TROY CITY SCHOOLS
Community Advisory Team
Meeting #2, April 4th, 2017
Welcome

Eric Herman, Superintendent
Purpose:
To understand TCS facility challenges and opportunities, and develop a master plan that aligns with the community’s expectations and desires.
Agenda:
Funding Review
Survey Results
Operational Costs
Pros & Cons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - District Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Valuation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Limit of 9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding Debt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Share of 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Share of 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding - 30 Year Debt Schedule

4% Average interest Rate
4.15 Mills of Debt Payments for 30 Years
.5 Mills for Maintenance (required)

4.65 Total Maximum Millage (per info 4/17, subject to change)
# Funding - $/Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Annually</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$406</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding - GWOC Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GWOC District Name</th>
<th>Property Tax per Pupil</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Income Tax per Pupil</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Eff. Mills</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beavercreek</td>
<td>8,736.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,739.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>10,164.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,165.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairborn</td>
<td>4,443.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>820.61</td>
<td>5,263.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>3,840.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>699.73</td>
<td>4,556.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber Heights</td>
<td>4,807.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,818.51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering-Fairmont</td>
<td>9,053.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,055.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5,123.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,132.94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad River- Stebbins</td>
<td>3,132.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,150.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamisburg</td>
<td>6,438.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,444.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northmont</td>
<td>5,560.06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,568.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piqua</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,578.62</td>
<td>4,868.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>3,950.65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,965.65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboro</td>
<td>5,862.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,869.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>2,633.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,653.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipp City</td>
<td>6,777.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,782.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trotwood- Madison</td>
<td>2,951.07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,970.07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Troy</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,107.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,288.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,409.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalia-Butler</td>
<td>8,479.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,483.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Carrollton</td>
<td>4,908.47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,918.47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenia</td>
<td>4,758.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>736.44</td>
<td>5,507.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding - District Profile

### Fiscal Year 2016 Similar Districts Grouping

Comparing District: Troy City(Miami)
- **Fiscal Year:** 2016
- **Run:**

Sorted by: Most to Least Similar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>IRN</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Average Daily Membership (ADM)</th>
<th>Poverty as % of ADM</th>
<th>% of Population Administrative or Professional Occupations</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>% of Population with College Degree or More</th>
<th>% Agricultural Property</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Non-Residential &amp; Non-Agricultural Per Pupil</th>
<th>% Minority Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44925</td>
<td>Troy City</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>38,850</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>801.7</td>
<td>44,464</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44602</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>39,874</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>379.9</td>
<td>39,457</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45120</td>
<td>Wooster City</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34,025</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>712.4</td>
<td>57,705</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44936</td>
<td>Miamisburg City</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>39,876</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,307.2</td>
<td>59,072</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44958</td>
<td>Vandalia-Butler City</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39,206</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>644.0</td>
<td>57,208</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49924</td>
<td>Perry Local</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>35,703</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,248.1</td>
<td>34,643</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50161</td>
<td>Howland Local</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>36,323</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1,171.2</td>
<td>61,417</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43877</td>
<td>Delaware City</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>5,121</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40,001</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,065.3</td>
<td>39,057</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44164</td>
<td>Kent City</td>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,591.2</td>
<td>51,899</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>48296</td>
<td>Austintown Local</td>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>33,707</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,391.3</td>
<td>34,108</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43505</td>
<td>Ashland City</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>31,918</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>345.3</td>
<td>39,772</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44487</td>
<td>New Philadelphia City</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>32,153</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>312.2</td>
<td>37,351</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48306</td>
<td>Boardman Local</td>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>36,020</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,478.2</td>
<td>76,608</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>47381</td>
<td>Southwest Local</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>38,404</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>336.1</td>
<td>44,715</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>43638</td>
<td>Bowling Green City</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>30,856</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>298.3</td>
<td>70,291</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>43893</td>
<td>Dover City</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>35,679</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>484.9</td>
<td>30,152</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>43521</td>
<td>Athens City</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>30,641</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>393.3</td>
<td>67,547</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45799</td>
<td>Shawnee Local</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>43,045</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>394.9</td>
<td>40,821</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44529</td>
<td>North Olmsted City</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40,125</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,781.7</td>
<td>70,497</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>48223</td>
<td>Springfield Local</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39,495</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1,302.5</td>
<td>53,922</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>44420</td>
<td>Mount Vernon City</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>33,044</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>31,600</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Funding - District Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Troy City SD, Miami</th>
<th>Similar District Average</th>
<th>Statewide average of Local, E.V., &amp; City Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District Area Square Mileage (FY15)</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Pupil Density (FY15)</td>
<td>118.37</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>41.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average Daily Membership (FY15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,616.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,825.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,828.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Year-End Enrollment (FY15)</td>
<td>4,152.09</td>
<td>3,647.81</td>
<td>2,574.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander Students as % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>82.93%</td>
<td>82.59%</td>
<td>74.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Students As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Students In Poverty (FY15)</td>
<td>41.58%</td>
<td>38.32%</td>
<td>47.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Students With Limited English Proficiency (FY15)</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Students With Disability (FY15)</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B - Personnel Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Troy City SD, Miami</th>
<th>Similar District Average</th>
<th>Statewide average of Local, E.V., &amp; City Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers' Average Salary (FY15)</td>
<td>$56,860.09</td>
<td>$55,576.24</td>
<td>$56,747.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Teachers With 0-4 Years Experience (FY15)</td>
<td>19.85%</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>25.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Teachers With 4-10 Years Experience (FY15)</td>
<td>22.47%</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
<td>18.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding - District Profile

