NEW RESIDENT / PUBLIC-SOURCE GUIDE

Understanding D11's $775 million school bond

The proposed improvements. The obligation if approved.
The history, the governance and the questions still open.

For a reader new to Colorado Springs and School District 11. No prior knowledge of local schools, MLOs, COPs or Colorado school governance is assumed.

BASE EVIDENCE CUTOFF: SEPTEMBER 9, 2026 • UPDATED SEPTEMBER 19

Proposed election: November 3, 2026. [1]

Prepared by Rob Rogers • Independent civic research
Not a district publication or voting recommendation.

A reader's map

Read front to back, or use your PDF viewer's bookmarks to go directly to a section.

The decision in five minutes / 3

First, orient yourself to D11 / 4

What the ballot authority would mean / 5

Bond, MLO and COP: three different tools / 6

What might it cost my household? / 7

How earlier votes and debt led here / 8

What the proposed work could improve / 9

A school portfolio, not one kind of school / 10

How were projects prioritized? / 11

Why the public totals differ / 12

Borrowing costs and the missing bridge / 13

Teacher compensation: real commitment, conditional amount / 14

Existing debt: why the payoff date matters / 15

Who governs schools and buildings? / 16

Campus partnerships and shared buildings / 17

Charter funding: two legal lanes / 18

Oversight: build on what exists, verify what improves / 19

The decision: benefits, costs and alternatives / 20

Campaign disclosure context: a shared registered agent / 21

Voting and finding your own records / 22

Questions that can produce useful answers / 23

Appendix A1 | Find a school allocation / 24

Appendix A2 | Find a school allocation / 25

Appendix A3 | Find a school allocation / 26

Methods and limits / 27

Source directory / 28

Evidence labels in ordinary language

"Signed" identifies adopted text. "Proposed" does not mean delivered. "District reports" attributes a claim. "Calculated" identifies our arithmetic. "Not found in reviewed sources" is a bounded research limit, not proof a record does not exist.

Blue numbered citations are live links to original sources. Source notes identify dates, page numbers and important limits. Some large agency PDFs can be slow to open.

The decision in five minutes

A substantial facilities proposal, additional tax authority if approved, and a financing plan that still needs a clearer public explanation.

Colorado Springs School District 11 is asking voters for authority to borrow up to **$775 million** for capital purposes. The Board adopted the election resolution on August 5, 2026, for the November 3 election. The signed question sets separate ceilings of **$1.48 billion in total repayment** and **$49.8 million in additional district taxes annually**. These are three different measures of the proposal, not three estimates of construction spending. [1]

The proposal includes major school renovations, a new Holmes Middle School, Palmer High School Phase 2, career and technical education spaces, heating and cooling systems, safety improvements and hazardous-material removal. These are consequential potential benefits for students and staff. The school sheets are proposed plans, however, not completion guarantees or independently validated cost estimates. [1] [4]

Teacher compensation is part of the proposal through a second step: bond financing would retire or refinance certain existing lease-purchase debt, called **certificates of participation (COPs)**. That could free some revenue from an existing **mill levy override (MLO)**, a voter-approved local property tax, for teacher compensation. The Board has conditionally committed to budget any MLO revenue that actually becomes available through successful bond financing for compensation, subject to annual appropriation and law. Bond proceeds themselves cannot pay salaries. [2]

The principal unanswered question is not whether the district has described worthwhile work. It is whether one dated proposed financing schedule can connect the selected work, overlapping cost lists, inflation, borrowing assumptions, retirement of existing COP debt and annual net compensation relief. The reviewed sources contain important pieces, including a May financing comparison, but not that complete bridge. [4] [5] [8] [10] [29] [58]

> **Reading position:** This is an independent, source-linked orientation, not a district publication, engineering audit or recommendation to vote yes or no. Missing public documentation is not proof of missing money, misconduct or an unworthy project.

Election-status boundary: Board referral is established. As checked September 17, D11's bond page labels the measure Ballot Question 4A. That district-published designation does not substitute for the county-certified ballot or prove that bonds have been sold. Consult the county and your actual ballot for final voting information. [1] [3] [20]

First, orient yourself to D11

A city address, a school attendance boundary and a property-tax district are not interchangeable.

D11 is a public school district, not a department of Colorado Springs city government. Its elected Board of Education makes district policy, adopts budgets and authorizes major actions. The superintendent administers the district. The bond is a D11 question: qualified electors residing in the district vote, not everyone with a Colorado Springs mailing address or a child attending a D11 school. [1] [3] [37]

D11's website describes a district established in 1872 and, in the September 9 snapshot, displays 20,448 students and 60 schools and charters. Those figures orient a newcomer to scale; they are website snapshot counts, not an independently reconciled school or enrollment census. For an address or program, start with D11's enrollment page and school finder. [38] [39] [40]

Start with your property record and voter registration before interpreting a tax estimate. School choice can let a child attend a school away from the neighborhood school; it does not move the family home into a different taxing jurisdiction. Use the district school finder as orientation, and the county record for your own parcel and ballot. Property ownership is not itself voter qualification. [39] [40] [37]

How school money reaches D11

Colorado districts receive operating money through a combination of state and local sources. Under the state school-finance system, the local share includes property and vehicle-ownership taxes; the state supplies a separate share. A voter-approved MLO raises additional local revenue for its approved purposes. The proposed bond would authorize new borrowing for capital work, repaid through a separate tax and debt mechanism. These channels have different rules and should not be treated as one account. [59] [1] [33]

Names you will encounter

Table 1. Who does what in the D11 bond decision

Name or institution	Role in this decision
D11 Board of Education	Elected governing body that referred the measure; would authorize later borrowing, budgets and implementation.
Michael Gaal	Superintendent identified in the signed August resolutions. His administrative role is distinct from the Board's voting authority.
RBC Capital Markets	The district's bond underwriter identified in the May work-session packet; presented preliminary finance options.
El Paso County Clerk and Recorder	Election administrator specified in the referral; not the body selecting school projects.
Public Consulting Group (PCG)	District-commissioned external reviewer of the MLO spending plan; its assessment is not a bond underwriting or construction audit.
Mill levy override (MLO) citizen oversight committee	Existing committee concerned with MLO program spending. It is not the new bond oversight committee promised on passage.

The role descriptions above come from the signed resolutions, May finance packet and PCG assessment. Names identify responsibility; association with a school, adviser or organization does not establish improper influence. [1] [2] [8] [12]

What the ballot authority would mean

Read the signed question before treating a project sheet or tax calculator as a promise.

Table 2. What the signed question authorizes

Quantity in the signed question	What it describes	What it does not describe
$775 million	Maximum additional bond principal authority.	A cash grant or the cost of new construction alone.
$1.48 billion	Maximum total repayment, including principal and interest, stated in the question.	An additional $1.48 billion on top of principal.
$49.8 million annually	Maximum annual district-wide tax increase stated in the question.	A household bill or a fixed tax rate.

The question allows bonds in one or more series, at prices above or below principal, with terms and maturities permitted by law. Its repayment clause has no fixed mill-rate limit, while the question separately states the $49.8m annual district-wide tax-increase ceiling. A description such as “a 10-mill bond” is an illustration, not the full legal authority. Read the clauses together; this guide does not offer a legal opinion on their interaction. [1]

The $1.48 billion ceiling is the combined repayment amount. It is not $775 million in principal plus another $1.48 billion. Actual repayment will depend on the bonds eventually sold and their terms. [1]

Approval would provide continuing authority that can be exercised over time. It would not itself sell bonds, select a contractor, set a final interest rate or complete a school. The resolution also declares intent to reimburse certain eligible costs incurred before bond delivery. A reimbursement is not automatically an additional project or additional proceeds. [1]

The signed question names major purposes but uses inclusive language rather than attaching a closed, item-by-item spending schedule. It names renovations to Doherty, Coronado, Mitchell and Palmer high schools and describes broader district capital uses. The public project sheets are important planning evidence; the reviewed record does not establish that each printed allocation is an independently enforceable entitlement. [1] [4]

The question calls for an independent citizens’ oversight committee appointed by the Board to review use for voter-approved projects, and states that no money goes to administrator salaries. Voters should be able to see who serves on the committee, how often it reports publicly, which contracts and budgets it can review, and how changes to a project’s scope, budget or schedule are approved and documented. [1]

> **Established:** Signed August 5 action. **Still subsequent:** election result, final financing and issuance, project-specific contracting or prior-cost verification as applicable, and audited delivery. Draft minutes record a 6-1 bond vote and a separate 7-0 compensation vote. [19]

Bond, MLO and COP: three different tools

The same taxpayer can support several school-finance mechanisms at once.

