

## **CABINET RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. Leave 6<sup>th</sup> Grade in Elementary Schools for Now; Open Skyline as an Elementary School in 2017-2018 and Seek Transitional Funding**
- 2. Relocate Current Skyline Programs and Seek Transitional Funding**
- 3. Seek Bond and Building Reserve Levies for:**
  - a. Longfellow and Roosevelt Replacement Schools**
  - b. Little Russell Transition**
  - c. GFHS Upgrade**
  - d. CMR Upgrades and Multipurpose Space**
  - e. Athletic Facility Upgrades**
  - f. Other K-8 Facility Upgrades**

## **I. Leave 6<sup>th</sup> Grade in Elementary Schools for Now; Open Skyline as a 16<sup>th</sup> Elementary School**

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW:**

- Prepare Skyline to return as an elementary school. See rationale below.
- Relocate the GFPS preschool programming to a location to be determined:
  - Newly purchased site;
  - West wing of PGEC; or
  - Regional sites while seeking a new combined location:
    - Longfellow Elementary Annex (two classrooms) with eventual new space built in the newly constructed Longfellow Elementary School
    - Chief Jo Elementary Annex (two classrooms)
    - Mountain View Elementary (two classrooms)
- End lease with Headstart at Skyline. Perhaps relocate with GFPS preschool to PGEC or newly purchased site with a new lease agreement.
- End lease with the MSU Extension Service with offer of PGEC location. PGEC could be desirable due to location, kitchen facilities, garden space, and programmatic interface with alternative high school programs.
- End lease with the Parent Participation Preschool.

### **RATIONALE:** It makes sense to consider this approach because:

- Skyline was originally designed as an elementary school when it was built in 1970. It is one of the District's newest buildings.
- Growth is happening on the westside. New housing developments are proposed in the Skyline area.
- Opening Skyline as the 16<sup>th</sup> elementary school, would necessitate boundary changes that would relieve the number of westside classrooms that exceed standards and allow for additional classroom space as well. Other boundary adjustments could be made at the same time throughout the city to reduce the number other classrooms that exceed standards.
- The new Roosevelt school can be built with a larger functional capacity than it currently has to add more classrooms in that part of the city in the potential near future.
- The disruption to current K-6 programs would be minimal. This eliminates the probable debate from the factions in our community that do not want 6<sup>th</sup> grades in middle schools. It allows for more focused discussions on the facility needs instead of programmatic needs.

- The functional capacities at the two middle schools have plenty of room for the larger 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade classes that are projected up to the 2020/2021 school year.
- Should the predicted enrollment increases not continue, it is easier to reduce the number of elementary schools than a 3<sup>rd</sup> middle school again.
- Should the enrollment increases continue or exceed predictions, discussions could begin regarding a 3<sup>rd</sup> middle school at that time.
- Timelines are doable. See timeline table.
- A 16<sup>th</sup> elementary school would result in another \$50,000 basic entitlement payment from the State.
- The purchase of a new site for preschool would provide space for the eventual expansion of preschool through the Preschool Expansion Grant and the potential expansion through Early Edge legislative action. If a new site can't be secured, then it should be recommended to include a preschool wing on the new Longfellow and Roosevelt sites that would be suitable for future expansion.

#### IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:

- Requires the continued study of opening a 3<sup>rd</sup> middle school in the future.
- Requires the relocation of the GFPS preschool and associated moving costs.
- Requires the termination of leases with Headstart, the MSU Extension Agency and the Parent Participation preschool. This will result in a loss of revenue.
- Purchasing a new building for the preschool requires a capital outlay and probable remodeling expenses.
- Relocation of preschool to PGEC requires some facility upgrades at PGEC which is an added expense.
- Relocation of preschool to regional sites requires:
  - The relocation of the Care Program and the Alliance for Youth from Chief Joseph Annex to PGEC as an option.
  - Requires room modifications to Longfellow and Chief Joseph Annexes.
  - Requires modifications to the storage space at Mountain View Elementary.
  - Moving expenses.
- Requires additional on-going funding for elementary school staffing which are significant.
- Requires change in boundaries for most elementary schools.
- Requires significant bussing and transportation modifications.
- Due to Skyline being repurposed into other educational configurations since its closure as an elementary school in 1979, it will require major renovations and new construction.