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>School Inside Millage (FY14 [FY16])</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>School District Income Tax Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$2,210.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Local Tax Effort Index (FY15)</td>
<td>1.1923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E - Expenditure Per Pupil Data:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Administration Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$1,330.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Building Operation Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$1,681.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Instructional Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$6,334.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pupil Support Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$412.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Staff Support Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$249.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Total Expenditure Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$10,080.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### F - Revenue By Source Data:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>State Revenue Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$4,273.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>State Revenue As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Local Revenue Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$6,013.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Local Revenue As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Other Non-Tax Revenue Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$737.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Other Non-Tax Revenue As % of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Federal Revenue Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$822.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Federal Revenue As % Of Total (FY15)</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Total Revenue Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$11,845.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Total Formula Funding Per Pupil (FY15)</td>
<td>$2,009.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Total Formula Funding As % Of Income Tax Liability (FY15)</td>
<td>43.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G - District Financial Status From Five Year Forecast Data:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Salaries As % Of Operating Expenditures (FY15)</td>
<td>57.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits As % Of Operating Expenditures (FY15)</td>
<td>23.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Purchased Services As % Of Operating Expenditures (FY15)</td>
<td>14.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials As % Of Operating Expenditures (FY15)</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Other Expenses As % Of Operating Expenditures (FY15)</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review - Process

- FACILITY STEERING TEAM
- ENROLLMENT ASSESSMENT
- PRESENT TO STAFF
- COMMUNITY ADVISORY TEAM
- BOE
- ED VISIONING
Review - Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K (special needs)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K - 12 Total</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>4,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Tech Off-Site</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,232</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>4,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

decline of 142
Review - Options

• Maintain
• Renovate
• Replace
Maintain

A. Heating system
B. Roofing
C. Air Conditioning
D. Electrical
E. Plumbing
F. Windows
G. Structure
H. Walls and Chimney
I. Floor & Roof Structure
J. General Finishes
K. Interior Lighting
L. Security Systems
M. Emergency lighting
N. Fire Alarm
O. Handicapped Access
P. Site
Q. Sewer System
R. Water Supply
S. Exterior Doors
T. Asbestos Abatement
U. Life Safety
V. Technology
W. Loose Equipment

