

October 19, 2026
Board Questions and Responses
[Regular Meeting - Oct 19 2026 - Agenda - Pdf.pdf](#)

Agenda Item G.1 - District's Long-Term Financial Sustainability

I would like a comprehensive, school-by-school financial analysis identifying the fully loaded annual operating cost of each facility, not just those proposed for consolidation.

This analysis should extend beyond traditional facilities expenses to include all costs associated with operating each school and educating its students.

The following workbooks provide school-level cost information for the years indicated:

[School Cost Projections FY 26-27.xlsx](#)- This is spend projections and 9.8.26 enrollment data

Note – the two historical files for 24-25 and 25-26 include comprehensive full-year actual spend including staffing plan costs:

- [School Costs FY25-26.xlsx](#)- Updated data with FY26 actual costs and student counts.
- [School Costs FY24-25.xlsx](#)- Initial work by team finance in fall/winter FY25 to understand the cost of each school and cost per student.
- [Summary of Staffing Plan Costs.xlsx](#)- This file includes summarized **staffing plan** spend information. It also projects the possible position reductions that lead to an anticipated \$8.5 million in staffing plan savings.

Something important to note is that costs associated with operating each specific school site are not the primary criterion we used to make decisions around closures and consolidations. Sites with more students cost the district more in total dollars, but they cost less per pupil. Running low-capacity schools creates higher per pupil costs and inefficient use of resources, in addition to limits on the opportunities and experiences for students.

The cost per school was not the only factor we considered in school consolidations. There were four primary factors that drove decisions:

- Current Student Enrollment
- Enrollment trends
- Building size, capacity/usage and condition
- Physical location of building and safe walking path to school

Other factors taken into consideration:

- Student outcomes
- Unique program offerings (e.g., Montessori)
- Student demographics and needs at each site
- Historic retention/transfer data
- Distance students travel to school
- Number of school options nearby
- Physical barriers that impact walking safety (railroad tracks, highways, geographic features)

This analysis should extend beyond traditional facilities expenses to include all costs associated with operating each school and educating its students, including:

- Personnel: Salaries, benefits, instructional staff, paraprofessionals, administration, support personnel, and contracted services. -

Personnel expenditures are included in the following school-cost workbooks:

- [School Costs FY24-25.xlsx](#)
- [School Costs FY25-26.xlsx](#)
- [School Cost Projections FY 26-27.xlsx](#)
- Curriculum and Instruction: Textbooks, instructional materials, classroom supplies, assessments, intervention programs, and curriculum licenses.

These costs traditionally come from bond funds and will predominantly remain the same:

- The majority of curriculum, instruction, and technology costs are allocated per pupil (i.e. you have 20 students so you need 20 workbooks). However, some costs are allocated by classroom (i.e. display boards, routers). In either case, the majority of costs here would follow students or teachers to new classrooms.

Technology: Student and staff devices, instructional software, technology subscriptions, network infrastructure, maintenance, cybersecurity, and technical support.

- Same rationale as above: The majority of curriculum, instruction, and technology costs are allocated per pupil (i.e. you have 20 students, so you need 20 workbooks). However, some costs are allocated by classroom (i.e. display boards, routers). In either case, the majority of costs here would follow students or teachers to new classrooms.

**Curriculum and technology spend for these items come from bond funds and are not necessarily allocated by school site.*

Student Services: Special education, counseling, nursing, mental health services, gifted and talented programming, and other student support programs.

- Counselors, nurses, and GT Teachers are allocated according to the staffing plan
- Mental Health Services are a shared cost across the district
- Special Education staff are allocated based on the number of students served. Given that this plan assumes we retain all students, there is minimal impact on staff anticipated and all materials would still be necessary.
- Facilities and Operations: Utilities, custodial services, building maintenance, groundskeeping, repairs, insurance, safety, security, and facility-related contracts.

Facilities and operations expenditures are included in the following school-cost workbooks:

- [School Costs FY24-25.xlsx](#)
- [School Costs FY25-26.xlsx](#)
- [School Cost Projections FY 26-27.xlsx](#)
- Transportation and Nutrition: School-specific transportation expenses, food services, cafeteria operations, and associated personnel.
 - Child Nutrition expenses are included in the above workbooks
 - We do not track transportation expenses by school site. What we can tell you is that last year we spent \$16.6mm. in FY26. Of this \$11.7mm is salaries and benefits, \$4.9 is nonsalary costs like fuel, repairs/maintenance, parts, tires, and supplies. The transportation budget this year is \$14.65mm (we receive \$1.1mm from the state to fund our student transportation)

However, I can share that the following regarding transportation that may be helpful:

- The District is working with Hop Skip Drive to model out transportation for next year based on proposed school closures and consolidations.
- At this time, it appears that there will be a need to add additional routes for elementary schools. As we move forward, the District will be able to refine how many routes, opposed to a range that we have currently.