COST ESTIMATES:

• Skyline Upgrades:			
• Addition of gymnasium:		\$ 800,000	
• Drop off pick-up area for parents/students:		\$ 160,000	
• Carpet:		\$ 100,000	
• Addition and removal of interior walls (Includes electrical):		\$ 300,000	
• Fire Alarm upgrades:		\$ 60,000	
• Intercom:		\$ 30,000	
• Data:		\$ 50,000	
• Air Conditioning:		\$ 200,000	
TOTAL		\$1,700,000	
• Preschool Relocation:			
• Purchase, remodel and move to a new site		\$1,000,000	OR
• Remodel and relocate to PGEC			
Bathrooms, etc.		75,000	
Elevator & 2 Stair Lifts		\$ 375,000	
SUBTOTAL		\$ 450,000	OR
• Remodel and relocate to LF, CJ, MV		\$ 50,000	AND
• Lease revenue potential losses		\$ 59,000	
• New Elementary Staffing:			
• Principal		\$ 95,000	
• Administrative Assistant		\$ 35,000	
• Counselor/Music/Art/Library/PE		\$ 200,000	
• Classroom Teachers (12)		\$ 600,000	
• Custodians		\$ 50,000	
• Aides		\$ 40,000	
• Elementary Entitlement		(\$ 50,000)	
TOTAL		\$ 970,000	

TIMELINES:

<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>
Preschool site decision (Fall, 2015)	Complete preschool site upgrades (Fall, 2016)	August, 2017: Open Skyline Elementary School
Develop funding and public relations plan of attack (Fall, 2015)	Move preschool and open new preschool site (Winter, 2017)	Adjust boundaries and staffing depending on student needs
Hold levy elections as necessary (February, 2016?)	Finalize elementary boundary changes (Fall, 2017)	
Begin preschool site upgrades (Spring/Summer,2016)	Begin Skyline upgrades (Winter, 2017)	
	Complete Skyline upgrades (Spring, 2017)	
COMMUNICATION	COMMUNICATION	COMMUNICATION

## PROJECT ACTION A: Upgrade GFHS including infrastructure repairs

**PROJECT PURPOSE(S):** To improve the educational environment and safety:

- Address infrastructure needs in the areas of heating and ventilation (HVAC), electricity, & plumbing
- Address safety issues to include student/staff/public travel between the Main and South Campus
- Upgrade all learning spaces including Career and Technical Education (CTE) facilities
- Address parking and access concerns
- Increase natural lighting through a window replacement project

**PROJECT OVERVIEW:** Over a 5-year period, construction, refurbishing and remodeling will take place.

The following will be accomplished:

- A new heating and ventilation system will be installed and commissioned.
- Replacement of electrical receptacles, circuits and breakers throughout the building.
- Replacement of pipes, sinks, toilets and water fountains throughout the building.
- Remodel of classrooms in conjunction with the HVAC, electrical and plumbing upgrades
- Construction of a connector between the Main Campus and South Campus.
- Construction of a new Career and Technical Education (CTE) facility to be located...
- Develop new parking areas
- Provide support and matching funds for community effort for new windows

**PROJECT RATIONALE:** As the public indicated that they preferred to upgrade GFHS instead of building a new high school, the scope of the work is large but necessary.

- It makes sense to upgrade HVAC, electricity and plumbing to ensure:
  - A comfortable learning environment
  - Efficient and cost effective ways of heating the buildings
  - Adequate electrical infrastructure for modern technology and electrical needs
  - Water and toilets are available to building inhabitants
- It makes sense to remodel classrooms as the HVAC, electrical and plumbing upgrades happen:
  - Access to these items will necessitate some destruction of current walls, cabinets, etc.
  - This will modernize classrooms and make them viable for years to come
- It makes sense to build a connector between the two buildings because:
  - There are safety needs that must be addressed
    - The passage between the two buildings from November through March at times can be treacherous due to the slope, northside shading and the propensity for ice accumulation.
  - There are student and public flow needs that need to be addressed
    - Due to the use of the facility for a variety of reasons, the flow between the two buildings should be easier and more comfortable
    - The handicapped accessibility needs to be improved to both buildings
- It makes sense to build a new CTE facility because:
  - Current building space is inadequate for current program needs, i.e welding and metals manufacturing, construction technology program, etc.
  - The current facility does not allow for flexibility of programmatic changes as workforce training demands change
  - The existing building construction is of poor quality
  - There is inadequate project and material storage space
- It makes sense to establish additional parking because:
  - The availability of parking is inadequate and estimated at 310 spaces short of what is needed
  - Special event parking is especially problematic
  - Will increase the safety of students, staff, neighbors and visitors

**GFHS PROJECT IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:**

- Updating a building listed on the Historical Register is expensive
- Historical preservation will need to be evaluated and considered for all projects
- Work will need to be phased to ensure the least amount of disruption during the school year
- Requires a plan for temporary student locations during construction
- To do all projects, will need other sources of funding. For example, window replacement via private donations is assumed. This plan assumes there will be private donations for some projects.

