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### 1.0 Executive Summary

## Before constructionbased solutions can be considered, utilization of current space should be fully understood.

The Wyoming School Facilities Department (WSFD) seeks to make informed decisions regarding the efficacy of current facilities to adequately serve their current and projected student enrollments. In November of 2012, the WSFD retained the Planning Team of MOA ARCHITECTURE / BrainSpaces to conduct facility Capacity Study of educational facilities for six school districts throughout the state of Wyoming, including facilities that serve Kindergaren through 12 grades in Campbell County School District \#1, which is the focus of this report.

The study analyses the utilization of existing spaces within the district's schools and compares them with statewide benchmarks for the room sizes and student capacities. The analyses result in school capacity numbers for each school facility, based on usages of existing spaces. The capacities of all schools are compared with both current and future student enrollments to identify and/or locate capacity issues throughout the District. Once documented, these issues serve as the starting point for the development of options and remedies, as needed, to define the best and most cost-effective solution for the district to accommodate its student enrollments.

This report documents key components of the Capacity Study, and represents a compilation of data, information and insights from a multitude of sources. Each of the District's schools were studied using floor plans, room inventories, enrollment data, and building tours as well as correspondence with representatives from the District.

## B. Facilities Addressed in the Study

## K-6 Grade Level Schools

- Buffalo Ridge Elementary
- Conestoga Elementary
- Hillcrest Elementary
- Lakeview Elementary
- Meadowlark Elementary
- Paintbrush Elementary
- Prairie Wind Elementary
- Pronghorn Elementary
- Sunflower Elementary
- Wagon Wheel Elementary


## 7-9 Grade Level Schools

- Twin Spruce Junior High School (7-9)
- Sage Valley Junior High School (7-9)


## 10-12 Grade Level Schools

- Campbell County High School South (10)
- Campbell County High School North (11-12)


## Anomaly Schools not included in the Capacity Study

- Recluse Elementary School (K-8) - Rural
- Little Powder Elementary School (K-8) - Rural
- Cottonwood Elementary School (K-6) - Rural
- Rozet Elementary School (K-6) - Rural
- Rawhide Elementary School (K-6) - Rural
- 4J Elementary School (K-6) - Rural
- Wright Junior/Senior High School (7-12) - Rural
- Westwood High School (10-12) - alternative high school


## C. Overview of Issues

Campbell County School District No. 1has a self-reported capacity concern in its K-9 grade levels. CCSD operates schools within Gillette as well as the surround Campbell County community. The capacity study focuses on capacity issues within the City of Gillette. The identified anomaly facilities are either rural schools that does not factor into capacity within Gillette, or in the case of Westwood Alternative High School, are not factored into the student enrollments or capacity.
CCSD grade level configurations are primarily K-6 / 7-9 / 10-12. The single district high school operates with a split campus. Campbell County South High School serves grade 10, Campbell County North High School serves grades 11-12. The district has expressed a willingness to explore modification of grade levels to K-6 / 7-8 / 9-12 and K-5 / 6-8 / 9-12 configurations to align school grade levels with available capacity.

To plan for future capacity needs, the facility plan should identify non-construction options before considering construction options (renovation, additions, and construction of new buildings). Nonconstruction options include maximizing capacity in underutilized school buildings; modifications of school boundaries; modifications of school grade configurations; and similar approaches.

## D. Calculated Capacities vs. Enrollments

It is not feasible to create a NON-CONSTRUCTION SCENARIO given the severity of the capacity issue within Campbell County School District. Enrollment projections far exceed available capacity in the K-9 grade levels. There is excess capacity available in the 10-12 grade levels through and including year 2020.

The evaluation of AY 2011/2012 capacity issues within the K-12 grade levels in Campbell County School District \#1 are as follows:

## Elementary Schools:

Overall, the K-6 schools within CCSD had a shortage in capacity of 444 students in AY2011/2022.
The capacity shortage has continued to grow at a steady pace. Two new K-6 schools are currently in the planning/construction phases, and will provide additional capacity but they do not alleviate the current shortage of capacity in K-6 schools.

K-6 Schools that had excess capacity available in 2011/2012 include:

- None

K-6 schools that were close to capacity ( $+/-10 \%$ ) in 2011/2012 include:

- None

K-6 schools that were significantly over capacity in 2011/2012 include:

- Conestoga Elementary School (K-6)
- Hillcrest Elementary School (K-3)
- Lakeview Elementary School (K-6)
- Meadowlark Elementary School (K-6)
- Paintbrush Elementary School (K-6)
- Prairie Wind Elementary School (K-6)
- Pronghorn Elementary School (K-6)
- Sunflower Elementary School (K-6)
- Wagon Wheel Elementary School (K-6)


## Jr. High Schools:

Overall, the 7-9 schools within the CCSD have available capacity of 177 students. However, enrollment growth projects show capacity being reached by AY2015/2016.

7-9 Jr. High Schools that had excess capacity available in 2011/2012 include:

- Twin Spruce Jr. High School (7-9)
- Sage Valley Jr. High School (7-9)


## High School Campus:

Overall, the 10-12 high school within CCSD does not have a current capacity issue. Furthermore, the high school campus is not projected to have a capacity issue through AY2020/2021

10-12 high school campus facilities that had excess capacity available in 2011/2012 include:

- South High School Campus (10)
- North High School Campus (11-12)

In summary, currently the CCSD K-9 schools show a capacity issue in which capacity is significantly exceeded by current and projected enrollments.

District wide, CCSD had a significant K-6 capacity issue in AY 2011/2012 that continues to grow yearly as enrollments within the district increase. District wide in AY 2011/2012, the K-6 schools were over capacity by 444 students. AY 2012/2013 has experienced an actual enrollment increase of 220 students. It is projected that in AY2014/2015, with the inclusion of two new K-6 schools currently in planning/construction, enrollments will still exceed capacity by 365 students. Strong growth in enrollments is projected to continue up to and including year 2020.

The grade level 7-8 Jr. High Schools within the district currently do not have a capacity issue, however they are projected to reach capacity in AY2015/2016.
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The K-6 schools have a current capacity issue that continues to grow. District wide in AY 2011/2012, the K-6 schools were over capacity by 444 students.

WSFD APPROVED METHODOLOGY TO CALCULATE CAPACITY IN CCSD K-6 Schools:

- K-6 Restricted Capacity for AY2011-2012 is 3,337 students
- K-6 enrollment for AY2011-2012 was 3,821
- K-6 enrollment is on a path of steady growth and is projected to reach 5,230 in AY20202021
- A current capacity issue is identified within the K-6 grade levels in AY2011-2012
- Current capacity will be exceeded by projected enrollments in AY 2020-2021 by 1,237 students

WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (AY2011-12)
GRADES K-6


| WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS: GRADES K-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 | 3,377 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (444) | (664) | (803) | (981) | $(1,128)$ | $(1,310)$ | $(1,437)$ | $(1,588)$ | $(1,706)$ | $(1,853)$ |

WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (AY2011-12)
WITH BUFFALO RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND LAKEVIEW REPLACEMENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
GRADES K-6


WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS WITH BUFFALO RIDGE \& LAKEVIEW: GRADES K-6

| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 3,993 | 3,993 | 3,993 | 3,993 | 3,993 | 3,993 |
| ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | $(444)$ | $(165)$ | $(304)$ | $(365)$ | $(512)$ | $(694)$ | $(821)$ | $(972)$ | $(1,090)$ | $(1,237)$ |

WSFD APPROVED METHODOLOGY TO CALCULATE CAPACITY IN CCSD 7-9 Schools:

The 7-9 schools do not have a current capacity issue; however they are projected to reach capacity in AY2015/2016.

- 7-9 Restricted Capacity for AY2011-2012 is 1,944 students
- 7-9 enrollment for AY2011-2012 was 1,767
- 7-9 enrollment is on a path of slow but steady growth and is projected to reach 2,453 in AY2020-2021
- A current capacity issue is not identified within the 7-9 grade levels; however they are projected to reach capacity in AY2015/2016.

WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (AY2011-12)
GRADES 7-9


WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS: GRADES 7-9

| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 |
| ENROLLMENT | 1,767 | 1,876 | 1,929 | 1,916 | 1,994 | 2,026 | 2,166 | 2,242 | 2,397 | 2,453 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 177 | 68 | 15 | 28 | $(50)$ | $(82)$ | $(222)$ | $(298)$ | $(453)$ | $(509)$ |

WSFD APPROVED METHODOLOGY TO CALCULATE CAPACITY IN CCSD 10-12 Schools:

The 10-12 high school does not have a current capacity issue; nor is it projected to by AY2020/2021

- 10-12 Restricted Capacity for AY2011-2012 is 2,463 students
- 10-12 enrollment for AY2011-2012 was 1,512
- 10-12 enrollment is on a path of slow but steady growth and is projected to reach 2,108 in AY2020-2021
- A current capacity issue is not identified within the 10-12 grade levels nor will capacity be reached in AY 2020/2021


## WSFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (AY2011-12) GRADES 10-12
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## E. Planning Scenarios

Based on the WSFD Methodology to Calculate Capacity, a total of seven scenarios were identified and discussed with the School District and WSFD. After a collaborative review and discussion, five scenarios were selected for further assessment and cost analysis as part of the Facility Plan. The five scenarios were then presented to the School District and WSFD for review and discussion.

The five scenarios included for assessment and cost analysis are:

Five scenarios were selected for further assessment and cost analysis as part of the Facility Plan. The five scenarios were then presented to the School District and WSFD for review and discussion.

| Scenario \#1: | CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE $9^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS Convert North and South High School Campus into two, independent comprehensive high schools. Provide renovations at each campus to provide for comprehensive 9-12 educational needs as independent high schools. Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to 7-8 grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \#2: | MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS <br> Move $9^{\text {th }}$ graders into the high school system. South Campus serves grades 9-10, North Campus serves grades 11-12. Provide flexibility for future conversion to two independent comprehensive high schools. Provide addition at South Campus to meet capacity needs. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to 7-8 grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools. |
| Scenario \#3: | MAINTAIN DISTRICT GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION; NO CHANGE TO EXISTING HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW 7-9 Jr. HIGH SCHOOL; BUILD NEW K6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS <br> Maintain existing high school campus system and facilities. Transition existing J. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build one new grade 7-9 Jr. High School. Build three new elementary schools. |
| Scenario \#4: | CONVERT SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOL. CONVERT NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE $10-12$ HIGH SCHOOL. EXPAND NORTH HIGH SCHOOL TO MEET CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS |

CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE $9^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS Convert North and South High School Campus into two, independent comprehensive high schools. Provide renovations at each campus to provide for comprehensive 9-12 educational needs Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to 7-8 grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools.
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Convert and renovate South High School Campus from a grade 10 high school into a grade 7-9 Jr. High School. Provide addition and renovate North High School Campus to convert from a grade 11-12 school into a grade 10-12 High School. Transition existing Jr. High Schools to confirm to 85\% utilization. Build three new elementary schools.
Scenario \#5: COMPLETE GRADE LEVEL TRANSFORMATION OF ALL SCHOOLS WITHIN THE DISTRICT; EXISTING K-6 SCHOOLS CONVERT TO K-5 GRADE LEVELS; EXISTING GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOLS CONVERT TO GRADE 6-8 MIDDLE SCHOOLS; EXISTING GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS CONVERTS TO GRADES 9-12 CAMPUS
Convert grade K-6 elementary schools to K-5 grade levels. Build two new elementary schools. Convert grade 7-9 Jr. High Schools into Grade 6-8 Middle Schools.
Transition Sage Valley and Twin Spruce Middle Schools to confirm to 85\% utilization.
Build one new middle school. Move $9^{\text {th }}$ grade into the high school system. South Campus converts to a grade 9-10 campus; North Campus stays a grade 11-12 campus.
Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs.

Scenarios Identified but not carried forward to assessment:

| Scenario A: | CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE ALL 10- |
|  | 12 STUDENTS INTO NORTH UNTIL THE RENOVATION AND |
|  | ADDITIONS TO SOUTH ARE COMPLETE; MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO |
|  | THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO |
|  | MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 |
|  | ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS |
|  | This scenario was eliminated for the following reasons: |

- North High School cannot handle the number of combined 9-12 grades, thus this scenario was determined to be unfeasible.

| Scenario B: | MOVE 9 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; RENOVATE JR. HIGH |
|  | SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; |
|  | MOVE K-6 SCHOOL INTO THE SAGE VALLEY JR. HIGH FACILITY TO |
|  | CREATE TWO SCHOOLS ON THIS CAMPUS; BUILD NEW K-6 |

## F. RECOMMENDATION: Most Cost Effective Remedy

The five scenarios developed as part of this study are assessed using a three level scoring matrix including 1) A basic question of feasibility, 2) A matrix of assessments of educational, operational, site and community impacts, and 3) A cost analysis. Evaluation criteria are detailed in Section 6.0 of this report.

Scenario \#2 is identified as the Most Cost Effective Remedy:
SCENARIO \#2:
Move 9th graders into the high school system.
South Campus serves grades 9-10; North Campus serves grades 11-12.

Provide flexibility for future conversion to two independent comprehensive high schools.

Provide addition at South Campus to meet capacity needs.
Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to $7-8$ grade levels.

Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization.

Build three new elementary schools.

## RANKING \#1 - Most Cost Effective Remedy

Scenario \#2: MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Cost Impacts: $\$ 92,611,082$ over an eight year time period. (Not including projected land costs)

## Scenario \#2 represents the Most Cost Effective Remedy. It directly and positively impacts the district in several ways including:

This scenario provides the best transition of all district schools to state mandated conformance to grade level capacity. This scenario is a system wide approach that works for all grade levels. This scenario utilizes existing district resources and excess capacity well, results in the best utilization of the existing Jr. Highs and High School, and best meets the values of the community. This is the second lowest cost scenario with its costs are spread over an 8 year time period. It was determined to provide the best educational value to the district.

This scenario:

1. Addresses Capacity Concerns: This scenario resolves the capacity issue utilizing existing facility resources through a district approved reconfiguration of grade levels in existing Jr. High and High Schools. The approach transforms 7-9 Jr. High Schools into 7-8 schools, having the effect of reducing enrollments at these schools. Ninth graders then move into the high school campus, utilizing available excess capacity. Expansion of the high school is provided as enrollments increase and justify additional capacity. New school construction is devoted to grade K-6 schools. New K-6 schools can be located in areas of need.
2. Educational Impact: This scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district. The existing Jr. High Schools can undertake renovations to provide staff planning spaces and conform to state mandated $85 \%$ utilization.
3. Operational Impact: This scenario maximizes use of capacity at district schools, thus limiting operational impacts. This scenario does not require forced mobility of students through district boundary modifications. This scenario maintains minimal district transportation costs for busing.
4. Site Impact: This scenario maximizes current school sites.
5. Community / District Impact: This scenario maintains a single high school system but provides flexibility to migrate to a two high school system in the future. Grade level changes occur in the Jr. High and High School system. The district is in agreement with the grade level changes.
6. Cost Impacts: $\$ 92,611,082$ over an eight year time period.

### 2.0 Introduction

## A. Why Study School Capacity?

The Wyoming School Facilities Department (WSFD) seeks to make informed decisions regarding the efficacy of current facilities to adequately serve their current and projected student enrollments.
The study analyses the utilization of existing spaces within the district's schools and compares them with statewide benchmarks for the room sizes and student capacities. The analyses result in a school capacity number for each school facility, based on its usages of existing space. The capacities of all schools are compared with both current and future student enrollments to identify and/or locate capacity issues throughout the District. Once documented, these issues serve as the starting point for the development of options and remedies, as needed, to define the best and most cost-effective solution for the district to accommodate its student enrollments.

To plan for future capacity needs, facility planning strategies identify non-construction options before considering construction options (renovation, additions, and construction of new buildings). Non-construction options can vary widely, such as closing underutilized school buildings; modifications of school boundaries; modifications of school grade configurations; and other similar approaches. In short, the WSFD realizes that before any construction can be considered, utilization of current space should be fully understood.

The purpose of the Capacity Study is to evaluate and future capacity within grades 6-12 in Campbell County School District \#1.

## B. What is Included in This Report?

There are a number of factors important to determining the capacity of school facilities. These factors are documented and collectively analyzed to inform the facilities strategies and recommendations included in this report.

This report documents overall district parameters such as enrollment projections, boundary maps, grade configurations and educational plans. The report also includes detailed information on individual facilities in the district. Summaries of the capacity calculations for each facility are included in the report, and floor plan diagrams are used to document current room assignments as well as to illustrate areas within each school which deviate from the WSFD's benchmarks for capacity.
The process used to complete the capacity study is defined, and meetings and conversations are documented.

The report includes facility planning options that were identified during the process as well as the criteria for assessment of each option. Ultimately, the recommendation for the most cost effective remedy is defined and illustrated. Strategies are intended as a combination of broad-brush and specific architectural planning actions. However, the actual feasibility of all architectural interventions must be verified by a qualified team of architects and engineers before any action is taken.

The appendix contains meeting minutes as well as a glossary of terminology used in the report.

## C. How Was It Developed?

The purpose of the Capacity Study is to evaluate and future capacity within grades K-8 in the Campbell County School District.
For the purposes of this report, the term "class" refers to the number of students and the term "classroom" refers to a physical room.
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Note that there is no intended hierarchy in the sequence that school data is presented in this report, and lists included are generally not prioritized.
A description of the process used to develop this report follows.

## 2.A. 1 Approach

The review and assessment of capacity for school districts within this study has been conducted in a collaborative process involving the School District, the WSFD and the Planning Team. The process involved multiple meetings with each school district and the WSFD to ensure all voices were heard.

An outline of the process is as follows:

- MEETING \#1 - Capacity Study kick-off meeting held at the School District. Participants included the School District, WSFD and Planning Team representatives.
- Data collection by the Planning Team
- Capacity analysis of individual schools identified within the study.
- MEETING \#2 - Options identification meeting held at the School District. Participants included the School District, WSFD and Planning Team representatives.
- MEETING \#3 - Options identification meeting held at the School District with the District Planning Committee. Participants included the School District, WSFD and Planning Team representatives.
- Option feasibility study
- Option cost analysis
- MEETING \#4 - Collaborative review of option feasibility and costs as well as Planning Team recommendation of the Most Cost Effective Remedy. Participants included the School District, WSFD and Planning Team representatives.
- Preparation of Draft Plan and Final Opinion of the Most Cost Effective Remedy.
- Preparation of Final Facility Capacity Plan
- PRESENTATION TO THE WSFD COMMISSION


## 2.A. 2 Data \& Resources

The WSFD's AiM database provided the data for the quantitative parameters such as room uses, sizes, and quantities, as well as for overall site sizes and building squarefootages for each of the district's educational facilities.

Facility assessments were completed by FEA in spring 2012 and provided to the Planning Team through the AiM database. These assessments of individual facilities included data collected during the 2011-12 school year and thus represents room uses identified at that time.

WSFD provided the Planning Team with enrollment history and enrollment projections used in this study.

WSFD provided the Planning Team with building inventories for each district, including both broad and specific information such as site information and school addresses, building gross square-footages, etc.

Unique district-specific information was gathered directly from District personnel and/or District resources, studies and other documents.
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## 2.A. 3 Unique District Parameters

While there are blanket similarities in school facilities across the state, each district in the study has identified issues, such as unique programs, operations, schedules, demographics, facility uses and special needs populations, that are unique to their school communities and/or to specific schools in the district.

Space utilization for educational facilities was studies through a combination of quantitative and qualitative information. Mathematical calculations using established formulas provide objective, quantifiable data. The goals and practices unique to each district provided a qualitative overlay.

Where clarifications and/or modifications to the AiM data were warranted, additional conversations occurred, and tours of some of the facilities were conducted.

The Planning Team collected and considered information from each district on changes to facilities and/or room assignments that have taken effect after spring 2012. However, since the purpose of the study was to evaluate school capacity only, changes to program offerings, staffing, curriculum, joint use agreements, and/or other operational practices, whether current or future, are not addressed.

## 2.A. 4 WSFD Parameters

The Capacity Study utilizes specific parameters and criteria in the evaluation of capacity. Parameters include:

- $\quad$ The base line school year for the study is 2011/2012.
- Actual enrollment data for school years 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 are utilized in the study.
- Capacity is analyzed up to and including school year 2020/2021.
- Enrollment projections are based on the approved cohort methodology, data provided thru AiM on 11/21/2012 with 10 years of trailing data.
- In Campbell County School District \#1, the study was conducted for grades K through 8
- Utilization rates for the capacity studies are $100 \%$ for grades K-6 and $85 \%$ for grades 7 12. If 6 th grade is in a middle school configuration with grades $6-8$, it is calculated using an $85 \%$ utilization rate.
- Restricted classroom capacities are calculated according to the WSFD's "Method to Calculate School Building Capacity", dated June 2012.
- Facility assessments were completed by FEA in spring 2012 and provided to the Planning Team through the AiM database. The Planning Team has considered information from each district on changes to facilities and/or room assignments that have taken effect after spring 2012.


## 2.A. 5 Proposed Adjustments to (or Clarifications of) WSFD Parameters

During the course of the Capacity Analysis process, a number of issues have arisen in which the Planning Team has applied its professional judgment. The issues include inaccurate information contained within the Aim Database, information disputed by individual school districts, inappropriate application of capacity to individual educational spaces as well as others. A summary of modifications and process or inclusion of updated information is outlined below.
a) Changes to Square Footage Allowances:

These changes affect the "big box" spaces including gymnasiums, vocal music rooms and instrumental music rooms. After discussions between the Planning Team, School Districts and the WSFD, adjustments to the square foot per student allowance were made to represent a more realistic model of how these spaces can be reasonably scheduled and staffed, and how they are actually used.

- Gymnasiums are calculated on the basis of 200 square feet of useable space per student. Useable space is defined as the open floor area of the gym less any areas for fixed bleachers or other fixed equipment.
- For vocal and instrumental music rooms, capacity is calculated on the basis of 60 square feet per student. Instrumental rooms are capped at 50 students maximum, however there is no cap for vocal music rooms.


