

Durango School District

Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC)

School Replacement & Consolidation Planning Framework

May 2026

Table of Contents

[Table of Contents](#)

- [1. Executive Summary](#)
- [2. Purpose and Scope](#)
 - [2.1 Purpose](#)
 - [2.2 Scope of Work](#)
 - [2.3 Items Excluded from Scope](#)
- [3. Planning Assumptions and Guiding Principles](#)
 - [3.1 Replacement Planning Must Be Flexible](#)
 - [3.2 Replacement Must Account for Swing Space](#)
 - [3.3 Replacement and Consolidation Decisions Must Align with Enrollment Balancing](#)
 - [3.4 Operational Efficiency Must Be Considered Alongside Facility Condition](#)
 - [3.5 Transportation Equity Must Be Central to Consolidation Decisions](#)
 - [3.6 Open Enrollment Policies Should Support Long-Term Facility Stability](#)
- [4. Current State Snapshot: Facilities and Enrollment Context](#)
 - [4.1 Facilities Condition and Life Expectancy](#)
 - [4.2 Enrollment Trends and Demographic Shifts](#)
 - [4.3 Boundary Redistricting Context](#)
 - [4.4 Combined Classes and Educational Equity](#)
- [5. School Replacement Methodology](#)
 - [5.1 Overview of Replacement Matrix](#)
 - [5.2 Committee Discussion on Weighting and Refinements](#)
 - [5.3 Methodology Conclusion](#)
- [6. Replacement Rankings and Scenario Outcomes](#)
 - [6.1 Replacement Ranking \(Base Scenario – No Redistricting Assumed\)](#)
 - [6.2 Replacement Ranking \(Scenario – Redistricting Assumed\)](#)
 - [6.3 Implications of Ranking Results](#)
- [7. School Consolidation Analysis](#)
 - [7.1 Why Consolidation Has Become a Major Consideration](#)
 - [7.2 Demographer Guidance on Consolidation Candidates](#)

- [7.3 Specific Scenario Considerations: Animas Valley Restructuring](#)
 - [7.4 Consolidation Constraints and Considerations](#)
- [8. Enrollment Balancing and Boundary Strategy](#)
 - [8.1 Boundary Work as a Prerequisite](#)
 - [8.2 Paired Enrollment Balancing](#)
 - [8.3 Open Enrollment Enforcement](#)
 - [8.4 Three Springs Elementary as a Capacity Lever](#)
- [9. Options Framework](#)
 - [Option A: Replacement-Driven Strategy](#)
 - [Option B: Consolidation-Driven Strategy](#)
 - [Option C: Hybrid Strategy \(Recommended\)](#)
- [10. Recommended Path Forward \(LRPC Recommendation\)](#)
 - [10.1 Near-Term Priorities \(2024–2028\)](#)
 - [10.2 Mid-Term Priorities \(2028–2032\)](#)
 - [10.3 Long-Term Priorities \(2032 and Beyond\)](#)
- [11. Proposed Replacement and Consolidation Sequencing](#)
 - [11.1 Consolidation Candidate Priority \(Based on Demographer Guidance\)](#)
 - [11.2 Replacement Priority \(After Redistricting Scenario Assumptions\)](#)
- [12. Timeline Framework](#)
- [13. Decision Triggers \(Recommended for Board Adoption\)](#)
 - [Consolidation Triggers](#)
 - [Replacement Triggers](#)
 - [Boundary Redistricting Triggers](#)
 - [Trigger Exceptions](#)
- [14. Community Engagement, Education and Communications Framework](#)
 - [Guiding Principles](#)
 - [Community Education](#)
 - [Recommended Engagement Strategies](#)
 - [Communications Planning](#)
 - [Building Community Trust](#)
- [15. Appendices](#)

1. Executive Summary

The Durango School District Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) has conducted a multi-year review of district facility needs, enrollment trends, and long-term capacity requirements to guide future decisions related to school replacement, school consolidation, and enrollment balancing.

The committee's work began with the development of a replacement prioritization approach grounded in objective criteria, including facility condition assessment (FCA) results, school age and modernization history, deferred maintenance needs, operating cost per pupil, projected enrollment trends, and growth indicators. The LRPC has repeatedly emphasized that while ranking data is essential, replacement decisions cannot be made solely from building condition and age; they must be tied directly to demographic realities, boundary redistricting decisions, and the District's ability to maintain equitable program offerings across schools.

