discussed lessons learned from the bond program. Mark Grayson emphasized the importance of clear and precise bond ballot language. Larry Huang cautioned against overcommitting to too many projects simultaneously and suggested that future bond planning consider economic conditions and capacity constraints, including the potential need for supplemental bonds. Richard Kelly observed that the committee’s primary mechanism for action is communicating with the Board of Trustees and noted the need for a more formalized process for submitting recommendations. Monty Exter suggested that several of the issues raised would be more appropriately addressed through a bond planning committee and emphasized the importance of stronger coordination between that body and the CBOC. Anna Valdez moved that additional lessons learned be shared via email and discussed at a future meeting.</p>
<p>Future Items for Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Additional lessons learned will be shared via email and discussed at a future meeting. ● AISD staff will share updated consolidated financial information that includes contextual details. ● Identify whether there is a response from the committee to be submitted to the Board regarding Hill ES. ● Clarify the current status of the bylaws revisions. ● Provide an update on developments that have occurred in the interim related to Hill ES.

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

CBOC Meeting Addendum

This addendum is issued to provide a full list of public comments received for the Jan. 9, 2026, CBOC meeting.

IN-PERSON PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Lily McClure: I am a parent of two kiddos at Hill Elementary, and it's the District's responsibility to ensure that the voter-approved bond is implemented as promised. Voters approved a full modernization of Hill Elementary. Hill is now being asked to accept a multi-phase plan that represents a significant departure from that commitment, extending construction timelines and increasing disruption for students, staff, and families as a result of broader district constraints. Why should the Hill community bear this burden? This committee plays a critical oversight role. Families are not asking for blame, they are asking for transparent oversight, rather than redefining success downward. The bond should be implemented with integrity.

Carolyn Kenny: Dear Community Bond Oversight Committee,

I respectfully request that the Community Bond Oversight Committee carry out its charge to ensure that the Hill Elementary full modernization remains faithful to the scope of work approved by district voters.

In 2022, voters approved approximately \$30.7 million for a fully modernized Hill Elementary campus. Current projections are approximately \$78 million. District leadership has indicated that about \$18 million of that increase is attributable to inflation, and that the remaining shortfall—approximately \$30 million—reflects an underestimation of baseline project cost at the time of the bond election.

This distinction matters. Inflation is broadly understood. However, a significant baseline underestimation—and the resulting plan to split Hill's voter-approved full modernization into two phases, demolishing and rebuilding only part of the campus in the initial phase and deferring second phase completion to future funding—represents a substantive change to scope from the full modernization voters approved. Under the CBOC's bylaws, changes of this magnitude warrant formal oversight, documentation, and recommendation.

To date, the conclusion that both phases cannot be funded within the current bond has been communicated by staff, but it has not yet been independently evaluated or acted upon by the CBOC through your formal oversight role.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the CBOC take three actions consistent with its charge:

First, evaluate the current state by requesting documentation of the analytical basis for the approximately \$48 million increase in projected project cost—distinguishing required elements from discretionary design choices, and separating inflation-driven increases from original cost underestimation.

Second, formally document scope fidelity in the public record by acknowledging that Hill Elementary was uniquely underfunded relative to its voter-approved full modernization scope due primarily to original cost underestimation.

Third, consistent with its oversight role, independently evaluate whether the full voter-approved modernization of Hill Elementary can be delivered within the current bond program—through reprioritization, phasing adjustments, or other corrective actions—and make a formal recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the feasibility of funding both phases under the 2022 Bond.

In closing, Hill Elementary's situation is not merely a budget variance. It is a scope-fidelity issue fundamental to voter trust. Formal documentation, evaluation, and recommendation by the CBOC will help ensure transparency, accountability, and continuity as this bond program moves forward.

Thank you for your time and for your service.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL:

1. To the Bond Oversight Committee,

I am writing as a Hill Elementary parent and a Westover Hills resident to express my deep concern regarding the current implementation plan for the 2022 Bond. I have significant reservations about the fiscal efficiency and safety protocols of the current multi-phased proposal.

The 2022 Bond was approved by voters as a **full modernization** of Hill. However, current plans indicate that due to a district funding error, the \$43.2M currently allocated will only deliver **42% of the approved scope** (46,000 SF of the required 109,500 SF). This creates a "bridge to nowhere" scenario, where the completion of our school is entirely dependent on a future bond that is far from guaranteed.