## b) Capacities for Very Small Classrooms:

Some schools include very small spaces that are being used classrooms and/or teaching stations, and as such, they show student capacity in the AiM database. While it is understood that school administrators may be using these small spaces out of necessity to overcome overcrowded facilities, it is unreasonable to expect that a space smaller than 500 net square feet can consistently support a teacher and a class of students engaging in regular educational activities. It is expected that these smaller rooms were intended for functions, such as resource rooms, offices and storage, as opposed to serving as classrooms. Therefore, such rooms that are smaller than 500 square feet are excluded from the list of spaces that generate student capacity.

## c) Classroom Sizes and "Capped" or "Maximum" Capacities:

The WSFD methodology for determining school capacity includes parameters for the numbers of students per room (class-size) and square-footage per student (classroom size) in rooms with various educational uses. It is important to note that these parameters represent a methodology for generating uniform capacity calculations in schools throughout the state - however, the parameters are not intended to serve as restrictions for class-size or classroom size, nor are these parameters intended as requirements for a district's operational, programmatic or functional use of their schools.

For example, using the WSFD methodology, a high school general classroom has a maximum restricted capacity of 25 students, which when multiplied by 37.5 square foot per student, yields a classroom size of 937.5 square feet. It is recognized that many classrooms are smaller than this, and that the capacity calculation methodology results in a classroom capacity of fewer than 25 students. The smaller student capacity of a smaller classroom helps create a more clear and consistent baseline for a given school facility's capacity, but in no way is it meant to be a requirement for a district to limit the number of students they wish to assign to a given classroom.

## d) School district funded enhancements:

School district funded enhancements to increase gymnasium square footage will be included as capacity carrying space. Pre-K classrooms built through enhancement funding will not be counted towards capacity.
e) Career Technical Classrooms:

Recognizing that some CTE programs require both "classroom" space and "lab" space, the AiM database counts capacity in only one or the other of these spaces. Increases in the utilization of some of these classrooms can alleviate overcrowding in some instances, and should be considered as capacity-generating spaces on a case-by-case basis.

## f) Alternative Schools:

Alternative schools serve students who, for one reason or another, do not succeed in a typical school environment. Additional supports and services are provided for these
students to navigate their educations and succeed in school. In these environments, class-sizes are capped at 15 students per classroom.
g) K-8 Schools:

Several K-8 schools exist throughout the state, primarily in rural areas and often with smaller student enrollments. For the purposes of this study, K-8 schools are evaluated on a case-by-case basis; however the majority of K-8 schools are calculated using the WSFD's methodology for elementary schools.
h) Pre-Kindergarten Classrooms:

Several schools throughout the state utilize a kindergarten classroom for prekindergarten education. For the purposes of this study, classrooms designated in AiM as pre-kindergarten classrooms are counted as capacity-generating spaces, similar to kindergarten classrooms.

## 2.A. 6 Development \& Assessment of Scenarios

The three scenarios developed as part of this study are assessed based on a three level scoring matrix. The first level is a general test of the scenario feasibility. The basic question is, "Is the scenario feasible, or is there a factor or factors that render the scenario infeasible?" Infeasibility is defined as educationally or functionally unachievable. Based on that basic question, two of the scenarios were deemed to be infeasible. All were then evaluated based on a second level of analysis.
The second level assessed each scenario based on the following criteria.

1. Educational Impacts - Does the scenario provide adequate space to meet the educational specifications necessary to support the educational plan?
2. Operational Impacts - Does the scenario result in better operational efficiencies for the District?
3. Site Impacts - How does the scenario impact the site or is the scenario impacted by the site?
4. Community Impacts - Does the scenario address community concerns or does it result in developing issues that the community will have concerns with?
5. District specific and unique issues - Each of the above criteria were also evaluated against district specific and unique issues related to that particular category.
Each criteria was evaluated on a five (5) point scale where a mark of three (3) represents a neutral score. In addition, each criterion was weighted on a five point importance factor scale. Higher points were assigned to more significant criteria in the analysis so as not to over or under emphasize a particular criterion.
A project cost analysis was then developed for each scenario, including costs associated with renovation, additions, new construction, and changes in operational costs. Each scenario was evaluated for "cost effectiveness" based on how it resolves capacity in relationship to utilization facilities that have excess capacity. This ranking was developed to provide an objective view to how wisely costs are balanced against use of existing facility resources.
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### 3.0 District Overview

## A. Building Inventory

The following schools are included in this study:

1. Buffalo Ridge Elementary School (K-6)
2. Conestoga Elementary School (K-6)
3. Hillcrest Elementary School (K-6)
4. Lakeview Elementary School (K-6)
5. Meadowlark Elementary School (K-6)
6. Paintbrush Elementary School (K-6)
7. Prairie Wind Elementary School (K-6)
8. Pronghorn Elementary School (K-6)
9. Sunflower Elementary School (K-6)
10. Wagon wheel Elementary School (K-6)
11. Twin Spruce Junior High School (7-9)
12. Sage Valley Junior High School (7-9)
13. Campbell County High School North (11-12)
14. Campbell County High School South (10)

The following is a list of schools NOT being addressed in the study:

1. Recluse Elementary School (K-8) - Rural
2. Little Powder School (K-8) - Rural
3. Cottonwood School (K-6) - Rural
4. Rozet School (K-6) - Rural
5. Rawhide School (K-6) - Rural
6. 4J School (K-6) - Rural
7. Wright Junior / Senior High School (7-12) - Rural
8. Westwood High School (10-12) - Alternative High School

## B. Grade Configurations

Campbell County School District \#1 currently operates in the following grade level configurations:

- K-6 elementary school
- 7-9 middle school
- 10-12 high school


## C. District Growth Pattern Map

All schools in Campbell County School District \#1 are located in proximity to each other with the exception of the 'rural' schools.
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## D. Enrollment Projections

|  | Actual Enrollment |  |  | Projected Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oct of | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Grade | K | 639 | 696 | 689 | 710 | 732 | 754 | 776 | 798 | 820 | 841 |
|  | 1 | 588 | 591 | 641 | 634 | 654 | 674 | 694 | 714 | 734 | 754 |
|  | 2 | 520 | 596 | 595 | 645 | 638 | 659 | 679 | 699 | 719 | 739 |
|  | 3 | 537 | 540 | 612 | 611 | 662 | 655 | 676 | 697 | 717 | 738 |
|  | 4 | 508 | 559 | 548 | 620 | 619 | 671 | 664 | 685 | 706 | 727 |
|  | 5 | 518 | 517 | 569 | 557 | 631 | 630 | 683 | 676 | 697 | 719 |
|  | 6 | 511 | 542 | 527 | 580 | 568 | 644 | 643 | 697 | 689 | 711 |
|  | 7 | 634 | 613 | 645 | 628 | 691 | 677 | 766 | 765 | 830 | 821 |
|  | 8 | 590 | 653 | 624 | 657 | 639 | 703 | 689 | 780 | 779 | 845 |
|  | 9 | 543 | 610 | 660 | 630 | 664 | 646 | 711 | 696 | 788 | 787 |
|  | 10 | 545 | 560 | 620 | 670 | 641 | 675 | 656 | 722 | 707 | 801 |
|  | 11 | 492 | 542 | 532 | 589 | 637 | 609 | 641 | 624 | 686 | 672 |
|  | 12 | 475 | 467 | 501 | 492 | 545 | 589 | 563 | 593 | 577 | 635 |
|  | TOTAL | 7,100 | 7,486 | 7,762 | 8,025 | 8,322 | 8,585 | 8,841 | 9,146 | 9,451 | 9,791 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## E. District Unique \& Specific Issues

- Rural schools not viable option to alleviate capacity Recluse K-8 excluded from study Little Powder K-8 excluded from study Wright JR / SR High School excluded from study?
- District-wide approach to "Big Box" spaces for capacity What is the "right size" capacity of these types of spaces?
- Grade Configurations

Moving $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade to Middle School configuration which would require additional education by teachers

- School Enrollment and Capacity

950 student maximum Middle School enrollment
State funding at $75 \%$ utilization VS. State classroom utilization rate at $85 \%$

- Classroom Utilization

Need for off period for classroom step up if teaching from carts

- Attendance Policies

Enrollment \& Capacity impacts from On-line courses and off-campus learning

- Community growth identified in Zoning
- Food Service

Junior High Schools food service near capacity Delivery of food to schools

- Transportation
- Larger Middle Schools could potentially impact tiered bus system
- Special Education

Greater increase of students in Individualized Education Program

- Existing site or building limitations / opportunities Need to consider Enrollment based on use of Temporary Classrooms but do not account for Temporary Classroom space towards Capacity
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### 4.0 Capacity Analysis

## A. District wide Capacity Overview

The charts below illustrate school capacities using the approved SFD methodology. Schools are listed in alphabetical order.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 | K-6 |
| 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 0 | 435 | 413 | 382 | 346 | 486 | 446 | 453 | 447 | 413 | 3,821 |
| BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | - |
| BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 0 | 348 | 380 | 382 | 277 | 405 | 432 | 388 | 381 | 382 | 3,377 |
| 2011 ACTUAL Ufilization Factor: | 0\% | 0\% | 109\% |  | 125\% | 120\% | 103\% | 117\% | 117\% | 108\% | - |
| $(-)=$ Space NEEDED, $(+)=$ Space AVAILABLE | 0 | (87) | (33) | 0 | (69) | (81) | (14) | (65) | (66) | (31) | (444) |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) | 7-9 | 7-9 | 7-9 | 11-12 | 10 | 10-12 |
| 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 826 | 941 | 1,767 | 876 | 540 | 1,416 |
| BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | 85\% | 85\% | - | 85\% | 85\% |  |
| BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 934 | 1,010 | 1,945 | 1,458 | 1,005 | 2,463 |
| 2011 ACTUAL Utilization Factor: | 75\% | 79\% | - | 51\% | 46\% | - |
| $(-)=$ Space NEEDED, (+) = Space AVAILABLE | 108 | 69 | 178 | 582 | 465 | 1,047 |
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## B. Data \& Tools Used for Capacity Calculations

## 4.A. $1 \quad$ AiM $^{\text {TM }}$ Data (WSFC's facility management system)

AiM refers to the facilities management data maintained by the Wyoming School Facilities Commission. Data included in this web-based resource was downloaded for the six school districts included in this study. Relevant data for the purposes of this capacity study includes information for each school in the six districts studied. In addition to overall information on each school, such as building area and site sizes) data relevant to verifying and calculating capacity for the purposes of this study include the following items for each individual school building:

- a listing of all the spaces in the building
- a space numbering system that corresponds to color-coded floor plans
- the net square-footages for each space in the building
- an identification of the use/function of every space in the building
- a calculated capacity for each capacity-generating space (i.e. classrooms, etc.)

The planning team sorted, analyzed and summarized the data collected from the AiM database, discussed these summaries with representatives from each school district, and verified anomalies with both Districts and SFD staff.

## 4.A. 2 Floor Plans

Floor plans for all schools in the study were developed in coordination with the AiM database and graphically reflect the numerical data in AiM. The planning team used these floor plans as part of the capacity study. While color coding of the original floor plan files was removed, and plans were graphically enhanced for readability at reduced sizes included in this Capacity Study report, the plans were used as-is without modification to wall locations, room sizes or any other physical parameter used to calculate capacities of existing buildings. Any proposed modifications to physical facilities illustrated as part of the "remedies" are clearly marked as such.

## 4.A. 3 SFD Methodology Guidelines

Classroom capacities for all schools in the study are calculated according to the WSFD's "Method to Calculate School Building Capacity", dated June 2012. This methodology outlines specific parameters for identifying which spaces carry capacities, the numbers of students per classroom use/type, the maximums or caps on class sizes for the purposes of calculating capacity, and the utilization rates that apply to elementary, middle and high schools.

## 4.A. 4 Proposed Modifications/Clarifications to SFD Methodology

During the course of the Capacity Analysis process, a number of issues have arisen in which the Planning Team has applied its professional judgment. The issues include inaccurate information contained within the Aim Database, information disputed by individual school districts, inappropriate application of capacity to individual educational spaces as well as others. A summary of modifications and process or inclusion of updated information is outlined below.

## a) Changes to Square Footage Allowances:

These changes affect the "big box" spaces including gymnasiums, vocal music rooms and instrumental music rooms. After discussions between the Planning Team, School Districts and the WSFD, adjustments to the square foot per student allowance were
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made to represent a more realistic model of how these spaces can be reasonably scheduled and staffed, and how they are actually used.

- Gymnasiums are calculated on the basis of 200 square feet of useable space per student. Useable space is defined as the open floor area of the gym less any areas for fixed bleachers or other fixed equipment.
- For vocal and instrumental music rooms, capacity is calculated on the basis of 60 square feet per student. Instrumental rooms are capped at 50 students maximum, however there is no cap for vocal music rooms.
b) Capacities for Very Small Classrooms:

Some schools include very small spaces that are being used classrooms and/or teaching stations, and as such, they show student capacity in the AiM database. While it is understood that school administrators may be using these small spaces out of necessity to overcome overcrowded facilities, it is unreasonable to expect that a space smaller than 500 net square feet can consistently support a teacher and a class of students engaging in regular educational activities. It is expected that these smaller rooms were intended for functions such as resource rooms, offices and storage, as opposed to serving as classrooms. Therefore, such rooms that are smaller than 500 square feet are excluded from the list of spaces that generate student capacity.

## c) Classroom Sizes and "Capped" or "Maximum" Capacities:

The WSFD methodology for determining school capacity includes parameters for the numbers of students per room (class-size) and square-footage per student (classroom size) in rooms with various educational uses. It is important to note that these parameters represent a methodology for generating uniform capacity calculations in schools throughout the state - however, the parameters are not intended to serve as restrictions for class-size or classroom size, nor are these parameters intended as requirements for a district's operational, programmatic or functional use of their schools.
For example, using the WSFD methodology, a high school general classroom has a maximum restricted capacity of 25 students, which when multiplied by 37.5 square foot per student, yields a classroom size of 937.5 square feet. It is recognized that many classrooms are smaller than this, and that the capacity calculation methodology results in a classroom capacity of fewer than 25 students. The smaller student capacity of a smaller classroom helps create a more clear and consistent baseline for a given school facility's capacity, but in no way is it meant to be a requirement for a district to limit the number of students they wish to assign to a given classroom.

## d) Career Technical Classrooms:

Recognizing that some CTE programs require both "classroom" space and "lab" space, the AiM database counts capacity in only one or the other of these spaces. Increases in the utilization of some of these classrooms can alleviate overcrowding in some instances, and should be considered as capacity-generating spaces on a case-by-case basis.

## e) Alternative Schools:

Alternative schools serve students who, for one reason or another, do not succeed in a typical school environment. Additional supports and services are provided for these students to navigate their educations and succeed in school. In these environments, class-sizes are capped at 15 students per classroom.

## f) K-8 Schools:

Several K-8 schools exist throughout the state, primarily in rural areas and often with smaller student enrollments. For the purposes of this study, K-8 schools are evaluated on a case-by-case basis; however the majority of K-8 schools are calculated using the WSFD's methodology for elementary schools.
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## g) Pre-Kindergarten Classrooms:

Several schools throughout the state utilize a kindergarten classroom for pre-kinder education. For the purposes of this study, classrooms designated in AiM as pre-kinder classrooms are counted as capacity-generating spaces, similar to kindergarten classrooms.

The following charts summarize relevant adjusted guidelines used in this study.

Elementary Schools (utilization factor $=100 \%$ )

| Spaces that carry capacity | SF/Student | Max/Restricted | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kindergarten | 50 | 16 |  |
| Grades 1-3 | 40 | 16 |  |
| Grades 4-6 | 40 | 25 |  |
| SpEd Self-Contained | 80 | 10 |  |
| Spaces that DO NOT carry capacity | SF/Student |  | Notes |
| Art Classrooms | - |  |  |
| Music Classrooms | - |  |  |
| Science Classrooms | - |  |  |
| SpEd Resource Classrooms | - |  |  |
| P.E./ Multi-Purpose | - |  |  |
| Computer Labs | - |  |  |
| Modular / Temporary Classrooms | - |  |  |
| Administrative \& Building Support Spaces | - |  |  |

Middle \& Jr. High \& High Schools (utilization factor = 85\%)

| Spaces that carry capacity | SF/Student | Max/Restricted | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Classrooms | 37.5 | 25 |  |
| Science Classrooms | 60 | 24 |  |
| SpEd Self-Contained | 80 | 10 |  |
| CTE Lab (Heavy) | 125 | 25 | includes FACS |
| CTE Lab (Light) | 60 | 25 |  |
| Computer Labs | 37.5 | no max. |  |
| Art Classrooms | 50 | 25 |  |
| Music (Vocal) | 60 | no max. |  |
| Music (Instrumental) | 60. | 50 |  |
| Gymnasia | 200 | no max. | unobstructed area |
| Fitness / Weights / Other PE | 55. | no max. |  |
| Health / PE Classroom | 37.5 | 25 |  |
| Broadcast / Recording Studio | 62 | 25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Spaces that DO NOT carry capacity |  |  | Notes |
| SpEd Resource Classrooms | - |  |  |
| Library / Media Center | - |  |  |
| Dining / Commons | - |  |  |
| Modular / Temporary Classrooms | - |  |  |
| Administrative \& Building Support | - |  |  |
| Spaces |  |  |  |

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

## C. Capacity Calculation Methodology Explained

## 4.A. 5 Methodology Overview

The WSFD provided the framework, data and overall methodology used to calculate the capacities of all schools in the study. The parameters were defined to achieve the most consistent data possible across all schools in all districts. Specific unique characteristics for both district-wide parameters and for individual schools were also defined and considered so that the objective data generated from the standardized methodology could be overlaid with recognition of unique and qualitative issues as applicable.

The methodology is summarized in the following steps:
a. Identify the uses of all rooms in the school (per AiM Database \& FEA Plans).
b. Determine which rooms carry capacity (per SFD Methodology).
c. Identify square-footages of each capacity space (per AiM Database).
d. Divide each room's square-footage by the area per student (per SFD Methodology).
e. Apply capacity restriction or cap as appropriate (per SFD Methodology).
f. Apply utilization factor (per SFD Methodology).
g. Apply a loading factor to accommodate small schools, as applicable.

The diagrams below illustrate how the SFD capacity parameters are used for the purposes of determining a school's capacity. It is important to reiterate that these parameters represent a methodology for generating uniform capacity calculations in schools throughout the state - however, the parameters are not intended to serve as restrictions for class-size or classroom size, nor are these parameters intended as requirements for a district's operational, programmatic or functional use of their schools.

When determining the capacity of the 940 square foot middle school classroom (left diagram), the area of the classroom is divided by 37.5 square-footage per student, resulting in a calculated capacity of 25 students.
The capacity of the smaller classroom (center diagram) is calculated similarly, however because it is small, the resulting capacity is only 20 students.

Using the same methodology, the capacity of the larger classroom (right diagram) shows a capacity of 30 students, but since this type of classroom is restricted to a maximum of 25 students, its capacity is 25 .


## 4.A. 6 AiM Data Worksheet Explained

As mentioned above, the primary source of data used in this study was retrieved from the state's AiM database. The following illustrates the methodology used to sort this data into relevant capacity calculation information. While this level of detail is not included in the body of this report, AiM spreadsheets for each school are included in the Appendix.

## EXAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 00



## 4.A. 7 Capacity Study Worksheet Explained

Each school in the Capacity Study includes a calculation spreadsheet similar to the example shown below. Each key category is linked to a summary spreadsheet so that capacity issues can be viewed across the entire district.


## 4.A. 8 Floor Plan Diagrams Explained

Each school in the Capacity Study includes floor plans color-coded, similar to the example shown below, for easy identification of challenges and potential opportunities for accommodating student enrollments.

Using the AiM database's indications for the function/uses of each space, the color coding indicates areas where the size of the classroom is in good alignment with SFD guidelines (green); areas where the size of the classroom is minimally smaller or larger than the SFD guidelines (yellow); and areas where the size of the classroom does not align with SFD guidelines for square-footages per student (red).

Remedies included later in this report are not expected to make small adjustments to classroom sizes to rectify minor inconsistencies. Instead, the color coding is simply a graphic documentation of the AiM data, illustrating classrooms where accommodating a consistent class sizes may be challenging in a given school facility, and if remedies are to include some extent of construction, these are the areas that might be targeted.
This floor plan shows a sample school with spaces color coded.