However, travel time for students will remain about the same or slightly decrease.

- The district is considering having parents sign up for transportation services, as it will help with routing and placement of bus stops to be more in line with need.
 - Also, the District is looking at changing start times for schools to help with elementary transportation and walkers.
 - The District is working with the City and community partners to address walk hazards for students, leveraging resources such as crossing guards, walking school bus, signage, MTTA, etc.).
-
- Capital and Deferred Maintenance: Anticipated facility improvements, major equipment replacements, deferred maintenance obligations, and projected capital needs.

Site-level bond and building expenditures for FY 25-26 are available below:

[Bond Funds by Site FY25-26.xlsx](#)

[Building Fund - FUND 21 FY25-26.xlsx](#)

For each school, I would like the analysis to identify the actual annual expenditures, funding sources, gross building square footage, student enrollment, building capacity, and utilization rate.

Most importantly, I would like four comparative financial measures provided for every school:

The School Costs FY24-25, 25-26, 26-27 workbooks above contain school-level cost and enrollment information, including the comparative measures identified below. Please refer to the individual workbooks for the specific fields and fiscal-year data available in each.

1. Total operating cost per square foot: The fully loaded annual cost of operating the school and providing educational services, including appropriate districtwide allocations.
2. Total operating cost per student: The fully loaded annual expenditure divided by student enrollment.
3. Building utilization: Current enrollment compared with the building's functional student capacity.
4. Net avoidable operating costs: The actual recurring expenditures that would be eliminated through consolidation, after accounting for costs transferred to receiving schools, additional expenses created by consolidation, and continuing obligations associated with vacated facilities.

The [Operations Costs Predictor.xlsx](#) contains estimates related to this measure.

I would also like to distinguish direct school expenditures from centrally allocated expenses, as well as restricted funding from unrestricted General Fund expenditures. Where possible, please provide three years of actual expenditure data, the current fiscal-year budget, and a three-year forecast.

[Central Services Site Proportional Amts.xlsx](#) This sheet is helpful in understanding all of central services spend such as bus drivers, mental health professionals, finance, HR, data analysis, etc. However, these costs are not comprehensively charged to school costs workbooks, but are critical to supporting student learning and operation of schools.

The school-cost workbooks provide information for FY25, FY26, and projected FY27 data as described above. The materials identified in this response include school-level expenditures and certain projections; however, those workbooks are not exhaustive of every expenditure in the District. Information provided here does not establish that every requested distinction—particularly direct versus centrally allocated costs, restricted versus unrestricted funding, and a complete three-year forecast—is available for every school.

For schools proposed for consolidation, this analysis should include the receiving schools and identify projected changes in staffing, instructional resources, transportation, facility expenses, and other operating costs. It should also differentiate one-time transition expenses from recurring savings and establish when those savings are expected to be realized.

The [Operations Costs Predictor.xlsx](#) workbook provides estimates related to the operating-cost impacts of consolidation. The materials summarized here identify immediate and long-term savings, however, they do not encompass all receiving-school impacts or one-time transition costs.

As a Board Member, I need to understand not only which buildings are more expensive to maintain or which schools have higher operating costs, but also whether consolidation produces measurable, sustainable General Fund savings without compromising the educational services provided to students.

The District recognizes the importance of evaluating both the financial impact of consolidation and the continued delivery of educational services. As noted above, operating cost was not a primary criterion in developing the recommendations; enrollment, enrollment trends, building capacity and condition, student outcomes, program offerings, student needs, travel distances, identify nearby school options, and walking safety were also considered. The Operations Costs Predictor.xlsx workbook provides estimates of operating-cost impacts, while the school-cost workbooks provide comparative cost information.

I recognize this is a comprehensive request, but having consistent financial measures across our schools would provide greater clarity in evaluating the recommendations before us and help establish a more transparent framework for future facilities and financial planning.

We agree that consistent financial measures can support informed evaluation of the current recommendations and strengthen future facilities and financial planning. The workbooks referenced above provide the available school-level cost information and related estimates.

Bond Allocations and Project Status: Springdale and Sequoyah

It would be helpful to see a school-by-school accounting of the 2021 bond funding proposed and allocated for Springdale and Sequoyah elementary schools. I would appreciate the following information for each site:

1. **Original commitments:** The projects and funding amounts initially proposed for each school, including the ballot initiative language and any project lists or supporting materials presented to voters.