A major theme of the committee's work is that the District must maintain flexibility in long-range planning. The LRPC recognizes that the replacement ranking matrix should be revisited regularly as updated demographic and housing development (growth) data becomes available. The committee also noted that replacement sequencing should account for "swing space" and interim student relocation needs during construction.

As the committee progressed, discussions expanded to include the growing likelihood of school consolidation as a long-term strategy, particularly given demographic projections indicating a decline in the school-age population over the next two decades. In February 2026, Western Demographics provided guidance indicating that schools with enrollment below approximately 300 students become viable candidates for consolidation. Based on this analysis, Sunnyside Elementary (SSE), Animas Valley Elementary (AVE), and Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME) were identified as the most viable consolidation options, in that order.

Across all meetings, the LRPC has consistently reinforced that boundary redistricting is a necessary prerequisite to long-term replacement and consolidation planning. School boundaries have not undergone major revision since 2016, and shifting housing development patterns, particularly the growth occurring in Three Springs and nearby areas, will require districtwide enrollment balancing to prevent inefficiencies, inequities, and increased reliance on combined-grade classrooms.

Based on the committee's work to date, the LRPC recommends a phased planning strategy:

1. **Short-Term (2024–2028):** Complete Three Springs Elementary with built-in capacity reserve, implement consolidation plan for SSE, maintain flexibility for enrollment shifts, and begin formal boundary analysis.
2. **Mid-Term (2028–2032):** Implement boundary adjustments and evaluate consolidation triggers and scenarios, especially for AVE, and FLME.

3. **Long-Term (2032 and beyond):** Prepare for the next major replacement bond cycle, with Durango High School (DHS) and Escalante Middle School (EMS) remaining the highest ranked replacement needs under all scenarios reviewed.

This plan reflects the LRPC's view that school replacement and consolidation decisions should be treated as an adaptable long-range framework rather than a fixed schedule, with regular review against updated demographic, facility, and operational cost data.

2. Purpose and Scope

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to summarize the Long Range Planning Committee's work to date related to:

- School replacement planning
- School consolidation considerations
- Enrollment balancing and boundary redistricting impacts
- Long-term sequencing considerations for future bond planning

This document is intended to serve as a planning framework to support Board of Education decision-making and future community engagement.

2.2 Scope of Work

This plan includes:

- Summary of committee discussions and conclusions regarding replacement and consolidation
- Summary of the School Replacement Data matrix and replacement ranking results
- Key demographic and operational planning considerations
- Recommended planning approach and sequencing logic

2.3 Items Excluded from Scope

This document does not serve as a comprehensive summary of all LRPC work. Topics excluded include:

- Deferred maintenance implementation details
- Workforce housing program development
- Cooling and HVAC project discussions
- Furniture replacement programming
- Non-school facility repurposing decisions except where they affect swing space and replacement feasibility

3. Planning Assumptions and Guiding Principles

The LRPC's work to date has produced several consistent guiding principles that should shape any final replacement or consolidation decisions.

3.1 Replacement Planning Must Be Flexible

Replacement rankings and long-range sequencing must be treated as a living plan. Updated demographic projections, changes in housing growth patterns, and shifting operational constraints require regular review and adjustment.

3.2 Replacement Must Account for Swing Space

A school replacement decision cannot be made without identifying where displaced students will attend school during construction. The availability of swing space is a limiting factor that may alter sequencing even when replacement needs are clearly ranked.

3.3 Replacement and Consolidation Decisions Must Align with Enrollment Balancing

The committee has repeatedly emphasized that replacement rankings change depending on boundary assumptions. A final replacement schedule cannot be finalized without parallel boundary work.

3.4 Operational Efficiency Must Be Considered Alongside Facility Condition

The LRPC has consistently discussed the importance of operating cost per pupil and the sustainability of maintaining small sites. Operational efficiency must be a key driver when weighing renovation, replacement and/or consolidation.

3.5 Transportation Equity Must Be Central to Consolidation Decisions

The committee recognizes that consolidation decisions impact transportation ride times, student readiness, and family access. Any consolidation proposal must include analysis of travel time impacts, especially for younger students.

3.6 Open Enrollment Policies Should Support Long-Term Facility Stability

The District has discussed reinforcing open enrollment rules so that schools are not artificially overfilled by out-of-boundary students, requiring staffing increases that distort long-range facility planning.