## D. Individual School Analyses

## 4.A.9 Buffalo Ridge Elementary School (no AiM data available)

## 4.A. 10 Conestoga Elementary School


TEACHING SPACES \& CAPACITY CALCULATIONS

|  | Existing Building / Use |  |  |  |  |  | Methodology |  |  | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CORE LEARNING: | \# Rooms | Avg. Size of Room(s) | \# Students Resricted | \# Students Unrestricted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (Restricted) } \end{gathered}$ | Total (Unrestricted) | Net Area per Student | Maximum \# of Students | reference NSF |  |
| PK \& K Classrooms | 2 | 1,546 | 14 | 31 | 28 | 62 | 50 | 16 | 800 | 1 @ 2,384sf, 1 @ 709sf |
| Grades 1-3 Classrooms | 9 | 702 | 16 | 18 | 144 | 158 | 40 | 16 | 640 |  |
| Grades 4-5/6 Classrooms | 9 | 783 | 20 | 20 | 176 | 176 | 40 | 25 | 1,000 |  |
| Special Ed. / Self-Contained |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 10 | 800 |  |

ACTIVITY SPACES: (non-capacity spaces)

| Special Ed Pull-out/ Resource | 9 | 428 | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer Lab |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Science Classrooms |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Art Classrooms | 1 | 855 | - | - | - | - |
| Music Classrooms | 2 | 711 | - | - | - | - |
| MPR/Gymnasium |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Fithess / Weight Room / Other |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Health/PE Classroom |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Open Plan Instructional Area |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Library/Media Center |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| \# of capacity spaces: | 20 |  |  |  | 348 | 396 |


| 80 | 10 | 800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 | 25 | 938 |
| 60 | 25 | 1,500 |
| 50 | 25 | 1,250 |
| 60 | 50 | 3,000 |
| 200 | no max | na |
| 200 | 25 | na |
| 55 | 25 | 1,375 |
| - | - | - |
| - | - | - |


| $\square$ |
| :--- |
| $\square$ |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Plan Diagram: Conestoga Elementary School


## LEGEND

For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelinesRED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

## 4.A. 11 Hillcrest Elementary School

SCHOOL: HILLCREST ELEMENTARY


Shaded cells are for input data. Others calculate automatically.

| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 413 | students |
| BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | 100\% |  |
| BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 380 | students |
| UNRESTRICTED Capacity X BUF: | 475 | students |
| 2011 ACTUAL Utilization Factor: | 109\% |  |
| In 2011, this school was OVER ENROLLED by: | 33 | students |

## ADJUSTED CAPACITY (Loading Factor)

10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment 413 students OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor (OLF): 1.0 SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR: $\mathbf{3 8 0}$ students In 2011, this school was OVER ENROLLED by: 33 students \% of 2011-12 Enrollment: $8 \%$ -
Note: WSFD Area Calculated using: 380 Students (Equals 2011-12 SFD Building Capacity)

| TEACHING SPACES \& CAPACITY CALCULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing Building / Use |  |  |  |  |  | Methodology |  |  | Notes: |
| CORE LEARNING: | \# Rooms | Avg. Size of Room(s) | \# Students Resricted | \# Students Unrestricted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (Restricted) }( \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (Unrestricted) } \end{gathered}$ | Net Area per Student | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maximum } \\ \text { \# of Students } \end{gathered}$ | reference NSF |  |
| PK \& K Classrooms | 4 | 970 | 16 | 19 | 64 | 78 | 50 | 16 | 800 |  |
| Grades 1-3 Classrooms | 9 | 1,090 | 16 | 27 | 144 | 245 | 40 | 16 | 640 | VERIFY: 1 @ 2,850sf, others avg 870sf |
| Grades 4-5/6 Classrooms | 7 | 870 | 22 | 22 | 152 | 152 | 40 | 25 | 1,000 |  |
| Special Ed. / Self-Contained | 2 | 1,150 | 10 | 14 | 20 | 29 | 80 | 10 | 800 |  |

## ACTIVITY SPACES: (non-capacity spaces)

| Special Ed Pull-out/ Resource | 12 | 603 | - | - | - | - | 80 | 10 | 800 | 6 are > 800sf |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer Lab | 2 | 1,098 | - | - | - | - | 38 | 25 | 938 |  |
| Science Classrooms |  |  | - | - | - | - | 60 | 25 | 1,500 |  |
| Art Classrooms | 1 | 1,047 | - | - | - | - | 50 | 25 | 1,250 |  |
| Music Classrooms | 2 | 1,043 | - | - | - | - | 60 | 50 | 3,000 |  |
| MPR/Gymnasium | 1 | 4,120 | - | - | - | - | 200 | no max | na |  |
| Fitness / Weight Room / Other |  |  | - | - | - | - | 200 | 25 | na |  |
| Healh/PE Classroom |  |  | - | - | - | - | 55 | 25 | 1,375 |  |
| Open Plan Instructional Area |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Library/Media Center | 1 | 2,487 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| \# of capacity spaces: | 22 |  |  |  | 380 | 475 |  |  |  |  |

NOTE:
Hillcrest is a prototype school along with Prairie Wind. Currently the district is in design/construction of two other schools utilizing this prototype. Hillcrest and Prairie Wind were completed prior to state mandated 16:1 and 25:1 classroom ratios. Thus, capacity established during planning of these schools does not currently apply. We are utilizing the actual WSFD methodology for calculated capacity for each of these schools. Hillcrest Elementary functions as the district center for several SPED programs that do not count towards capacity as they are not self-contained. Thus, there is a difference in capacity between Hillcrest and Buffalo Ridge.

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Plan Diagram: Hillcrest Elementary School


## 4.A.12 Lakeview Elementary School (no AiM data available)

## 4.A. 13 Meadowlark Elementary School



Plan Diagram: Meadowlark Elementary School

Second Floor


First Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

## 4.A. 14 Paintbrush Elementary School



Plan Diagram: Paintbrush Elementary School


LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN = the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelinesRED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE = the space is a non-capacity space

## 4.A. 15 Prairie Wind Elementary School

| SCHOOL: PRAIRIE WIND ELEMENTARY |  |  |  | Shaded cells are for input data. Others calculate automatically. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physical Address: 200 Overdale Drive, Gillette 82718 |  |  |  | SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) |  |  |
| AiM Reference: 0301-033-0100 |  |  |  | 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 446 | students |
| Grades Served: $7 \quad$ Grade(s) K-6 |  |  |  | BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | 100\% |  |
| Year Built |  |  |  | BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 432 | students |
| Portables on Site / Use: |  |  |  | UNRESTRICTED Capacity X BUF: | 495 | students |
| Special Considerations: Site size unavailable |  |  |  | 2011 ACTUAL Uilization Factor: | 103\% |  |
|  |  |  |  | In 2011, this school was OVER ENROLLED by: 14 |  | students |
| BUILDING SIZE \& SITE SIZE |  |  |  | ADJUSTED CAPACITY (Loading Factor) |  |  |
| 2011 Gross Building Area: | 66,065 sq. ft | 72,248 (AiM) 2011-12 Site Size: |  | 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment | 446 | students |
| WSFD Area (for 2011-12 Capacity): | 57,978 sq. ft (max) | SFD Site Calc: | 0.00 acres | OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor (OLF): | 1.0 |  |
| Building is Oversized by: | 8,087 sq. ft | Site Oversized by: | 0.00 acres | SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR: | 432 | students |
| Exist. Bldg as \% of SFD Calc. Area: | 114\% \% | Existing Site as \% of SFD Calc: | 0\% | In 2011, this school was OVER ENROLLED by: | 14 | students |
|  |  |  |  | \% of 2011-12 Enrollment | 3\% |  |
| Note: WSFD Area Calculated using: | 432 Students (Eq | uals 2011-12 SFD Building Capacity) |  |  |  |  |

TEACHING SPACES \& CAPACITY CALCULATIONS

|  | Existing Building / Use |  |  |  |  |  | Methodology |  |  | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CORE LEARNING: | \# Rooms | Avg. Size of Room(s) | \# Students Resricted | \# Students Unrestricted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (Restricted) } \end{gathered}$ | Total (Unrestricted) | Net Area per Student | Maximum \# of Students | reference NSF |  |
| PK \& K Classrooms | 5 | 992 | 16 | 20 | 80 | 99 | 50 | 16 | 800 |  |
| Grades 1-3 Classrooms | 9 | 859 | 16 | 21 | 144 | 193 | 40 | 16 | 640 |  |
| Grades 4-5/6 Classrooms | 9 | 901 | 22 | 23 | 198 | 203 | 40 | 25 | 1,000 | $2>1,000$ sf |
| Special Ed. / Self-Contained | 1 | 1,043 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 80 | 10 | 800 |  |
| ACTIVITY SPACES: (non-capacity spaces) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special Ed Pull-out/ Resource | 8 | 681 | - | - | - | - | 80 | 10 | 800 | $4>800 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Computer Lab | 2 | 1,098 | - | - | - | - | 38 | 25 | 938 |  |
| Science Classrooms |  |  | - | - | - | - | 60 | 25 | 1,500 |  |
| Art Classrooms | 1 | 1,047 | - | - | - | - | 50 | 25 | 1,250 |  |
| Music Classrooms | 2 | 1,043 | - | - | - | - | 60 | 50 | 3,000 |  |
| MPR/Gymnasium | 1 | 4,120 | - | - | - | - | 200 | no max | na | Gym only |
| Fitness / Weight Room / Other |  |  | - | - | - | - | 200 | 25 | na |  |
| Health/PE Classroom |  |  | - | - | - | - | 55 | 25 | 1,375 |  |
| Separate MPR | 1 | 2,458 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Includes separate MPR |
| Library/Media Center | 1 | 4,120 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| \# of capacity spaces: | 24 |  |  |  | 432 | 495 |  |  |  |  |

NOTE:
Prairie Wind is a prototype school along with Hillcrest. Currently the district is in design/construction of two other schools utilizing this prototype. Hillcrest and Prairie Wind were completed prior to state mandated 16:1 and 25:1 classroom ratios. Thus, capacity established during planning of these schools does not currently apply. We are utilizing the actual WSFD methodology for calculated capacity for each of these schools. Hillcrest Elementary functions as the district center for several SPED programs that do not count towards capacity as they are not self-contained. Thus, there is a difference in capacity between Hillcrest and Buffalo Ridge.

Plan Diagram: Prairie Wind Elementary School


## 4.A. 16 Pronghorn Elementary School



## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Plan Diagram: Pronghorn Elementary School


For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacily space

## 4.A. 17 Sunflower Elementary School



Plan Diagram: Sunflower Elementary School


## LEGEND

For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE = the space is a non-capacity space

## 4.A. 18 Wagon Wheel Elementary School



Plan Diagram: Wagon Wheel Elementary School


For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacily space

## 4.A. 19 Sage Valley Junior High School



Plan Diagram: Sage Valley Junior High School
Basement

## LEGEND

For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN = the space size aligns with SFD guidelinee
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelinesRED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space


Sage Valley JHS
Second Floor


Third Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines


RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE = the space is a non-capacity space

## 4.A. 20 Twin Spruce Junior High School



Plan Diagram: Twin Spruce Junior High School

First Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
$\square$ WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

Twin Spruce JHS - Second Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

Twin Spruce JHS - Third Floor

## LEGEND

For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space


Twin Spruce JHS - Fourth Floor


## 4.A. 21 Campbell County High School - North

| SCHOOL: | CAMPBELL COUNTY HS - NORTH |  |  |  |  |  |  | Shaded cells are for input data. Others calculate automatically. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physical Address:AiM Reference:Coniguration/Grade Levels: | 1000 Camel Drive, Gillette 82716 |  |  |  |  |  |  | SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0301-023-0100 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: BENCHMARK Uotization Factor (BUF): |  |  | 876 | students |
|  | Grade(s) 11-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85\% |  |
| Year Built 2 BUILDINGS: 1972 (Main), 1977 (G) | 2 BUILDINGS: 1972 (Main), 1977 (G) |  |  |  |  |  |  | BENCHMARK Ubilization Factor (BUF): <br> BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): |  |  | 1,458 | studentsstudents |
| Portables on Site / Use: <br> Special Considerations: | 3 (1969, 1975) |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNRESTRICTED Capacity X BUF: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Use 2 main buildings: Main (308,917sf), G Bldg ( 19,600 sff, |  |  |  |  |  |  | In 2011, there was space AVAILABLE for: $\frac{51 \%}{582}$ |  |  |  | students |
|  | plus various small other out-buildings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BUILDING SIZE \& SITE SIZE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ADJUSTED CAPACITY (Loading Factor) |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 Gross Building Area: | 304,010 sq. ft. |  |  |  | 2011-12 Site Size: |  | 57.30 acres | $\begin{aligned} \text { 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment } & 876 \\ \text { OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor (OLF): } & 1.00\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | students |
| WSFD Area (for 2011-12 Capacity): | 244,463 sq. ft. (max) |  |  |  |  | Site Calc: | 34.58 acres |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building is Oversized by: | 59,547 |  |  |  | Site Ov | rsized by: | 22.72 acres | SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR: |  |  | 1,715 | students students |
| Exist. Bldg as \% of SFD Calc. Area: | 124\% |  |  | Existing Site as \% of SFD Calc: |  |  | 166\% | In 2011, there was space AVAILABLE for: <br> \% of 2011-12 Enrollment |  |  | 839 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 96\% |  |
| Note: WSFD Area Calculated using: | 1,458 Students (Equals 2011-1 |  |  | 12 SFD Building Capacity) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TEACHING SPACES \& CAPACITY CALCULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Note: calculations include rounding |  |  |  |  |
|  | Existing Building / Use |  |  |  |  |  | Methodology |  | Notes: |  |  |  |
| CORE LEARNING: | \# Rooms | Avg. Size of Room(s) | \# Students Resricted | \# Students Unrestricted | TotalTotal <br> (Restricted) <br> (Unrestricted) |  | Net Area per Student | Maximum  <br> \# of Students  <br> reference  <br> NSF  |  |  |  |  |
| Core Classrooms | 35 | 889 | 22 | 24 | 774 | 830 | 37.5 | 25 | 938 | 5<650sf |  |  |
| Science Classrooms | 9 | 1,286 | 21 | 21 | 186 | 193 | 60 | 24 | 1,440 |  |  |  |
| Special Ed. / Self-Contained | 3 | 723 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 27 | 80 | 10 | 800 |  |  |  |
| SpEd Resource/Pull-out | 11 | 693 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | no capacity $9>600 \mathrm{SF}$ |  |  |
| ACTIVITY SPACES: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CTE Lab (Heavy) | 10 | 2,793 | 20 | 22 | 198 | 223 | 125 | 25 | 3,125 |  |  |  |
| CTE Lab (General) | 4 | 1,026 | 17 | 17 | 68 | 68 | 60 | 25 | 1,500 |  |  |  |
| Computer Lab | 5 | 879 | 23 | 23 | 115 | 117 | 37.5 | 25 | 938 | 1-530 SF |  |  |
| Art Classrooms | 4 | 1,126 | 18 | 18 | 72 | 73 | 62 | 25 | 1,550 | 1@1,570sf |  |  |
| Music Classrooms | 2 | 1,683 | 28 | 28 | 56 | 56 | 60 | 50 | 3,000 |  |  |  |
| Gymnasium | 1 | 11,300 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 200 | no max | na |  |  |  |
| Auxiliary Gym | 2 | 6,587 | 33 | 33 | 66 | 66 | 200 | no max | na |  |  |  |
| Finess / Weight / Dance / Other | 2 | 2,732 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 99 | 55 | 25 | 1,375 |  |  |  |
| Healt/PE Classroom | 1 | 811 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 37.5 | 25 | 938 |  |  |  |
| Performance/Drama | 1 | 1,132 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 30 | 37.5 | 25 | 938 | non-auditorium space |  |  |
| BroadcastProducion Studio |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 25 | 1,550 |  |  |  |
| \# of capacity spaces: ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | 79 |  |  |  | 1,715 | 1,861 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Plan Diagram: Campbell County High School - North
First Floor


## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Campbell County High School - North
Second Floor


Third Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger thanSFD guidelinesRED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE = the space is a non-capacity space


[^0]
## 4.A. 22 Campbell County High School - South

## SCHOOL: CAMPBELL COUNTY HS - SOUTH

Physical Address: 4001 Saunders Blvd., Gillette 82716
AiM Reference: 0301-027-0100
Configuration/Grade Levels: 1 Grade(s) 10
Year Built

## 1999

Portables on Site / Use:
Special Considerations: Verify: Enrollment

| BUILDING SIZE \& SITE SIZE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 Gross Building Area | 194,483 sq. ft. | 2011-12 Site Size: | 56.80 acres |
| WSFD Area (for 2011-12 Capacity) | 174,399 sq. ft. (max) | SFD Site Calc: | 30.05 acres |
| Building is Oversized by | 20,084 sq. ft. | Site Oversized by: | 26.75 acres |
| Exist. Bldg as \% of SFD Calc. Area | 112\% \% | Existing Site as \% of SFD Calc: | 189\% |

Shaded cells are for input data. Others calculate automatically.

| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 540 | students |
| BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | 85\% |  |
| BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 1,005 | students |
| UNRESTRICTED Capacity X BUF: | 1,075 | students |
| 2011 ACTUAL Utilization Factor: | 46\% |  |
| In 2011, there was space AVAILABLE for: | 465 | students |

ADJUSTED CAPACITY (Loading Factor)
10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: 540 students OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor (OLF): 1.00
SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR: 1,183 students In 2011, there was space AVAILABLE for: 643 students
\% of 2011-12 Enrollment: $\qquad$

Note: WSFD Area Calculated using: 1,005 Students (Equals 2011-12 SFD Building Capacity)

| TEACHING SPACES \& CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | Note: calculations include rounding |
| :--- | :--- |



Plan Diagram: Campbell County High School - South
First Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

Campbell County High School - South
Second Floor

LEGEND
For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:
GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
YELLOW $=$ the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelines
RED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelines
WHITE = the space is a non-capacily space

## E．District－wide Capacity Summary

The following chart summarizes capacity calculations for 6－12 schools in Campbell SD1：

The charts below illustrate school capacities using the approved SFD methodology．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS（2011－12） | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 | K－6 |
| 10／3／2011 ACTUAL Enrollment | 0 | 435 | 413 | 382 | 346 | 486 | 446 | 453 | 447 | 413 | 3，821 |
| BENCHMARK Ubilization Factor（BUF）： | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | － |
| BLDG CAPACITY（Restricted X BUF）： | 0 | 348 | 380 | 382 | 277 | 405 | 432 | 388 | 381 | 382 | 3，377 |
| 2011 ACTUAL Utilization Factor： | 0\％ | 0\％ | 109\％ |  | 125\％ | 120\％ | 103\％ | 117\％ | 117\％ | 108\％ | － |
| $(-)=$ Space NEEDED，（＋）＝Space AVAILABLE | 0 | （87） | （33） | 0 | （69） | （81） | （14） | （65） | （66） | （31） | （444） |
| ADJUSTED CAPACITY（Loading Factor） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor（OLF）： | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | － |
| SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR： | 0 | 348 | 380 | 382 | 277 | 405 | 432 | 388 | 381 | 382 | 3，377 |
| $(-)=$ Space NEEDED，（＋）＝Space AVAILABLE | 0 | （87） | （33） | 0 | （69） | （81） | （14） | （65） | （66） | （31） | （444） |
| BUILDING SIZE（2011－12） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 Gross Building Area： | 0 | 54，512 | 68，210 | 35，057 | 35，086 | 57，032 | 66，065 | 60，857 | 52，963 | 48，302 | 478，084 |
| WSFD GSF（2011－12 Capacity）： | 0 | 49，586 | 52，812 | 0 | 42，058 | 55，299 | 57，978 | 53，610 | 52，912 | 53，012 | 417，267 |
| $(-)=$ Area NEEDED，$(+)=$ Area AVAILABLE | 0 | 4，926 | 15，398 | 35，057 | $(6,972)$ | 1，733 | 8，087 | 7，247 | 51 | $(4,710)$ | 60，817 |
| Exist Bldg as \％of SFD Calc．Area： | 0\％ | 110\％ | 129\％ | 0\％ | 83\％ | 103\％ | 114\％ | 114\％ | 100\％ | 91\％ | 115\％ |
| SITE SIZE（2011－12） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011－12 Site Size： | 0.00 | 9.77 | 7.98 | 0.00 | 2.88 | 5.69 | 0.00 | 10.64 | 5.53 | 6.72 | 49.21 |
| SFD Site Calc： | 0.00 | 7.48 | 7.80 | 0.00 | 6.77 | 8.05 | 0.00 | 7.88 | 7.81 | 7.82 | 53.63 |
| （－）＝Acreage NEEDED，（＋）＝Acreage AVAILABLE | 0.00 | 2.29 | 0.18 | 0.00 | （3．89） | （2．36） | 0.00 | 2.76 | （2．28） | （1．10） | （4．42） |
| Existing Site as \％of SFD Calc： | 0\％ | 131\％ | 102\％ | 0\％ | 43\％ | 71\％ | 0\％ | 135\％ | 71\％ | 86\％ | 92\％ |

## NOTE：

Capacities for Buffalo Ridge Elementary School and Lakeview Replacement Elementary School will utilize planning capacities established by the WSFD．Each school will utilize a planning capacity of 499 students．Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service．The capacity shown for Lakeview Elementary school in the matrix above is the existing Lakeview，not the replacement school．

NOTE：
The existing Lakeview Elementary School will be replaced with a new school currently in the planning process．The existing Lakeview capacity will be removed upon opening of the replacement school and is reflected so in all scenarios．The district would like to maintain the option to keep the existing Lakeview Elementary School as a temporary relief to capacity issues dependent upon the selection of the recommended scenario， funding for recommended remedies and schedule dates for opening of new K－6 schools．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (2011-12) | K-6 | 7-9 | 7-9 | 7-9 | 11-12 | 10 | 10-12 |
| 10/3/2011 ACTUAL Enrollment: | 3,821 | 826 | 941 | 1,767 | 876 | 540 | 1,416 |
| BENCHMARK Utilization Factor (BUF): | - | 85\% | 85\% | - | 85\% | 85\% | - |
| BLDG CAPACITY (Restricted X BUF): | 3,377 | 934 | 1,010 | 1,945 | 1,458 | 1,005 | 2,463 |
| 2011 ACTUAL Utilization Factor: | - | 75\% | 79\% | - | 51\% | 46\% | - |
| (-) = Space NEEDED, (+) = Space AVAILABLE | (444) | 108 | 69 | 178 | 582 | 465 | 1,047 |
| ADJUSTED CAPACITY (Loading Factor) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OBSERVATIONAL Loading Factor (OLF): | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | - |
| SFD CAPACITY x LOADING FACTOR: | 3,377 | 934 | 1,010 | 1,945 | 1,715 | 1,183 | 2,898 |
| $(-)=$ Space NEEDED, (+) = Space AVAILABLE | (444) | 108 | 69 | 178 | 839 | 643 | 1,482 |
| BUILDING SIZE (2011-12) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 Gross Building Area: | 478,084 | 172,246 | 168,551 | 340,797 | 304,010 | 194,483 | 498,493 |
| WSFD GSF (2011-12 Capacity): | 417,267 | 138,475 | 149,743 | 288,218 | 244,463 | 174,399 | 418,862 |
| $(-)=$ Area NEEDED, (+) = Area AVAILABLE | 60,817 | 33,771 | 18,808 | 52,579 | 59,547 | 20,084 | 79,631 |
| Exist. Bldg as \% of SFD Calc. Area: | 115\% | 124\% | 113\% | 118\% | 124\% | 112\% | 119\% |
| SITE SIZE (2011-12) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011-12 Site Size: | 49.21 | 13.41 | 21.04 | 34.45 | 57.30 | 56.80 | 114.10 |
| SFD Site Calc: | 53.63 | 19.34 | 20.10 | 39.45 | 34.58 | 30.05 | 64.63 |
| (-) = Acreage NEEDED, (+) = Acreage AVAILABLE | (4.42) | (5.93) | 0.94 | (5.00) | 22.72 | 26.75 | 49.47 |
| Existing Site as \% of SFD Calc: | 92\% | 69\% | 105\% | 87\% | 166\% | 189\% | 177\% |

### 5.0 Option Identification

## A. Scenario Development Overview

Based on the WSFD Methodology to Calculate Capacity, a total of seven scenarios were identified and discussed with the Campbell County School District and WSFD. After a collaborative review and discussion, five scenarios were selected for further assessment and cost analysis as part of the Facility Plan. The five scenarios were then presented to the School District and WSFD for review and discussion.

