

Committee Findings Report

Meeting Title: Citizens Steering Committee
District Master Planning
Marshall Public Schools

Date: October 9, 2006



1. Committee Findings Overview

- The committee has successfully reviewed and prioritized the June 12, 2006 Facility Needs Assessment produced by Kingscott Associates for the Marshall Public Schools per the Board of Education request.
- The original FNA Report indicated a total of \$76.7 million in identified improvements for the District's Facilities.
- The Committee has reached consensus that of the \$76.7 originally identified cost; at least \$51.6 million of the costs were rated as a High or Immediate Priority.
- Of the identified Immediate Priority items, a total prioritized cost of \$34.0 million was compiled from the High School Facility alone.
- The committee created an additional Guiding Principle for use in the prioritization effort as follows: "The solution must be supported by the community and reflect its desires for its students and their educational future."

2. Categories of the FNA Report reviewed by the Committee

- The Committee worked primarily at the FNA main category level, and in order to develop further prioritization, the committee reviewed information prepared by Kingscott that subdivided main categories into sub-categories. Main Categories reviewed are as follows:
 - a. Health / Safety / Code Requirements / ADA Compliance
 - b. Life Cycle Costs
 - c. Energy Savings
 - d. Technology
 - e. Owner Expressed Needs
- Explanations of the main category components were identified in the Introduction section of the FNA Report.

3. Sub-Categories of the Health / Safety / Code Requirements / ADA Compliance Category

- The committee identified safety of the students and staff of the district as a prime necessity in the overall prioritization tasks. This main category was viewed as the most critical of all categories. (see *Categorized Needs review sheets included in section 4 of this report*)
- The committee reviewed and prioritized sub-categories for this FNA main category as follows in the order of prioritization:
 - a. ADA Compliance (*highest priority*)
 - b. Life Safety Systems
 - c. Hazardous Materials
 - d. Building Components
 - e. Utilities and Systems
 - f. Sitework and Playgrounds (*lowest priority*)

- The committee prioritized all facilities costs from the FNA identified in this main category, but also identified a facility prioritization list as follows:
 - a. High School (*to be addressed first*)
 - b. Middle School
 - c. Gordon Elementary
 - d. Hughes Elementary
 - e. Shearman Building
 - f. Walters Elementary (*newest facility with the least amount of need*)
 - g. Proposed New Transportation Facility (*no identified costs in this category, as the building does not yet exist*)

4. Sub-Categories of the Life Cycle Category

- The committee reviewed and prioritized sub-categories from the original FNA report as follows: (*see Categorized Needs review sheets included in section 4 of this report*)
 - a. Educational Improvement
 - b. Environmental Improvement
 - d. General Material Upgrade
- Items included in sub-category c. “Aesthetic Improvement” were removed by the prioritization process.
- Across all buildings, projects identified at the High School and Middle School were identified as high or immediate priority.

5. Sub-Categories of the Energy Savings Category

- The committee reviewed and prioritized sub-categories from the original FNA report as follows: (*see Categorized Needs review sheets included in section 4 of this report*)
 - a. 0 – 10 Year Investment Return
 - b. 10 Year Plus Investment Return
- Items included in sub-category c. “Upgrade or Added Feature” were removed by the prioritization process.
- Across all buildings, projects identified at the High School and Middle School were identified as high or immediate priority.

6. Sub-Categories of the Technology Category

- The committee reviewed and prioritized sub-categories for this FNA main category as follows in the order of prioritization: (*see Categorized Needs review sheets included in section 4 of this report*)
 - a. Infrastructure (*highest priority*)
 - b. Educational Delivery
 - c. Student Achievement
 - d. District Hardware
 - e. Security
 - f. Communications (*lowest priority*)
- It was suggested that there were operational as well as cost efficiencies to benefit the district if the technology category was reviewed with all facilities inclusive (*the prioritization cost statements from above include only technology prioritizations identified at the High School*)

- The committee prioritized all facilities costs from the FNA identified in this main category, but also identified a facility prioritization list as follows:
 - a. High School (*to be addressed first*)
 - b. Middle School
 - c. Gordon Elementary
 - d. Hughes Elementary
 - e. Shearman Building
 - f. Walters Elementary (*newest facility with the least amount of need*)
 - g. Proposed New Transportation Facility (*no identified costs in this category, as the building does not yet exist*)

7. Review / Prioritization of the Owner expressed Needs Category

- The committee further explored these items and prioritized the provided potential solutions of the “Owner Expressed Needs” category from the original FNA report as follows: (*see Owner Needs supplemental information review sheets included in section 4 of this report*)
 - a. HS 1st & 2nd Floor Classrooms – baseline plus option B
 - b. HS Media Center and Building Central Administration area – baseline costs plus option B
 - c. HS Vocational Technology Classrooms – baseline plus option C
 - d. HS Kitchen & Cafeteria – baseline plus option A
 - e. HS Auditorium – baseline plus option A
 - f. HS Building Entries Addition – baseline plus option A
 - g. MS Media Center– baseline costs plus the addition of the TV Studio remodeling.
 - h. MS Auditorium – Baseline plus option A
 - i. Additional Classrooms at Gordon Elementary – baseline costs only
 - j. New Transportation Facility – the committee deferred recommendation on this item and requested the District provide further information on the past agreements with the City of Marshall.

8. Review of Funding Options

- The committee reviewed the opportunity for the District to apply revenues from the Sinking Fund (*recently approved by the Citizens of Marshall – Thank you Citizens!*) to some of the FNA Needs. It was reviewed that the sinking fund will generate approximately \$400,000 annually which cannot support the level of work identified in the FNA Report.
- Possible Bond Scenarios were reviewed by the committee, and their financial impact to the average property owner within the District.
- Options ranged from \$7.9 million (no tax increase) to 40 million (2.55 mill increase).

9. Conclusions

- The committee recognized and acknowledged the economic conditions of the community.
- The committee has identified prioritized “phase one” improvements for the high school and middle school to be highest or immediate priority. Total cost for the identified high priority scope of work is \$51.6 million. The consensus of the committee was that the immediate need for this work was real and would not go away.
- The committee could not come to consensus on what level the community would support a bond issue. Several members were convinced that the District should ask the community for this amount (even in light of the current economic conditions).
- Very few members felt that the District should “shelf” the information and take a “wait and see” or “do nothing” approach.

- The committee also discussed that the amount of work that could be accomplished for a “NO NEW TAXES” approach did not adequately address the core of the facility needs at this time. The committee also recognized that the longer the District waits to do something, the further the current tax levels will decrease. This will ultimately provide less revenue in a “no new taxes” proposal or require more millage increase to reach comparable bond issue levels.
- A majority of the committee would recommend work at the High School be the top priority (phase one of a long range master plan), with other prioritized work to follow in the future as economic conditions improve, and taxes were nearing the point of declining millage (future phases of the long range master plan).
- Several members felt a great sense of accomplishment and commitment to the prioritization process they had undertaken in the past few months. There is a great sense of dedication to the results of the process, and several members felt that informing the community on what they had done and why they arrived at the prioritized need was important to the success of their children, their school district, and ultimately to their community. However, they also acknowledged the economic condition of the community, and suggested that further testing of the community’s ability to financially support the recognized needs of the District be considered.

Respectfully Submitted
Committee Co-chairs

Jackie Hathaway & Charles Cook