**GFHS PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES:**

Before Bond Passage:	Immediately After Bond Passage:	After Plan Approval:				
		Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Refine plan	RFP & selection of an Owners' Representative	Connector		CTE Building		Parking
Detail and finalize the estimates for renovation	Process for architect selection	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC
Detail the logistics for the safety /security and proper learning environment for students during construction.	Architect selection	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing
	Plan development	Electricity	Electricity	Electricity	Electricity	Electricity
	Plan approval	Classroom upgrades/ Technology	Classroom upgrades/ Technology	Classroom upgrades/ Technology	Classroom upgrades/ Technology	Classroom upgrades/ Technology

**GFHS PROJECT COST ESTIMATES:**

Infrastructure Repair & Updates:	Costs
HVAC	\$6,360,179
Electrical	\$3,500,000
Plumbing	\$552,000
Sidewalks	\$50,000
Doors and Locks	\$60,360
Roof	\$625,000
Windows	\$1,000,000
Technology	\$3,520,000
Classrooms	\$10,080,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$25,747,539</b>
<b>Other:</b>	
Connector	\$7,000,000
CTE	\$5,200,000
Parking	\$975,000
Temp Locations	\$850,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$39,772,539</b>

## PROJECT ACTION B: Upgrade CMR including infrastructure repairs and construct a multipurpose space

### PROJECT PURPOSE(S):

- Address the infrastructure, safety and technology needs of a 50-year old building
- Provide additional space for student activities and community access that are part of GFPS comprehensive educational programming

**PROJECT OVERVIEW:** Over a 5-year period, construction, refurbishing and remodeling will take place. The following will be accomplished:

- Upgrades in the heating and ventilation system will be completed and commissioned.
- Replacement of pipes, valves and pumps throughout the building.
- Construction of a two-story multipurpose space to include an athletic practice facility.
  - Located on the southwest side of the current gym structure
  - Connected to current gym for shared access to locker rooms, etc.
- Upgrade current fire alarm system
- Fix foundation issues that have arisen due to the building settling.
- Refurbish track and practice football area
- Upgrade technology infrastructure
- Cement work surrounding the campus
- Replacement of plastic panels around windows

**PROJECT RATIONALE:** As CMR celebrates its 50<sup>th</sup> birthday, it is time to upgrade

- It makes sense to upgrade HVAC and plumbing to ensure:
  - A comfortable learning environment
  - Efficient and cost effective ways of heating the buildings
  - Water and toilets are available to building inhabitants
- It makes sense to upgrade the fire alarm system to bring the building up to current safety expectations
- It makes sense to fix foundation and cement issues to repair current problems and prevent further issues associated with settlement
- It makes sense to repair/replace the elevator to comply with ADA specifications. Future repairs will only become more costly.
- It makes sense to build a multi-purpose learning space because:
  - Gym practice space is minimal and in dire need (some teams practice at West)
  - Visitor gathering area and concessions area inadequate
  - Inadequate Wrestling practice area
  - Inadequate/antiquated weight and workout facilities for AA competition

### PROJECT IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:

- Safety and Security issues during construction
- Maintaining an instructional environment during construction
- Upgrades and renovations are expensive and sometimes uncover unknowns
- Comparability with other AA school environments

**CMR PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES:**

Before Bond Passage:	Immediately After Bond Passage:	After Plan Approval:				
		Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Refine plan	RFP & selection of an Owners' Representative	Fire Alarms	Build Multipurpose Space	Elevator	Foundation & Cement	
	Process for architect selection	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC	HVAC
	Architect selection	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing	Plumbing
	Plan development					
	Plan approval					