The five scenarios included for assessment and cost analysis are:

## Scenario 1

CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE 9h GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Convert North and South High School Campus into two, independent comprehensive high schools. Provide renovations at each campus to provide for comprehensive 9-12 educational needs as independent high schools. Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to 7-8 grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools.

## Scenario 2

MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Move 9th graders into the high school system. South Campus serves grades 9-10; North Campus serves grades 11-12. Provide flexibility for future conversion to two independent comprehensive high schools. Provide addition at South Campus to meet capacity needs. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to 7-8 grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools.

## Scenario 3

MAINTAIN DISTRICT GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION; NO CHANGE TO EXISTING HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW 7-9 Jr. HIGH SCHOOL; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Maintain existing high school campus system and facilities. Transition existing Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build one new grade 7-9 Jr. High School. Build three new elementary schools.

## Scenario 4

CONVERT SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOL. CONVERT NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL. EXPAND NORTH HIGH SCHOOL TO MEET CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
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Convert and renovate South High School Campus from a grade 10 high school into a grade 7-9 Jr. High School. Provide addition and renovate North High School Campus to convert from a grade 11-12 school into a grade 10-12 High School. Transition existing Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Build three new elementary schools.

## Scenario 5

COMPLETE GRADE LEVEL TRANSFORMATION OF ALL SCHOOLS WITHIN THE DISTRICT; EXISTING K-6 SCHOOLS CONVERT TO K-5 GRADE LEVELS; EXISTING GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOLS CONVERT TO GRADE 6-8 MIDDLE SCHOOLS; EXISTING GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS CONVERTS TO GRADES 9-12 CAMPUS

Convert grade K-6 elementary schools to K-5 grade levels. Build two new elementary schools. Convert grade 7-9 Jr. High Schools into Grade 6-8 Middle Schools.

Transition Sage Valley and Twin Spruce Middle Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization.
Build one new middle school. Move $9^{\text {th }}$ grade into the high school system. South Campus converts to a grade 9-10 campus; North Campus stays a grade 11-12 campus.
Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs.

Scenarios Identified but not carried forward to assessment:

## Scenario A: CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE ALL 10-12 STUDENTS INTO NORTH UNTIL THE RENOVATION AND ADDITIONS TO SOUTH ARE COMPLETE; MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

 This scenario was eliminated for the following reasons:- North High School cannot handle the number of combined 9-12 grades, thus this scenario was determined to be unfeasible.

Scenario B: MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; MOVE K-6 SCHOOL INTO THE SAGE VALLEY JR. HIGH FACILITY TO CREATE TWO SCHOOLS ON THIS CAMPUS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS This scenario was eliminated for the following reasons:

- District expressed a strong reluctance to place K-6 school on the Jr. High campus
- Community has a strong reluctance to have a K-6 school placed on the Jr. High campus
- With the K-6 taking capacity at this school, a future addition will be required for the Jr. High. There is not site area available to accommodate a future addition. Thus, this scenario was determined to be unfeasible.
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## B. Scenario 1

## CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT

 COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS1. Convert North and South High School Campus into two, independent comprehensive high schools. Provide renovations at each campus to provide for comprehensive 9-12 educational needs as independent high schools.
2. Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs.
3. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to $7-8$ grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Renovate to provide teacher planning facilities (this will decrease available teaching stations but increase utilization).
4. Incorporate capacity increases with Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools. Utilize planning capacity of 499 students each for these two schools.
5. Build three new elementary schools.

The following comments pertain to this scenario:

- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding $9^{\text {th }}$ graders into the high school system.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by moving 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to $85 \%$ utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools have a planned capacity assigned by the WSFD of 499 students.
- Capacity utilizing the WSFD approved methodology was used for Hillcrest and Prairie Wind Elementary Schools. These are two prototype schools that originally had a planning capacity of 499 prior to State Statute requirements for classroom capacity. As such, we recommend utilizing the capacity identified with the approved methodology rather than the planning capacity. This is consistent with our approach on other schools within the State.
- Hillcrest Elementary School contains a district wide SPED program which effectively lowers its capacity. We point this out because Hillcrest and Prairie Wind are similar prototype schools but are shown with dissimilar capacities.
- Confirm timing for opening of new elementary school B. If actual enrollments are below projections, that school may be able to open a year later.
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## Currently Planned or Under Construction Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Planned <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elementary | K-6 | Fall 2012 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 sf |
| Lakeview <br> Elementary | K-6 | Fall 2013 | 382 | 499 | 117 | 0 sf |

*Capacities shown for these two schools are planning capacities established by the WSFD. Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service.

Proposed New K-6 Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| School A - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School B - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School C - | K-6 | Fall 2018 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |

Proposed Grade Level Change to Existing Jr. High Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 1,010 | 1,010 | 0 | 0 sf |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 934 | 934 | 0 | 0 sf |

Proposed Renovations to 7-8 Schools for Staff Planning Areas

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 1,010 | 885 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 934 | 809 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |

*these renovations enable the school to adhere to the classroom utilization requirements- confirm \# of staff members to be accommodated with school district @ 75 sf per staff member, (accommodates 12 staff members in a 900 sf room)
*Parish Hall located at Twin Spruce Jr. High is currently high on the WSFD condition index. Should it be scheduled for removal/replacement, future planning should incorporate classroom and staff planning needs as a result.
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Proposed Grade Level Change of North and South Campus into 9-12 High Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| South High <br> School | $9-12$ | Fall 2016 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 0 | 24,373 <br> sf |
| North High <br> School | $9-12$ | Fall 2016 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 0 | 0 sf |

Proposed Addition to South High Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| South High <br> School | $9-12$ | Fall 2016 | 1,005 | 1,458 | 453 | $70,064 \mathrm{sf}$ |

## K-6 Grade Levels

| Enrollment |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,821 students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,367 students |
| Projected Enrollment |  | AY2020/2021 | 5,230 students |
| Projected Capacity |  | AY2020/2021 | 5,432 students |
|  |  |  |  |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 202 students |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 1,409 students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 2,065 students |  |

7-8 Grade Levels

| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 1,224 students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,944 students |  |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,666 students |  |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,694 students | (includes deduction of 250) |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 28 students |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 442 students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | (250) students | (includes deduction of 250) |
| 9-12 Grade Levels |  |  |  |
| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 2,055 students |  |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 2,463 students |  |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 2,895 students |  |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 2,916 students |  |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 21students |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 840 students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 453 students |  |

K-6 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


SCENARIO 1: GRADES K-6

| SCENARIO 1: GRADES K-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 | 5,377 | 5,525 | 5,672 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (444) | (165) | (304) | (365) | 454 | 272 | 145 | 477 | 359 | 212 | 65 | (83) | (230) |

## SCENARIO \#1 <br> 7-8 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 1. GRADES 7-8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1944 | 1944 | 1944 | 1944 | 1944 | 1694 | 1694 | 1694 | 1694 | 1694 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,767 | 1,876 | 1,929 | 1,916 | 1,994 | 1,380 | 1,455 | 1,546 | 1,609 | 1,666 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 177 | 68 | 15 | 28 | (50) | 314 | 239 | 148 | 85 | 28 |

## SCENARIO \#1 <br> 9-12 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY
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## C. Scenario 2 <br> MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. Move 9th grade into the high school system. South Campus converts to a grade 9-10 campus; North Campus stays a grade 11-12 campus.
2. Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs.
3. Plan south addition to allow flexibility for future conversion of south into a comprehensive 9-12 high school.
4. Grade level change at two Jr. High Schools to go from 7-9 grade levels to $7-8$ grade levels. Transition Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Renovate to provide teacher planning facilities (this will decrease available teaching stations but increase utilization).
5. Incorporate capacity increases with Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools.
6. Build three new elementary schools.

The following comments pertain to this scenario:

- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding $9^{\text {th }}$ graders into the high school system.
- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by moving 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to $85 \%$ utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools have a planned capacity assigned by the WSFD of 499 students.
- Capacity utilizing the WSFD approved methodology was used for Hillcrest and Prairie Wind Elementary Schools. These are two prototype schools that originally had a planning capacity of 499 prior to State Statute requirements for classroom capacity. As such, we recommend utilizing the capacity identified with the approved methodology rather than the planning capacity. This is consistent with our approach on other schools within the State.
- Hillcrest Elementary School contains a district wide SPED program which effectively lowers its capacity. We point this out because Hillcrest and Prairie Wind are similar prototype schools but are shown with dissimilar capacities.
- Confirm timing for opening of new elementary school B. If actual enrollments are below projections, that school may be able to open a year later.


## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

## Currently Planned or Under Construction Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Planned <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elementary | K-6 | Fall 2012 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 sf |
| Lakeview <br> Elem. | K-6 | Fall 2013 | 382 | 499 | 117 | 0 sf |

*Capacities shown for these two schools are planning capacities established by the WSFD. Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service.

Proposed New K-6 Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| School A - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School B - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School C - | K-6 | Fall 2018 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |

Proposed Grade Level Change to Existing Jr. High Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 1,010 | 1,010 | 0 | 0 sf |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 934 | 934 | 0 | 0 sf |

Proposed Renovations to 7-8 Schools for Staff Planning Areas

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 1,010 | 885 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-8$ | Fall 2016 | 934 | 809 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |

*these renovations enable the school to adhere to the classroom utilization requirements- confirm \# of staff members to be accommodated with school district @ 75 sf per staff member, (accommodates 12 staff members in a 900 sf room)
*Parish Hall located at Twin Spruce Jr. High is currently high on the WSFD condition index. Should it be scheduled for removal/replacement, future planning should incorporate classroom and staff planning needs as a result.
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Proposed Grade Level Change to Existing High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| South <br> Campus | $9-10$ | Fall 2016 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 0 | 16,323 <br> sf |

Proposed Additions to High School Campus

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| South <br> Campus | $9-10$ | Fall 2016 | 1,005 | 1,605 | 600 | $94,711 \mathrm{sf}$ |

## K-6 Grade Levels

| Enrollment |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,821 students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,367 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 5,230 students |  |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 5,432 students |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 202 students |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 0 9}$ students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 2,065 students |  |

## 7-8 Grade Levels

| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 1,224 students |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,944 students |  |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,666 students |  |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,694 students | (includes deduction of 250) |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 28 students |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 442 students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | (250) students | (includes deduction of 250) |

9-12 Grade Levels Combined

| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 2,055 students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 2,463 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 2,895 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 3,063 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 168 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 840 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 600 students |
| 9-10 South Campus |  |  |
| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 1,088 students |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,005 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,588 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,605 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 17 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 500 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 600 students |


| 11-12 North Campus |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 967 students |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,458 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,307 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,458 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 151 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 340 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 0 students |

## SCENARIO \#2

K-6 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


| SCENARIO 2: GRADES K-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 | 5,377 | 5,525 | 5,672 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (444) | (165) | (304) | (365) | 454 | 272 | 145 | 477 | 359 | 212 | 65 | (83) | (230) |

SCENARIO \#2
7-8 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



## SCENARIO \#2 <br> 9-10 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 2: GRADES 9-10-SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,088 | 1,170 | 1,280 | 1,301 | 1,304 | 1,320 | 1,367 | 1,418 | 1,496 | 1,588 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (83) | (165) | (275) | (296) | (299) | 285 | 238 | 187 | 109 | 17 |

SCENARIO \#2
11-12 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


| SCENARIO 2: GRADES 11-12 - NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 967 | 1,009 | 1,034 | 1,081 | 1,182 | 1,198 | 1,204 | 1,217 | 1,263 | 1,307 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 491 | 449 | 424 | 377 | 276 | 260 | 254 | 241 | 195 | 151 |

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

## D. Scenario 3

## MAINTAIN DISTRICT GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION; NO CHANGE TO EXISTING HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW 7-9 Jr. HIGH SCHOOL; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. Maintain current split campus high school system. No change to high school facilities.
2. Transition existing Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Renovate to provide teacher planning facilities (this will decrease available teaching stations but increase utilization).
3. Construct one new grade 7-9 Jr. High School.
4. Incorporate capacity increases with Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools.
5. Build three new elementary schools.

The following comments pertain to this scenario:

- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district.
- Scenario does not take advantage of available capacity at High School to alleviate capacity issues in the Jr. High schools.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools through construction of a third Jr. High School.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to $85 \%$ utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools have a planned capacity assigned by the WSFD of 499 students.
- Capacity utilizing the WSFD approved methodology was used for Hillcrest and Prairie Wind Elementary Schools. These are two prototype schools that originally had a planning capacity of 499 prior to State Statute requirements for classroom capacity. As such, we recommend utilizing the capacity identified with the approved methodology rather than the planning capacity. This is consistent with our approach on other schools within the State.
- Hillcrest Elementary School contains a district wide SPED program which effectively lowers its capacity. We point this out because Hillcrest and Prairie Wind are similar prototype schools but are shown with dissimilar capacities.
- Confirm timing for opening of new elementary school B. If actual enrollments are below projections, that school may be able to open a year later.
- Scenario has significant impacts to district transportation costs. Additional costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 600,000$ per year.


## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Currently Planned or Under Construction Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Planned <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elementary | K-6 | Fall 2012 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 sf |
| Lakeview <br> Elem. | K-6 | Fall 2013 | 382 | 499 | 117 | 0 sf |

*Capacities shown for these two schools are planning capacities established by the WSFD. Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service.

Proposed New K-6 Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| School A - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School B - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School C - | K-6 | Fall 2018 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |

Proposed Renovations to 7-9 Schools for Staff Planning Areas

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-9$ | Fall 2014 | 1,010 | 885 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-9$ | Fall 2014 | 934 | 809 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |

*these renovations enable the school to adhere to the classroom utilization requirements- confirm \# of staff members to be accommodated with school district @ 75 sf per staff member, (accommodates 12 staff members in a 900 sf room)
*Parish Hall located at Twin Spruce Jr. High is currently high on the WSFD condition index. Should it be scheduled for removal/replacement, future planning should incorporate classroom and staff planning needs as a result.

Proposed New 7-9 Jr. High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| School D - | $7-9$ | Fall 2016 | 0 | 818 | 818 | 121,277 <br> sf |

K-6 Grade Levels
Enrollment
Capacity
Projected Enrollment
Projected Capacity
Available Capacity
Enrollment Growth
Capacity Growth

7-9 Grade Levels
Enrollment
Capacity
Projected Enrollment Projected Capacity

Available Capacity plus addition of 818)

Enrollment Growth Capacity Growth plus addition of 818)

10-12 Grade Levels
Enrollment
Capacity
Projected Enrollment
Projected Capacity
Available Capacity
Enrollment Growth
Capacity Growth

| AY 2011/2012 | 3,821 students |
| :--- | :--- |
| AY 2011//2012 | 3,367 students |
| AY20202021 | 5,230 sududent |
| AY2020/2021 | 5,432 students |
| AY2020/2021 | 202 students |
| AY2011/2021 | 1,409 students |
| AY2011/2021 | 2,065 students |

AY 2011/2012 1,767 students
AY 2011/2012 1,944 students
AY2020/2021 2,453 students
AY2020/2021 2,512 students
AY2020/2021 59 students

AY2011/2021 686 students AY2011/2021 568 students
(includes deduction of 250

AY 2011/2012 1,512 students
AY 2011/2012 2,463 students
AY2020/2021 2,108 students
AY2020/2021 2,463 students
AY2020/2021 355 students
AY2011/2021 596 students
AY2011/2021 0 students

## SCENARIO \#3 <br> K-6 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 3: GRADES K-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 | 5,377 | 5,525 | 5,672 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (444) | (165) | (304) | (365) | 454 | 272 | 628 | 477 | 359 | 212 | 65 | (83) | (230) |



SCENARIO 3: GRADES 7-9

| SCENARIO 3: GRADES 7-9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,943 | 1,943 | 1,943 | 1,694 | 1,694 | 1,694 | 2,512 | 2,512 | 2,512 | 2,512 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,767 | 1,876 | 1,929 | 1,916 | 1,994 | 2,026 | 2,166 | 2,242 | 2,397 | 2,453 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 176 | 67 | 14 | (222) | (300) | (332) | 346 | 270 | 115 | 59 |

## SCENARIO \#3 <br> 10-12 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS, CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 3: GRADES 10-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 | 2,463 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,512 | 1,569 | 1,654 | 1,752 | 1,823 | 1,873 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 1,971 | 2,108 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 951 | 894 | 809 | 711 | 640 | 590 | 602 | 524 | 492 | 355 |

## E. Scenario 4 <br> CONVERT SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOL. CONVERT NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL. EXPAND NORTH HIGH SCHOOL TO MEET CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. Convert South High School Campus from a grade 10 high school into a grade 7-9 Jr. High School. Renovate South building to conform to Jr. High educational needs.
2. Convert North High School Campus from a grade 11-12 school into a grade $10-12$ High School. Renovate and provide addition to accommodate grade level restructuring and additional capacity.
3. Transition existing Jr. High Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Renovate to provide teacher planning facilities (this will decrease available teaching stations but increase utilization).
4. Incorporate capacity increases with Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools.
5. Build three new elementary schools.

The following comments pertain to this scenario:

- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity within high schools by converting south campus into a Jr. High.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by creating a third Jr. High.
- Scenario allows existing Jr. High Schools to conform to $85 \%$ utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario eliminates current split campus system and creates a single high school within the district with minimal opportunity to transform to a two high school district. This will be a very large high school.
- Scenario requires significant renovations at South campus to accommodate grade 7-9 educational needs.
- Scenario requires renovations at north campus to accommodate grade 10 educational needs.
- Scenario expands north campus.
- Scenario could incorporate alternate to replace North with a new school if/when suitability needs index allowed. However it is difficult to align these schedules.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Scenario doesn't take grade 9 out of Jr. Highs.
- Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools have a planned capacity assigned by the WSFD of 499 students.
- Capacity utilizing the WSFD approved methodology was used for Hillcrest and Prairie Wind Elementary Schools. These are two prototype schools that originally had a planning capacity of 499 prior to State Statute requirements for classroom capacity. As such, we recommend utilizing the capacity identified with the approved methodology rather than the planning capacity. This is consistent with our approach on other schools within the State.
- Hillcrest Elementary School contains a district wide SPED program which effectively lowers its capacity. We point this out because Hillcrest and Prairie Wind are similar prototype schools but are shown with dissimilar capacities.
- Confirm timing for opening of new elementary school B. If actual enrollments are below projections, that school may be able to open a year later.
- Scenario has significant impacts to district transportation costs. Additional costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 600,000$ per year.


## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

- North High School is high on the WSFD condition index, thus, scenarios that involve utilizing it as a single high school should strongly consider a replacement high school as an alternate.


## Currently Planned or Under Construction Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Planned <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elementary | K-6 | Fall 2012 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 sf |
| Lakeview <br> Elem. | K-6 | Fall 2013 | 382 | 499 | 117 | 0 sf |

*Capacities shown for these two schools are planning capacities established by the WSFD. Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service.

Proposed New K-6 Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| School A - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School B - | K-6 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School C - | K-6 | Fall 2017 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |

Proposed Renovations to 7-9 Schools for Staff Planning Areas

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $7-9$ | Fall 2014 | 1,010 | 885 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $7-9$ | Fall 2014 | 934 | 809 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |

*these renovations enable the school to adhere to the classroom utilization requirements- confirm \# of staff members to be accommodated with school district @ 75 sf per staff member, (accommodates 12 staff members in a 900 sf room)
*Parish Hall located at Twin Spruce Jr. High is currently high on the WSFD condition index. Should it be scheduled for removal/replacement, future planning should incorporate classroom and staff planning needs as a result.

Proposed Conversion of South High School Campus into a Grade 7-9 Jr. High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| South Jr. <br> High | $7-9$ | Fall 2016 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 0 | 48,362 sf |

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Proposed Conversion of North High School Campus into a Grade 10-12 High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| North High <br> School | $10-12$ | Fall 2016 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 0 | 0 sf |

Proposed Addition to North High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North High <br> School | $10-12$ | Fall 2016 | 1,458 | 2,208 | 750 | 125,752 <br> sf |

Alternate \#1 - Construct Replacement for North High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North High <br> School | $10-12$ | Fall 2016 | 0 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 370,215 <br> sf |

## K-6 Grade Levels

| Enrollment |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,821 students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity |  | AY 2011/2012 | 3,367 students |
| Projected Enrollment |  | AY2020/2021 | 5,230 students |
| Projected Capacity |  | AY2020/2021 | 5,432 students |
| Available Capacity |  | AY2020/2021 | 202 students |
|  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 1,409 students |  |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 2,065 students |  |

## 7-9 Grade Levels

Enrollment
Capacity
Projected Enrollment
Projected Capacity plus addition of 1,005 )

Available Capacity
Enrollment Growth
Capacity Growth
plus addition of 1,005 )

## 10-12 Grade Levels

Enrollment
Capacity
Projected Enrollment
Projected Capacity

AY 2011/2012
AY 2011/2012
AY2020/2021
AY2020/2021
AY2020/2021
AY2011/2021
AY2011/2021

AY 2011/2012
AY 2011/2012
AY2020/2021
AY2020/2021

AY2020/2021
AY2011/2021
AY2011/2021

1,767 students
1,944 students 2,453 students
2,699 students (includes deduction of 250

246 students
686 students
755 students

| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 100 students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 596 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 750 students |

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

## SCENARIO \#4 <br> K-6 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 4: GRADES K-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 4,959 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 | 5,442 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,821 | 4,041 | 4,180 | 4,358 | 4,505 | 4,687 | 4,814 | 4,965 | 5,083 | 5,230 | 5,377 | 5,525 | 5,672 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | (444) | (165) | (304) | (365) | 454 | 272 | 145 | 477 | 359 | 212 | 65 | (83) | (230) |

SCENARIO \#4
7-9 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


| SCENARIO 4: GRADES 7-9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 2,699 | 2,699 | 2,699 | 2,699 | 2,699 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,767 | 1,876 | 1,929 | 1,916 | 1,994 | 2,026 | 2,166 | 2,242 | 2,397 | 2,453 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 177 | 68 | 15 | 28 | (50) | 673 | 533 | 457 | 302 | 246 |

## SCENARIO \#4 <br> 10-12 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 4: GRADES 10-12 - SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 2,208 | 2,208 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 967 | 1,009 | 1,034 | 1,081 | 1,182 | 1,873 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 1,971 | 2,108 | 2,183 | 2,332 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 491 | 449 | 424 | 377 | 276 | 335 | 347 | 269 | 237 | 100 | 25 | (124) |

## F. Scenario 5 <br> COMPLETE GRADE LEVEL TRANSFORMATION OF ALL SCHOOLS WITHIN THE DISTRICT; EXISTING K-6 SCHOOLS CONVERT TO K-5 GRADE LEVELS; EXISTING GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOLS CONVERT TO GRADE 6-8 MIDDLE SCHOOLS; EXISTING GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL SPLIT CAMPUS CONVERTS TO GRADES $9-12$ SPLIT CAMPUS

1. Convert grade K-6 elementary schools to $\mathrm{K}-5$ grade levels. This will reduce capacity at all existing schools due to a higher percentage of K-3 grade level students within the schools.
2. Incorporate capacity increases with Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview Elementary Schools.
3. Build two new elementary schools.
4. Convert grade 7-9 Jr. High Schools into Grade 6-8 Middle Schools.
5. Transition Sage Valley and Twin Spruce Middle Schools to confirm to $85 \%$ utilization. Renovate to provide teacher planning facilities (this will decrease available teaching stations but increase utilization).
6. Build one new middle school.
7. Move $9^{\text {th }}$ grade into the high school system. South Campus converts to a grade 9-10 campus; North Campus stays a grade 11-12 campus.
8. Provide addition at South High School to meet capacity needs.
9. Plan south addition to allow flexibility for future conversion of south into a comprehensive 9-12 high school.