Warm, safe & dry
Maintain

**warm, safe & dry**  $7.8m

**District support**  $2.5m

**inflation & soft costs**  $2.6m

---

5 year maintenance plan  **$12.9m**
**Status Quo**
(5 year plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Troy Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKSON</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEYWOOD</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOK</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYLE</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANCLEVE</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,998,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Troy Share** $12,998,826

**State Share** $0

**Total** $12,998,826
Maintain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>warm, safe &amp; dry</td>
<td>$7.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District support</td>
<td>$2.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflation &amp; soft costs</td>
<td>$2.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 year maintenance plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.9m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/C, controls and elec</td>
<td>$50.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm, safe, dry &amp; <strong>cool</strong></td>
<td>$63.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st Century Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renovate

- **OFCC Assessment**
  - Ohio Facility Construction Commission
- **State minimum standards**
  - curriculum, fire suppression, HVAC, ADA, furn, etc.
- **State pays 33%**
- **The 2/3rds Rule**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year built</th>
<th>% to Renovate</th>
<th>Cost to Renovate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy HS</td>
<td>1958, 2006</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$38,306,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy JH</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$16,552,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>1919, 2006</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$11,824,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookson</td>
<td>1964, 1968</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$8,673,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>1949, 2006</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$7,985,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>1930, 1973</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>$7,247,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$6,259,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>1950, 1974</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$7,064,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Cleve</td>
<td>1913, 1951</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$16,466,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$120,381,626
Replace

- OSDM
  - State minimum standards
    - curriculum, *room sizes*, fire suppression, HVAC, ADA, furn, etc.
  - 33% state share

cost to abate/demo is included in masterplan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$46,973,131</td>
<td>$23,136,020</td>
<td>$70,109,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds

Junior High: 704
Senior High: 1175
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy Share</th>
<th>$40,745,487</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Share</td>
<td>$20,068,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$60,814,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW ELEMENTARY 1 - 1187
CONJOINED PK-2 AND 3-6 SCHOOLS

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy City Schools</th>
<th><a href="http://www.shp.com">www.shp.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Where?
SAMPLE GREENFIELD SITE

- 16 ACRES (10 ACRES PLUS 1 PER 100 STUDENTS)
- NEW PK-6TH GRADE BUILDING (1 OF 4) AT 71,338 SF
  - 590 STUDENTS
- 112 CARS
- 15 BUSES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookson</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Cleve</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

pollev.com/shpsurveys
Which word do you feel best describes the condition of the current school buildings in Troy City Schools?

- Good: 14%
- Average: 20%
- Below Average: 53%
- Poor: 12%
Compared to other nearby public school districts, would you say that the conditions of the Troy City School buildings are better, about the same, not as good, or are you not familiar enough with them to have formed an opinion?

- Better: 2%
- About the same: 6%
- Not as good: 80%
- Not familiar: 12%

Respond at PollEv.com/shpsurveys
Do you agree there are poor conditions in some of the district buildings that create an unsuitable environment for learning?

- Agree: 68%
- Disagree: 26%
- Unsure: 6%
Based on the state's co-funding of up to 33% of a possible renovation or replacement project, would you be likely to support a bond issue?

- Yes: 74%
- Maybe: 10%
- No: 16%
- Not enough information yet: 0%
Please rank your concerns 1 to 4, with 1 being the most important (drag each response line to reorder)

1st: Technology / Educational Resources
2nd: Air Conditioning / Heating / Cooling / Thermal Comfort
3rd: Security / Monitoring Systems
4th: Accessibility

Respond at PollEv.com/shpsurveys
Which word do you feel best describes the condition of the current school buildings in Troy City Schools?