Table 3. Three school-finance tools

Tool	Plain-language explanation	Why it matters here
General obligation bond	The district borrows for authorized capital purposes and repays investors over time through the approved tax/debt mechanism.	The proposed new $775m authority. Principal, proceeds and repayment are distinct.
Mill levy override (MLO)	Voter-approved local property-tax revenue beyond the district's regular school-finance funding, subject to the approved purposes.	D11 already has 2000 and 2017 MLO programs. Some existing revenue services COP debt.
Certificates of participation (COPs)	Lease-purchase financing: investors hold interests in lease payments. The underlying agreements and appropriation provisions matter.	D11 proposes to retire or refinance existing obligations so certain MLO revenue can support compensation.

COPs are not merely another name for the proposed general obligation bond. Existing COP documents have separate payment, redemption and defeasance provisions. D11's MLO revenues support recurring educational programs and some capital/debt commitments. Paying one COP obligation from MLO revenue does not turn the whole override into a construction fund. The new bond would create a repayment obligation even if it releases existing MLO revenue: shifting a cost does not erase it. [1] [2] [9] [10] [25] [26]

D11 currently reports no property-tax-supported bond debt. That does not mean it has no COP obligations or existing MLO taxes. If approved, the proposed bond would add a new tax/debt commitment, not merely rename an existing bond levy. [3] [9]

Four numbers that should never be silently substituted

Principal is the stated borrowed amount. **Proceeds** are the money generated by a sale, which can differ because of premium or discount and transaction costs. **Debt service** is scheduled principal and interest payments. **Net relief** is the amount an existing budget can actually redirect after the selected transaction and remaining obligations are accounted for. The original COP offering gives one historical sources-and-uses example; the May bond presentation models future repayment. Neither supplies the missing proposed 2026 bridge between the two. [8] [10]

The constitutional framework includes the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights, or TABOR, in Article X, section 20. The signed referral invokes TABOR's voter-approval requirements for this new tax and debt and asks to collect and spend the resulting revenue as a voter-approved revenue change. This is a description of this measure, not a claim that every school financing arrangement is legally identical. [1]

What might it cost my household?

Use the assessor's property value, a stated assessment rate and an explicitly labeled mill-rate assumption.

A mill is $1 of tax for each $1,000 of assessed value. Actual value is the assessor's value of the property, not necessarily its sale price or a real-estate website estimate. Assessed value is calculated by applying a statutory assessment percentage to that value, with applicable classifications and adjustments. A total property-tax bill can contain several taxing jurisdictions; a D11 estimate is only one component. The May 27, 2026 Board work-session presentation explains the basic calculation. [8]

Colorado Legislative Council Staff is the state legislature's nonpartisan research office. State law asks it to check whether a statewide school-property-tax limit requires a temporary reduction in the residential assessment rate used for school-district taxes. Its January 2026 memo says no reduction below 7.05% is required for the 2026 property-tax year. That supports the 7.05% assumption in this illustration; it does not set D11's proposed bond mills or predict a household's tax bill. [35]

The D11-linked calculator uses 7.05% and 10 additional mills. The district's native FAQ instead describes a total levy moving from 37.7 to 46.3 mills, an 8.6-mill increase. These are different public illustrations, not a reconciled final tax projection. The May 27 finance presentation was a preliminary work-session comparison, not an adopted household tax schedule. [27] [36] [8]

Table 4. Illustrative annual household tax

Illustrative assessor value	Annual at 8.6 mills	Annual at 10 mills
$300,000	$181.89	$211.50
$400,000	$242.52	$282.00
$500,000	$303.15	$352.50
$600,000	$363.78	$423.00

Calculated examples: value x 0.0705 x assumed additional mills / 1,000. At a $400,000 value, those illustrations average $20.21 or $23.50 per month. They are not a range guaranteeing the eventual bill. The table assumes ordinary residential treatment, excludes individual exemptions/adjustments and does not project future values, rates or phased borrowing. It does not apply a residential formula to business property.

> **Important:** Neither 8.6 nor 10 mills replaces the signed question's full authority. Ask D11 to reconcile the FAQ, calculator and current financing assumptions. Ask for the estimated first-year and peak-year impact, not only a monthly headline. [1] [8] [27] [36]

How earlier votes and debt led here

D11's operating overrides, past capital borrowing and debt-retirement decisions have different histories.

Table 5. Earlier votes and financing milestones

Period / record	What the primary record establishes
November 2000 MLO	D11 reports approval of $26,998,822 annually for staffing, class size, materials, safety and oversight.
November 2004 bond, Issue 3F	The county sample ballot proposed $131.7 million in debt with a maximum repayment cost of $269,931,600. A later Colorado Department of Education bond-history table records that D11 passed a bond election in 2004. A county-certified vote tally for Issue 3F has not been located in the reviewed records. [34] [60]
November 2016 property-tax override, Issue 3C	The county's official final results record 53,676 Yes votes and 55,751 No votes. The override failed. [61]
November 2016 bond authorization, Issue 3D	The same official final results record 52,094 Yes votes and 57,019 No votes. The bond authorization failed. [61]
November 2017 MLO	D11 reports approval of Issue 3E: $42m annually, with inflation adjustments from 2019. Uses included compensation, facilities, technology, charter equity, student support and earlier debt payoff.
November 2021 D11 Ballot Issue 4B	The county's automatic recount recorded 27,465 Yes votes and 27,476 No votes, an 11-vote defeat. This result alone does not make the 2026 proposal comparable. [50]
December 2022 payoff	A May 2023 district account reports a completed bond payoff but combines the resulting resources with an inflation adjustment.
2024 COP financing	The offering disclosed $120m principal. MLO-supported lease-purchase debt is part of the proposed compensation-relief mechanism.
August 2026 referral	The Board adopts the $775m bond question and a separate contingent compensation commitment.

Sources include D11's MLO ballot records; the county's 2004 sample ballot, 2016 final results and 2021 recount; CDE's bond history; the 2022 payoff account; the COP disclosure; and the signed 2026 resolutions. This is not a complete election or borrowing inventory. [33] [34] [60] [61] [50] [17] [10] [1] [2]

The 2000 MLO was recurring revenue, not a one-time capital fund, and lacked the 2017 MLO's inflation mechanism. The 2017 program covered compensation and services as well as capital costs and an earlier debt payoff; it did not prepay every later building need. [33] [25] [26]

A May 2023 agenda combines resources from the December 2022 debt payoff with an inflation adjustment. It does not isolate payoff savings or establish 2026 net teacher-compensation relief. [17]

What the proposed work could improve

The facilities case deserves direct attention, not merely a footnote to the financing questions.

The signed question identifies career and technical education (CTE), hazardous-material removal, cooling, heating, air filtration, safety and school renovations. CTE means learning spaces and programs connected to careers such as healthcare, engineering, skilled trades and technology. The intended benefit is a more usable learning environment; neither the question nor a project rendering proves the eventual educational result. The district's Project Plans page links the school PDF used below; each example identifies its page. [1] [4] [6]

Table 6. Examples from the school project PDF

Published example	Proposed school allocation	Proposed benefit and source page
Holmes Middle School	$80m	Complete rebuild / new facility; school PDF p. 36.
Palmer High School	$150m	Phase 2 rebuild, remaining facility deficiencies, fine arts and athletics; p. 65.
Coronado High School	$20m	Library, CTE, cafeteria/gym, classrooms and entries; p. 19 also describes district-directed heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) work.
Doherty High School	$20m	CTE including culinary/business spaces, cafeteria, auditorium, classrooms and entries; p. 21.
Roy J. Wasson Academic Campus	$8m	Bathrooms, CTE and auditorium renovations; p. 71.
Steele Elementary	$7m	Addition/renovation addressing the sheet's stated 103% utilization; p. 83.