4. Current State Snapshot: Facilities and Enrollment Context

4.1 Facilities Condition and Life Expectancy

The committee has reviewed FCA results and facility age data, noting that multiple schools have exceeded expected life cycles. Early committee discussion specifically identified Park, Needham, Sunnyside, and Fort Lewis Mesa as schools past life expectancy as of 2024.

However, committee members cautioned that building age alone is not sufficient for ranking replacement needs, as many sites have undergone partial renovations at different points in time. This complicates simple “year built” comparisons and requires deeper infrastructure analysis.

4.2 Enrollment Trends and Demographic Shifts

The committee has received multiple updates on demographic trends and the anticipated impacts of new housing developments.

The LRPC has discussed that enrollment growth is not evenly distributed and that some schools are experiencing declining enrollment due to open enrollment patterns and local shifts, while other areas show future growth potential.

The committee also recognized that demographic projections suggest a decline in school-age population over the next two decades, increasing the likelihood that consolidation will become necessary to maintain program quality and fiscal sustainability.

4.3 Boundary Redistricting Context

The committee noted that district boundaries were last revised in 2016 with only minor adjustments. The committee has repeatedly stated that boundary redistricting must be addressed in the near term to stabilize enrollment, reduce inefficiencies, and support long-term replacement decisions.

4.4 Combined Classes and Educational Equity

Committee members expressed concern that uneven enrollment distribution has already contributed to combined-grade classrooms in some schools. Multiple committee members strongly opposed combined-class models, emphasizing the negative instructional impacts and the risk of family disengagement.

5. School Replacement Methodology

5.1 Overview of Replacement Matrix

The LRPC reviewed a replacement ranking spreadsheet (Appendix A) designed to quantify replacement priority using multiple criteria.

The matrix includes scoring elements such as:

- Facility condition and deferred maintenance need
- Enrollment projections
- Growth indicators
- Operating cost per pupil
- School size and utilization
- Programmatic considerations
- Other feasibility factors

The committee has discussed that the higher the total score, the higher the replacement priority.

5.2 Committee Discussion on Weighting and Refinements

The committee has debated how to weigh criteria appropriately. Recommendations and discussion themes included:

- Clarifying “area of growth” definitions and ensuring it does not duplicate enrollment projections
- Considering whether 10-year projections are more appropriate than shorter-term projections
- Adding additional metrics such as “average age of systems” rather than relying on the building’s original construction year
- Increasing the weight of operational dollars per pupil to better reflect long-term sustainability
- Considering enrollment served (number of students impacted) as a stronger driver than visual comparisons

5.3 Methodology Conclusion

The LRPC’s conclusion is that the ranking matrix is a valuable tool but should not be used in isolation. Replacement sequencing must be cross-checked against:

- boundary changes and enrollment balancing
- feasibility of construction and available land
- interim student relocation capacity

- bond timing and district debt capacity

6. Replacement Rankings and Scenario Outcomes

6.1 Replacement Ranking (Base Scenario – No Redistricting Assumed)

The current replacement ranking matrix lists replacement priorities in the following order:

1. Durango High School (DHS)
2. Escalante Middle School (EMS)
3. Park Elementary (PKE)
4. Needham Elementary (NDE)
5. Riverview Elementary (RVE)
6. Animas Valley Elementary (AVE)
7. Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME)
8. Sunnyside Elementary (SSE)

The committee noted that while DHS and EMS rank highest, feasibility and sequencing complexity must be considered.

6.2 Replacement Ranking (Scenario – Redistricting Assumed)

Under redistricting assumptions, the ranking shifts as follows:

1. Durango High School (DHS)
2. Escalante Middle School (EMS)
3. Needham Elementary (NDE)
4. Riverview Elementary (RVE)
5. Park Elementary (PKE)
6. Animas Valley Elementary (AVE)
7. Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME)
8. Sunnyside Elementary (SSE)

This shift demonstrates that boundary decisions will materially affect which schools rise in urgency.

6.3 Implications of Ranking Results

The committee's discussions reflect several key conclusions:

- DHS and EMS remain top priorities across all scenarios.
- Elementary replacement sequencing is highly sensitive to redistricting.
- A replacement schedule should not be finalized until boundary work is completed.
- The matrix should be updated regularly as new demographic data is received.