**CMR PROJECT COST ESTIMATES:**

<b>Infrastructure Repair &amp; Updates:</b>	<b>Cost</b>
HVAC	\$53,864
Plumbing	\$250,000
Fire alarm	\$300,000
Elevator Repair	\$200,000
Doors/Locks	\$125,000
Foundation repairs	\$1,048,171
Windows	\$40,000
Sidewalks	\$60,000
Water main replacement	\$100,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$2,177,035</b>
<b>Other:</b>	
Multi-purpose space	\$5,750,000
CMR track and field upgrades	\$250,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,177,035</b>



## PROJECT ACTION C: **Replace Roosevelt with new construction on current Lowell site**

### PROJECT PURPOSE(S):

- Construct a modern elementary school to replace an 86-year old building in a safer location

### PROJECT OVERVIEW:

- Upgrade Little Russell (2615 Central Ave. W.)
  - Fix sewer
  - Upgrade boiler that is original to building
  - Install ductwork for ventilation required for paint and carpentry shop
  - Update restroom facilities
  - Upgrade phone system
  - Create office spaces
  - Build a steel building – 80' x 180'
- Relocate current programs and departments housed at Lowell (3117 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.) to Little Russell
- Relocate Buildings and Grounds (B&G) located at the District Office Building (DOB) to Little Russell
- Upgrade current B&G space at the DOB to accommodate Environmental Education & Technology
  - 3 spaces for Environmental Education (1 instruction, 2 supply and storage)
  - 2 spaces for staging and supply/storage space for Technology
- Relocate Environmental Ed and Technology to the new DOB spaces
- Demolish Lowell
- Construct a new school on the 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. property

### PROJECT RATIONALE:

- It makes sense to build a replacement building for Roosevelt.
  - It is 87 years old and its infrastructure is suffering from age. A very conservative estimate of repairs that need to be done in the next 10 years is over \$1M with more anticipated to include major plumbing and structural fixes.
  - It is not a viable educational building for another 50 years.
  - The location of Roosevelt, surrounded by 3 heavily trafficked one-ways, is less than ideal. There are safety issues for students and parents due to the traffic.
  - Enrollment is projected to slightly increase and this northside neighborhood has affordable housing which leads to predictions that this will continue to be a family-oriented area.
  - Annual operational savings will occur because the building will include many modern energy saving measures.
- It makes sense to build the replacement building at Lowell.
  - The District already owns the property.
  - Relocation of current departments and programs at Lowell is possible.
  - It is only 9 blocks between the two sites so it is still within the neighborhood.
- It makes sense to relocate all B&G departments to Little Russell.
  - Better coordination of efforts
  - The amount of space available is conducive to this department's needs.
- It makes sense to relocate Environmental Education & Technology to the DOB.
  - Both programs require significant numbers of items to be run through the warehouse and then trucked to either Lowell or Little Russell. With this configuration, the amount of trucking required would be significantly reduced. This is a cost savings.
  - This would put both programs with the rest of their departments which allows for better coordination of efforts.

**ROOSEVELT PROJECT IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:**

- Little Russell is not centrally located so there will be travel time from the westside to eastside. This can be mitigated by proper dispatching.
- Boundaries may need to be reviewed and there may be bussing/transportation implications.
- Will require passage of a bond/building reserve levy.
- Preschool opportunities should be considered.

**ROOSEVELT PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES:**

Before Bond Passage:	Immediately After Bond Passage:	After Plan Approval:				
		Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Refine plan	RFP & selection of an Owners' Representative	Upgrade Little Russell	Demolish Lowell	Relocate students to new school		
Communicate the plan	Process for architect selection	Upgrade DOB B&G site	Construct new Roosevelt School	New Roosevelt School opens		
Board action	Architect selection	Relocate B&G to Little Russell		Begin process for surplus Roosevelt		
	Plan development	Relocate Tech and Environmental Ed to DOB		Advertise Roosevelt as for sale		
	Plan approval					
	Begin state process for opening a new school					

**ROOSEVELT PROJECT COST ESTIMATES AND PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES:**

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| • Costs associated with Little Russell reconfiguration - \$1,000,000                | Building Reserve Levy |
| • Costs associated with DOB B&G change to Environmental Ed & Technology - \$200,000 | Building Reserve Levy |
| • Demolition of Lowell and construction of new school - \$15M                       | Bond Levy             |
| • Moving expenses – TBD   | Existing Sources      |

TOTAL

\$16.2M

## **PROJECT ACTION D: Replace Longfellow with new construction on current site (1100 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.)**