These are amounts in the school PDF, not reconciled all-in project budgets. A separate public project list is available as a six-page PDF and remains accessible in its earlier Excel (XLSX) format. That list gives different amounts for some of the same campuses than the 99-page school project PDF. Readers should not substitute figures from one document for figures from the other. Appendix A lists all 52 PDF allocations so a reader can find a familiar school without mistaking a few major projects for the entire proposal. [4] [5] [58]

One concrete historical condition is documented at Palmer: the May 6 agenda described asbestos-containing materials in the 1939 wing and recommended a $1,006,245.70 abatement contract with independent testing. That supports a specific renovation need. It is not evidence of current student exposure, completed abatement or final testing results. [21]

> **Potential value:** addressing aging building systems, improving comfort and safety, expanding useful learning spaces and replacing an obsolete facility. **Verification still needed:** final scopes, realistic costs and schedules, construction quality, and the building and learning environment delivered.

A school portfolio, not one kind of school

How to read the project list without assuming every campus has identical governance.

A school portfolio is simply the mix of schools and programs the district serves, operates, authorizes or supports. It includes neighborhood schools, specialized programs, alternative settings, innovation arrangements and charter schools. A building can host more than one program; a school's public funding does not by itself identify who owns its building. The six charter-labeled pages below are entries in one school PDF, not a complete charter roster or settled share of all bond work. [4] [5] [22] [58]

Table 7. Schools and programs named in the project PDF

Names on the list	Orientation for a new resident
Coronado, Doherty, Mitchell, Palmer	The four high schools specifically named in the signed bond question. Their project sheets use West, Northeast, Southeast and Central service-area labels respectively.
Holmes, Galileo, Jenkins, Mann, North, Russell, Sabin, Swigert	Middle-school entries. The PDF labels Jack Swigert simply "Swigert"; it identifies Holmes for a rebuild.
RJWAC / Wasson	Roy J. Wasson Academic Campus. A campus/program label, not shorthand for a single conventional high-school governance model.
West	The plan identifies a K-8 school: kindergarten through eighth grade.
Academy ACL, CIVA, Colorado Military Academy, East Hills, Orton, Thomas MacLaren	Six charter-labeled allocation pages in the combined PDF. Inclusion does not mean identical authorizers, owners or contract terms.

"Academy ACL" refers to the Academy for Advanced and Creative Learning; CIVA is the arts-focused charter name shown in the project list. Colorado Military Academy is often shortened to CMA. These names should not be conflated with Colorado Springs School of Technology (CSST), an innovation school discussed later. The PDF's school-type and service-area labels are planning labels, not a legal ownership register. [4]

The six charter-labeled PDF allocations total $47.5 million by addition. That is not established as the complete charter share: the public project list has additional schools or conditional lines. Charter participation is also not proof of favoritism; Colorado has a separate capital-participation framework. [4] [5] [24] [58]

> For any project, the useful follow-up is the same: identify the site, owner, operator, students served, agreement, useful life, full cost and ongoing public oversight. Do not treat a school's label as an answer to all of these questions.

How were projects prioritized?

A method is documented. The final application of that method remains a separate evidence question.

The March 18 presentation describes a normalized need score: **50% functional utilization, 25% Facility Condition Index and 25% educational adequacy**. Higher utilization and poorer conditions increase need. Schools are then ranked within school type. This is substantive selection evidence; it would be inaccurate to say the district offered no criteria. [7]

Functional utilization asks how heavily a school's usable capacity is being used. Facility condition concerns the building's repair needs. Educational adequacy concerns how well the spaces serve educational functions. These answer different questions: an underused building can still need repairs, and a heavily used building can have educational shortcomings even if its structure is sound. The source's underlying measures and final school scores matter more than a label such as "old" or "full." [7]

The same presentation describes regional investment tiers for elementary schools, paired middle-school allocations by regional need, and higher investment for the two highest-need high schools. It separately identifies district-directed work. This means the final plan cannot be evaluated solely by dividing $775 million by enrollment or comparing each school's displayed allocation with its student count. [7]

What a final selection record should make visible

Table 8. Records needed to test final selection

Record	What it would let taxpayers test
Dated condition, capacity and adequacy inputs	Whether comparisons use common definitions and current data.
Final scores, tiers and exception reasons	How the published method led to actual choices, including major rebuilds.
Selected versus alternate project flags	Which line items will be funded and which are options or deferred needs.
School-specific and district-wide cost mapping	Whether HVAC, roofs or safety work already appear in another allocation.
Enrollment/capacity scenarios	Whether long-lived capital choices remain useful under different future enrollment patterns.

The reviewed record does not supply all of these final records. This is a bounded documentation gap, not proof that no internal analysis exists or that the described needs are invalid. [4] [5] [7] [29]

Why the public totals differ

The arithmetic is reproducible. The missing scope decisions cannot be supplied by arithmetic, and the public-list total is not a deficit.

September 16 publication update

On September 16, D11 republished its Bond home and Project Plans pages and replaced the visible planned-projects workbook link with a six-page PDF titled FinalBondProjectList852026.xlsx. The prior XLSX remains directly reachable but is no longer linked from those pages. A decimal-currency comparison finds the PDF and legacy XLSX contain the same 235 numeric values, totaling $797,629,698. This confirms a public format change and value consistency between those two files; it does **not** supply a sources-and-uses schedule, a grand total, a selection record or a financing reconciliation. [3] [5] [6] [58]

Table 9. Public planning totals and their limits

Public record / calculation	Amount	Boundary
52 school allocations in the PDF	$477,500,000	School-sheet subtotal only.
Same 52 groupings in public project list	$595,043,698	39 match; 13 differ from the school PDF.
All numeric school lines in public project list	$608,629,698	Includes four additional groups.
Public project-list inflation line	$75,000,000	Treatment and overlap not fully reconciled.
Public project-list COP payoff line	$114,000,000	Planning entry, not a transaction-specific payoff quote.
All 235 numeric amount cells in public project list	$797,629,698	Mechanical sum, NOT a selected bond budget.

The additional numeric groups are Community Prep, James Irwin, Roosevelt and Tesla/Bijou. Eastlake and Spruce Community each have a conditional “$2-$3M” text entry, excluded from the numeric sum. The public project list is a static XLSX/PDF table, not a linked financing model. It does not establish that every row is selected, additive or paid solely from bond proceeds. [5] [58]

Among same-school differences, Coronado is $20 million in the school PDF versus $45 million in the public project list; Doherty $20 million versus $60 million; and RJWAC $8 million versus $43 million. These are meaningful scope questions. They are not proof of overruns, double counting or money diverted from another school. The school PDF and XLSX were both linked when checked September 9. As checked September 17, D11’s pages link the new six-page PDF instead; the prior XLSX remains directly reachable but is no longer a page link. [3] [4] [5] [6] [58]

The March presentation also described $156 million in district-directed work, while the May presentation listed approximately $90 million for deferred HVAC and approximately $120 million for COP payoff. These figures come from different stages and categories. Adding them to current school amounts would manufacture a model the district has not documented in these sources. [7] [8]

Borrowing costs and the missing bridge

There is a preliminary finance comparison. There is not yet a complete reconciled model in the reviewed record.