7. School Consolidation Analysis

7.1 Why Consolidation Has Become a Major Consideration

As demographic data indicates long-term declines in the school-age population, the committee has increasingly discussed consolidation as a strategy to:

- maintain equitable programming opportunities
- reduce inefficiencies in staffing and operational cost
- minimize reliance on combined-grade classrooms
- support districtwide enrollment balancing

The committee has discussed that consolidation may ultimately be more sustainable than replacing multiple small schools.

7.2 Demographer Guidance on Consolidation Candidates

In February 2026, Western Demographics presented that schools with enrollment at or below approximately 300 students become candidates for consolidation.

The demographer identified the most viable consolidation options, in order:

1. Sunnyside Elementary (SSE)
2. Animas Valley Elementary (AVE)
3. Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME)

7.3 Specific Scenario Considerations: Animas Valley Restructuring

The committee discussed the possibility of converting Animas Valley to a K–3 school, citing higher projected enrollment in early grades and lower projected enrollment in grades 4–5.

However, the committee raised concerns that moving grades 4–5 could increase the risk of families open-enrolling or choosing non-district schools.

7.4 Consolidation Constraints and Considerations

The committee identified that consolidation cannot be pursued solely based on facility efficiency. Key constraints include:

- transportation ride time impacts
- family accessibility and equity concerns
- availability of receiving-school capacity
- community resistance and trust impacts

- program and staffing implications

8. Enrollment Balancing and Boundary Strategy

8.1 Boundary Work as a Prerequisite

The committee has consistently stated that replacement and consolidation decisions depend on boundary redistricting. Replacement rankings change depending on enrollment assumptions.

The committee recommends formal boundary analysis and community engagement as a near-term planning priority.

8.2 Paired Enrollment Balancing

The committee discussed balancing specific school pairs to stabilize utilization, including:

- Needham and Park
- Escalante and Miller

This balancing concept supports long-term sustainability without requiring immediate consolidation.

8.3 Open Enrollment Enforcement

The committee discussed strengthening open enrollment enforcement to ensure students are placed primarily within their attendance boundaries unless open seats exist without increasing staffing.

8.4 Three Springs Elementary as a Capacity Lever

The committee has emphasized that Three Springs Elementary should be built to support approximately 3.5 to 4 rounds of capacity and should not be filled immediately. The intent is to preserve long-term capacity for redistricting adjustments and future enrollment shifts.

9. Options Framework

This section summarizes three strategic approaches the District may take. Each is based on committee discussions and reflects realistic pathways for board consideration.

Option A: Replacement-Driven Strategy

Under this approach, the District continues prioritizing replacement projects based primarily on the replacement matrix rankings, with consolidation used only as a last resort.

Advantages

- aligns with facility need rankings
- easier to communicate as “fixing aging schools”
- preserves neighborhood school identity

Risks

- may be financially unrealistic given long-term enrollment decline
- may result in replacing schools that become underutilized
- may increase bond requirements beyond feasible debt capacity

Option B: Consolidation-Driven Strategy

Under this approach, the District prioritizes consolidation of small schools and defers major replacement decisions until enrollment stabilizes.

Advantages

- improves operational efficiency
- reduces staffing complexity
- better aligns with demographic decline

Risks

- transportation and equity concerns
- strong community resistance potential
- may delay addressing urgent facility needs

Option C: Hybrid Strategy (Recommended)

This approach balances replacement planning with consolidation triggers and boundary adjustments, using regular data updates to guide decisions.

Advantages

- adaptable and data-driven
- financially sustainable
- aligns with demographic realities
- supports program equity and capacity management

Risks

- requires consistent (perhaps annual) review discipline
- may be perceived as “uncertain” without clear decision triggers
- requires robust community communication and engagement

10. Recommended Path Forward (LRPC Recommendation)

Based on the LRPC's work to date, the committee recommends adoption of the Hybrid Strategy (Option C).

10.1 Near-Term Priorities (2024–2028)

- Complete Three Springs Elementary with capacity reserve.
- Begin formal boundary and enrollment balancing analysis.
- Implement consolidation plan for SSE (the top candidate for consolidation)
- Continue updating the replacement matrix annually.
- Maintain flexibility in facility use planning to preserve swing space capacity.