The following comments pertain to this scenario:

- Scenario reduces capacity issue at elementary schools transforming grade 7-9 Jr. High Schools into grade 6-8 Middle Schools.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-5 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Scenario does not align existing K-5 school capacity with grade level capacity needs.
- Scenario requires forced mobilization due to boundary modifications.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to $85 \%$ utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario does not alleviate capacity issues at Twin Spruce and Sage Valley. Scenario only shifts $9^{\text {th }}$ grade out and $6^{\text {th }}$ grade in. Thus, scenario requires construction of a new middle school.
- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district.
- Scenario has significant impacts to district transportation costs. Additional costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 600,000$ per year.
- Scenario has significant impacts to district due to transition into Middle Schools. Costs are driven by Department of Education requirements. Cost impact is estimated to be approximately $\$ 700,000$.


## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Currently Planned or Under Construction Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Planned <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elementary | K-5 | Fall 2012 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 sf |
| Lakeview <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2013 | 382 | 499 | 117 | 0 sf |

*Capacities shown for these two schools are planning capacities established by the WSFD. Future studies should look at actual capacities of these two schools once they are in service.

Proposed New K-5 Schools

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| School A - | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |
| School B - | K-5 | Fall 2018 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 63,944 <br> sf |

Capacity Reductions at Elementary Schools due to Grade Level Reconfiguration

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | Revised <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | RF of <br> Rev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Buffalo Ridge <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 499 | 481 | 18 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Conestoga <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 348 | 334 | 14 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Hillcrest Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 380 | 365 | 15 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Lakeview <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 499 | 481 | 18 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Meadowlark <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 277 | 266 | 11 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Paintbrush <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 405 | 389 | 16 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Prairie Wind <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 432 | 415 | 17 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Pronghorn <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 388 | 372 | 16 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Sunflower <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 381 | 366 | 15 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Wagon Wheel <br> Elem. | K-5 | Fall 2015 | 382 | 365 | 15 | $3,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |

Proposed Renovations to 6-8 Schools and inclusion of Staff Planning Areas

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Decrease | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sage Valley <br> Jr. High | $6-8$ | Fall 2014 | 1,010 | 885 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Twin Spruce <br> Jr. High | $6-8$ | Fall 2014 | 934 | 809 | 125 | $4,500 \mathrm{sf}$ |

*these renovations enable the school to adhere to the classroom utilization requirements- confirm \# of staff members to be accommodated with school district @ 75 sf per staff member, (accommodates 12 staff members in a 900 sf room)
*Parish Hall located at Twin Spruce Jr. High is currently high on the WSFD condition index. Should it be scheduled for removal/replacement, future planning should incorporate classroom and staff planning needs as a result.

Proposed New 6-8 Middle School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> New <br> Const. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| School C - | $6-8$ | Fall 2016 | 0 | 700 | 700 | 104,745 <br> sf |

Proposed Grade Level Change to Existing High School

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Renov. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| South <br> Campus | $9-10$ | Fall 2014 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 0 | 16,323 <br> sf |

Proposed Additions to High School Campus

| School | Proposed <br> Grade <br> Levels | Completion <br> Date | Current <br> Capacity | New <br> Capacity | Net <br> Capacity <br> Increase | SF of <br> Addition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| South <br> Campus | $9-10$ | Fall 2015 | 1,005 | 1,605 | 600 | $94,711 \mathrm{sf}$ |

K-5 Grade Levels
Enrollment
Capacity
schools were functioning as
Projected Enrollment
Projected Capacity
Available Capacity
Enrollment Growth
Capacity Growth

AY 2011/2012
AY 2011/2012 3,244 students
K-5 schools) (does not include Buffalo Ridge and Lakeview schools)
AY2020/2021 4,518 students
AY2020/2021 4,790 students
AY2020/2021 262 students

AY2011/2021 1,208 students
AY2011/2021 1,546 students

## 6-8 Grade Levels

| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 1,735 students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,944 students |  |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 2,377 students |  |
| Projected Capacity plus addition of 682) | AY2020/2021 | 2,394 students | (includes deduction of 250 |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 17 students |  |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 642 students |  |
| Capacity Growth plus addition of 682) | AY2011/2021 | 450 students | (includes deduction of 250 |

## 9-12 Grade Levels Combined

| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 2,055 students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 2,463 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 2,895 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 3,063 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 168 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 840 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 600 students |
| 9-10 South Campus |  |  |
| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 1,088 students |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,005 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,588 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,605 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 17 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 500 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 600 students |
| 11-12 North Campus |  |  |
| Enrollment | AY 2011/2012 | 967 students |
| Capacity | AY 2011/2012 | 1,458 students |
| Projected Enrollment | AY2020/2021 | 1,307 students |
| Projected Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 1,458 students |
| Available Capacity | AY2020/2021 | 151 students |
| Enrollment Growth | AY2011/2021 | 340 students |
| Capacity Growth | AY2011/2021 | 0 students |

SCENARIO \#5
K-5 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


| SCENARIO 5: GRADES K-5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 3,377 | 3,876 | 3,876 | 3,993 | 4,321 | 4,321 | 4,321 | 4,804 | 4,804 | 4,804 | 4,804 | 4,804 | 4,804 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 3,310 | 3,499 | 3,652 | 3,777 | 3,937 | 4,043 | 4,172 | 4,268 | 4,394 | 4,519 | 4,644 | 4,770 | 4,895 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 67 | 377 | 224 | 216 | 384 | 278 | 149 | 536 | 410 | 285 | 160 | 34 | (91) |

## SCENARIO \#5 <br> 6-8 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY



| SCENARIO 5: GRADES 6-8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,944 | 1,694 | 1,694 | 2,394 | 2,394 | 2,394 | 2,394 | 2,394 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 1,735 | 1,808 | 1,797 | 1,865 | 1,899 | 2,024 | 2,098 | 2,242 | 2,298 | 2,377 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 209 | 136 | 147 | (171) | (205) | 370 | 296 | 152 | 96 | 17 |

SCENARIO \#5
9-10 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT VS. CAPACITY


| SCENARIO 5: GRADES 9-10 SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,005 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 | 1,605 |
| - ENROLLMENT | 545 | 560 | 620 | 1,301 | 1,304 | 1,320 | 1,367 | 1,418 | 1,496 | 1,588 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 460 | 445 | 385 | (296) | 301 | 285 | 238 | 187 | 109 | 17 |



| SCENARIO 5: GRADES 11-12 - NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SCHOOL YEAR | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| SFD CAPACITY CALCULATIONS | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 1,458 |
| ENROLLMENT | 967 | 1,009 | 1,034 | 1,081 | 1,182 | 1,198 | 1,204 | 1,217 | 1,263 | 1,307 |
| AVAILABLE CAPACITY | 491 | 449 | 424 | 377 | 276 | 260 | 254 | 241 | 195 | 151 |

### 6.0 Option Assessment

## A. Assessment Criteria

The five scenarios developed as part of this study were assessed based on the three level scoring matrices. The first level was a general test of the scenario feasibility. The basic questions was, "Is the scenario feasible or is there a factor or factors that render the scenario infeasible?" Infeasibility can be described as educationally or functionally infeasible. Based on that basic question, two of the scenarios were deemed to be infeasible. All were then evaluated based on a second level of analysis.

The second level assessed each scenario based on the following criteria.

1. Educational Impacts - Does the scenario provide adequate space to meet the educational specifications necessary to support the educational plan?
2. Operational Impacts - Does the scenario result in better operational efficiencies for the District?
3. Site Impacts - How does the scenario impact the site or is the scenario impacted by the site?
4. Community Impacts - Does the scenario address community concerns or does it result in developing issues that the community will have concerns with?
5. District specific and unique issues - Each of the 4 above criteria were also evaluated against district specific and unique issues related to that particular category.

## CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Each criteria was evaluated on a five (5) point scale where a mark of three (3) represents a neutral score. In addition, each criterion was weighted on a five point importance factor scale. Higher points were assigned to more significant criteria in the analysis so as not to over or under emphasize a particular criterion.

A project cost analysis was then developed for each scenario, including costs associated with renovation, additions, new construction, and changes in operational costs. Each scenario was evaluated for "cost effectiveness" based on how it resolves capacity in relationship to utilization facilities that have excess capacity. This ranking was developed to provide an objective view to how wisely costs are balanced against use of existing facility resources.

| 180 Points | Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues at little to no cost and <br> utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that <br> are over capacity. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 160 Points | Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with limited renovations <br> and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities <br> that are over capacity. |
| 140 Points | Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant <br> renovations and/or additions and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to <br> the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity. |
| 100 Points | Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant <br> renovations and/or additions along with new construction and utilizes facilities <br> that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over <br> capacity. |
| Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with new construction and <br> utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that <br> are over capacity. |  |
| $\mathbf{6 0 ~ P o i n t s ~}$ | Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with limited renovations <br> and does not utilize facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those <br> facilities that are over capacity. |
| Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant |  |
| renovations and/or additions and does not utilize facilities that have excess |  |
| capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity. |  |



## Operational Impact

Does the scenario result in better operational efficiencies for the District?


| Overall |
| :--- |
| Scenario allows for ease of district maintenance / operations |
| Scenario maximizes existing district building resources |
| Scenario provides consolidated building functions / programs for students and staff |
| Scenario provides opportunity to address existing building condition issues |
| Scenario provides opportunity to increase technology infrastructure (for 21st Century Learning) |
| Scenario improves room capacity issues |
| Scenario mavimizes use of available capacity in existing buildings |
| Scenario schedule for capacity remedies does not adversly affect the district |
| District Specific Unique lssues |
| Scenario meets school enrollment targets identified by district |
| Scenario does not require forced mobility of students |
| Scenario does not affect current Jr. High staffing requirements and Department of |
| Education allocated funding (moving 6th grade and creating Middle Schools) |
| Scenario requires minimal changes to District transportation operations and costs |
| Scenario does not require start up costs for new Ir. High or Middle School |
| Scenario does not require start up costs for second High School |





## Scenario \#1

## Scenario \#2

## Scenario \#3

| Campbell County School District No.1 | Project cost Summary | Scenario No. 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Conceptual Cost Analysis - Summary |  | Date: $3 / 19 / 2013$ |


| SCENARIO \#1 | 2014 | 2016 | 2017 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subtotal Project Cost | $\$ 59,596,917$ | $\$ 5,843,246$ | $\$ 22,306,271$ | $\$ 87,746,433$ |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | $\$ 59,596,917$ | $\$ 5,843,246$ | $\$ 22,306,271$ | $\$ 87,746,433$ |

120 Points Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant renovations and/or additions along with new construction and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity.

| Campbell County School District No. 1 Conceptual Cost Analysis - Summary Capacity Study: K-12 | PROIECT COST SUMMARY | Scenario No. 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Date: 3/19/2013 |  |
| SCENARIO \#2 | 2014 | 2016 | 2017 | Total |
| Subtotal Project Cost | \$66,179,978 | \$4,124,833 | \$22,305,271 | \$92,611,082 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$66,179,978 | \$4,124,833 | \$22,306,271 | \$92,611,082 |

120 Points Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant renovations and/or additions along with new construction and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity.

| Campbell County School District No. 1 |  | Scenario No. 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conceptual Cost Analysis - Summary | PROJECT COST SUMMARY |  |  |
| Capacity Study: K-12 |  | Date: 3/19/2013 |  |
| SCENARIO \#3 | 2014 | 2017 | Total |
| Subtotal Project Cost | \$81,411,378 | \$22,306,271 | \$103,717,648 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$81,411,378 | \$22,306,271 | \$103,717,648 |

20 Points Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with new construction and does not utilize facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity.


120 Points Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant renovations and/or additions along with new construction and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity.

Scenario \#5

| Campbell County School District No. 1 Conceptual Cost Analysis - Summary Capacity Stuodr: K-12 | PROJECT COST SUMMARY | Scenario No. 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Date: 3/19/2013 |  |
| SCENARIO \#5 | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | Total |
| Subtotal Project Cost | \$84,379,357 | \$2,058,437 | \$22,306,271 | \$108,744,065 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$84,379,357 | \$2,058,437 | \$22,306,271 | \$108,744,065 |

120 Points Scenario accomplishes resolution of capacity issues with significant renovations and/or additions along with new construction and utilizes facilities that have excess capacity to the benefit of those facilities that are over capacity.

## Campbell School District 1

Summary of Scenario Assessments

| Scenariol |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Operational Impact | 277 |
| Educational Impact | 235 |
| Site Impact | 61 |
| Community Impact | 120 |
| Cost | 120 |
| Total |  |
| Scenanoz |  |
| Operational Impact | 287 |
| Educational Impact | 265 |
| Site Impact | 58 |
| Community Impact | 135 |
| Cost | 120 |
| Total |  |
| Scenanto 3 |  |
| Operational Impact | 191 |
| Educational Impact | 158 |
| Site Impact | 65 |
| Community Impact | 105 |
| Cost | 20 |
| Total |  |
| Scenario 4 |  |
| Operational Impact | 165 |
| Educational Impact | 200 |
| Site Impact | 43 |
| Community Impact | 55 |
| Cost | 120 |
| Total |  |
| Scenario 5 |  |
| Operational Impact | 122 |
| Educational Impact | 170 |
| Site Impact | 43 |
| Community Impact | 80 |
| Cost | 120 |
| Total | 12. |

## B. Scenario 1 Cost Assessment

| Camptell County School District Na. 1 Conceptual Cost Analysis Capacity Study: K-12 |  |  | Scenario No. 31 - 2014 <br> Date: 3/19/2013 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONSTRUCTION CDSTS BREAKDCOWN | \$ | Pet (\%) | Cost/5I | Subtotal Cont | Total |
| Nicw Sulding Consinution Cost Yew Desgy <br> hiew Suiding Cotsalruction Cost - Toldyper <br> Prasesed THRW Athation Stres + 3te Inepalopmant <br> Prosossd Rerouved sulding äres <br>  <br>  <br> Proposed improvements to Eesting Bulding Ares - FEA Report Demoltion of Existing Building | $\begin{aligned} & 61,94 \\ & 62,946 \\ & 7,20 \mathrm{me} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 15,585,000 \\ \$ 15,485,000 \\ \$ 1 \cdot 1, \ldots 13,12: 3 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ |  |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST <br> Comingency (SW Consbaction \& 2\% Design for New \& Dentilian Work) <br> Contrgency (7\% Constrection $52 \%$ Devign for Addtons <br> Comingency ctow Construction \& 2\% Desigen for Renowationsi |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7.00 \% \\ & 9.00 \% \\ & 12.00 \% \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 55,984,800 \\ \$ 2,238,040 \\ \$ 1,251,152 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ |  |
| SUSTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST RREAKDOWN | 197,952 | 83.03\% | \$249.98 | - | \$49,483,902 |
| ESCNLATION FACTOR (4\% per year) |  | PCt(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| tham Buitug Densimatian Cest - Uwew Dencery Hew Buidnt Denstintion Cost- =robokpe Nicw Suiding 4dition Cenzoruation Cost Pangratud Lexshation <br> R:M-sition <br> Contingency [Delizn \& Kew Wersi <br> Contingency (Design \& Additions) Contingency (Desigen \& Renovations) |  | astris <br> actis <br> 4 COH <br> ACOM <br> 1ctic <br> 4. COK <br> 4.00\% <br> 4.005 | S. 101 <br> 5 Cc 0 <br> 50.60 <br> se.ca <br> 40.01 <br> 30.60 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 | Ss.encera <br> \$539.45 <br> \$560,512 <br> 30 <br> 511 <br> \$85,522 <br> \$50,446 <br> 50 |  |
| SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST |  | 3.32\% | 50.c0 | - | 51,979,350 |
| CONSTRUCTION COST | 5 | Pat (\%) | Cost/ 5 F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | 197,952 | 86.35\% | \$259.98 | - | \$51,463,352 |
| OTHER COSTS |  | Pat (\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| Loose Fumbhings / Equipment (Phone equipment, building fumiture, <br>  <br>  tertno ogy for nen-instr. ctonal p.rpeses; <br> Locse Fumbhing / Equipmem ; Fho e equioment, buidig fumliure, <br>  <br>  testro ogy for non-Instr.ct onal p.rpesse: <br>  thasroem tumbue sto g : shesting. media center shetaing, woos shetoes. papar cutters. copies, clannige esuizmant, CTE instr-ctional Equ pmom. a'v <br>  | - | $6.30 \%$ <br> 6.30\% <br> 6.atis | $5 C .00$ <br> 50.80 <br> se. 0 | $31.047,463$ <br> \$1.047,063 $5,1 \mathrm{~S}, 129$ | sworl un Eenst Casts fior पew coretruction on y <br> Sutad un Lornt Cesuls /'ct "rotctyre conetrurtion onk <br> 3ased an Const costs ror - $w$ ddation <br> ocivituthen cerlf |
| TOTAL OTHER COSTS | 197,952 | 5.06\% | \$15.22 | - | \$3,012,924 |
| SOFT COSTS | 5 | Pat (\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cont | Total |
| Printing - Bid Documents <br> Adteertive for Bid <br> 1 and survey <br> Sol Sering / Phase 1 Emironmenal <br> Gevenerencal akon-y forricu fos <br>  <br> Commissioning - 3nd Farty <br> unchitoctaral Fes i Raimbursendes New Consinuction <br> Architectural Fees / heimburseables - 户rototype Design <br> Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Addrions <br> Architectural Fees/Reimburseables - Renovation <br> Construction Management (CM) Fees | 197,952 <br> 197,952 <br> 177,535 <br> 227,8:85 <br> 197,962 <br> 127, 6 6木 <br> 127.8.35 <br> 63,242 <br> 63,949 <br> 70,054 <br> 197,952 | 0.27\% <br> 0.05\% <br> 1063 <br> 0.10 sh <br> $0.25 \%$ <br> 11258 <br> $0.32 \%$ <br> $8.0 \%$ <br> 10.00\% <br> 1200\% <br> $0.00 \%$ | 50.70 <br> so.cs <br> 4.12 <br> 50.40 <br> 50.65 <br> 4. 1.5 <br> 52.04 <br> $\$ 2633$ <br> \$15. m 0 <br> $\$ 23.98$ <br> 50.00 <br> so.co | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 138,951 \\ \$ 15,439 \\ \$ 15,074 \\ \$ 51,033 \\ \$ 12 \mathrm{~S}, 658 \\ \$ 128, \mathrm{ksk} \\ \$ 267,069 \\ \$ 1, \$ 83,825 \\ \$ 1,010,295 \\ \$ 1,080,303 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ | Based on Conat Cost liased on Comst Cont Hesed an Comert rost Bassd on Coner Coxt Basid on Cerst Cast Hesed on Currat Etrd Bysed an Conet Cost Includis Othe Cest includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing |
| TOTA SOFT COSTS | 197,952 | 8.59\% | 525.87 | - | 55,120,641 |


| PROIECT COST | 5 | Pet(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL PMOJECT COST | 197,552 | 100.00\% | \$301.07 | - | \$59,596,917 |
| OPERATIONAL COSTS | 5 | Pct(\%) | Cost/SF | sibtotal Cost | Total |
| ```Utilities - Electrical Consumption Unilites - Gas Consumption Unilities - Water Consumption Uvilities - Serwer / Waste Water Custodial Maintenance - Current Maimenance - Deferred Site / Grounds - Maintenance Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in eacess of eaisting route``` | $\begin{array}{r} 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 197,952 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 0.005 <br> 0.006 <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> 0.005 <br> 0.006 <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> 0.005 <br> 0.006 | so.co <br> \$0.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> \$0.565 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & 50 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \\ & \$ 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| TOTAL OPEMATIONAL COSTS | 197,952 | 0.00\% | 50.60 | - | 50 |



| PROLECT COST | Sf | Pat $\mid$ S\| | Cost/5 | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST | 33,373 | 100.00s | \$175.69 | -..- | \$5,843,246 |
| OPERATIONAL COSTS | SF | Pct (3) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
|  | 383a | 1200\% | San | (s) |  |
| Unlites - Gas Co-sumbten | 33,373 | 0000 | Sowo | 50 |  |
| Uliitiva - Wuan Canvemplian | 33,373 | 0.003 | sam | 50 |  |
|  | 3x37 | 1200\% | Som | $\infty$ |  |
| Custocial | 33,373 | 0.00\% | so.0s | 50 |  |
| Masteramev - Current | 33,3/3 | $0.00 \%$ | So.00 | so |  |
| Maintenance - Deferred | 38.373 | 0.00\% | \$0.00 | 50 |  |
| Site / Grounds - Maintenance | 33,373 | 0.00\% | \$0.00 | S0 |  |
| Transportation - Busing - Cost per mie in exsess of exinting route | 0 | 0.00\% | \$0.56s | 50 |  |
| TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS | 33,373 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | --.- | so |



| Prontct cost | Sf | Pct $\mid$ ( $)^{\text {a }}$ | Cost/5 | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL PMOJECT COST | 63,944 | 100.00\% | \$348.34 | -..- | \$22,306,271 |
| OPERATIONAL COSTS | SF | Pct ( ${ }^{\text {ck }}$ ) | Cost/5F | subtotal Cost | Total |
| Uiitiver - Almatreal Onnumptian | 65, 8 ¢ | E.cen | Soso | ¢ |  |
| Utilies - Gas co-sumoten | 63,54 | 0 cos | Sou0 | 50 |  |
| Uliitiva - Wuar Canvomplian | 63.94 | 0.608 | sam | 50 |  |
| Uhities-5emer / \%/mete worte | 6xsed | H208 | Sam | क |  |
| Custocial | 63,94 | $0.60 \times$ | so.0 | 50 |  |
| Maunteramev - Current | 63.944 | 0.008 | so.00 | 50 |  |
| Maintenance - Deferred | 63.944 | 0.00\% | \$0.00 | 50 |  |
| Site / Grounds - Maintenance | 63,944 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | S0 |  |
| Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in exsess of exinting route | 0 | 0.00\% | \$0.56s | 50 |  |
| TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS | 63.944 | $0.00 \%$ | 50.00 | --- | 50 |