RBC's May 27 presentation compares three repayment structures for the proposed $775 million. Its assumptions include 5.5% coupon rates (the stated interest rates on the bonds), three tranches issued every two years and no growth in assessed value. A tranche is one installment of borrowing. These are preliminary modeling assumptions, not the final interest rate or adopted issuance schedule. [8]

Table 10. Preliminary May 27 repayment scenarios

Preliminary case	Maximum annual debt service	Total repayment
20-year	$54,198,575	$1,300,704,117
25-year	$49,733,275	$1,442,147,617
30-year	$46,782,375	$1,590,483,717

The comparison illustrates a tradeoff: extending repayment can lower the annual payment while increasing total repayment. The 25-year figures are numerically below the later $49.8 million and $1.48 billion ceilings, but annual debt service and annual tax increase are distinct quantities. Numerical proximity does not establish that the Board adopted that case or that a later transaction meets all legal requirements. The 30-year case exceeds the later repayment ceiling; it should not be represented as the inevitable bond outcome. [1] [8]

The appropriate pre-election model

A useful proposed model would identify its date and version and the work selected for each project. It would show costs with overlaps removed, expected cost increases by construction year and a contingency allowance for unexpected costs. It would also state expected borrowing dates, interest assumptions, net proceeds, estimated transaction costs and the COP retirement method. Finally, it would show how much MLO revenue would become available each year after accounting for the transaction and remaining obligations. It would also show how the plan changes if bids, rates or timing change. This is an analytical checklist, not a claim that each field must already be a final market price.

Eventual closing documents serve a different purpose: they establish actual sale prices, fees, escrow deposits and final repayment terms. Pre-election estimates should be explicit and testable now; future costs should remain estimates until priced and executed. The original COP disclosure is not the missing 2026 refinancing calculation. [10]

> The most important unresolved connection is between **what is selected**, **what it costs**, **how it is financed** and **what existing revenue is genuinely released**. Separate accurate documents do not automatically form one coherent budget.

Teacher compensation: real commitment, conditional amount

The district has conditionally committed to use MLO revenue released through the proposed COP transaction for teacher compensation. The reviewed sources do not specify the exact net amount available or a schedule of raises.

Resolution 2027-03 says that, if voters approve the bond, MLO revenues no longer required for COP debt service shall be budgeted for teacher compensation, subject to annual appropriation and applicable law. The resolution expressly does not itself appropriate money, create a contractual compensation right or remove the Board's annual budget authority. That is stronger than a casual aspiration, but narrower than a guaranteed individual raise. [2]

Table 11. Steps before compensation funding is available

Step	Necessary distinction
1. Voters approve new bond authority	Approval is a prerequisite, not itself the refinancing transaction.
2. District completes an appropriate COP retirement/refinancing	The instrument, timing, call restrictions and escrow cost affect what can be released.
3. Existing MLO revenue becomes available	Use net annual relief, not simply original principal or a gross debt-payment number.
4. Board appropriates compensation funding	Distribution, timing, eligibility and recurring affordability must be budgeted.

The audited debt schedule provides a useful baseline: annual service for the 2024 COP alone is roughly $8.3 million in FY2027 (the fiscal year ending June 30, 2027). That is an instrument-specific payment baseline, not the exact net compensation benefit. [9]

The audit distinguishes funding sources: the 2024 COP is supported by the district's MLO share, the 2019 COP by charter MLO shares, and the 2016 COP by the General Fund. Therefore the total of all COP payments cannot automatically be labeled money available for district teacher pay. The precise obligations included in the proposed transaction are material. [9]

> **What a teacher or taxpayer still needs:** obligations retired, transaction and residual costs, date revenue is released, annual net amount, who receives compensation, distribution method and the later appropriation. No exact raise is promised by this guide.

Existing debt: why the payoff date matters

"Pay off the COPs" is a financing objective, not a complete transaction description.

The 2024 COP offering disclosed $120 million in principal and about $9.33 million in original premium. The total sources-and-uses amount therefore differed from principal. Those historical amounts describe the original financing, not cash presently available or the price of retiring it in 2026. [10]

The original optional-redemption provision first allows a par call on December 15, 2033, for specified later maturities beginning in 2034. Earlier maturities are not subject to optional early redemption. A "par call" is repayment at principal value under the contract's call terms. It would be wrong to assume the full outstanding balance can simply be called at par immediately. [10]

The documents also provide for defeasance and escrow. In broad terms, defeasance involves setting aside qualifying resources to satisfy obligations under the agreement; an escrow is a controlled account holding those resources. These provisions mean the 2033 call date alone does not prove earlier release of MLO revenue is impossible. Whether and how that works here depends on the selected transaction, required approvals and calculations. [10]

The public project-list $114 million payoff line, the May presentation's approximately $120 million figure and audited principal balances should remain separate. A balance on a particular reporting date is not necessarily an all-in escrow requirement. Accrued interest, future payments, investment assumptions, fees and the obligations included can change the calculation. This guide does not invent those missing inputs. [5] [8] [9] [10] [58]

The taxpayer question

Ask for a dated proposed transaction schedule now, showing the instruments and maturities, planned retirement or defeasance method, estimated cash/escrow requirement, expected funding sources and net MLO relief by year. After a transaction, compare the estimate with actual closing records and later audited reporting.

> **Avoid both overstatements:** "The COPs can certainly be paid off immediately for $114m" is not established. "The call restriction makes the teacher-pay proposal impossible" is also not established. The transaction-specific model is what resolves the question.

Who governs schools and buildings?

The bond list includes schools with different operators, agreements and approval paths.

The proposed project sheets put these governance questions at named sites. They list $15 million for Mitchell High School, $1.24 million for East Hills, and $1 million for Orton. These are planning allocations, not proof of completed spending or of who will own and maintain each improvement. [4]

This matters if public bond money improves a school site: the operator, property owner, contracting party and public overseer may differ. A district-authorized **charter school** is public but operates through a separate entity under a charter contract. D11 policy assigns its governing body responsibility for budget, service contracts and personnel while preserving district accountability and state financial/reporting requirements. An **innovation school**, by contrast, operates within the district under an approved plan with specified waivers and governance powers. These are not interchangeable categories. [22] [41]

Table 12. Governance questions at named proposed bond sites

Proposed bond site	What the records establish and what remains to check
Mitchell High School - $15 million	Mitchell is a D11 innovation high school. Its project sheet proposes auditorium, classroom, lighting and other upgrades. Board draft minutes and its pathway plan describe an innovation renewal and external academic partnership; they do not establish that the partner owns or controls bond-funded improvements. [4] [43] [44]
East Hills - $1.24 million	East Hills is a D11-authorized charter school with a proposed allocation. Board records also approve co-occupancy at Mann. Charter approval and shared-site approval do not, by themselves, settle the construction contract, property responsibilities or maintenance costs. [4] [43] [46]
Orton - $1 million	The project sheet lists a charter-school allocation. May 13 draft minutes record Orton/Trailblazer co-occupancy approval. The allocation and minutes do not establish the full shared-site cost or assign every future building obligation. [4] [47]

These records establish distinct school arrangements and Board actions, not a transfer of district operations or building ownership. The project sheets themselves do not settle final contracting, title, maintenance or public reporting for these investments. [4] [22] [43] [44] [46] [47]

> Different school models can broaden opportunities. For each proposed capital project, the useful questions are who owns and maintains the improved property, which agreements govern its use, who approves changes and how public spending will be reported.

Campus partnerships and shared buildings

Separate the school, the property, the agreement and the money before drawing conclusions.

The **University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS)** is the campus partner for CSST's facility. D11's April 2025 record reports a 6-1 authorization of a design-build renovation capped at $2.35m, and the agenda identifies Capital Reserve MLO funds. That is a district capital decision for an innovation-school facility, not a charter MLO distribution or proof that money entered CSST's separate nonprofit. Authorization is not the same as final expenditure. [45] [48] [41]

Pikes Peak State College (PPSC) appears in a separate Wasson campus initiative. May 6 final minutes record approval of an agreement-negotiation/execution framework. The supporting memo attributes an approximately $5m tenant-improvement commitment to PPSC and preserves later approval requirements for any innovation expansion. That attributed commitment is not an inspected completed transfer, executed full project package or already approved new innovation school. [46] [21]

D11 separately approved East Hills/Mann co-occupancy in May 2026, and the May 13 draft minutes record Orton/Trailblazer co-occupancy approval. These put charter and district programs in shared-site arrangements. The agreements' operating costs, maintenance, space allocation and construction responsibilities matter; co-location alone does not answer those questions. [46] [47] [21]

Table 13. What selected campus entries do not establish

Public bond-plan entry	What not to infer
East Hills: $1.24m, PDF p. 23	Not proof of the full cost of sharing Mann or of an unrestricted payment to an outside organization.
Orton: $1m, PDF p. 64	Not the complete Trailblazer agreement or proof all future facility costs are covered.
RJWAC/Wasson: $8m, PDF p. 71	Not proof that the whole allocation is for the PPSC proposal.
Spruce: conditional $2-$3M workbook line	Not a settled amount or proof of a finalized selected project.