### **PROJECT PURPOSE(S):**

- Construct a modern elementary school to replace an 62-year old building with considerable structural concerns

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW:**

- Relocate Longfellow students to:
  - Option 1: Roosevelt Elementary once they have moved to new school
  - Option 2: Put Longfellow into the new school until the new Longfellow is built
- Demolish current building
- Construct a new school on the same Longfellow site
- Native American Library relocation from Paris Gibson to Longfellow

### **PROJECT RATIONALE:**

- It makes sense to build a replacement building for Longfellow.
  - It is 62 years old and its infrastructure is suffering from age and from structural issues caused by an unstable foundation. A very conservative estimate of repairs that need to be done in the next 10 years is over \$2.3M with little confidence that the repairs will fix the foundational issues.
  - It is not a viable educational building for another 50 years.
  - The location of Longfellow is strategic. It serves a low-income neighborhood and is easily accessible on foot or by public transportation. It serves as a “community center” for this neighborhood.
  - Enrollment is projected to increase and this southside neighborhood has low-income housing which leads to predictions that this will continue to be a family-oriented area.
- It makes sense to build the replacement building on its current site.
  - The District already owns the property.
  - Modern engineering can solve the foundational issues that exist.
  - With the right design, an even better community center concept could be built.
  - With a cultural center emphasis (Native American Library), grants may be available.
  - Annual operational savings will occur because the building will include many modern energy saving measures.

### **PROJECT IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:**

- Timing would require the relocation of the entire school to a different location while the new school is built. There is not enough lot space to build and have school in the current building.
  - Transportation will be an issue during this phase.
- Boundaries may need to be reviewed.
- Will require passage of a bond/building reserve levy.
- Headstart and preschool opportunities should be considered.

**LONGFELLOW PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES:**

Before Bond Passage:	Immediately After Bond Passage:	After Plan Approval:				
		Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Refine plan	RFP & selection of an Owners' Representative	Upgrade Little Russell	Demolish Lowell	New Roosevelt School opens	Complete construction on Longfellow School	New Longfellow School opens
Communicate plan	Process for architect selection	Upgrade DOB B&G site	Construct Roosevelt School	Relocate Longfellow students and staff		Move Native American Library
Communication with current partners (Headstart, etc.)	Architect selection	Relocate B&G to Little Russell		Provide transportation to new location		
Board action	Plan development	Relocate Tech and Environmental Ed to DOB		Demolish current building		
	Plan approval			Begin construction on Longfellow School		
				Begin process for surplusung Roosevelt		
				Advertise Roosevelt as for sale		

**LONGFELLOW PROJECT COST ESTIMATES AND PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES:**

- Demolition of Longfellow and construction of new school - \$15M
- Moving expenses

Bond Levy  
Existing Resources

**TOTAL**

**\$15M**

## PROJECT ACTION E: Upgrade infrastructure in all K-8 buildings (except Longfellow and Roosevelt) and PGEC

### PROJECT PURPOSE(S):

- Address infrastructure needs in these areas depending on the needs of the schools
- In order to be compliant with the American Disabilities Act, install elevator and/or stairwell lifts so students, staff and the public with disabilities can access all levels.

**PROJECT OVERVIEW:** See SmartSheets

### PROJECT COST ESTIMATES AND PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES:

All from bond/building reserve levy:

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Elementary (excluding Roosevelt and Longfellow): | \$6,373,347 |
| • NMS & EMS:                                       | \$4,976,244 |
| • PGEC:  | \$2,135,712 |

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,485,303</b>
--------------	---------------------

## **PROJECT ACTION F: Athletic Facilities Upgrades**

### **PROJECT PURPOSE(S):**

- Address the need for upgrades and repairs to District athletic facilities

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW:**

- Install artificial turf on memorial field
- Resurface the Memorial Stadium track
- Renovate and resurface the CMR High School Tennis Courts

### **PROJECT RATIONALE:**

- Artificial turf offers:
  - Lower maintenance costs
  - No pesticides or fertilizers
  - Fewer injuries
  - Water savings
  - Increased playing time and field access
  - Eliminates the need for periodic “Crowning” of natural field surface (expensive)
- It makes sense that the Memorial track would be resurfaced at the same time that the field is being renovated due to the extensive nature of that construction.
- The track needs to be periodically resurfaced due to:
  - The heavy use and wear over time
  - Freezing and thawing effects the subsurface and overcoat layers
- The CMR Tennis courts are also susceptible to extensive freezing and thawing and heavy use. The fencing around the courts is in ill-repair as well. Therefore, they need to be renovated in the very near future.