I urge the Committee to consider the following course corrections to maximize current funds:

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

- **Reduce "Sunk" Costs:** A significant portion of the current budget is being diverted to "On-Site Swing" costs (portables and temporary utilities). I propose the district investigate a "**Renovate-in-Place**" strategy with an accelerated, multi-shift construction schedule. Shortening the timeline would reduce the massive expenditure on temporary portables, allowing more capital to go into the permanent building.
- **Prioritize the Building Envelope:** Rather than delivering a 100% finished "partial" wing, the district should evaluate using the \$43.2M to address the **entire campus envelope** (roof, HVAC, and electrical infrastructure). If the "bones" of the full modernization are completed now, interior finishes can be managed through recurring CAPEX budgets rather than waiting years for a new bond.
- **Challenge Construction Inefficiency:** Phasing this project into two separate bond cycles (Phase 2 now, Phase 3 later) is fiscally irresponsible due to the cost of re-mobilization and projected inflation. We need a transparent "Full Project" bid to see the true cost-savings of doing the work once.

Furthermore, I am gravely concerned about the Health and Safety of our students: An active demolition on a campus with nearly 1,000 children is a high-risk liability. Given the age of Hill, the presence of **asbestos and lead** is a certainty, not a possibility. If an on-site swing is utilized, I am requesting:

- **Independent Third-Party Air Monitoring:** Daily testing with results posted publicly for parents to ensure no hazardous dust migration.
- **Negative Pressure Containment:** Industrial-grade HEPA filtration between the construction zones and student areas.
- **Strict "Wet Method" Demolition:** Mandatory water suppression to prevent particles from becoming airborne.

The Hill community deserves the full modernization that was promised and voted for in 2022. We want to be engaged as informed partners to find a solution that protects our children's health and ensures the district's fiscal accountability.

Thank you for your oversight and your commitment to our students.

Sincerely,

Landon Thompson - Hill Elementary Parent and Westover Hills Resident

2. To whom it may concern,

It is absolutely crucial to reevaluate the modernization plan for Hill Elementary school in light of the mistake made by AISD. The current plan would deliver only about **42% of the approved scope** while relying on a future bond to complete the remainder. This raises major concerns about the feasibility of the plan, and does not give us confidence that the plan will meet the needs of the school. Not to mention that there is no clear path toward another bond to complete the project.

It makes most sense to reevaluate and come up with a new plan that is aligned with the actual budget, ensuring parents and staff and engaged throughout the process.

3. Hi all,

As a native Austinite, I was thrilled to send my kids to Hill knowing about its decades' long stellar reputation. Realizing it was the same facilities my own friends attended was a shock.

As a new kindergarten mom, I was assured we would be getting our new school soon. One year of upheaval sounded stressful, but seeing how well Doss turned out was also exciting.

Now, I have a second grader and a first grader, with my youngest starting kindergarten next fall. We have less hope and less money than we could have imagined.

We deserve

1) The amount of money we were promised to fund a full project

And/or

2) the district and city bending over backwards to create a custom solution that meets our specific needs.

What we do not need is a half-finished job that disrupts our students, teachers, and administrators for years and years to come.

Thank you for your consideration,

Rachel Upshaw

Hill mom

4. To the Bond Oversight Committee,

I am writing as a taxpayer and a parent of a 5th grader, 3rd grader and a Kindergartner at Hill Elementary. In 2022, I voted for a bond that promised a **full modernization** of our school. The current proposal—resulting from a district error—delivers only 42% of that scope and relies on a future, unpassed bond to finish the job. This is not the stability my children or our community deserve.

The currently proposed plan to demolish part of our school & move students to portables is deeply concerning, especially considering that we would be without the approved funds to complete the project. Leaving our campus "in flux" based on a hypothetical future vote not only damages voter confidence, but also significantly disrupts our students' academic environment.

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

I urge the committee to advocate for a pragmatic pivot:

- **Prioritize Safety First:** Construct the security vestibule immediately. (Ideally in such a way that the project can still stand during any near-future modernization projects.)
- **Utilize Existing Funds Wisely:** Use the funds that are already approved (which I believe is ~\$30 million) to modernize and repair our *existing* buildings rather than entering a demolition phase that leaves us with a half-finished campus.
- **Restore Trust:** Pause the current plan until families are engaged as partners on the tradeoffs & until the community is reasonably satisfied with the updated strategy.

We need a solid, concrete plan that improves our school now, not a phased proposal that leaves us waiting for funding that may never come. Our kids & our community deserve better.

Respectfully,
Ashley Nipper
512.577.0522
Mom to Beck (5th), Grady (3rd) & Cal (Kinder)

5. **Bond Oversight Committee,**

As a parent and neighbor of Hill Elementary, I am deeply concerned about the Hill modernization. Although AISD has taken responsibility for the errors made in budgeting, our campus will still be left with an incomplete project. This project only strains the trust we have as parents and community members in AISD leadership.