The amounts above are planning entries, not expenditures. A final project crosswalk should identify which agreement, property and public benefit each investment serves. District expenditures, school obligations, college commitments and nonprofit support should not be added into one pool without transaction evidence. [4] [5]

> A responsible assessment can recognize expanded educational opportunities and also ask who controls the asset after construction, who pays ongoing costs, and what happens if enrollment or the partnership changes.

Charter funding: two legal lanes

Colorado's operating-revenue rules are not a formula for dividing a bond.

Colorado's operating-MLO law, C.R.S. 22-32-108.5, enacted through HB17-1375, provides two routes for a participating district: a plan for equitable use or distribution of the revenue, or distribution of at least 95% of the per-pupil MLO share to charter and innovation schools. The law expressly excludes bonded-debt mills from its definition of additional MLO revenue. An operating-MLO calculation is therefore not a per-pupil entitlement to bond proceeds. [23]

Capital participation has its own framework in C.R.S. 22-30.5-404. SB26-145, effective May 28, 2026, addresses charter capital proposals, notice, consideration and explained decisions. The enacted text also preserves a needs-priority rule for qualifying charter facilities. That is more than an invitation to comment, but it is not a rule that every charter automatically receives an equal or enrollment-proportional amount. [24]

Eligibility and exceptions matter. The act includes a voluntary, mutually agreed proposal route that exempts subsection (3)'s procedures, not every statutory requirement. It also changes the recently authorized-school exception to three years. These provisions must be applied to actual school and proposal facts; the project sheets alone do not establish which route D11 used. [24]

Table 14. Records needed to assess charter participation

Separate record set	What it would establish
Operating MLO plan and annual calculations	How eligible recurring operating revenue is allocated or equitably used.
Charter capital solicitation and proposals	Which capital needs were submitted and through which statutory route.
Comparable needs assessments and notices	Why projects were included, excluded or ranked differently.
Facility contracts and asset records	Who owns, maintains and accounts for the improved property.
Actual spending and public reports	What was paid, delivered and verified after authorization.

> No legal-compliance or violation conclusion is made here. Lawful charter support is not itself evidence of favoritism. The unresolved issue is the decision trail and accountability for each use of public resources. [22] [23] [24]

Oversight: build on what exists, verify what improves

D11 has an MLO oversight history. Its record is mixed, not blank.

Program Implementation Plans, or PIPs, translate MLO purposes into programs and budget lines. An MLO committee reviews this work, and external assessments examine spending-plan implementation. That system is distinct from the independent citizens' bond oversight committee described in the new ballot question. Existing MLO oversight does not automatically provide bond project, procurement or construction oversight. [1] [12] [25] [26]

PCG's June 2022 assessment of D11's 2000 and 2017 MLO spending plans credited regular reporting and documentation while identifying weaknesses in onboarding and validation of performance measures. Its January 2026 MLO assessment reports more consistent presentations and continuing work on program measures, alongside incomplete performance indicators and a lack of formal onboarding reported by new committee members. These are findings from assessment periods, not proof that every condition remained unchanged in September. [18] [12]

There is follow-through evidence. Committee notes document PIP-owner training and governance work. June 4, 2025 draft minutes record a 6-0 adoption of Policy BDFM, MLO Governance; the published June framework calls for triennial external review and public reporting. The current site links an FY2024-25 annual summary, and the September 2 charge directs implementation work. These are concrete steps, not proof of full completion. [31] [32] [43] [15] [14] [16]

Those reviews concern the existing MLO program. A bond committee would face different decisions about project scopes, contracts, costs and completed work. The next table identifies records that could make bond oversight useful; financial audits, performance reviews and construction inspections answer different questions. [1] [12] [18]

Table 15. Evidence of bond oversight

Useful bond safeguard	Evidence taxpayers should be able to see
Independent, capable committee	Published charter, selection criteria, membership, conflicts and access rights.
Project-level financial reporting	Original/current budget, commitments, payments, contingency use and funding source.
Scope and schedule control	Approved changes, reasons, revised completion dates and student disruption plans.
Outcome and closeout reporting	Completed work, inspections, warranties and final cost versus approved scope.
Recommendation tracking	Responsible owner, due date, evidence of completion and public status.

The decision: benefits, costs and alternatives

A reader can value the improvements and still ask for a more transparent financing plan.

Table 16. Benefits and questions to weigh

Reasonable consideration	What the record supports / what remains open
Better learning environments	Named capital purposes and proposed school scopes are public. Building condition and usability can be assessed as work is completed. Longer-term educational effects cannot be known before construction.
Teacher recruitment and retention	A signed conditional commitment directs released MLO revenue to compensation. Exact net resources and pay distribution remain unverified.
Taxpayer affordability	If approved, the question would create additional tax/debt authority. A household estimate must use its own property data and appropriate assumptions.
Long-term stewardship	Borrowing can finance work sooner and spread repayment over time. Interest, future maintenance and capital selection still have opportunity costs.
Trust and accountability	Existing reporting and external reviews provide an institutional base. Final project/finance reconciliation and implementation records remain important.

If the measure passes

Passage would authorize the district to proceed within the approved question. Later debt issuance, project-specific procurement or prior-cost verification as applicable, annual appropriations and oversight would still be needed. Some related work already exists; the resolution contemplates eligible reimbursement. School sheets and prospective pay relief are not proof of delivery. [1] [2]

If the measure does not pass

This particular new borrowing authority would not be granted. The vote would not by itself eliminate existing school needs, MLO programs or COP obligations. The district would have to decide how to prioritize available resources, defer or phase work, or consider another proposal. No adopted, fully funded “no” alternative resolving all identified needs was established in the records reviewed for this guide. [1] [9] [25] [26]

Possible approaches such as a smaller package, phased work, a different debt-retirement strategy or different project priorities are analytical alternatives, not free substitutes or district-adopted plans. Compare each using the same condition evidence, student impacts, cost assumptions and borrowing horizon.

> This guide’s conclusion is about evidence quality, not a voting instruction: evaluate the worthwhile purposes, the additional public obligation and the strength of the plan connecting the two.

Campaign disclosure context: a shared registered agent

A disclosed shared role between two separate committees is worth seeing clearly and describing narrowly.

Colorado TRACER's current detail page lists **D11 Friends** as an active El Paso issue committee, registered August 26, 2026, with the stated purpose "to support the D11 bond issue" and registered agent Caden Salladay. At retrieval, the filing history showed its committee-registration form; its first listed report of contributions and expenditures was due October 13. [53]

TRACER separately lists **D11 Parents and Teachers** as a 2025 El Paso independent-expenditure committee, now marked terminated, with Caden Salladay as its registered agent. Its November 4, 2025, 48-hour notice reports a $9,762.90 expenditure for a texting communication, names Axiom Strategies as the payee, and identifies Bruce Cole, Jeremiah Johnson and Michelle Ruehl as supported candidates. That notice is one disclosed communication, not a complete campaign-spending or candidate-allocation record. [54] [55]

TRACER contribution exports report **$210,642.40** in two unamended itemized contributions to D11 Parents and Teachers from Advance Colorado Action: $125,000 dated October 8, 2025, and $85,642.40 dated January 2, 2026. Those records document funding of the 2025 independent-expenditure committee. They do not establish that Advance Colorado Action funds D11 Friends or that the two committees share donors, staff, strategy or control. [56]

The official 2025 expenditure export separately records six unamended electioneering advertising payments to Axiom Strategies labeled MAIL or MAIL COMMUNICATION, totaling **$138,480**. The rows do not identify the candidate, message or individual mail piece for each payment. [56]

Contemporaneous Pikes Peak Bulletin reporting identified D11 Parents and Teachers' broader campaign communications as opposing Charles Johnson, LeAnn Baca Bartlett and Michael Carsten while supporting Jeremiah Johnson, Bruce Cole and Michelle Ruehl. This is attributed secondary reporting, not a TRACER finding. It does not show which specific mailing concerned which candidate or convert the mail total into candidate-specific spending. [57]

TRACER does not assign political labels to candidates. This guide therefore identifies disclosed committee status, filings and communications without characterizing a slate by ideology or treating a candidate assessment as an official finding.

