OPTION DEVELOPMENT (SHORT TERM) DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
Reducing Capacity Pressures at Basswood Elementary and Rice Lake Elementary: Capacity Options Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Add space at Oak View/Garden City; boundary change</th>
<th>Add space at Basswood, Rice Lake, Garden City; no boundary change</th>
<th>Relocate elementary STEM magnet from Weaver Lake to Oak View; building addition at Weaver Lake and Garden City; boundary change</th>
<th>Move Rice Lake and Basswood Kindergartners to Oak View; building additions at Oak View and Garden City; boundary changes later?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Cost/Budget within Anticipated Funding Stream</td>
<td>Alignment with Future Growth</td>
<td>Eliminates need for a boundary change</td>
<td>Maintain Current Transportation Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option A

Forces for:
- Fits within available funding
- Simple solution; less effect on families
- Creates capacity; allows flexibility for not-yet-known enrollment growth
- Provides long-term solution
- Balanced option
- Maintains current operations costs

Merits further consideration: 7 tables
Do not move forward: 0 tables

Forces against:
- Expanding a school in area without population growth (Oak View)
- Boundary changes are challenging
- Not intuitive to those not on the ECMAC journey – they may not understand terms like core area capacity
- Even after expanding Garden City, projections show it will be slightly over capacity in 2 years. Is this an effective solution in the long term?
- Depending on boundary changes, there could be transportation inefficiencies or longer ride times
Option B

Forces for:
- Does not require boundary change
- Easier to communicate because it’s a more straightforward solution

Forces against:
- Basswood common areas are not large enough to accommodate more students
- Costs (projected at $20 million) would exceed available funding of $15 million
- What is the consequence for students (what would we reduce elsewhere) if we spend the extra money on this option?
- How big is too big for an elementary school? Will the school always need that much capacity?
- Does not appear to be fiscally responsible – there are other options

Merits further consideration: 0 tables
Do not move forward: 7 tables
Option C

Forces for:
- Work of attendance area team could surface implications that would provide more information
- Can it help with the longer term solution?
- Unknown (at this time) curricular/programmatic challenges associated with moving a magnet program are not enough to disqualify
- Oak View is a more central location
- There would be more flexibility/more options for a potential Fernbrook boundary change in the future if Fernbrook were adjacent to a school with boundaries

Forces against:
- Transportation complications/costs
- # of families affected
- Physical site characteristics of Oak View vs. Weaver
- What is the benefit to students?
- Change of diversity makeup?
- Programmatic challenges?
- How is this option tied to our guiding principles?
- Two schools that do not have current capacity challenges would bear the brunt of boundary changes driven by capacity challenges at other schools

Merits further consideration: 3 tables
Do not move forward: 2 tables
No consensus: 2 tables
Option D

Merits further consideration: 0 tables
Do not move forward: 7 tables

Forces for:
- Construction at Oak View could be tailored to kindergarten students

Forces against:
- Transition would impact our youngest, most vulnerable learners
- Not a true kindergarten center; could accommodate only some additional kindergartners
- More complicated transportation
- Not a long-term solution