

# Budgets/Priorities/Recommendations

---

## Program Definition

A comprehensive facilities improvements program of this magnitude presents a number of challenges. In the process of developing an effective *Master Program*, a number of factors must be considered as each can have a significant influence on cost, scheduling, etc.

- ◆ Scope of Improvements
- ◆ Economy of Scale
- ◆ Project Connectivity
- ◆ Available Construction Time
- ◆ Staging Areas
- ◆ Influence on Facility Operations
- ◆ Program Creep
- ◆ Priority of Improvement
- ◆ Program/Project Funding

Each of these factors must be carefully considered when developing a comprehensive *Master Program*. As each campus improvement plan was developed, our goal was to provide improvement recommendations and propose cost options that will be flexible to accommodate the District's curriculum, programmatic and fiscal goals.

## Program Budgets

By taking a line item approach to providing improvements to each facility, **OBR** was able to determine individual budget items and from those, derive overall program budgets for each campus.

Detailed budgets for specific campus improvements were presented in Section 4. Soft costs, which typically include professional fees, non-fixed asset costs, contingency, inflation, etc., were also accounted for.

## Priorities

Both Staff and the Facilities Task Force carefully evaluated the list of needs for each facility. Individual improvements were identified as a priority 1 through 3 as follows:

- ◆ Priority 1 – Immediate need
- ◆ Priority 2 – Important, but not at this time
- ◆ Priority 3 – Not important

Staff priorities are included in the summaries in Section 4.

# *Budgets/Priorities/Recommendations*

---

## *Capacities*

As illustrated in Section 6 of the report, the District has significant capacity challenges to deal with at all of its elementary campuses, including Carver. As enrollment continues to climb, it will be necessary to provide additional instructional space. Of course, with the use of temporary classrooms, it's very likely that core support spaces will become overwhelmed. Restrooms, cafeterias, libraries, gymnasiums, etc., all become inadequate for a growing student body.

Lockhart High School has some room to grow. However, some classrooms do have lower capacities due to their size relative to the State standards. Further, there is insufficient space at this time to consider returning the high school to a 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade campus.

Lockhart Junior High School is operating very efficiently. Currently, there are a few "extra" classrooms; however, as student enrollment numbers continue to climb, it will be necessary to plan for additional space in the future.

## *Priorities & Considerations*

Based on facility tours and extensive analyses of the data, the Facility Task Force went to work at evaluating each individual campus need as discussed above. Campus improvements were divided into two categories.

- Maintenance Projects
- Capital Improvements

The intent was to provide the District with a prioritized list of maintenance items along with a prioritized list of capital projects. From those lists, the District could effectively plan and budget for annual maintenance. Likewise, the capital project lists would be a valuable tool for the District as it looks at strategies to fund those needs.

As noted, the spreadsheets that provide a detailed summary of the improvements identified by campus were presented in Section 4. The sheets also indicate the priority level given by the respective campus staff.

Given the extensive nature of improvements identified at the High School, the Task force evaluated other options. The basis for this analysis was the reality that, even with the upgrades, the facility would still fall short, in a number of areas, of the State required minimum for educational spaces.

# *Budgets/Priorities/Recommendations*

---

There are also a number of functional and programmatic challenges within the High School that become more apparent as the student enrollment climbs.

This assessment lead to an analysis of how these spaces might be replaced. The Task Force reviewed a number of options.

## *Preliminary Options*

As a starting point, the Task Force discussed several preliminary options for tackling the High School challenge for which OBR prepared scope and budgets. These options were as follows:

- Option 1 – Build a new High School. This option proved cost prohibitive. In addition to site acquisition, the cost of having to recreate spaces that are still functional coupled with relocating the District’s athletic facilities made this option impractical.
- Option 2 – Move the High School to the Junior High School and vice versa. This option also proved to be impractical. The Junior High is set up well for 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade. Each grade level is essentially housed in its own wing. Moving these students to the High School was also not received well by the Task Force. Additionally, relocating athletic facilities to the site coupled with upgrades needed to serve high school students (i.e., science labs) were very costly. Further, the High School would still have to be overhauled for the Junior High students.
- Option 3 – Overhaul the current High School. This option, though challenging, provides the best of all options. It allows the District to keep a number of functional spaces in use, such as the Cafeteria, Gymnasiums, Athletic facilities and some classrooms. It also provides an opportunity for expansion to enable consolidation of 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grades.

# Budgets/Priorities/Recommendations

## Recommendations

The Task Force met several times to review and discuss the various options and costs. The following represents the Task Force’s recommendations and framework for moving forward:

- The High School is no longer educationally adequate and should be overhauled. Provided that the District can illustrate that the High School will serve the district well for many years, and the proposal is not another “patchwork” approach to upgrades, the Task Force agreed with the scope and the budget. *A multi-phased program was developed and is provided behind the first divider in the Appendix.*
- In that regard, the Task Force recommends the District consider engaging an architect to begin to develop schematics of the proposed High School, validate the scope, and get design input from staff, students and community before finalizing the budget.
- We discussed the Maintenance and Capital needs at the remaining campuses. Per the Task Force recommendation, we sent those campus summaries to the respective principals/staff and allowed them to review and prioritize each item. The summaries were provided in Section 4, however the total for each are provide below:

Facility	Size (SF)	Maintenance Budget	CIP Budget
Bluebonnet Elementary School	68,982	\$94,235	\$233,855
Carver Kindergarten	45,925	\$614,726	\$403,397
Navarro Elementary School	56,751	\$470,862	\$716,529
Plum Creek Elementary School	67,288	\$421,789	\$501,467
Clear Fork Elementary School	58,840	\$472,379	\$2,055,212
Lockhart Junior High School	151,175	\$228,729	\$2,231,945
ML Cisneros Freshman Campus	68,946	\$626,076	\$3,094,774
District-Wide - 5 Year Roofing Plan			\$619,750
District-Wide - 5 Year HVAC Plan			\$4,144,270
		<b>\$2,928,796</b>	<b>\$14,001,199</b>

A copy of the 5 year plan for roofing and HVAC is provided in the appendix.

# *Budgets/Priorities/Recommendations*

---

- The District should also consider funding to acquire at least two new Elementary School sites and one Middle School site. However, the District should make contact with developers/land owners and pursue the prospect of site donations.
- With the capacity challenges at the elementary level, Task Force agreed it would be difficult to propose an overhaul of the High School and not propose at least one new elementary school. A new PK-5<sup>th</sup> grade campus for 650-700 students would cost \$16M-\$20M.
- With the construction of a new elementary campus, the District should consider converting all elementary campuses to PK-5<sup>th</sup> grade, including Carver.
- With the 9<sup>th</sup> grade at the High School, the District can repurpose M.L. Cisneros for Central Administration. Other functions such as Special Education and Community Education could relocate to that facility. There is also an opportunity to relocate Pride High School and the LDMC to that facility.

## *Feedback*

In an effort to gather feedback from Staff, a survey specific to the recommendations developed by the Task Force was developed. The survey was distributed to staff members at all campuses. Over 300 responses were returned with overwhelming support for the Task Force recommendations.

The survey was also distributed to Central Office and other Administrators in the District. Several dozen responses were returned with comparable support for the recommendations. These surveys are provided behind the last two tabs in the Appendix.

*With any plan, the assumptions and conditions for deriving conclusions must be revisited. A facilities plan is not a stagnate document. It should be updated and adapted as new challenges arise.*