- Good: 7%
- Average: 20%
- Below Average: 72%
- Poor: 2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEYWOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN CLEVE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR HIGH</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR HIGH</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>Still requires maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Troy Share**: $34,719,736

**State Share**: $17,100,766

**Total**: $51,820,502
How appropriate do you believe the previous option (Option A) is?

- Not at all appropriate: 41%
- Not appropriate: 30%
- Neutral: 25%
- Appropriate: 2%
- Very Appropriate: 2%

Respond at PollEv.com/shpsurveys or text SHPSURVEYS to 22333 once to join, then A, B, C, D, or E.
Troy City Schools

**NEW ELEMENTARY 1** - 594

**NEW ELEMENTARY 2** - 594

**NEW ELEMENTARY 3** - 593

**NEW ELEMENTARY 4** - 593

**Troy Share**

$46,973,131

**State Share**

$23,136,020

**Total**

$70,109,150

**Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds**
How appropriate do you believe the previous option (Option B) is?

- Not at all appropriate: 29%
- Not appropriate: 31%
- Neutral: 21%
- Appropriately: 19%
- Very appropriate: 0%
NEW PRIMARY 1 - 539
NEW PRIMARY 2 - 539
NEW INTERMEDIATE 1 - 648
NEW INTERMEDIATE 2 - 648

Troy Share
$46,264,859
State Share
$22,787,170
Total
$69,052,029

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds
How appropriate do you believe the previous option (Option C) is?

- Not at all appropriate: 21%
- Not appropriate: 33%
- Neutral: 10%
- Appropriate: 29%
- Very appropriate: 6%
NEW ELEMENTARY 1 - 1187
CONJOINED PK-2 AND 3-6 SCHOOLS

Troy Share $40,745,487
State Share $20,068,673
Total $60,814,160

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds

option ‘D’
How appropriate do you believe the previous option (Option D) is?

- Not at all appropriate: 10%
- Not appropriate: 6%
- Neutral: 6%
- Appropriate: 25%
- Very appropriate: 52%

Respond at PollEv.com/shpsurveys
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40,745,487</td>
<td>$20,068,673</td>
<td>$60,814,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds.

**NEW ELEMENTARY 1 - 1187 CONJOINED PK-2 AND 3-6 SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40,745,487</td>
<td>$20,068,673</td>
<td>$60,814,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status Quo - Still requires maintenance funds.
Please rank the options in order of their appropriateness for the Troy community.

1st
Option ‘D’ - Build two connected p-2nd and 3-6th elementaries (demo existing elems) and maintain JH & HS

2nd
Option ‘C’ - Build two new p-2nd elementaries and two new 3-6th elementaries (demo existing elems) and maintain JH & HS

3rd
Option ‘B’ - Build four new p-6th elementaries (demo existing elems) and maintain JH & HS

4th
Option ‘A’ - Renovate elementaries (Demo Van Cleve) and maintain JH & HS

Respond at PollEv.com/shpsurveys
Operational Costs

**current**
- custodial
- preventative maintenance
- permanent improvements
- utilities

**new**
- custodial
- preventative maintenance
- -
- utilities & AC
Table Conversations

- groups of 7 or 8
- write your answers on a flip chart sheet (with a fat marker)
Table Conversations

- Identify top 3 pros of options ‘B’ & ‘D’, and rank them.
- Identify top 3 cons of options ‘B’ & ‘D’, and rank them.
- Other considerations?
Table Conversations - **Option ‘B’**

**Pros:**
- Neighborhood Feel (x 11)
- Benefits of New Buildings (x3)
- Efficiency/Maintenance
- Less Vehicle Congestion (x2)
- More Equitable District (x4)
- Fewer Students per Building (x7)
- Less Transportation (x5)
- Less Land (per site) Required (x5)
- Minimize Building (Safety) Risks
- Continuity of Instruction

**Cons:**
- More Land Overall
- Possible Demographic Polarity
- More Expensive (x9)
- Buildings Not big enough
- Thinning of Gifted/Special Needs Offerings (x2)
- Discontent with Building Locations
- Bussing (x6)
- Where to Build?
- More staff required than “D”
- More Long Term Costs
- Losing Historic Existing Buildings
### Table Conversations - **Option ‘D’**

**Pros:**
- Collaboration (x9)
- Less Expensive (x6)
- Funds Leftover (Debt Limit)
- Improve Diversity (x3)
- Lower Administrative Costs (x2)
- Less Building to Maintain
- Less Bldg Rivalry
- Easier Access to Instructional Opportunities
- Save $$ Through Common Food Services
- Attractive to potential new residents
- Greater Flexibility of Spaces (x2)
- Fewer Building Transitions

**Cons:**
- Impersonal
- Larger Land Acquisition
- Neighborhood Feel Lost
- Haves/Have Nots
- Higher Transportation Costs
- Operational Costs of Larger Building
- Increased Bussing Time
- Infrastructure Needs on Locations of Buildings
- Districting Options
Table Conversations - Considerations?