> **What this does and does not show:** the shared registered agent is a documented public-record fact. It does not establish that either committee was formed, funded, staffed, directed or controlled by the other, or that they shared donors, officers, staff, vendors, transfers of money, strategy or coordination. Those stronger claims would require specific transaction, governance or communication evidence.

Voting and finding your own records

Use current official election information; a school finder is not a voter-registration record.

Only qualified voters residing within D11's boundaries vote on the district measure. Owning property is not itself voter qualification; a renter can be a qualified district voter. A property owner living elsewhere should not assume ownership makes the measure appear on their ballot. The state's residence guidance includes apartments and people without permanent housing. Check your official voter record and assigned ballot. [1] [3] [37] [49]

Table 17. Election milestones and voter actions

County's published milestone	What to do
October 26, 2026	County-listed last date to register or update online and still have a ballot mailed.
October 27 through Election Day	County directs registration/updates and ballot service to a Voter Service and Polling Center.
November 3, 2026, 7 p.m.	Ordinary ballot receipt deadline; postmarks do not count. Follow the county's specific rules and exceptions.
Sample ballot and TABOR notice	Marked available soon in the September 9 county capture. Check these before relying on a ballot label or final financial notice.

The county's election-information page links voter registration, ballot tracking and election records. These are the authoritative starting points for your voting logistics; recheck them as Election Day approaches. This guide does not reproduce every voter category, identification rule, military/overseas exception or curing deadline. [37]

Finding documents in this guide

In this guide's Appendix A, find the school allocation and open its link to the district's corresponding project sheet. The separate source directory at the end of this guide links the signed bond resolution, May preliminary finance presentation, final audit, original COP offering, Board records and MLO reports. The county election website is for voting logistics, not for navigating this guide's appendices. [4] [1] [8] [9] [10] [13]

Questions that can produce useful answers

Ask for a document, an assumption or an accountable decision - not just reassurance.

Table 18. Questions and the records that would answer them

Question	A useful answer would include
What is the final selected program?	One dated list identifying included, alternate and deferred work, with sites, owners and full scopes.
How does it reconcile to financing?	Sources and uses linking net proceeds, school projects, district-wide work, inflation, contingency and other funding.
What does debt retirement really cost?	COP-by-COP retirement/defeasance estimate, escrow assumptions, fees and residual obligations.
What is the net compensation benefit?	Annual release schedule and later appropriation/distribution plan, not an original principal balance.
Why these projects and these amounts?	Final condition/capacity data, scores, tiers, exceptions and charter-process records.
What happens if conditions change?	Interest-rate and bid-cost sensitivities, scope priorities, contingencies and change-approval rules.
How will delivery be monitored?	Committee charter, conflict disclosures, public reports, contract access and final cost/scope audits.
How does this fit the changing portfolio?	Enrollment and capacity assumptions, site agreements, useful-life analysis and ongoing operating obligations.

Begin with the signed question, project page, finance presentation and audited report. The source directory identifies exact documents and locators. School-specific links in Appendix A open the combined public PDF at the relevant page when the PDF viewer supports page fragments. [1] [6] [8] [9]

How to use this guide responsibly

A district project page is primary evidence of what the district proposes, not independent proof of construction need or future success. An auditor’s report supports the statements and periods it actually examines. A meeting packet may be proposed; a signed resolution establishes adopted text. Automatic captions are leads and attributed context, not verified verbatim speech. A document not found in the reviewed sources is not proven nonexistent.

Appendix A1 | Find a school allocation

School PDF allocations, not reconciled all-in budgets or guaranteed expenditures.

All 52 allocation-bearing pages are included across three tables. Service-area labels are transcribed from the district PDF; they are not parcel boundaries. The school sheets say April 2026 and remained linked when reviewed September 9. These tables do not reproduce every proposed task; follow the page link for scope. [4] [6]

Table A1. School allocations in the district PDF

School / campus label	Service area	PDF allocation	PDF p.
Academy ACL	Districtwide	$9,300,000	2
Adams Elementary	Central	$1,000,000	3
Audubon Elementary	Southeast	$2,000,000	5
Bristol Elementary	West	$7,000,000	7
Buena Vista Elementary	Citywide	$3,000,000	9
Carver Elementary	Northeast	$1,000,000	11
Chipeta Elementary	West	$3,000,000	13
CIVA	Districtwide	$3,100,000	15
Colorado Military Academy	Districtwide	$8,680,000	16
Columbia Elementary	Central	$3,000,000	17
Coronado High School	West	$20,000,000	19
Doherty High School	Northeast	$20,000,000	21
East Hills	Districtwide	$1,240,000	23
Edison Elementary	Central	$2,000,000	24
Freedom Elementary	Northeast	$1,000,000	26
Fremont Elementary	Northeast	$1,000,000	28
Galileo Middle School	Southeast	$7,000,000	30
Grant Elementary	Southeast	$2,000,000	32

> Combined subtotal across all 52 school allocations in Appendix A: **$477,500,000**. District-wide work, other public project-list groups, inflation and debt retirement are not reconciled by this table. Do not subtract this subtotal from $775m and call the difference unallocated cash.

Appendix A2 | Find a school allocation

School PDF allocations, not reconciled all-in budgets or guaranteed expenditures.

All 52 allocation-bearing pages are included across three tables. Service-area labels are transcribed from the district PDF; they are not parcel boundaries. The school sheets say April 2026 and remained linked when reviewed September 9. These tables do not reproduce every proposed task; follow the page link for scope. [4] [6]

Table A2. School allocations in the district PDF, continued

School / campus label	Service area	PDF allocation	PDF p.
Henry Elementary	Southeast	$7,000,000	34
Holmes Middle	West	$80,000,000	36
Howbert Elementary	West	$2,000,000	38
Jackson Elementary	West	$1,000,000	40
Jenkins Middle School	Northeast	$7,000,000	42
Keller Elementary	Northeast	$3,000,000	44
King Elementary	Northeast	$2,000,000	46
Madison Elementary	Southeast	$3,000,000	48
Mann Middle School	Central	$7,000,000	50
Martinez Elementary	Northeast	$3,000,000	52
McAuliffe Elementary	Southeast	$3,000,000	54
Midland Elementary	West	$1,000,000	56
Mitchell High School	Southeast	$15,000,000	58
Monroe Elementary	Southeast	$1,000,000	60
North Middle School	Central	$9,000,000	62
Orton	Districtwide	$1,000,000	64
Palmer High School	Central	$150,000,000	65
Penrose Elementary	Southeast	$2,000,000	67

> Combined subtotal across all 52 school allocations in Appendix A: **$477,500,000**. District-wide work, other public project-list groups, inflation and debt retirement are not reconciled by this table. Do not subtract this subtotal from $775m and call the difference unallocated cash.

Appendix A3 | Find a school allocation

School PDF allocations, not reconciled all-in budgets or guaranteed expenditures.