The initial proposition information for Springdale and Sequoyah is included in [Springdale and Sequoyah 2021 Bond.xlsx](#). The original proposition language and project information for the overall

2021 bond are available in [2021 Props with Projects.xlsx](#). The amounts identified for each site in planning materials are planning estimates, not fixed commitments; actual costs may vary as project scope and pricing change over time. No recommendations were made to change the 2021 bond projects at these sites.

2. **Completed work:** A description of the work completed, completion dates, and actual expenditures.

Actual expenditures can be found in the [Springdale and Sequoyah 2021 Bond.xlsx](#) document. The details of work completed and completion dates are forthcoming.

3. **Outstanding work:** Any projects that remain pending, partially completed, deferred, or canceled, along with their original budgets, remaining funding, and anticipated timelines.

The major remaining 2021 bond project identified for Sequoyah is its renovation, which is currently on hold pending the Board's decision regarding the District's consolidation recommendation. If the Board does not approve the District's recommendation to close Sequoyah, the project is expected to proceed to the City for permitting, with construction planned for summer 2027.

4. **Funding changes:** Whether any 2021 bond funding originally identified for either school was subsequently reduced, redirected, or reallocated. Please identify the amounts, the projects or sites that received those funds, and the reasons for each change.

No funds identified for Springdale or Sequoyah were redirected or reallocated. Some bond dollar allocations are based on student enrollment and are adjusted accordingly.

5. **Oversight and authorization:** Whether the Bond Oversight Committee recommended or approved any such changes, and which body or official ultimately authorized them. Please include relevant committee minutes, Board actions, and supporting documentation.

No changes to the Springdale or Sequoyah projects were brought to the Bond Oversight Committee for consideration for changes.

Please distinguish between commitments included in the voter-approved ballot language and allocations identified in accompanying planning materials. If no specific funding was proposed or allocated for either school, please confirm that as well.

The voter-approved proposition language and supporting project materials are available in [2021 Props with Projects.xlsx](#) and [Springdale and Sequoyah 2021 Bond.xlsx](#). The site-level amounts in the planning materials should be understood as planning estimates rather than fixed commitments, as project scope and pricing can change. No funds identified for these sites were redirected or reallocated.

A side-by-side summary for the two schools, accompanied by the underlying records, would help me understand what was proposed, what has been delivered, and what remains outstanding.

The referenced Springdale and Sequoyah 2021 Bond.xlsx and 2021 Props with Projects.xlsx files provide the initial proposition and project information. Site-level bond and Building Fund expenditure records are also available in BOND FUNDS BY SITE FY25–26.xlsx and Building Fund – Fund 21 FY25–26.xlsx. Together, these records can be used to compare planned projects, expenditures to date, and remaining work.

The Sequoyah site has several ADA compliance concerns, HVAC and building management upgrades that need to be addressed. Additionally, increased enrollment could intensify traffic and parking congestion creating additional safety risks. Poor drainage and tree roots are contributing to foundation movement, potentially affecting structural integrity.

The Springdale site sits on the corner of East Pine and North Lewis Ave. The direct frontage on Pine Street has heavy traffic congestion and has been a point of prior accidents involving students creating a safety concern. The site has inadequate parking with little teacher parking, no visitor parking and no practical room for future expansion. There are foundational issues for the facility and persistent water intrusion creating electrical and mechanical problems.

The Dolores Huerta site has limited parking, insufficient staff parking and limited visitor parking. The neighborhood association has indicated that the District needs to discontinue using the pool parking lot for parent drop-off/pick-up and for buses. Eliminating the use of this parking area would shift additional traffic onto surrounding streets which would intensify with increased enrollment. To accommodate additional students, the school would likely require a building addition, expansion and/or extensive modification to provide adequate space for music, art, special education, specialized instruction, intervention services, and staff workspaces.

[TPS BUILDING INFO](#) document may be helpful to you to understand building details and timeline of major investments.

Information previously provided to the Board is below and included here for easy reference.

Board Q&A for easy reference: [October 5, 2026 - Board Qs/Response Final](#)

Board Q&A for easy reference: [September 21, 2026 - Board Qs/Response Final](#)

[Admin Cost Explanation.pdf](#)

[Letter to SPED Families](#)

[Outreach to Spanish-speaking Community](#)

[9.21.26 District School Closures Articles.pdf](#)

[Leon Co. Schools Considers \\$30M Loan.docx](#)

[District Planning FAQ on website](#)

[District website planning page - timeline, FAQ, surveys and more!](#) - Note: there is also a high-resolution boundary map linked on this page as of this week, and it is an attachment to the October 19 agenda item.