- Redistricting Plans - What are they?
- Tax Burden Significant (State Portion Compared to nearby what Districts Received)
- Effect on Permanent Operating Levy
  - Stay in Place Until New Buildings Complete
  - Possible for Reduction or New Solution Upon Building Completion
- What are Options for Walkers
- What Land is Being Pursued
- Overall Representation of District at Meetings
- Possible Tweaking of Grade Levels Included in Options
- Bussing/Transportation May Increase in Cost
- Options for Purchasing New Buses and Personnel to Operate
- Possible Uses for Existing Buildings that may be Vacated (Lower Student Impact on New Buildings)
- Renewable Energy Options (LEED Silver Minimum Requirement of State of Ohio)
- Timeframe after funding - 2.5 to 3 year process (P...
QUESTIONS
THANK YOU

Community Advisory Team

Meeting #3, May 9th, 2017
The following photographs illustrate the product of conversations participants had at their tables. Each table summarized their dialogue for the benefit of the whole group.
Plan B

**Pros**
1. Have land for 2 of 4 buildings
2. Redistricting:
   - Some semblance of neighborhood schools
3. Security/minimize risk

**Cons**
1. Possibility of demographic polarity between schools
2. Redistricting
3. More bussing required

---

Plan D

**Pros**
1. Cost efficiency
2. Flexibility of space
   - Grade shift/population shift
   - Multi-purpose space
3. Buffer to address needs at Jr High/High School

**Cons**
1. Land availability $$
2. Traffic
   - Location
   - Travel time
   - Infrastructure
3. Loss of school/community center

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pros:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More intimate</em></td>
<td><em>Less transitions - Fewer students</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neighborhood feel</em></td>
<td><em>Consistency in educational programs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More convenient</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For parents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cons:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cons:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>More land</em></td>
<td><em>Larger lots</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More expensive</em></td>
<td><em>Loss of neighborhood feel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Harder to find land/more expensive</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pros for B
1) Maintains neighborhood schools
2) Buildings: Hook, Concord, Heywood, Cokson: land options available
3) These schools could still be in use while construction going on.

Cons:
1) Most costly of 2 options
2) Concern for lost jobs
3) No money left for Jr. High and High School.

Other considerations
1) Tax levy for Park District

Pros for "D"
1) More efficient use of resources
2) Less maintenance
3) 

Cons for "D"
1) Busing
2) No land currently available to build on
3) Redistricting
Pro's

1. B - Geography
2. B - Building Population
3. B - Teacher/student ratio
4. D - Demographic
   - Rich school
   - Poor school
5. D - Overpopulation/traffic issues
6. D - Cost - resources
   - Food services

Con's

1. B - Mix of ages
2. B - Operating cost
3. B - Transportation costs
4. B - Thinning of "gifted" special needs resources

Top 3 Positive
Top 3 Negative

What didn't they talk of?

B

Cons

- Not big enough
- Busing
- Economical/Divide
- Lot size
- Not big enough
- Less efficient/more expensive
- Too many kids per school

Pros

- Neighborhood schools
- Greater socio-economic mix
- New schools/attractive to families
- Smaller schools
- Teacher collaboration

Troy has much bigger burden than surrounding communities
(others paid 50-60 up to 90% by state)

Other
What Happens if it doesn't pass on the Ballot?

What happens if the JH/High buildings have issues before debt paid off?

What do the playgrounds look like for option D?

Other?