All 52 allocation-bearing pages are included across three tables. Service-area labels are transcribed from the district PDF; they are not parcel boundaries. The school sheets say April 2026 and remained linked when reviewed September 9. These tables do not reproduce every proposed task; follow the page link for scope. [4] [6]

Table A3. School allocations in the district PDF, continued

School / campus label	Service area	PDF allocation	PDF p.
Queen Palmer Elementary	Central	$1,000,000	69
RJWAC	District wide	$8,000,000	71
Rogers Elementary	Central	$1,000,000	73
Rudy Elementary	Northeast	$7,000,000	75
Russell Middle School	Northeast	$9,000,000	77
Sabin Middle School	Northeast	$7,000,000	79
Scott Elementary	Northeast	$2,000,000	81
Steele Elementary	Central	$7,000,000	83
Stratton Elementary	Central	$3,000,000	85
Swigert Middle School	Southeast	$9,000,000	87
Taylor Elementary	Central	$1,000,000	89
Thomas MacLaren	Districtwide	$24,180,000	91
Trailblazer Elementary	West	$1,000,000	92
Twain Elementary	Central	$1,000,000	94
West	West	$3,000,000	96
Wilson Elementary	Southeast	$1,000,000	98

Combined subtotal across all 52 school allocations in Appendix A: **$477,500,000**. District-wide work, other public project-list groups, inflation and debt retirement are not reconciled by this table. Do not subtract this subtotal from $775m and call the difference unallocated cash.

Methods and limits

A comprehensive orientation to the decision, not an audit of every transaction or a substitute for professional advice.

The principal evidence is the signed August resolutions; the public school PDF; the current PDF project list and retained legacy XLSX; March and May planning/financing presentations; final audited statements; the original 2024 COP offering; adopted or proposed governance records; official state legislation; and district-commissioned external MLO assessments. Public agency publications can be primary for their own decisions while still requiring attribution for evaluative claims.

The 52 school allocations are re-extracted from the retained 99-page original PDF and checked to sum to $477.5 million. The current project-list PDF and retained XLSX were compared as decimal-currency values: each has 235 numeric entries, with the same values occurring the same number of times. Conditional text entries are kept separate. This validates a format correspondence, not a district-adopted program or a financing reconciliation. A table sum is derived arithmetic. High-dollar financing anchors were checked against retained documents; exact source locators appear in the directory. [4] [5] [58]

No claim is made that all internal district working papers were obtained. Several earlier portal searches timed out. The missing-finance-model finding is limited to successfully retrieved and reviewed sources through September 17, including later August/September packets and the September 16 project-list PDF. Future closing records cannot be treated as presently knowable actual costs. [5] [58]

The base bond research cutoff is September 9, 2026, with discrete updates: the official County recount source for 2021 D11 Ballot Issue 4B was verified September 14; campaign-disclosure detail pages were checked September 16; D11's republished bond pages and project-list PDF were checked September 17; and the historical 2004 and 2016 election records were checked September 19. The guide uses public originals and retained public-source captures, not private email or restricted Google Drive material. The county's public 2016 result PDF was downloaded without authentication. No CORA email or form was drafted or submitted. [60] [61]

The review does not establish present hazardous-material exposure, every engineering condition, future enrollment, the exact household tax bill, actual bond pricing, a net teacher-pay amount, completion of every oversight recommendation or a legal violation. A final county-certified ballot/measure identifier was not independently established in this guide. Follow current county election information.

Governance context separates school operation, authorization, property, revenue and nonprofit support. Shared advisers, personnel or training do not by themselves prove common control, coordination, motive or improper funding. Legal summaries explain the relevant mechanisms; they are not individualized legal or financial advice.

> Source updates can change this guide. A newly released dated financing crosswalk, revised school plan, county ballot, compensation appropriation or actual closing should be evaluated against the relevant passage, not silently substituted into a historical comparison.

Source directory

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[1] Signed bond-election resolution 2027-02, August 5, 2026
pp. 2-4: question, authority, certification instruction; signed instrument.
resources.finalsite.net

[2] Signed teacher-compensation resolution 2027-03, August 5, 2026
Both pages: contingent commitment, appropriation and no-contractual-right limits.
resources.finalsite.net

[3] D11 bond information hub
Checked September 17, 2026. D11 labels the measure Ballot Question 4A and links the current PDF project list. District statements about its own proposal, not county-certified election evidence.
www.d11.org

[4] D11 combined school project plans
99-page PDF; school sheets labeled April 2026. Appendix A gives physical PDF page numbers.
resources.finalsite.net

[5] D11 planned-projects workbook, legacy direct XLSX
Directly retrieved September 17; one static sheet, no formulas. Rows 298-299: inflation and COP payoff. No longer linked from D11's bond pages; formal version precedence unresolved.
www.d11.org

[6] D11 project-plan landing page
Checked September 17. Links the 99-page school PDF and, after the September 16 re-publication, the six-page PDF project list rather than the legacy XLSX.
www.d11.org

[7] March 18, 2026 facilities planning presentation
Slides 6-9: normalized need score, regional allocations and district-directed work.
d11.community.highbond.com

[8] May 27, 2026 bond finance work-session packet / RBC
Retained version --v2; PDF pp. 4, 7-8: scope and preliminary financing cases. RBC Capital Markets is identified as bond underwriter.
d11.community.highbond.com

[9] D11 FY2025 final audited financial report
Note 8, printed pp. 52-54 / PDF pp. 60-62: COP funding, actual and scheduled debt service.
s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[10] D11 Series 2024 COP Official Statement
June 4, 2024; printed pp. 18-25 / PDF pp. 26-33; Appendix B p. B-25 / PDF p. 195. Original offering, not a 2026 payoff quote. EMMA blocked the final automated link check; the preserved original is also embedded as a PDF attachment in this guide.
emma.msrb.org

[11] D11 June 3, 2026 board packet / proposed FY2027 budget
Retained --v5; PDF pp. 135, 140-142 / budget pp. 41, 46-48. Proposed schedules, not an executed refinancing.
d11.community.highbond.com

[12] PCG ninth triennial MLO assessment, January 2026
District-commissioned external assessment. pp. 13-14 historical MLO context; pp. 60-69 governance and recommendations. Primary for its own assessment findings.
d11.community.highbond.com

[13] D11 current MLO information page
Links public spending summaries and external assessments; captured September 9.
www.d11.org

[14] D11 FY2024-25 MLO / PIP annual summary
District annual reporting; publication does not independently verify every program outcome.
www.d11.org

[15] D11 Mill Levy Override Governance Policy, June 2025
Both pages; published framework. Source 43, Action F.3, records a 6-0 adoption of Policy BDFM; policy adoption does not prove completed implementation.
resources.finalsite.net

[16] FY2026-27 MLO committee charge and roster
p. 1; membership dated September 2, 2026; directions for review and implementation, not completion evidence.
d11.community.highbond.com

[17] May 17, 2023 MLO amendment background
Official post-event account of December 2022 debt payoff and combined resources from payoff plus inflation adjustment.
d11.community.highbond.com

[18] D11 June 2022 PCG assessment
Printed pp. 30-38 and 47-50: oversight strengths and recommendations.
www.d11.org

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[19] D11 August 5, 2026 draft meeting minutes
E.1-E.2: 6-1 bond vote, 7-0 compensation vote. Capital spotlight contains attributed progress reports.
d11.community.highbond.com

[20] D11 August 19, 2026 draft meeting minutes
p. 2: 6-0 election-agreement authorization, subject to legal review; not executed agreement or county receipt.
d11.community.highbond.com

[21] D11 May 6, 2026 board packet
Retained --v2: PDF pp. 6-7 Palmer; pp. 71-75 PPSC/Wasson and East Hills/Mann; pp. 78-79 scheduled Resolution 2026-48 / Innovation Collective.
d11.community.highbond.com

[22] D11 August 19, 2026 packet / charter policy LBD
Retained --v4, PDF pp. 76-77: separate charter governing bodies, accountability and facility terms.
d11.community.highbond.com

[23] Colorado HB17-1375, equitable MLO support
Signed act pp. 2, 4-6, 8; C.R.S. 22-32-108.5. Additional MLO revenue excludes bonded-debt mills.
leg.colorado.gov