## C. Scenario 2 Cost Assessment

| Camplell County School District Na. 1 Conceptual Cost Analysis Capacity Study: K-12 |  |  | Scenario No. *2 - 2014 <br> Date: 3/19/2013 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONSTLUCTION CDSTS BREAKCOWN | \$ | Pct (\%) | Cast/5I | Subtotal Cont | Total |
| Now Suiding Cons:nuctio Cost Yew Desgy Hiwe Euidink Cotratrution Cost - Totctype Prasesed TApw Athation hrea + 3te Dpealopmant <br> Prososed Re-oversd sulding áres <br> Prosesad Swnispace Areas andior Nifor Re'evationti <br>  <br> Proposed Improwements to Evsting Bulding Ares - FEA Report Demoltion of Existing Building | $\begin{aligned} & 61,94 \\ & 62,94 \\ & 41,71 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\$ 25000$ <br> \$25003 <br> รมีams <br> $\$ 15005$ <br> SSOCD <br> s1sam <br> 50.00 <br> $\$ 12.00$ |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST <br> Comirgency (SW Constration \& 2\% Desien for Wew \& Dentilise Work <br>  <br> Comingency (10W Cosstrution \& 2\% Desien for Kenawions) |  | $\begin{gathered} 7.00 \% \\ 9.00 \% \\ 12.00 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 50,914,200 \\ \$ 2,238,040 \\ \$ 1,704,796 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ |  |
| SuETOTAL CONSTRUCTON COST RREAKDOWN | 222,599 | 82.80\% | \$246.44 | - | \$54,857,038 |
| ESCALATION FACTOR (4\%\% per year) |  | Pct(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Totat |
|  hiew Buiding Sonstruction Boet - Erobotpo Now Suiding idcition Conzzuction Cost Pensratad Lextaltuliun <br> 1:emalhnn <br> Contingency ;Deizn \& Ken Worki <br> Contingency (Design \& Additions) <br> Contingency (Design \& Benovations) |  | astas: <br> actio <br> $4 \mathrm{CO}^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ <br> 4CO: <br> actio <br> 4. COH <br> 4.00\% <br> 4.005 | S. 10 <br> $\sec 0$ <br> 50.50 <br> se. $/ \mathrm{A}$ <br> ceal <br> 50.50 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST |  | 3.32\% | 50.00 | - | 52,194,282 |
| CONSTRUCTION COST | 5 | Pat(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | 222,599 | 86.21\% | \$256.39 | - | \$57,051,320 |
| OTKER COSTS |  | Pat(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| Loose Fumishings / Equipment (Phone equipment, building fumiture, <br>  <br>  terrno opy for nen-Instr.ct onsl p.rocses; <br> Locse Fumbhing ; Equipmem ;Fho'e epuioment, buidig fumiturs, <br>  <br>  tertro ogy for nen-Instr.ct onal p.rocsse: <br>  thaserocm tumture sto ige ghesting. media center shetoine, soos shotoes. papar cutters. copies, claningesuizmant, CTE instr-ctional Equpmom. a'y <br>  | - | $6.30 \%$ <br> $6.30 \%$ <br> 6.antis | $5 C .00$ <br> 50.50 <br> se. $/ 4$ | $\$ 1.047,463$ <br> \$1.047,453 <br> \$1,241,02.3 | sarost un Eenst Casts fior Yew co-stuction on y <br> Sxatil un Lonsl Cessbs /at archotyne oonetrution only <br> 3aset on Const Costs for cen iddtion <br> ocivituther conly |
| TOTAL OTHER COSTS | 222,599 | 5.006\% | \$14.99 | -- | 53,335,898 |
| SOFT COSTS | \$ | Pat (\%) | Cost/5F | Subtetal Cont | Total |
| Printing - Bid Documents <br> Adtaertive for Bid <br> I snit survey <br> Sol Soring / Phase 1 Emironmens:1 <br>  <br> Tonsinuthan Therg i Imquet nans <br> Commissioning-3d Forty <br> üchitoctaral Fes i Raimburscuales New Consiruction <br> Architectural Iees / Meimburseables - Drototype Design <br> Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Addrions <br> Architectural Fees/Reimburseables - Renovation <br> Construction Management (CM) Fees |  | 0.27\% <br> 0.05\% <br> 1063 <br> $0.10 \%$ <br> $0.25 \%$ <br> $112 \%$ <br> 0.32\% <br> $8 \mathrm{CO} \mathrm{\%}$ <br> 10.005 <br> $1200 \%$ <br> 0.00\% | 50.69 <br> soces <br> 4. 13 <br> 50.45 <br> Sc. 64 <br> 4.1.12 <br> \$2. 32 <br> $\$ 2633$ <br> \$15.40 <br> $\$ 23.98$ <br> 50.00 <br> so.co | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 154,039 \\ \$ 13,125 \\ \$ 13,15, \\ \$ 57,031 \\ \$ 142,628 \\ \$ 192, \mathrm{k} 26 \\ \$ 295,667 \\ \$ 1.583,825 \\ \$ 1,010,295 \\ \$ 2,271,397 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ | Based on Const Cost liased on Const Cout Hesed an Comert rost Bassd on Coner Coxt Basad on Carst Cast Hesed on Currat Etrd Bysed an Conet Cost Includis Othe Cest includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing |
| TOTAL SOFT COSTS | 222,599 | 8.75\% | \$26.02 | - | 55,792,761 |


| PROIECT COST | 5 | Pct(\%) | Cost/5F | Subtotal Cost | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL PROUECT COST | 222,599 | 100.00\% | \$297. 31 | - | \$66,179,978 |
| OPERATIONAL COSTS | 5 | Pat(\%) | Cost/SF | Sibtotal Cost | Total |
| Uetities - Electrical Consumption | 222,599 | 0.005 | 50.00 | so |  |
| Uvilites - Gas Consumption | 222,599 | 0.00\% | \$0.00 | 50 |  |
| Uelities - Water Consumption | 222,599 | 0.00\% | \$0.00 | \$0 |  |
| Uulities - Sewer/ Waste Water | 222,599 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | \$0 |  |
| Cuntodial | 222,599 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | 50 |  |
| Maimenance - Current | 222,599 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | \$0 |  |
| Maimenance - Deferred | 222,599 | $0.00 \%$ | 50.co | \$0 |  |
| Site / Grounds - Mairtenance | 222,599 | 0.005 | 50.c0 | 50 |  |
| Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in eacess of existing route | 0 | 0.00\% | \$0.565 | so |  |
| TOTAL OPEYATIORLAL COSTS | 222,599 | 0.00\% | 50.60 | - | 50 |


| Campbell County School District No. 1 Corcaptual Cost Analysis Capacity Studn: K-12 |  |  |  | Scenario No. 22 - 2016 <br> Date: $3 / 19 / 2013$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN | $5 F$ | Pct (\%) | Cost/s5 | Suthotal Cost | Total |
| Now Bulfing Corst uction Cos: New Design <br> New Buithne Corstution Cos. Frototype <br> Propoced Hisw Pddilion Ares + Sitc Dereopment <br> Pruponal Anescatud Euidi-g A.res <br> Propoced 5wng Scroc Arcas indfor Minor Renovatio's <br> Proposed Grade Levil Cumesicen Areas <br> Proposed Improvements to Existing Building Area - FEA Report Demolition of Existing Building | 9,005 16,323 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2: 0.00 \\ & \$ 23000 \\ & \$ 200.00 \\ & \$ 1.0 .00 \\ & \$ 50.00 \\ & \$ 150.00 \\ & \$ 0.00 \\ & \$ 12.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 450,000 \\ \$ 2,4<3,450 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ |  |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST <br> Contingeney (SA, Corntruction \& 15 Desien for Mesi \& Demolision Mork\} Contingency (7w Construction \& 2\% Design for Adshonst Contingency (10x Conitruction \& 2w Design for henowitism) |  | 300\% <br> $9.00 \%$ <br> $12.00 \%$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2,898,450 \\ \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 347,814 \end{array}$ |  |
| SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN | 25,323 | 7870\% | \$128.19 | .-m | \$3,246,264 |
| ESCALATION FACTOR (49 PAT YTSH |  | Pat(\%) | cost/ss | Subrotal Cost | Total |
| New Building Construction Cost - New Design New Building Construction Cost - Frototype New Building Addition Construction Cost Renovated Construction <br> Demolition <br> Contingency (Design \& New Work) <br> Contingency (Design \& Additions) <br> Contingency (Design \& Renorations) |  | 12.00\% <br> 12.006 <br> 12.00\% <br> 12.006 <br> $12.00 \%$ <br> 12.006 <br> $12.00 \%$ <br> 12.006 | 50.00 <br> $\$ 0.00$ <br> 50.00 <br> $\$ 0.00$ <br> $\$ 0.00$ <br> $\$ 0.00$ <br> 50.00 <br> $\$ 0.00$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 347,814 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 41,738 \end{array}$ |  |
| SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST |  | 9.46\% | 50.00 | - | \$399,552 |
| CONSTRICTION COST | $5 F$ | Pex(8) | Cont/5 | Sutnotil Cost | Total |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | 25,323 | 88.14\% | \$143.58 | -- | \$3,635,816 |
| OTHER COSTS |  | Fct (\%) | Cost/sF | Subnotal Cost | Tocal |
| Losee Fu'nehings iEqu pment ifhore equ pment, buis ne turniture. <br>  papse cutters. copisrs, tisaning coulsment, CTE Irgtustional Equip-ent. <br>  <br>  <br>  paper otters, ocpiers, teaning equigement, CII I-stwatiaral Equip-ent, any technology for no-instructionsi parpocesi <br> Losse Furnishlags / Equipment thone equement, buiding turaltures, classroom fursiture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cutters, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes) | - | $530 \%$ $5.30 \%$ | Sa.a 50.00 50.00 | sa so so so | Eased en Censt Coets tor ripen mansirut san onfp <br> Rased en Conal Costs far Protokppe tmestuiten only <br> Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only |
| TOTAL OTHER COSTS | 25.323 | $000 \%$ | 50.00 | -- | So |
| Soft Costs | $5 F$ | Pat(\%) | Cost/ss | Subholicest | Total |
| Primting - Bid Dccuments <br> Advertise for Bid <br> Land Survey <br>  <br> Sover-mb:lal Ran-cy froinw furs <br> Constuation Testing i Incpeatione <br> Commisiarine - zed Porty <br> Anc-itectural Fees ; Aeimbursentles - New Constriation <br>  <br> Architevtural rews / Neimiburswables - Adatium <br> Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Nenoration <br> Construction Management (CM) Fees | $\begin{array}{r} 25,323 \\ 25,323 \\ = \\ 25,323 \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ 25,323 \\ 25,323 \end{array}$ | $0.27 \%$ <br> 0.05\% <br> 0.03\% <br> 210n <br> 025\% <br> $0.25 \%$ <br> 25\% <br> 505\% <br> 1a.00\% <br> 12.005 <br> $0.00 \%$ | 50.39 <br> 50.04 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> S0. 36 <br> 50.00 <br> sen 00 <br> Solo <br> So.0.0 <br> Sa.00 <br> \$17.23 <br> 50.00 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 9,817 \\ \$ 1,091 \\ \$ 1,091 \\ \$ 3,636 \\ \$ 0,200 \\ \$ 9,060 \\ \$ 13,906 \\ \$ 9 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 436,298 \\ \$ 0 \end{array}$ | Rased an Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost Esacd uni Cunsi Cla Rasudun Cunal Oest BeseJ on Const Ccst Resudan Cantil Cest Intides Dthe "Cots Inchales Oilher Cost Inchaden Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing |
| TOTAL SOFT COSTS | 25,323 | 11.86\% | \$19.31 | - | \$489,017 |
| PROJECT COST | SF | Pct (\%) | Cost/sF | Subtatal Cost | Tocal |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST | 25,323 | 100.005 | \$16289 | - | \$4,124.833 |
| OPCRATIONAL COSTS | $5 F$ | Pat(\%) | Cost/sm | Subuta Cost | Tetal |
| ```Utitice Eloxtical Consumpton Usiitiva - Gus Carsampricen Utitice Wote Consu"cton```  ```Cutcocial Maintenance - Current Maintenance - Deferred Site / Grounds - Maintenance Transportation - Buxing - Cost per mile in excess of exsting route``` | $\begin{aligned} & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \\ & 25,323 \end{aligned}$ | 0006 <br> anas <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> anas <br> 2005 <br> 0.006 <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> $0.00 \%$ <br> $0.00 \%$ | 50.00 <br> sum <br> 50.00 <br> San 0 <br> \$0.00 <br> S0.00 <br> 50.00 <br> 50.00 <br> $\$ 0.565$ | \$0 $\$ 0$ $\$ 0$ $\$ 0$ 50 $\$ 0$ $\$ 0$ $\$ 0$ 50 50 $\$ 0$ |  |
| TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS | 25,323 | 0.00\% | 50.00 | - | 50 |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Corcaptual Cost Analysis Capacity Studn: K-12} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 42 - 2017 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN \& \(5 F\) \& Pct( \(\times\) \% \& Cost/s: \& Suthotal Cost \& Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Now Bulfing Corst uction Cos: New Design \\
New Bulithe Corstuction Cos: - Prototype \\
Proposed Idsw Pddrion Ares + Sitc Dereopment \\
Pruponal Aneswatud Euidi-g A.res \\
Propoced 9wng Sproc Ancez \\
 \\
Proposed Improvements to Evisting Building Area - FEA Report \\
Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} \& c3,94 \& \& \begin{tabular}{l}
\$2:0.00 \\
sciulu \\
\(\$ 200.00\) \\
sisncen \\
\(\$ 50.00\) \\
550.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} \& \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 15500.006\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) \& \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
Contingeney (SA, Corntruction \& 15 Desien for Mesi \& Demolision Mork\} Contingency (7w Construction \& 2\% Design for Adshonst Contingency (10x Conitruction \& 2w Design for henowitism)
\end{tabular} \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 3.00 \% \\
\& 900 \% \\
\& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] \& \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 15,986,000 \\
\$ 1,119,020 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] \& \\
\hline SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN \& 63,944 \& 76.65\% \& \$26750 \& .-m \& 517,105,020 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOR (49 PAT YTSH \& \& Pat(0) \& cost/ss \& Subrotal Cost \& Total \\
\hline New Building Construction Cost - New Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype Now Building Addrition Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition Contingency (Design \& New Work) Contingency (Design \& Additions) Cootingency (Design \& Renovations) \& \& \begin{tabular}{l}
16.00\% \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 2,557,760 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 179,043 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] \& \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST \& \& 12.27\% \& 50.00 \& .-m \& \$2,736803 \\
\hline CONSTRICTION COST \& \(5 F\) \& Mef(8) \& Cont/5 \& Subiñai Cont \& Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \& 63,944 \& 88.95\% \& \$310.30 \& -- \& \$19,841,823 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS \& \& PCt (\%) \& Cost/sF \& Subnotal Cost \& Tocal \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Losee Fu'nehings iEqu pment ifhore equ pment, buis ne turniture. \\
 paper cutters. copisrs, tisaring coulsment. CTE Irgtustional Equip-ent. \\
 \\
 \\
 paper otters, copiers tiearing equisment, CI I-stwetiaral Equip-ent, any technology for na-instructions p.rpocesi \\
Losse Furnishlags / Equipment thone equement, buiding turnlture, classroom fursiture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cutters, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes)
\end{tabular} \& - \& 5.336
\(5.35 \%\)

$5306 \%$ \& sax

50.00

50.00 \& \$1,468,287 \& | Pased en Censt Coets tor The:" amsiruat san ontp |
| :--- |
| Rased cn Cenal Costs far Protokppe tunstuiten only |
| Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only | <br>

\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS \& 63,944 \& $520 \%$ \& 518.27 \& -- \& \$1,168.257 <br>
\hline Soft Costs \& $5 F$ \& Pat(\%) \& Cost/ss \& Suthotil Cost \& Teat <br>

\hline | Primting - Bid Documents |
| :--- |
| Advertise for Bid |
| Land Survey |
|  |
|  |
| Construation Testing i Inceestiore |
| Commisiarine - zed Porty |
| Arctitectural Fees i Neimbursestles - New Constriation |
|  |
| Architectural rews / Neimiburswebles - Adatium |
| Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Benocation |
| Construction Management (CM) Fees | \& | 63,944 |
| :--- |
| 63,944 |
| 63,944 |
| 63.54 4 |
| 63,9.4c |
| 53.844 |
| 63,044 |
| 63,944 |
| 63,944 | \& | $0.27 \%$ |
| :--- |
| $0.03 \%$ |
| 0.03\% |
| 2.15 |
| $025 \%$ |
| 2.25\% |
| 252\% |
| $505 \%$ |
| $10.00 \%$ |
| $12.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | \& | 50.84 |
| :--- |
| 50.09 |
| 50.09 |
| so. 31 |
| 50.75 |
| 50.78 |
| 51.61 |
| Sola |
| S15. 77 |
| So.00 |
| 50.00 |
| $\$ 0.00$ | \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 53,573 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 19, \$ 42 \\
\$ 40,505 \\
\$ 49,605 \\
\$ 103,177 \\
93 \\
\$ 1,003,434 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
$$

\] \& | Based an Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost |
| :--- |
| Excedull Guntat ©at |
| Resudan Canal Cost |
| Escej on Const Ccst |
| ResudanCmat Cost |
| Intider Dthe Costs |
| Inthaiki Duline Costs tinchades other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing | <br>

\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS \& 63,944 \& 5818 \& 520.27 \& - \& \$1,296,190 <br>
\hline PROJECT COST \& SF \& Pct(\%) \& Cost/sF \& Subthotal Cost \& Tocal <br>
\hline TOTAL PROJECT COST \& 63,944 \& 100.005 \& \$348.84 \& - \& \$22,306,271 <br>
\hline OPCRATIONAL COSTS \& $5 F$ \& Pat(\%) \& Cost/sm \& Subuta Cost \& Tetal <br>
\hline ```
Utitice Eloctical Consumpton
Ufilitro. Gus Carsampticen
Utitice Wote Consu"cton

```

```

Cuetocial
Mainterance - Current
Maintenance - Deferred
Site / Grounds - Maintenance
Transportation - Buxing - Cost per mile in excess of exsting route