1. Will there be any options (safe) for walkers?
2. What are class sizes required by state?
3. What does student population look @ 10, 20, 30+ years?
4. What does rezoning look like?
5. How does Miami East/Redistricting affect Troy?
6. What are the land options that the district is investigating?

Pros:
- Neighborhood Concept
- Easier Transportation
- Don't need as much land

Cons:
- Conflict about where to put schools
- Extra Cost
- Multiple construction sites to manage

---

Pros:
- More diverse schools
- More equal access to programming/services
- Shared services - special needs

Cons:
- Finding land
- Not Neighborhood oriented
- Transportation - farther from home, more expensive

What happens if Permanent Improvement levy?

How about 3 Elem. Schools?

Instead of NC: start school in September. (media sources)
Pros:

B

1. Less administrative cost
2. Less buildings to maintain
3. More shared resources
4. Less kids in a building/site

D

1. Less expense

Cons:

B

1. Loss of neighborhood schools
2. Not cheaper to operate
3. No land

Other considerations:

1. People/jobs
2. Busing - times on a bus
3. Redistrict?
4. Curriculum improvements?
5. Property taxes could be higher than projected.
6. Group not well represented.

Community Based

New Schools
Can reuse some land/cost savings
4 kitchens/costs?
Losing teachers/staff?
Walker's/less transportation
Kids know each other
Family interactions for siblings close in age
Option: Cheaper into building
No more 3-5 grade building
PTO for community
Redistricting
K-6 buildings allow for older/younger buddy system

Bus ing/Increased transportation time

1. Teacher collaboration
2. Bigger campus/potential for savings
3. Playground facilities
4. New schools for large
5. Where are the buildings going?
6. Lunch schedules?
7. Shared gyms?
8. Losing teachers/staff?
9. Less school rivalry?
10. PTO for district

+ - votes
+ - минус

- Cons,
Top 3 Pros - B

* Smaller student population each school
* Less traffic congestion

Top 3 Pros - D

* Fewer administrators
* Staff collaboration
* Diversity of student population

Top 3 Negatives - B

* Requires more administrators
* Possibly more staff/costs

Top 3 Negatives - D

* Land acquisition
* Concern about "haves" and "have nots" with 2 schools

Other

New Air-conditioned buildings have possibilities for different scheduling - i.e. year-round school

Two New Bldgs.

PK-2
3-6

Shared resources
Community feel - one community
No redistricting or moves

Pro

* Identity
* Smaller student populations
* More equitable redistricting
* Transportation about same as now

Con

* Higher Cap Cost
* Land - where to build
* Less diversity
* Traffic concerns

Pro

* Less administrative costs
* Lower Cap Cost
**Pros**

- **B**
  - Keep neighborhood feel
  - New buildings/Construction

- **D**
  - Cheaper
  - Better facilities
  - Better district/teacher communication
  - Efficiency of collaboration
  - More uniformity

**Negative**

- Keep status quo
- Busing

**Other**

- Districting - How?
  - One K-3 building/one 4-6 - Eliminates competition
  - At/C not an option - costs
  - Staffing - Cafeterias, support staff - Will it change
  - Reductions?
  - Estimated time that old buildings will last

**Cons**

- 1 - More redundant staff
- 2 - More expensive (ST)
- 3 - Higher long term costs (ongoing operations)

**Pros - 1**

- Neighbor school

2 - More efficient, less maintenance

3 - Smaller school size/class size

4 - Flexibility of staff & resources

**Cons**

- 1 - Higher transportation costs
- 2 - Land acquisition/location

3 - Congestion of students/drop off/pick up

Other:

- Additional transportation needs (bus/equipment per student) [cost options]
Option B

Pros
- What we already knew neighborhood breakdown

Cons
- More

Option D

Pros
- Better sense of community school for families/staff

Cons
- Impersonal?
- More efficient use of support staff intervention
- Melting Pot

Other Considerations
- Can we keep them in one of our current buildings?
- More pre-K kids?
- Transport Where?