[24] Colorado SB26-145, charter capital-ballot participation
Signed act pp. 2-7; effective May 28, 2026. C.R.S. 22-30.5-404, including subsection (2.5); eligibility and procedural exceptions matter.
leg.colorado.gov

[25] D11 FY2023-24 2017 MLO Program Implementation Plans
PIP 10: reserves for early debt retirement. Historical plan, not a current settlement statement.
www.d11.org

[26] D11 FY2023-24 2000 MLO Program Implementation Plans
PIP 23: independent performance review. Historical program descriptions and budgets.
www.d11.org

[27] D11-linked homeowner calculator
Public configuration captured September 9: value x 7.05% x 10 mills / 1,000. Illustration, not a parcel tax certification.
app.calconic.com

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[28] D11 July 29, 2026 special meeting recording
Official recording; CC1 captions at 00:51:35 and 01:34:17 discuss an approximate annual compensation figure. Caption-derived context, not audio-verified quotation or net calculation.
www.youtube.com

[29] D11 September 2, 2026 board packet
Including PDF p. 14: prior compensation action; no integrated finance schedule found in this reviewed packet.
d11.community.highbond.com

[30] D11 MLO committee meeting information
Public meeting-record gateway. The September 9 capture linked notes through April 15, 2025; later records may be elsewhere.
www.d11.org

[31] D11 MLO committee notes, September 17, 2024
pp. 1-2: PIP-owner training and reporting alignment; not new citizen-member onboarding.
www.d11.org

[32] D11 MLO committee notes, April 15, 2025
pp. 1-2: recommendations, governance, bylaws, communication and onboarding follow-through work.
www.d11.org

[33] D11 historical 2000 and 2017 MLO ballot questions
pp. 1-2: ballot wording and district account of approval. The 2017 election-day wording is inconsistent; this guide uses month/year only.
resources.finalsite.net

[34] 2004 El Paso County sample ballot, preserved by NIST
Single-page ballot, p. 1, rightmost D11 Issue 3F column: $131.7m proposed principal; sample ballot establishes proposal terms, not certified passage.
www.nist.gov

[35] Colorado Legislative Council Staff: 2026 assessment-rate memo
p. 1: no balancing/correction reduction below 7.05% school-district residential assessment rate for property tax year 2026.
content.leg.colorado.gov

[36] D11 bond FAQ, native district webpage
September 9 HTML capture, taxpayer-cost section: 37.7 to 46.3 mills. Native webpage, not the separately published Google-document FAQ.
www.d11.org

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[37] El Paso County 2026 election information
September 9 capture: election and voter deadlines; sample ballot and TABOR notice still marked available soon. Check for updates.
clerkandrecorder.elpasoco.com

[38] D11 district homepage / published overview
September 9 snapshot: established 1872; displayed enrollment 20,448; 60 schools and charters. Website counts, not independently certified census totals.
www.d11.org

[39] D11 enrollment and address-based school lookup
Find My Neighborhood School gateway; school assignment is distinct from voter eligibility.
www.d11.org

[40] D11 public school finder
Address / ZIP school lookup and program directory; not a parcel-tax certification.
weared11.d11.org

[41] D11 CSST innovation plan
pp. 9-17 and 24-27: waivers, governing-board roles and proposed D11/CSST cost MOU.
d11.community.highbond.com

[42] CDE State Board announcement, April 11, 2024
State Board approval of Colorado Springs School of Technology innovation zone; official account of the action.
www.cde.state.co.us

[43] D11 June 4, 2025 draft minutes
F.11-F.13: Mitchell innovation renewal; separate East Hills and Spruce charter approvals; superintendent attribution of Legacy support.
d11.community.highbond.com

[44] Mitchell High School pathway plan
pp. 1 and 10-12: innovation and external-management pathway / Instructional Empowerment. Not proof of building transfer.
d11.community.highbond.com

[45] D11 April 2, 2025 draft minutes
E.5: 6-1 CSST/UCCS renovation authorization, capped at $2.35m; related agenda document 4012 identifies Capital Reserve MLO funding.
d11.community.highbond.com

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[46] D11 May 6, 2026 final minutes
H.5-H.6: PPSC/Wasson agreement authority and East Hills/Mann co-occupancy. Supporting packet 75705 pp. 71-75.
d11.community.highbond.com

[47] D11 May 13, 2026 draft minutes
Consent D.3, p. 2: Innovation Collective name change; pp. 3-4: Orton/Trailblazer co-occupancy.
d11.community.highbond.com

[48] D11 April 2, 2025 agenda
E.5: CSST renovation scope and Capital Reserve MLO budget source; read with the vote record, source 45.
d11.community.highbond.com

[49] Colorado Secretary of State voter-registration FAQ
Q3 registration deadlines and Q4 residence, including apartments and voters without permanent housing; reviewed September 9, 2026.
www.sos.state.co.us

[50] El Paso County Clerk and Recorder archived recount release for D11 Ballot Issue 4B
County release dated December 6, 2021; the automatic recount recorded 27,476 No votes and 27,465 Yes votes. The live original returned 404 when rechecked September 14, 2026; archive timestamp 20220120055741.
web.archive.org

[53] Colorado TRACER: D11 Friends committee detail
Retrieved September 16, 2026. Active El Paso issue committee; registration date, stated purpose and registered agent are the committee's disclosed fields.
tracer.sos.colorado.gov

Source directory (continued)

Click the title or blue source number. Sources are primary public records unless their source note explicitly identifies reporting or another posture.

[54] Colorado TRACER: D11 Parents and Teachers committee detail
Retrieved September 16, 2026. Separate El Paso independent-expenditure committee, marked terminated; current status and registered agent are disclosed fields.
tracer.sos.colorado.gov

[55] Colorado TRACER: D11 Parents and Teachers 48-hour independent-expenditure notice
Filed November 4, 2025. One notice-level disclosure of a $9,762.90 texting communication; it is not the committee's complete cycle spending or a per-candidate allocation.
tracer.sos.colorado.gov

[56] Colorado TRACER: D11 Parents and Teachers contribution and expenditure exports
Retrieved September 16 and 19, 2026, from the 2025 expenditure export and 2025-26 contribution exports. Six unamended electioneering-advertising rows labeled MAIL or MAIL COMMUNICATION total $138,480, without candidate, message or individual-mail allocation. Two unamended itemized Advance Colorado Action contributions, $125,000 dated October 8, 2025, and $85,642.40 dated January 2, 2026, total $210,642.40.
tracer.sos.colorado.gov

[57] Pikes Peak Bulletin, "Dark money and negative campaigns in the D11 school board race"
Contemporaneous secondary reporting, published October 28, 2025. Its candidate-support and opposition account is attributed reporting, not a primary filing or a candidate-specific mail-spending allocation.
pikespeakbulletin.org

[58] D11 FinalBondProjectList852026 PDF
Six-page PDF first linked on D11's bond pages September 16. PDF metadata title: FinalBondProjectList852026.xlsx. Its 235 numeric currency values match the legacy XLSX; it has no grand total, sources-and-uses schedule or financing reconciliation.
www.d11.org

[59] Colorado Department of Education, Public School Finance Act overview
State explanation of Total Program Funding and its state and local shares; an orientation to operating finance, not a source for this bond's cost.
ed.cde.state.co.us

[60] Colorado Department of Education, FY2008-09 district bond-history table
Physical PDF p. 154 / printed p. 146: Colorado Springs 11 row lists 04 as a passed bond-election year. The adjacent $231.529m is a 1997-2006 bond-debt figure, not the amount of 2004 Issue 3F; no county vote tally is supplied.
www.cde.state.co.us

[61] El Paso County 2016 General Election official final summary results
County archive report dated November 18, 2016: D11 Issue 3C Property Tax Override, 53,676 Yes and 55,751 No; Issue 3D Bond Authorization, 52,094 Yes and 57,019 No. Publicly downloadable without a Drive login.
drive.google.com