- **Hill's situation is unique and requires a tailored planning and engagement approach** to restore family confidence in the district's decision-making.
- **Voters approved a [full modernization](#) of Hill Elementary in the 2022 Bond**, but a district error resulted in insufficient funding and a shift to a multi-phased proposal. The current plan would deliver only about **42% of the approved scope** while relying on a future bond to complete the remainder—raising concerns about feasibility and confidence in the oversight process.
- Families want **clear information on tradeoffs, sequencing, and timelines** and to be engaged as **informed partners before decisions are finalized**, not after.

Erica Butler
Hill mom & neighbor

6. Dear Members of the CBOC,

Executive Summary: I am writing as a Hill Elementary parent to request that the CBOC formally recommend corrective action to the Board of Trustees regarding the Hill Elementary bond project. The current plan materially departs from the voter-approved Phase 2-of-2 modernization, relies on a speculative and unlikely future bond to complete essential scope, and is advancing toward construction this summer despite being widely viewed by the community as a highly unsatisfactory outcome. I respectfully ask the Committee to intervene to preserve bond integrity, mitigate delivery risk, and ensure families are fully informed before irreversible decisions are made.

My name is Cara Johnson, and I am a parent of a current 3rd grader at Hill Elementary School. I am writing to provide public comment ahead of your upcoming meeting regarding the Hill Elementary bond project.

I want to begin by acknowledging the complexity of delivering large-scale bond programs in a volatile construction and cost environment. I also recognize the important role the CBOC plays in ensuring projects remain faithful to voter-approved scope, are delivered responsibly, and maintain public trust. It is precisely because of that charge that I am asking the Committee to intervene and make a formal recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the current plan for Hill Elementary.

Hill Elementary was presented to voters as a Phase 2 of 2 modernization under the 2022 Bond, with an estimated project cost of \$30.7 million and the expectation of a complete, modernized campus. **However, the plan now moving forward represents a significant departure from what voters approved and what families understood they were supporting.**

According to the district's own presentation, the projected cost to deliver the full modernization now ranges from approximately \$78–88 million depending on swing options, with the currently proposed "Phase 2 of 3" alone exceeding the original total bond allocation for the entire project. Under this plan, the remaining scope would be deferred to a future bond that has neither been approved nor scheduled, leaving Hill students with an incomplete and highly compromised outcome. From a parent perspective, this is deeply concerning for several reasons:

- **It materially alters the voter-approved scope** from a Phase 2 of 2 modernization to a multi-bond dependency that was never presented to the community.
- **It creates substantial delivery risk** for current *and future* Hill students, who may never see the promised full modernization if future bonds fail (a realistic concern given Austin voters recently overwhelmingly rejected Prop Q amid skyrocketing property taxes).
- **It advances a plan described as "highly unsatisfactory" by the community**, yet construction is slated to begin as early as this summer, before these concerns are resolved or transparently addressed.

As a Hill parent, I am not asking for perfection. I am asking for fidelity, accountability, and transparency. Specifically, I respectfully request that the Community Bond Oversight Committee:

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

1. **Evaluate whether proceeding under the current approach aligns with the Committee’s responsibility** to ensure projects remain faithful to voter intent, manage program-level risk, and protect stakeholder trust.
2. **Formally recommend that the Board of Trustees direct staff to pursue a Phase 2 of 2 solution** by getting creative to recoup as much budget as possible to deliver the full modernization voters approved, rather than relying on a speculative future bond to complete essential scope.
3. **Ensure that Hill families and the broader community receive full and transparent communication** about the Committee’s recommendation and the district’s plan to achieve a complete modernization now within the current bond, including clear updates on scope, schedule, and budget as that plan is refined and implemented.

Hill Elementary families and Austin voters supported the 2022 Bond in good faith, believing it would result in a complete, modern learning environment for our children. **Moving forward with an incomplete plan, without exhausting all reasonable options to deliver on that promise, risks undermining public confidence not just in this project, but in the bond program as a whole.**

Thank you for your service and for your careful consideration of this request. I appreciate the Committee’s role in safeguarding both fiscal responsibility and the trust of the communities you represent.

Sincerely,

Cara Johnson
Hill Elementary Parent

7. Dear Austin ISD Bond Oversight Committee,

I am writing as a Hill Elementary parent regarding the proposed modernization plan under the bond program. Hill families are requesting that the district pause the current phased approach and instead move forward only when the entire modernization can be completed at one time, consistent with what voters approved in 2022.

The community voted in favor of a full modernization of Hill Elementary. Due to a district funding error, the scope has since been reduced, with completion now contingent on a future bond election. Relying on funding that has not yet been approved by voters raises serious concerns about feasibility and accountability.

Hill’s circumstances are distinct and warrant a more intentional planning and engagement process. Families need transparent information about tradeoffs, sequencing, and timelines, and we want to be meaningfully involved as informed partners before decisions are finalized—not after plans are already set.