``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
63.848 \\
63,044 \\
63.844 \\
63,0.4c \\
53.344 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(000 \%\) \\
anas \\
0.00\% \\
anas \\
200\% \\
0.006\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
0.006 \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
sum \\
50.00 \\
San 0 \\
\$0.00 \\
S0.00 \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.565\)
\end{tabular} & \$0
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
50
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS & 63,944 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{D. Scenario 3 Cost Assessment}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Camptel County School Distrikt No. 1 Conceptual Cosit Analysis Capacity Stusy. K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 83 -2014 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN & 5 F & Pt(\%) & \(\operatorname{cost} / 5 F\) & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
rase Suldng Conetuction Cxt Kew Design \\
rham Suldna Corct uction Cost Procolyce \\
 \\
P-ncosedillemtrathed liaharg pran \\
Prosesed 5unic 5-sce Arese snefor Wincer Renoustions \\
Poposed Gide Lavel Conatrsion áess \\
Proposed improvements to Evsting Bulling Avea - FEA Report \\
Demoltion of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
188,221 \\
53,944 \\
4006
\end{array}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 25 C . / 00 \\
& \$ 250.00 \\
& 520 . / .0 \\
& 515: .011 \\
& \$ 50.00 \\
& \$ 150.00 \\
& 50.00 \\
& \$ 12.00
\end{aligned}
\] & \(547,055,250\)
\(\$ 15,98 \mathrm{COD}\)
50
50
546800
59
50
50 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
 \\
 \\
Comigency (10W Constrution \& 2\% Delien for Aenowations)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.00 \% \\
& 9.00 \% \\
& 12.005
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 65,491,250 \\
\\
\$ 4,412,898 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 54,000
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUETOTAL CONSTAUCTON COST EREAKDOWN & 261,165 & 83,47\% & 5260.21 & - & \$67,958,138 \\
\hline ESCMLATON FACTOR |OS per vear) & & Pat (x) & Cost/s & Subtatal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
 rle suldne fidicion Constructive Sost Ranyosted Conziuztion \\
Defreftio- \\
 \\
Contingency (Design \& Additions) \\
Contingenty (Design \& Alenceations)
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
1. An: \\
4.06. \\
4.00\% \\
\(4.00 \%\) \\
4,00\% \\
 \\
4.00\% \\
4.00\%
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
samo \\
3500 \\
5005 \\
\(\$ 0.05\) \\
\(\$ 005\) \\
\$ano \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 1,2 k, 210 \\
\$ 038, A 00 \\
\$ 9 \\
\$ 12.005 \\
\$ 0 \\
5: \pi 6,516 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 2,160
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCMLATION FACTOR COST & & 3.345 & 50.00 & - & \$2,718,326 \\
\hline CONSTAUCTION COST & 57 & Pat(\%) & Cost/SF & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCHON COST & 251,165 & 36.81\% & \$270.62 & - & \$70,676,463 \\
\hline OTIER COSTS & & Pat(m) & Cost/5 & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Loose Fumishings / Iquipment (Phone eguigment, buililigg furniture, \\
 \\
 bethno agy for no"-insturiensl pirpeses! \\
Lacse Furnehnis: Equisment |Fhore esulemem, bulling fumburs, clazroom fumic.rc, storaze s'esíg. mada conter aleving bcol shalers. \\
 beten ugy for nu-inct-usinemal par pasea! \\
 \\
 paper cutte s, cociars, deaning equisment. CTE Instuaticnal Ecujpmenc, any wetho ony for no inex ucticnal parposes!
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(6.20 \%\) \\
6.20::
\[
6.20 \%
\]
\end{tabular} & \$0.02
\[
\$ 0.09
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\$3,033.660 \\
61,0<2,40:
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Hesed an Const Costs for Hem conetruction only \\
Basid cn Const Cosis for \\
 \(v-1\) ? \\
Hased en Const Costs for ncw fodicon \\
60 str-ction ant
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 261,165 & 5.07\% & \$15.82 & - & 54,130,463 \\
\hline Sort costs & 5 & Pct(x) & \(\operatorname{cost} / 9\) & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Prinking - Bis Documents \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Lind Sunce, \\
Sol Scring ! 'has: 1 Enviromamal \\
Goventeral Aas/cy Posiow Fiet \\
Lanvinuthen Inolimí inswalians \\
Fommisen-irg - Mrit Party \\
 \\
Architectural Fees / Reimbursesbles - Prototype Design \\
Architectiral Fees / Reimburseables - Addioions \\
Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Renovation \\
Construction Management [CM] Fees
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
232,166 \\
232,165 \\
261,165 \\
252,156 \\
252,106 \\
128,721 \\
63,904 \\
9,000 \\
261,165
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
0.276 \\
0.03\% \\
C.03 6 \\
\(0.20 \%\) \\
c.25\% \\
6.25s \\
2.57is \\
acor \\
10.005 \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.73\) \\
\(\$ 0.08\) \\
5003 \\
\$0.25 \\
\(\$ 0.68\) \\
\$2:0 \\
31.95 \\
\(\$ 24.51\) \\
\(\$ 14.14\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 6.99\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 190,826 \\
\$ 21,203 \\
\$ 21.203 \\
\$ 7 . .575 \\
\$ 176,691 \\
\$ 1.76,891 \\
\$ 15,518 \\
\$ 4,612 ., 595 \\
\$ 904,158 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 62,899 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & Based on Const Cost Based on Corst Cost Eseed on Coret Coet Eased on Coret Cost Rasiol an Corat Cost Hesel on Curst Lost Ilsond on Curser Dost Incl der Cthe Costs inclides Othe Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequenciry \\
\hline TOTM SOFT COSTS & 261.16 & 8.11\% & 528.29 & - & \(56.604,052\) \\
\hline PROIECT COST & \(5 F\) & Pt(m) & \(\operatorname{cost} / 5 \mathrm{~F}\) & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL PROJECT COST & 261,165 & 100.05\% & \$311.72 & - & \$81,411,378 \\
\hline OFT RATIONL COSTS & \$f & Pct (x) & Cmt/s & Sublatait cout & Trital \\
\hline ```
Utities - Ilectrical Consumption
Utilities - Gas Consumption
Utilities - Water Consumption
Utilities - Sewer / Waste Water
Cuntodial
Maimenance - Currem
Maimtenance - Deferred
Site / Grounds - Mintenance
Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in ewess of evisting route
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261,165 \\
261.165
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
0.00\% \\
0.00\% \\
0.00\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
0.00\% \\
0.005 \\
0.005 \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0565\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL DPERATONAL COSTS & 261,165 & 0.00\% & \$0.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Corcaptual Cost Analysis Capacity Studn: K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 43 - 2017 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN & \(5 F\) & Pct( \(\times\) \% & Cost/s: & Suthotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Now Bulfing Corst uction Cos: New Design \\
New Bulithe Corstuction Cos: - Prototype \\
Proposed Idsw Pddrion Ares + Sitc Dereopment \\
Pruponal Aneswatud Euidi-g A.res \\
Propoced 9wng Sproc Ancez \\
 \\
Proposed Improvements to Evisting Building Area - FEA Report \\
Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & c3,94 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\$2:0.00 \\
sciulu \\
\(\$ 200.00\) \\
sisncen \\
\(\$ 50.00\) \\
550.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 15500.006\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
Contingeney (SA, Corntruction \& 15 Desien for Mesi \& Demolision Mork\} Contingency (7w Construction \& 2\% Design for Adshonst Contingency (10x Conitruction \& 2w Design for henowitism)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3.00 \% \\
& 900 \% \\
& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 15,986,000 \\
\$ 1,119,020 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN & 63,944 & 76.65\% & \$26750 & .-m & 517,105,020 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOR (49 PAT YTSH & & Pat(0) & cost/ss & Subrotal Cost & Total \\
\hline New Building Construction Cost - New Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype Now Building Addrition Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition Contingency (Design \& New Work) Contingency (Design \& Additions) Cootingency (Design \& Renovations) & & \begin{tabular}{l}
16.00\% \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 2,557,760 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 179,043 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 12.27\% & 50.00 & .-m & \$2,736,803 \\
\hline CONSTRICTION COST & \(5 F\) & Mef(8) & Cont/5 & Subiñai Cont & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & 63,944 & 88.95\% & \$310.30 & -- & \$19,841,823 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & PCt (\%) & Cost/sF & Subnotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Losee Fu'nehings iEqu pment ifhore equ pment, buis ne turniture. \\
 paper cutters. copisrs, tisaring coulsment. CTE Irgtustional Equip-ent. \\
 \\
 \\
 paper otters, copiers tiearing equisment, CI I-stwetiaral Equip-ent, any technology for na-instructions p.rpocesi \\
Losse Furnishlags / Equipment thone equement, buiding turnlture, classroom fursiture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cutters, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes)
\end{tabular} & - & 5.336
\(5.35 \%\)

\(5306 \%\) & sax

50.00

50.00 & \$1,468,287 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Eased en Censt Coets tor ripen mansirut san onfp \\
Rased en Conal Costs far Protokppe tmestuiten only \\
Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 63,944 & \(520 \%\) & 518.27 & -- & \$1,168.257 \\
\hline Soft Costs & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/ss & Suthotil Cost & Teat \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Primting - Bid Documents \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Land Survey \\
 \\
 \\
Construation Testing i Inceestiore \\
Commisiarine - zed Porty \\
Arctitectural Fees i Neimbursestles - New Constriation \\
 \\
Architectural rews / Neimiburswebles - Adatium \\
Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Benocation \\
Construction Management (CM) Fees
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63.54 4 \\
63,9.4c \\
53.844 \\
63,044 \\
63,944 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(0.27 \%\) \\
\(0.03 \%\) \\
0.03\% \\
2.15 \\
\(025 \%\) \\
2.25\% \\
252\% \\
\(505 \%\) \\
\(10.00 \%\) \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.84 \\
50.09 \\
50.09 \\
so. 31 \\
50.75 \\
50.78 \\
51.61 \\
Sola \\
S15. 77 \\
So.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 53,573 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 19, \$ 42 \\
\$ 40,505 \\
\$ 49,605 \\
\$ 103,177 \\
93 \\
\$ 1,003,434 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Based an Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost \\
Evacdun Gunta Guat \\
Rasud un Contal Oest \\
Besed on Const Ccst \\
Evisudan Gensi Cost \\
Inebides The Cost \\
Inchatei Ouline Cobls \\
Inchaden Other Costs \\
Includes Other Costs \\
Includes Sequencing
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS & 63,944 & 5818 & 520.27 & - & \$1,296,190 \\
\hline PROJECT COST & SF & Pct(\%) & Cost/sF & Subthotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline TOTAL PROJECT COST & 63,944 & 100.005 & \$348.84 & - & \$22,306,271 \\
\hline OPCRATIONAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/sm & Subuta Cost & Tetal \\
\hline ```
Utitice Eloctical Consumpton
Ufilitro. Gus Carsampticen
Utitice Wote Consu"cton
```



```
Cuetocial
Mainterance - Current
Maintenance - Deferred
Site / Grounds - Maintenance
Transportation - Buxing - Cost per mile in excess of exsting route
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
63.848 \\
63,044 \\
63.844 \\
63,0.4c \\
53.344 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(000 \%\) \\
anas \\
0.00\% \\
anas \\
200\% \\
0.006\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
0.006 \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
sum \\
50.00 \\
San 0 \\
\$0.00 \\
S0.00 \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.565\)
\end{tabular} & \$0
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
50
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS & 63,944 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{E. Scenario 4 Assessment}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline PROJECT COST & 5 F & Pat (\%) & Cost/ SF & Subrotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline TOTAL PEOIECT COST & 262,805 & 100.00\% & \$285.41 & --- & 570.959,361 \\
\hline OPERATIONAL COSTS & 58 & Pex (\%) & Cant/si & Subtatal Cant & Total \\
\hline Utilities-Electrical Consumption & 262,640 & 0.00\% & \$0.00 & so & \\
\hline Utilities-Gas Comsumption & 262,640 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Utilities-Water Consumption & 262,640 & 0.005 & 50.00 & so & \\
\hline Utilities-Sewer/Waste Water & 262,640 & 0.00\% & 50,00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Custodial & 262,640 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Maintenance - Current & 262,640 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Maintenance - Deferred & 262,640 & 0.005 & 50.00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Ste / Grounds - Maintenance & 262,640 & 0.00\% & \$0.00 & \$0 & \\
\hline Trasportation - Busing - Cout per mile in evass of existing route & 0 & 0.00\% & \$0.565 & \$0 & \\
\hline TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS & 262,640 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Concenptual Cost Analysis Capacity Study: K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 44 - 2015 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BRLAKDOWN & 5 5 & Pat ( \(\mathrm{x}_{0}\) ] & Cost/5 & Subtrotal Cont & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
New Bulling Corst uation Cost New Dosizn Hew Buiting Co-stution Cast - Frototype \\
Propoeed Hzw addition Arce + Stc Dereopment \\
Pruporal Ferisvatull Euiding A/na \\
Propoced SWing Spsoc arcese indior Sinor Rorowatives \\
Propocoes Grace Lavel Comersion hreas \\
Proposed Improvements to Enisting Buiding Ares - IEA Report Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & 48,362 & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\$ 250.00 \\
\$ 20.00 \\
\$ 200.00 \\
\$ 150.00 \\
\$ 50.00 \\
\$ 150.00 \\
\$ 0.00 \\
\$ 12.00
\end{gathered}
\] & \(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 3,254,300\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
Contingency (SN Construction E. 1\$ Deeign for Mes E. Demolition Mork4 Contingency (T) Construction \& 2\% Desien for Mdsinens) Contingency (10\% Construction \& 2w Desien for hesowition)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.00 \% \\
& 9.00 \% \\
& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 7,254,300 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 870,516
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST PREAKDOWN & 48,362 & 81.62\% & 5168.00 & -- & \$8,124816 \\
\hline ESCHLATION FACTOR (4) Par yash & & Pct (x) & cort/ss & Subhotal Coat & Total \\
\hline New Building Construction Cont - Nerw Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype New Building Addifion Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition Contingency (Design \& New Work) Cortingency (Design \& Additions) Contingency (Design \& Renovations) & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(800 \%\) \\
\(800 \%\) \\
\(8.00 \%\) \\
\(800 \%\) \\
8.00\% \\
8.00\% \\
8.005 \\
8006
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 580,344 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 69,641
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 653\% & 50.00 & -- & \$649,985 \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COST & \(5 F\) & Pct (8) & Cost/5F & Sumbiat Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCHON COST & 48,362 & 88.14\% & \$181.44 & -- & \$8,774,801 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & Pat(\%) & Cost/5F & Subnotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
 clasionom fur iturs, sto age shaloíg. mosia center shelving bock shilutia papser c.tters. copisers, tisaring ceubisment. CTE I-stu:tional Eculp-ent. an stechncloas for non instuctionai parpoceal \\
Iover Fumshirgs fiqupment thare equpment, builing, furniture. \\
 \\
 any technolozy for no - instructions p.rpocesi \\
Losve Furnishlings / Equipment fhone equipment, bulding turnture, classroom furniture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cuttens, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes]
\end{tabular} & & \(5.39 \%\)
\(5.33 \% 4\)

\(6.306 \%\) & 50.00
50.00

50.00 & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Pased en Const Coets tor taw cencinction onlf \\
Esecd en Const Cocte for Vrototppe rumstruthen Cnly \\
Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only
\end{tabular} \\
\hline total other costs & 48,362 & a00\% & 50.00 & - & So \\
\hline S0FT COST5 & 5 F & Pat (\%) & Cost/55 & Sutrotic Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Printing - Bid Documents \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Land Survey \\
 \\
Gowermésal fae'cy fesinw Feas \\
Dansmatian lesting / Incouthams. \\
Conmisionina ard Party \\
 \\
जrc-lbetbursl Fees ; Felmburseztise - Frototype Oseign \\
 \\
Arctitectural Fees / Reimburseables - Rencreation \\
Construction Management (CM) Fees
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
48,362 \\
48,362 \\
48.362 \\
- \\
48,362 \\
48,362
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(0.27 \%\) \\
0.05\% \\
\(0.03 \%\) \\
0.06 \\
2.25\% \\
a25\% \\
252\% \\
kusk \\
\(10.00 \%\) \\
12.00\% \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.49 \\
50.05 \\
50.00 \\
to.00 \\
50.45 \\
4abo \\
50.00 \\
40.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
solou \\
\(\$ 21.77\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 23,692\)
\(\$ 2,632\)
\(\$ 2,632\)
\(\$ 9,775\)
\(\$ 21,937\)
\(\$ 21,427\)
\(\$ 45,529\)
\(\$ 3\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 1,052,976\)
\(\$ 0\) & Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cos nased an Conest Gott Based en Cenal Cost Hnoped un Cans Coot Raseden Cona: Cos Intlaines Dithe Cost In:l. des Othe Cost tinhales Other Coot Includes Other Cost Includes Sequencini \\
\hline TOTAL SOET COSTS & 48,362 & 1186\% & \$24.40 & - & \$1,180.211 \\
\hline PROUECT COST & \(5 F\) & Pat (\%) & Cost/sF & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL PROSECT COST & 48,362 & 100.00\% & \$205.84 & - & \$9,585,012 \\
\hline OFERATIONAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & \(\underline{n t}(\) (\%) & Cost/5s & Subholice Cot & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
vilties-Electites Consumpton \\
Utilites Gas Coreumption \\
vilites - Wiste Consu-pton \\
U:itics Eems / Waze Water \\
cintocisl \\
Manterunce - Current \\
Maintenance - Deferred \\
Site / Grounds - Maintenance \\
Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in excess of existing route
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
49.362 \\
43.362 \\
49.362 \\
42.362 \\
49.362 \\
48,302 \\
48,362 \\
48,102
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
005\% \\
200\% \\
005\% \\
\(200 \%\) \\
005\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
50.565
\end{tabular} & s0
\(\$ 0\)
90
\(\$ 0\)
50
50
50
50
50
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS & 48,362 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Concuptual Cost Analysis Capacity Study: K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 44 - 2016 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS ARLAKDOWN & 5 F & Pat ( \(\mathrm{x}_{0}\) ] & Cost/5 & Subtrotal Cont & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Now Bulling Corst uation Cost New Dosizn Hew Bulting Co-stution Cast - Frototype \\
Propoeed Nisw dddilion Arcs + Stc Dereiopment \\
P-uporad Antovatud Euiding A/na \\
Propoecd Sming Sproc arces \\
Proposed Grade Lavel Comuersion Lieas andior Ponnor Ronowations \\
Proposed Improvements to Enisting Buildirg Ares - IEA Meport Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & cos, \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 2: 0.00 \\
& \$ 20.100 \\
& \$ 200.00 \\
& \$ 1.0 .00 \\
& \$ 50.00 \\
& \$ 50.00 \\
& \$ 0.00 \\
& \$ 12.00
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 15,50000\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
 Contingency (7) Construxion \& 2 \(\$\) Desien for Id Contingency (100s Construction \& 2w Desien for Resowation)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.00 \% \\
& 9.00 \% \\
& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 15,985,000 \\
\\
\$ 1,119,030 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST PREAKDOWN & 63,944 & 79.42\% & 526750 & -- & \$17,105,020 \\
\hline ESCLAATION EMCTOR (4M PAR YEMA & & Pct(x) & Cost/ss & Subthotal coat & Totat \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
New Building Construction Cost - Nerw Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype New Building Addition Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition \\
Contingency (Design \& New Work) Cortingency (Design 8 Additiom) Contingency (Design \& Renovations)
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
12.00\% \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
12.00\% \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
12.00\% \\
\(12.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 1,918,320 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 134,282 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 953\% & 50.00 & -- & \$2,062.002 \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COST & \(5 F\) & Pct (\%) & Cost/5F & Subhoticest & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCHON COST & 63,944 & 88.95\% & \$299.60 & -- & \$19,157,622 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & Pat(\%) & Cost/SF & Subotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Locee Fu'nbhires i Equamsnt ifhove equ pment buiting furiture. \\
 \\
 any techocloan for nan instructional parposeal \\
 \\
 \\
 any technolozy for nov-instructions purpoeesi \\
tosve Furnibhings / Equipment (Fhone equement, buiding turnthure, classroom furniture, storage shelving, medla center shelving, book shelves, paper cufters, copiers, dearing equipment, CTE Instructional Eqvipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes)
\end{tabular} & - & \begin{tabular}{l}
5.3\% \\
5. \(30 \%\) \\
6306
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & \$ \$0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Eased en Censt Coets tor dew cenaruction onlt \\
Eased en Censt Coety tor Protcoppe tumsturton cn) \\
Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 63,944 & \(520 \%\) & 517.64 & - & \$1,127,972 \\
\hline Soft Costs & 5 F & Pat (\%) & Cost/5F & Sutrotial Cost & Total \\
\hline ```
Printing - Bid Documents
Advertise for Bid
Land Survey
Soir hatied / Phase 1 rovroome-tai
Gover mestal tae cy Fetiww Feas
La-strustian lesting / Incentiams
Commesionint ard Party
```



```
arceltectursl Fees / Feimburseatise - Frototype Oedign
Ancritertural Fews / Kicinibursedhes - Alditiurs
Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Rencration
Construction Management (CM) Fees
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
6,3,94* \\
63.942 \\
\(63,31 \mathrm{c}\) \\
63.244 \\
33.946 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(0.27 \%\) \\
0.05\% \\
0.03\% \\
\(0+0 \%\) \\
\(0.25 \%\) \\
025 \\
252\% \\
к日l: \\
\(10.00 \%\) \\
12.00\% \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.81\) \\
S0.0s \\
\(\$ 0.09\) \\
\$0. 0 \\
50.75 \\
40.5 \\
\(\$ 1.58\) \\
Salab \\
\(\$ 15.23\) \\
sol.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 51,726 \\
\$ 5,747 \\
\$ 5,747 \\
\$ 15,156 \\
\$ 47,284 \\
\$ 42,759 \\
\$ 30,620 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 973,708 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cos naspd an Const Geot Raseden Conal Cos Hnoped un Canst Cost Raseden Conal Cos Intlains Dilhe Cost Intl. des Othe Cost tinhales Other Cost Includes Other Cost Includes Sequencini \\
\hline TOTALSOET Cosis & 63,944 & 5818 & \$19.57 & - & \$1,251495 \\
\hline PROHECT COST & \(5 F\) & Pat (\%) & Cost/5F & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL PROIECT COST & 63,994 & 100.00\% & \$336.31 & - & \$21,537,0as \\
\hline OFERATIONAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & \(\underline{n t}(\) (\%) & Cost/5 & Subholice Cot & Total \\
\hline ```
Usitios - Electics Consumpton
Utitites Gà Corcumption
vilties - Waste Consu-pton
U:itics Eems / Waze Water
Tietocisl
Manterance - Current
Maintenance - Deferred
Site / Geounds - Maintenance
Transportation - Busing - Cost per mile in excess of existing route
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
33.946 \\
53.948 \\
63,94c \\
53.34 \\
63,94c \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
0
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
005\% \\
200\% \\
005\% \\
\(200 \%\) \\
005\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
30.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.565\)
\end{tabular} & s0
\(\$ 0\)
90
\(\$ 0\)
50
50
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS & 63,944 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell Counky Schosl Ditrikt Na． 1 Conceptial Cost Ansimis Capacity Stusy K－12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No， 14 －Ahernate 2014 \\
Oate：3／19／2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS EAEAKDOWN & 58 & Pat \(\mid\)｜ \(\mid\) & Cont／SF & Substaral Cont & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
h．me H－ibint Garsituthise Cabl－Implasernett \\
 \\
Propseed Aenwasted 3ul－Ing ires \\
Propxod Swing Spacc 4 cas anilor hinor Rongnticn： \\
 \\
 \\
Demolition of Exising Building \\
Deduct：Addition to North HS－Mard Construaction＋FFSL Costs
\end{tabular} & 1818,215