10.2 Mid-Term Priorities (2028–2032)

- Implement redistricting based on boundary analysis.
- Evaluate consolidation scenarios for AVE, FLME and/or in-town schools dependent on redistricting decisions.
- Establish consolidation “decision triggers” based on sustained enrollment thresholds and operational efficiency metrics.

10.3 Long-Term Priorities (2032 and Beyond)

- Prepare for the next major replacement bond cycle.
- Maintain DHS and EMS as top long-term replacement priorities.
- Adjust elementary sequencing based on redistricting outcomes and consolidation decisions.

11. Proposed Replacement and Consolidation Sequencing

The committee recommends the following as a planning framework rather than a fixed schedule.

11.1 Consolidation Candidate Priority (Based on Demographer Guidance)

1. Sunnyside Elementary (SSE)
2. Animas Valley Elementary (AVE)
3. Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME)
4. In-town school based on redistricting decisions

11.2 Replacement Priority (After Redistricting Scenario Assumptions)

1. Durango High School (DHS)
2. Escalante Middle School (EMS)
3. Needham Elementary (NDE)
4. Riverview Elementary (RVE)
5. Park Elementary (PKE)
6. Animas Valley Elementary (AVE)*
7. Fort Lewis Mesa Elementary (FLME)*
8. Sunnyside Elementary (SSE)*

*Replacement only if not consolidated or repurposed.

12. Timeline Framework

2024–2028

- Three Springs Elementary completion
- annual replacement matrix updates
- boundary analysis and community engagement launch
- consolidation of SSE

2028–2032

- implement boundary adjustments
- consolidation feasibility studies (AVE, FLME)
- determine bond feasibility and sequencing constraints

2032–2040

- replacement bond development and execution planning
- DHS replacement planning begins
- EMS replacement planning begins

2040+

- elementary replacements based on revised utilization, consolidation outcomes, and updated FCA conditions

13. Decision Triggers (Recommended for Board Adoption)

To finalize a long-range plan that is clear, defensible, and adaptive, the committee recommends formal adoption of the following decision triggers, whereby any one (1) item may cause the trigger for consideration:

Consolidation Triggers

- Sustained elementary school enrollment below 300 students for 3 consecutive years
- Elementary, middle or high school building utilization falling below 60% for consecutive years
- Inability to maintain full grade-level staffing without combined classes
- Operational cost per pupil of 20% or more compared to district average
- Availability of receiving-school capacity within acceptable transportation time thresholds

Replacement Triggers

- Facility systems and infrastructure have reached end-of-life and renovation or deferred maintenance costs approach or exceed established replacement thresholds (generally 60%–70% of replacement value).
- Building limitations prevent the effective delivery of required educational programming, including deficiencies related to capacity, electrical infrastructure, plumbing, mechanical systems, technology integration, accessibility, safety, or instructional space needs.
- Long-term operational or facility investments would not adequately resolve the building's functional limitations or sustainability challenges, even after major renovation.

Boundary Redistricting Triggers

- Sustained overutilization (>95%) at one site paired with sustained underutilization (<75%) at another
- New housing development causing measurable enrollment shift exceeding established thresholds

Trigger Exceptions

The committee recognizes that planning benchmarks and triggers are intended to guide evaluation and decision-making rather than function as automatic requirements for closure, consolidation, replacement, or boundary adjustment.

These considerations may apply to decisions regarding consolidation, replacement, repurposing, boundary adjustments, or other long-range planning actions.

Exceptions to established planning benchmarks should be limited and based on clearly defined districtwide strategic needs rather than localized program preferences or individual school identity.

A school or facility may warrant continued operation or investment despite exceeding established planning thresholds only when the Board determines that the site serves a formally designated and essential districtwide function that cannot reasonably or effectively be replicated elsewhere within the district.

Examples may include:

- Board-approved alternative education programs;
- districtwide specialized instructional or career/technical programs;
- schools serving geographically isolated populations where consolidation would create unreasonable transportation burdens;
- or facilities required to support legally mandated or operationally critical district services.

Higher operational costs, specialized staffing, or unique programming alone should not constitute sufficient justification for exception status unless the program has been formally identified by the District as serving a necessary and distinct districtwide purpose.

The committee further recommends that any approved exceptions:

- be formally documented by the Board,
- include clearly stated rationale,
- and be periodically reviewed to ensure continued alignment with district priorities, enrollment realities, and long-range sustainability goals.

While community identity and school history are important considerations, they should be evaluated alongside long-term educational, operational, and sustainability factors.