We respectfully ask the committee to prioritize input from Hill families and to reconsider advancing a partial build that significantly departs from what voters were originally promised.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Ben Brooks

8. Hello Sir/Madam,

Families are seeking clear, transparent information regarding project tradeoffs, timelines, and sequencing, as well as meaningful engagement before decisions are finalized.

Voters approved a full modernization of Hill Elementary as part of the 2022 Bond. However, due to a district funding error, the current proposal would deliver only approximately 42% of the originally approved scope, with completion of the remaining work contingent on a future bond. This has understandably raised concerns about feasibility, accountability, and confidence in the planning process.

Given Hill’s unique circumstances, a tailored planning and engagement approach is needed to rebuild trust and ensure families are informed partners in decision-making.

Thank you for your consideration,
David Parrish
(Father of two Hill ES Students, Griffin and Theo Parrish)

9. I am writing to the Bond Oversight Committee to share parent concerns regarding the current construction planning for Hill Elementary and to request greater transparency and engagement moving forward.

Hill’s current construction challenges require a transparent and accountable planning approach. A district error resulted in insufficient funding for the voter-approved project and a shift to a multi-phased plan that would deliver only about 42% of the approved scope, with the remainder dependent on a future bond—an outcome that is not acceptable to families. This has raised serious concerns about feasibility, oversight, and follow-through. We are asking for clear information about project priorities, scope decisions, and realistic timelines, and to be meaningfully engaged before decisions are finalized, not after.

Families do not want to move forward with a major construction project based on a partially developed plan that will directly impact students’ learning and well-being. We believe parents should be included in determining the best path forward to update the school responsibly with the funding currently available.

Lauren Hanschen

Mother of Hill Students

[Public comments](#) can be provided to the committee in writing via Austin ISD CBOCinternal@austinisd.org.

Limit 2 minutes per commenter. All comments, whether they are read or not, will be supplied to the committee in their entirety.

10. As a parent in the Hill Elementary community, I would like to express concern regarding the recent information that Hill's full modernization project was significantly underestimated and underfunded during the 2022 bond planning process. It is our understanding that this gap resulted from a planning miscalculation rather than cost escalation. While several 2022 bond projects are facing budget pressures, Hill's project appears to have been uniquely impacted in both scale and consequence.

Hill Elementary's facilities are in need of comprehensive updates to address ongoing maintenance challenges, functionality, safety, and alignment with modern academic standards. A full modernization was presented to and approved by voters in 2022, and the Hill community continues to believe that this commitment remains both necessary and appropriate. The current proposal, however, suggests completing only a portion of the scope now, with the remainder deferred to a future phase dependent on an additional bond election.

This approach introduces a level of uncertainty that is difficult for families and educators to reconcile. As such, the community is seeking greater clarity and transparency regarding how project costs are allocated, how phasing decisions are being made, and how community and academic input will inform a strategy that delivers the greatest educational value within the available funding.

The Hill community respectfully requests that AISD explore opportunities to reprioritize funds within the existing bond program to allow Hill Elementary to move forward with a full modernization, or the most comprehensive update feasible. At a minimum, we are asking for a transparent process, consistent engagement with the AISD project team, and a meaningful opportunity for the community to understand and contribute to the planning approach.

Finally, families have expressed concern regarding safety, disruption, and the extended uncertainty associated with a multi-phase construction plan. Many feel under-informed and are struggling to plan accordingly. We ask that AISD strengthen its community engagement efforts so that families feel better informed, supported, and more confident as decisions are made about the future of Hill Elementary.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Justin Gesch

11. Dear Members of the Bond Committee,

I am writing to express our continued concern regarding the clerical error that resulted in insufficient funding for the full modernization of our elementary school, as well as our strong dissatisfaction with the partial modernization currently being suggested as a solution.

The proposed partial modernization does not reflect the comprehensive improvements that families and the community understood would be delivered through the bond measure. We are concerned that moving forward with a reduced scope project may leave critical needs unaddressed and compromise the long-term safety, functionality, and educational value of the school.

Before any final decisions are made, we respectfully ask that the committee meaningfully engage families and school stakeholders and explore all available options to address the funding shortfall. This should include transparent communication about alternatives, potential phasing strategies, supplemental funding opportunities, or other solutions that could allow the project to better align with the original modernization goals.

Families deserve to be part of this conversation, particularly when the outcome will directly impact our children's learning environment for decades to come. We urge the committee to pause any final determinations until this engagement has occurred and all viable options have been carefully considered.

Thank you for your attention and for your service to our school community. We look forward to a collaborative and transparent process as next steps are evaluated.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Karr