

General Fund & Permanent Improvement Fund Cost Elimination/Avoidance

(Land & Building Value Information)

School Name	Average Estimated Maintenance & Operating Cost per Year (based on sq. ft.)	Average Estimated Capital Cost per Year (based on sq. ft.)	Estimated Roofing Expenditures planned thru 2030	Estimated Parking Lot Expenditures planned thru 2030	Estimated HVAC Expenditures planned thru 2030	Utility Cost per Year (Prior 5 Yr. Avg.)	Land Value	Building Value	Total Value
Creekside	\$65,278	\$28,243	\$1,250,000		\$150,000	\$94,994	See West Freshman		
Heritage	\$59,408	\$25,703	\$1,435,000	\$105,630	\$475,000	\$58,493	\$719,910	\$2,912,730	\$3,632,640
Hopewell ECS	\$82,225	\$35,575	\$1,558,900	\$338,255	\$125,000	\$71,359	\$648,000	\$4,061,610	\$4,709,610
Shawnee	\$58,869	\$25,470	\$1,200,000	\$125,892	\$350,000	\$57,789	\$760,480	\$3,141,850	\$3,141,850
Adena	\$64,232	\$27,366	\$1,920,000	\$132,911	\$225,000	\$54,767	\$787,860	\$3,704,030	\$4,491,890
Freedom	\$61,422	\$26,574	\$1,520,000	\$55,280	\$350,000	\$57,456	\$861,440	\$6,346,240	\$7,207,680
Woodland	\$65,456	\$28,320	\$1,100,000	\$63,070	\$350,000	\$60,809	\$1,112,250	\$7,636,070	\$8,748,320
Hopewell Jr.	\$74,357	\$32,171	\$2,300,000	\$649,769	\$120,000	\$66,517	\$667,820	\$2,905,920	\$3,573,740
Liberty Jr.	\$86,936	\$36,124	\$2,150,000	\$318,476	\$150,000	\$74,066	See Woodland		
West Freshman	\$182,387	\$78,910	\$1,450,000	\$566,489	\$125,000	\$109,383	\$2,364,240	\$18,587,200	\$20,951,440
District Totals	\$800,570	\$344,456	\$15,883,900	\$2,355,772	\$2,420,000	\$705,633	\$7,922,000	\$49,295,650	\$56,457,170

* Final option selected will impact net savings

* Cost elimination/avoidance will vary based on timing of MFP implemented and real time conditions that need addressed

* Land Value and Building Value is based of County Auditor and may not be reflective of actual commercial value

* Transportation costs are impacted by each option and in general considerations are as follows:

Option 1 - No change as structure remains the same

Option 2 - If freshman buildings are eliminated, continue to provide bus service to high school students?

Option 3 - General assumption is increased transportation costs for the shuttle service to shared high school building; however, few buildings may help offset some or all shuttle costs

Option 4 - General assumption is fewer buildings; more efficient routing; however, continue to provide busing to high school? Option to provide to 9-12?

* Staffing costs are impacted by each option and general considerations are as follows (can plan through natural attrition once plan selected):

Option 1 - No change as structure remains the same

Option 2 - Increased efficiencies in high school staffing (teachers and related services); **3** few buildings requiring fewer supports staff

Option 3 - Increased efficiencies in high school staffing (teachers and related services); **4** few buildings requiring fewer supports staff

Option 4 - Increased efficiencies in high school and junior school staffing (teachers and related services); **7** few buildings requiring fewer supports staff