### **PROJECT IMPACTS AND/OR CONSEQUENCES:**

- The timing of the construction of memorial field would be crucial for football season. If the construction began as soon as the spring track season ended, the field would be complete for the fall football season.
- If artificial turf is not installed, the surface needs to be crowned in the near future.
- The proposed upgrades will provide improved opportunities for both high schools and extended access by the community for Memorial field use.
- The proposed projects can be partially paid for by reserve funds that the district is currently holding. However, the remaining costs will require passage of a bond/building reserve levy.

**ATHLETIC PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES:**

Before Bond Passage:	Immediately After Bond Passage:	After Plan Approval: *				
		Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
Refine plan	RFP & selection of an Owners' Representative	Renovation of CMR Tennis Courts	Install artificial turf and renovation of track in Memorial Stadium			
Communicate plan	Process for architect selection					
	Architect selection					
	Plan development					
	Plan approval					

**ATHLETIC PROJECT COST ESTIMATES AND PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES:**

Area	Cost
Artificial turf Memorial Stadium	\$800,000
Track upgrades at Memorial Stadium	\$225,000
CMR tennis court renovation	\$180,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,205,000</b>

**Sources of Funding:**

**Existing Reserve Funds:**

\$300,000 Revenue Enhancement Fund  
 \$200,000 Facility Upgrade  
 \$500,000 Total Reserves

**Bond or Building Reserve Levy:**

\$705,000

**CABINET PROPOSAL SUBTOTALS: All to be funded through bond and building reserve levies, elementary and high school:**

**ADDRESSING INCREASING ENROLLMENT**

Leave 6th Grade in Elementary Schools for Now; Open Skyline as a 16th Elementary School	\$1,700,000
Staffing costs	\$ 970,000
Lease revenue loss	\$ 59,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$2,729,000</b>

Relocate Preschool

**OPTIONS:**

- |   |              |    |
|---|--------------|----|
| 1. Purchase new building for preschool          | \$ 1,000,000 | OR |
| 2. Paris Gibson West Wing Conversion & Elevator | \$ 450,000   | OR |
| 3. Regional at LF, CJ, MV                       | \$ 50,000    |    |

**Subtotal** **\$50 K - \$1M**

**ADDRESSING BUILDING STATUS CONCERNS:**

GFHS Updates	\$39,772,539
CMR Updates and Multipurpose Space	\$ 8,177,035
New Roosevelt	\$16,200,000
New Longfellow	\$15,000,000
K-8, PGEC Infrastructure	\$13,485,303
Athletic Facility Upgrades	\$ 705,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$93,339,877</b>

**TOTAL** **\$96,118,877 - \$97,068,877**

**Levy Recommendation:**

Cabinet recommends determining which of the components of the above items would be appropriate for a building reserve levy and which would be appropriate for a bond levy for each district. One major criterion includes the predicted length-of-life of the item. An item that will not still be in use in 20 years should not be included in the bond levy as it will take 20 years to pay off the bond.

After the funding buckets for the components are determined, predicted costs of all items must be verified. It is recommended that an RFP go out for an owner's representative/consultant to do this process.

Once costs are verified, the Board takes action for elementary and high school bond and reserve levies to be run simultaneously in February, 2016. The ballot would have 4 questions: elementary building reserve, high school building reserve, elementary bond and high school bond. Cabinet provides this rationale for doing this simultaneously:

- We feel we can more fully tell the story of the facility needs. If the levies were to be chunked into the building reserve first for example, we would still have to talk about an upcoming bond levy as all the components really do fit together. We feel that it would be confusing to the public and could be construed as "you're only telling us part of the story so you can come back and ask for more". We think it would be better to ask for it all: make a compelling case and see what happens.
- These levies can be run again. If one of the four pieces were to fail for example, that piece can be presented again with more focused messaging.



**Future Planning:**

Cabinet also recommends that with the successful passage of the bond and reserve levies, the Board and Cabinet continue to engage around enrollment trends and the aging facility issues. It is suggested that the consultant hired as noted above would lead the district through this process using the background information gleaned from this current process. It is suggested that a plan be developed to continue to address the district's facility needs.