14. Community Engagement, Education and Communications Framework

The committee recognizes that future decisions related to school consolidation, replacement, redistricting, and enrollment balancing will have significant impacts on students, families, staff, and the broader community. As such, transparent communication, proactive community engagement, and ongoing public education must be central components of the District's long-range planning efforts.

The committee recommends that the Board of Education and District administration develop and implement a robust community engagement and communications framework to support future planning discussions and decision-making processes.

Guiding Principles

The committee recommends that community engagement efforts be guided by the following principles:

- **Transparency:** Clearly communicate the data, assumptions, constraints, and rationale behind planning discussions and recommendations.
- **Consistency:** Ensure messaging remains clear, factual, and aligned across all District communications.
- **Accessibility:** Provide information in multiple formats and through multiple channels to ensure broad community access and understanding.
- **Empathy:** Recognize that discussions regarding school closure, consolidation, boundary changes, or replacement can create uncertainty and emotional concern for families, students, staff, and neighborhoods.
- **Two-Way Engagement:** Create opportunities for meaningful feedback, questions, and dialogue throughout the planning process. This does not necessarily have to be in-person and should include the entire community/tax-paying base.

Community Education

The committee believes a critical first step is educating the community on the broader context driving long-range planning discussions. Future communications should help the community understand:

- demographic and enrollment trends,
- facility condition realities and deferred maintenance pressures,
- operational and financial constraints,
- replacement versus renovation considerations,
- impacts of enrollment imbalance and combined-grade classrooms,
- and the long-term implications of maintaining underutilized facilities.

The committee recommends that the District proactively share planning data and educational materials before major decisions are considered in order to build understanding and trust throughout the process.

Recommended Engagement Strategies

The committee recommends consideration of the following engagement strategies:

- School-specific listening sessions
- Public presentations and workshops
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) documents
- Dedicated webpage and planning updates
- Community-wide surveys
- Staff engagement sessions
- Translation and accessibility supports where appropriate

Communications Planning

The committee recommends development of a formal communications plan to accompany future planning initiatives. The communications plan should include:

- clear communication timelines,
- identified spokespersons and points of contact,
- consistent messaging and talking points,
- strategies for addressing misinformation and rumors,
- and regular updates to staff, families, and the broader community.

The committee further recommends that communications occur early and consistently throughout the planning process, rather than only at points of decision-making.

Building Community Trust

The LRPC recognizes that long-range planning decisions may generate differing viewpoints and strong community emotions. The committee believes that maintaining trust will require the District to communicate openly, engage stakeholders respectfully, and demonstrate that decisions are being guided by objective data, educational equity considerations, operational sustainability, and the long-term needs of students.

The committee believes that a thoughtful and transparent engagement process will strengthen the District's ability to make informed long-term decisions while maintaining strong relationships with the communities it serves.

15. Appendices

Appendix A: School Replacement Data Matrix (Current Version)

-  School Replacement Data.xlsx

Appendix B: Demographer Key Takeaways (Western Demographics Presentation Summary)

-  Demographer Report Key Takeaways 05.2025

Appendix C: Bond Capacity Considerations (2032 Planning Assumptions)

- The table below represents bonding capacity projections, provided by RBC Capital Markets in April 2026, assuming relatively flat growth in assessed value year over year. These numbers represent the statutory maximum the district could issue, which would result in substantial tax increases to the public.
- If the district wanted to try for a “no tax” bond measure, with consideration for the projected step down in debt, RBC estimates the district could try for a \$155MM bond measure in 2032.

Assessment Year	Collection Year	Gross Assessed Value	Growth	Cumulative Principal Outstanding	Bonding Capacity	Bonding Capacity Remaining
2025	2026	1,901,728,670	-	210,340,000	380,345,734	170,005,734
2026	2027	1,901,728,670	0.0%	202,560,000	380,345,734	177,785,734
2027	2028	1,996,815,104	5.0%	197,455,000	399,363,021	201,908,021
2028	2029	1,996,815,104	0.0%	192,095,000	399,363,021	207,268,021
2029	2030	2,096,655,859	5.0%	186,470,000	419,331,172	232,861,172
2030	2031	2,096,655,859	0.0%	180,565,000	419,331,172	238,766,172
2031	2032	2,201,488,652	5.0%	174,365,000	440,297,730	265,932,730