330,843 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sane： \\
Sanan： \\
520000 \\
515000 \\
\(\$ 50.05\) \\
\＄15000 \\
scian \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} & 90
\(592,-251,254\)
90
90
\(\$ 9\)
\(\$ 9\)
90
\(\$ 3,970,116\)
\(-\$ 30,158,347\) & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & & & & 566，365，519 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Centingency［ 5 N Censtruction 8.2 W Deigen for New Werk］ \\
 \\
Contingmory［7\％Construction 52 K Devige for Addtoral \\
Cortingmery［IDE Construction 5 2W Devign far Renavations）
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{gathered}
7.00 \% \\
3.00 \% \\
2.00 \% \\
12.006
\end{gathered}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 5,473,763 \\
\$ 277,503 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUATOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN & 370．215 & 81．086 & 5197．51 & －－－ & \＄73．122．190 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOA（4X per year） & & Pat 㖵 & Cost／5F & Subuotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
New Building Constraction Cost－New Design New Builing Construction Cont－Beplacement Nirw Building Addtion Construction Cost \\
Renovated Construction \\
Demolition \\
Comingercy（Design I New Work） \\
Comtingency（Design \＆Addtions） \\
Comingency（Design s frencrations）
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
4．00\％ \\
\(4.00 \%\) \\
4．00\％ \\
4．00\％ \\
4．00\％ \\
4．00\％ \\
4．00\％ \\
4．00\％
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
S0．c0 \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
S0．c0 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 50.00\) \\
\＄0．00 \\
\＄0．co
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
53,722,150 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 158,805 \\
\$ 259,151 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SLETOTAL ESCNAATION FACTOR COST & & 6．57\％ & 90.90 & －－－ & \＄4．120．106 \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COST & SF & Pat｜e｜ & Cost／5F & Suthotal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & 370，215 & 85．60\％ & \＄208．64 & mer & \＄77，242，295 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & Pat \(|x|\) & Con／／5F & Subtotal Cont & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Inove Purnichings／Equipment（Phme equirment，haliding farmiturs． \\
 \\
 tochnokgey for non i structional purpoces： \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \\
 \\

\end{tabular} & &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
SC． 0 \\
secn \\
2xan
\end{tabular} & \[
54,00, y c a
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Bager on Const Cosestor Kew conzustion only \\
Stand an Caxulgmbias 5osdermem soncruct un saly \\
Baied on Consplcaics tor rew Ablitikn soncluat un santy
\end{tabular} \\
\hline total ather costs & 370．215 & c．ass & \＄10．92 & －－－ & \＄4．042．748 \\
\hline SOFT COSTS & SF & Pat 戌 & Cost／5F & Subtocal Cost & Tonal \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Printing－Bid Documents \\
Adwerixe for Bu \\
Land S．rma \\
Sal litr naif have 1 E－sirurmental \\
Eraemmertsi Ayentip Restew＂ees \\
「onstruction TeH－g ilrepections \\
Commiss oring בnd Fir： \\
4rchitesural Fees；＇Rai＂b．nendis ken Coneructon \\
Architectural Fees／Reimborieables－Replecement \\
Architectural Fees／Aeimborieakles－Additions \\
Architectural Fees／Reimborsesties－Renovation \\
Architectural Fees／Reimborsesbles－Demolition \\
Construction Management［CM）Fees
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
370，215 370． 215 4n \(\mathrm{n}, 21 \mathrm{~s}\) 4n． 21 s \\
30.215 30.215 30.215 370，215
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
0．27x \\
2.035 \\
ams \\
210： \\
520\％ \\
920\％ \\
252\％ \\
8．00\％ \\
3．006 \\
10．00\％ \\
12．005 \\
8006 \\
0．00\％
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.56\) \\
Sc． 66 \\
Sech \\
Sc． 21 \\
50.52 \\
50.52 \\
\＄1．28 \\
Scleo \\
\(\$ 20.19\) \\
So．co \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 1.07\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 208,554\)
\(\$ 23,173\)
\(\$ 21,123\)
\(\$ 22,262\)
\(\$ 193.105\)
\(\$ 193.105\)
\(\$ 401.560\)
\(\$ 9\)
\(\$ 7,474,419\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 152,506\)
\(\$ 0\) & Buied on Const Cont Suat on Conat cox Stam：sn Cexni Cibl stams an Cenvi Cibl baser on Cons Cost baser on Cons Cost Bxes on Consicat Indudes Other Costs Indudes Other Cests Indudes Other Costs Indudes Other Costs Indudes Other Costs includes Sequencirg \\
\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS & 370，215 & 2．92\％ & \＄24．17 & － & 58946978 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Paniect Cost & 5 &  & Cant／SF & Subtotal Cont & Total \\
\hline TOTAL PROIECT COST & 370，215 & 100．00\％ & 5242．73 & －－． & \＄50．212．021 \\
\hline OPERATIONU COSTS & \(5 F\) & Pat｜s］ & Cost／3F & Subrocal Cost & Total \\
\hline Uuilies－Electrical Consumption & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & S0．co & \＄0 & \\
\hline Ubilies－Cas Comumption & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & 90．co & so & \\
\hline Leities－Water Comumption & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & So．co & \＄0 & \\
\hline Ubilies－Sewer／Waste Water & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & 50．00 & \＄0 & \\
\hline Custodial & 370，215 & 000\％ & Soco & so & \\
\hline Maintensnce－Curent & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & 50.00 & \＄0 & \\
\hline Maintersance－Deferred & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & \＄0．00 & \＄0 & \\
\hline Site／Grounds－Maimenance & 370，215 & 0．00\％ & \＄0．c0 & \＄0 & \\
\hline Trarsportation－Basing－Cost per mie in encess of esilting route & O & 0．00\％ & \＄0．565 & \＄0 & \\
\hline TOTAL OPEMANOMAL COSTS & 370，215 & 0．0\％ & 5000 & －－－ & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{F. Scenario 5 Cost Assessment}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Campbell County School Dbstrict No. 1 Conceptual Cont Anshysis Capacity Studr: K-12 & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 45 - 2014 \\
Date: 3/19/2013
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTAUCTION COSTS BRENCOWNT & SF & Pct (S) & Cost/5F & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
How Suidig Corstructicn Cos: Hzw Deign \\
How buibli-g Larstrasian Cnsl-Prulaty:n \\
P-opered Nen Addt on Arss + Ste Osvelopmem \\
Propcsed Fxnoented Builiing diev \\
 \\
P-opered Grade leve Contersion Nesas andice Paincer Rerguztions \\
Proposed Improvements to Evisting Bulsing Aves - FEA Report \\
Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
168,689 \\
90,711 \\
26,322 \\
9 \mathrm{coD}
\end{array}
\] & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 25205\) \\
S2san9 \\
Scowos \\
\(\$ 15200\) \\
sanas \\
sones \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 42,172,25 C \\
50 \\
518,942,20 \\
\$ 2,43,45 C \\
\$ \operatorname{sen} 40 \mathrm{a} \\
50 \\
50 \\
50
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTON COST \\
Contingency (5x Corntruction \(82 \mathrm{2W}\) Devign far New \& Demol tian Work) \\
 Contingency (10\% Construction \(5 \mathbf{2 W}\) Desien for Aenowtions)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.00 \% \\
& 2.00 \% \\
& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 64,012,900 \\
\$ 2,952,053 \\
\$ 3,704,798 \\
\$ 347,814
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BAEAKOCOWN & 238.723 & 81. \(79 \%\) & 5239.04 & --. & \$49,017,570 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOR [4\% per weiel & & Fat (\%) & Cons/5F & Subtctal Coit & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
rusw suldig Coretucticn Con- Protctyse \\
 \\
Inentrostarl canatration \\
Demoltion \\
Cortine or (Denk Eftw thak) \\
Contingency (Design \& Addtionk) \\
Contingency (Design \& Revovations)
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
4.10cs \\
4.05\% \\
4.03\%, \\
1.10\% \\
4.05\% \\
4.034, \\
\(4.00 \%\) \\
4.005
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
4 4.cn \\
50.00 \\
50.60 \\
\(51 . c 1\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
so.co \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & S1, кынан: 50 \$737,689 51543 50 \$1.8.082 \$68,192 \(\$ 13,913\) & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 327\% & \$0.c0 & --- & \$2,760,703 \\
\hline CONSTEUCTION COST & \(5 F\) & Pat (3) & Cost/ 5 F & Subtocal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & 238,723 & 85.07\% & \$248.61 & --- & \$71,778,272 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & Pct (\%) & Cost/5F & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Locre Furnistings / Eqaipment (Phone equipment, building furniture, \\
 paper cutters ocpiers, dean ry equ pment, CT/ nstructinal taupment, amp teshrokge for non inet uztional surposes! \\
 rlascoom 'rrilure, sterage shelai-g, meil a ce-ter shetoreg benk shewes. papar cuttere, copicre, deaning squpment. CTE nstructional Equicment, amp testr-ekber fer not incl-ustiond surpeosal \\
 \\
 \\
 \\

\end{tabular} & - & \begin{tabular}{l}
6.304 \\
6.32\% \\
为 \\
\(520 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
secou \\
se. 0 \\
30.0
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
52,763,126 \\
5 \\
\(51,241 \mathrm{cx}\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Besed on Cons Const for rdew construction anly \\
Haned on Cons Casis for Prototype conetuction O-ly \\
Bassd on Ccnz: Costs tcr new 4.asition ravetruetion on \(\%\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 238,723 & 4.75\% & \$13.87 & . & \$4,004,219 \\
\hline SOFT COSTS & \(5 F\) & Pct (s) & Cost/5F & Subtotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Printing - Sid Documents \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Innd 9/resy \\
Sol Boring ; Phase 1 Enoi onmotal \\
Laskmmental Ranety Resinew furs \\
cocstract on Testing \(i\) inspectione \\
Commissioning ard Party \\
 \\
arceitectural Fees / Wemburseables - Prototyse Design \\
Anchitectural Fees / Reimburseables - Additions \\
Arelitectural Fees / Reimburseables - Renóvation \\
Construction Management (CM) Fees
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
238,723 \\
288,723 \\
108685 \\
168.6S3 \\
248.72 A \\
16865 \\
168.689 \\
1ehnms \\
94,711 \\
25,323 \\
258, 723
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
0.275 \\
\(0.03 \%\) \\
3038 \\
210\% \\
2254 \\
325\% \\
252 \\
kown \\
10.00\% \\
12.00\% \\
0.00s
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.67 \\
50.07 \\
30.13 \\
\(\$ 0.43\) \\
S1.62 \\
\(\$ 1 / 06\) \\
\(\$ 2.21\) \\
cos.5 7 \\
\$0.c0 \\
\(\$ 23.98\) \\
\(\$ 16.00\) \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 193,801 \\
\$ 21,533 \\
\$ 21,533 \\
\$ 71,778 \\
\$ 179,466 \\
\$ 179,466 \\
\$ 373,267 \\
53,975,300 \\
\$ 804,189 \\
\$ 2,271,397 \\
\$ 005,134 \\
50
\end{array}
\] & Baved on Const Cost Based on Const Cost issed on Coret Coet saxed on Co 'st Cost samalunCarst Licol sased en Co-et coet sased en Co'st Cost Iraduchs Oilhe Cavis Incluses other conts Includes Other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencirg \\
\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS & 288,723 & 10.19x & 529.78 & -... & \$8,596,856 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline PROMECT COST & 5F & Pct (5) & Cost/5F & Subtocal Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL PROIECT COST & 2318.723 & 100.00\% & \$292.25 & --- & \$34,379,157 \\
\hline OPERATIOVAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & Fat (8) & Coul/ 5 F & Subtecalcoit & Tetal \\
\hline Uflities - Electrical Consumption & 288,723 & a,ows & 50.00 & so & \\
\hline Utilities - Gas Consumption & 238,723 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & so & \\
\hline Utilities - Water Convamption & 238,723 & 0.00\% & S0.c0 & so & \\
\hline Utilities-Semes / Waste Water & 238,723 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & So & \\
\hline Custodial & 238,723 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & s0 & \\
\hline Mainterance - Current & 288,723 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & 50 & \\
\hline Maintesarce - Deferred & 238,723 & 2.00s & \$0.00 & so & \\
\hline Site / Grounds - Maintenance & 288,723 & 0.00\% & \$0.c0 & 50 & \\
\hline Transportation - Busing - Cost per mie in excess of existing route & 0 & 0.00\% & \$0.565 & so & \\
\hline TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS & 288.723 & 0.008 & \$0.00 & -- & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Corcaptual Cost Analysis Capacity Studn: K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. a5 - 2015 \\
Date: \(3 / 19 / 2013\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN & SF & Pct (\%) & Cost/s: & Suthotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Now Bulfing Corst uation Cos: New Design New Bulithe Corstuction Cos. - Frototype \\
Popoeed Hew Pddilion Ares + Ste Dere opmont \\
Prupcond Anescatual Euiding A.res \\
Propoced 5 wng Scsoc Arcas indior Ainor Renovatiors \\
 \\
Proposed Improvements to Evisting Building Area - FEA Report \\
Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & 30,600 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\$2:0.00 \\
S230.00 \\
\(\$ 200.00\) \\
\$15ncen \\
\(\$ 50.00\) \\
550.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
93 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 1500,0 c e \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
Contingeney (SA, Corntruction \& 15 Desien for Mesi \& Demolision Mork\} Contingency (7w Construction \& 2\% Design for Adshonst Contingency (10x Conitruction \& 2w Design for henowitism)
\end{tabular} & & \begin{tabular}{l}
300\% \\
\(9.00 \%\) \\
\(12.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 1,500,000 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 180,000
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN & 30,000 & 81.62\% & \$56.00 & .-m & \$1,680,000 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOR (49 PAT YTSH & & Pat (\%) & cost/ss & Subrotal Cost & Total \\
\hline New Building Construction Cost - New Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype Now Building Addrition Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition Contingency (Design \& New Work) Contingency (Design \& Additions) Cootingency (Design \& Renovations) & & \begin{tabular}{l}
8.00\% \\
\(8.00 \%\) \\
8.00\% \\
\(8.00 \%\) \\
8.006 \\
\(8.00 \%\) \\
\(8.00 \%\) \\
8.00\%
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 120,000 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 14,400
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 653\% & 50.00 & - & \$134.400 \\
\hline CONSTRICTION COST & \(5 F\) & Mex (8) & Cont/5 & Sutnotil Cost & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & 30,000 & 88.14\% & \$60.48 & -- & \$1,814,400 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & Fct (\%) & Cost/sF & Subnotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Losee Fu'nehings iEqu pment ifhore equ pment, buis ne turniture. \\
 papse cutters. copisrs, tisaning coulsment, CTE Irgtustional Equip-ent. \\
 \\
 \\
 paper otters, ocpiers, teaning equigement, CII I-stwatiaral Equip-ent, any technology for no-instructionsi parpocesi \\
Losse Furnishlags / Equipment thone equement, buiding turaltures, classroom fursiture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cutters, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes)
\end{tabular} & - & \(530 \%\)
\(5.30 \%\) & Sa.a
50.00
50.00 & sa
so
so
so & \begin{tabular}{l}
Eased en Censt Coets tor ripen mansirut san onfp \\
Rased en Conal Costs far Protokppe tmestuiten only \\
Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 30,000 & \(000 \%\) & 50.00 & -- & So \\
\hline Soft Costs & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/ss & Subholicest & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Primting - Bid Dccuments \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Land Survey \\
 \\
Sover-mb:lal Ran-cy froinw furs \\
Constuation Testing i Incpeatione \\
Commisiarine - zed Porty \\
Anc-itectural Fees ; Aeimbursentles - New Constriation \\
 \\
Architevtural rews / Neimiburswables - Adatium \\
Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Nenoration \\
Construction Management (CM) Fees
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30,000 \\
30,000 \\
30,600 \\
30 \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline 0,000 \\
30,000
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(0.27 \%\) \\
0.05\% \\
0.03\% \\
210n \\
025\% \\
\(0.25 \%\) \\
25\% \\
505\% \\
1a.00\% \\
12.005 \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.16 \\
50.02 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\$0.00 \\
SQ. 15 \\
50.00 \\
Sa. 0 \\
5 Cos \\
50.00 \\
sa.00 \\
\$7.26 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & 54,899 5544 \(\$ 544\) St,5:4 54,5:36 \(\$ 4.536\) \(50,4.35\) & lased an Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost Esacd uni Cunsi Cla Rasudun Cunal Oest Besed on Const Ccs Resudan Cantil Cest Incbides Dthe Cost Inthales Oiline Cost Inchaders Other Cost Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing \\
\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS & 30,000 & 11.86\% & 58.13 & - & \$244.037 \\
\hline PROJECT COST & SF & Pct (\%) & Cost/sF & Subtatal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline TOTAL PROJECT COST & 30,000 & 100.005 & \$68.61 & - & \$2,058,437 \\
\hline OPCRATIONAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/sm & Subuta Cost & Tetal \\
\hline ```
Utitice Eloxtical Consumpton
Usiitiva - Gus Carsampricen
Utitice Wote Consu"cton
```



```
Cutcocial
Maintenance - Current
Maintenance - Deferred
Site / Grounds - Maintenance
Transportation - Buxing - Cost per mile in excess of exsting route
``` & 30,000 3n, \(6 \times 10\) 30.000 3n,060 30.000 30,000 30,000 30,000 & \begin{tabular}{l}
0006 \\
anas \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
anas \\
2005 \\
0.006 \\
0.00\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
sum \\
50.00 \\
San 0 \\
\$0.00 \\
S0.00 \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.565\)
\end{tabular} & \$0
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
50
50
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS & 30,000 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Campbell County School District No. 1 Corcaptual Cost Analysis Capacity Studn: K-12} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Scenario No. 45 - 2017 \\
Date: \(3 / 19 / 2013\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline CONSTRUCTION COSTS BREAKDOWN & \(5 F\) & Pct( \(\times\) \% & Cost/s: & Suthotal Cost & Total \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Now Bulfing Corst uction Cos: New Design \\
New Bulithe Corstuction Cos: - Prototype \\
Proposed Idsw Pddrion Ares + Sitc Dereopment \\
Pruponal Aneswatud Euidi-g A.res \\
Propoced 9wng Sproc Ancez \\
 \\
Proposed Improvements to Evisting Building Area - FEA Report \\
Demolition of Existing Building
\end{tabular} & c3,94 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
\$2:0.00 \\
sciulu \\
\(\$ 200.00\) \\
sisncen \\
\(\$ 50.00\) \\
550.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 12.00\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 15500.006\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \\
Contingeney (SA, Corntruction \& 15 Desien for Mesi \& Demolision Mork\} Contingency (7w Construction \& 2\% Design for Adshonst Contingency (10x Conitruction \& 2w Design for henowitism)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3.00 \% \\
& 900 \% \\
& 12.00 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 15,986,000 \\
\$ 1,119,020 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUETOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST BREAKDOWN & 63,944 & 76.65\% & \$26750 & .-m & 517,105,020 \\
\hline ESCALATION FACTOR (49 PAT YTSH & & Pat(0) & cost/ss & Subrotal Cost & Total \\
\hline New Building Construction Cost - New Design New Building Construction Cost - Prototype Now Building Addrition Construction Cost Renovated Construction Demolition Contingency (Design \& New Work) Contingency (Design \& Additions) Cootingency (Design \& Renovations) & & \begin{tabular}{l}
16.00\% \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\) \\
\(16.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
\(\$ 0.00\) \\
50.00 \\
50.00
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 0 \\
\$ 2,557,760 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 179,043 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \\
\hline SUBTOTAL ESCALATION FACTOR COST & & 12.27\% & 50.00 & .-m & \$2,736803 \\
\hline CONSTRICTION COST & \(5 F\) & Mef(8) & Cont/5 & Subiñai Cont & Total \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST & 63,944 & 88.95\% & \$310.30 & -- & \$19,841,823 \\
\hline OTHER COSTS & & PCt (\%) & Cost/sF & Subnotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Losee Fu'nehings iEqu pment ifhore equ pment, buis ne turniture. \\
 paper cutters. copisrs, tisaring coulsment. CTE Irgtustional Equip-ent. \\
 \\
 \\
 paper otters, copiers tiearing equisment, CI I-stwetiaral Equip-ent, any technology for na-instructions p.rpocesi \\
Losse Furnishlags / Equipment thone equement, buiding turnlture, classroom fursiture, storage shelving, media center shelving, book shelves, paper cutters, copiers, clearing equipment, CTE Instructional Equipment, any technology for non-instructional purposes)
\end{tabular} & - & 5.336
\(5.35 \%\)

\(5306 \%\) & sax

50.00

50.00 & \$1,468,287 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Pased en Censt Coets tor The:" amsiruat san ontp \\
Rased cn Cenal Costs far Protokppe tunstuiten only \\
Based on Const Costs for new Addition construction only
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL OTHER COSTS & 63,944 & \(520 \%\) & 518.27 & -- & \$1,168.257 \\
\hline Soft Costs & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/ss & Suthotil Cost & Teat \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Primting - Bid Documents \\
Advertise for Bid \\
Land Survey \\
 \\
 \\
Construation Testing i Inceestiore \\
Commisiarine - zed Porty \\
Arctitectural Fees i Neimbursestles - New Constriation \\
 \\
Architectural rews / Neimiburswebles - Adatium \\
Architectural Fees / Reimburseables - Benocation \\
Construction Management (CM) Fees
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63.54 4 \\
63,9.4c \\
53.844 \\
63,044 \\
63,944 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(0.27 \%\) \\
\(0.03 \%\) \\
0.03\% \\
2.15 \\
\(025 \%\) \\
2.25\% \\
252\% \\
\(505 \%\) \\
\(10.00 \%\) \\
\(12.00 \%\) \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.84 \\
50.09 \\
50.09 \\
so. 31 \\
50.75 \\
50.78 \\
51.61 \\
Sola \\
S15. 77 \\
So.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.00\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 53,573 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 5,953 \\
\$ 19, \$ 42 \\
\$ 40,505 \\
\$ 49,605 \\
\$ 103,177 \\
93 \\
\$ 1,003,434 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0 \\
\$ 0
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Based an Const Cost Based on Const Cost Based on Const Cost \\
Excedull Guntat ©at \\
Resudan Canal Cost \\
Escej on Const Ccst \\
ResudanCmat Cost \\
Intider Dthe Costs \\
Inthaiki Duline Costs tinchades other Costs Includes Other Costs Includes Sequencing
\end{tabular} \\
\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS & 63,944 & 5818 & 520.27 & - & \$1,296,190 \\
\hline PROJECT COST & SF & Pct(\%) & Cost/sF & Subthotal Cost & Tocal \\
\hline TOTAL PROJECT COST & 63,944 & 100.005 & \$348.84 & - & \$22,306,271 \\
\hline OPCRATIONAL COSTS & \(5 F\) & Pat(\%) & Cost/sm & Subuta Cost & Tetal \\
\hline ```
Utitice Eloctical Consumpton
Ufilitro. Gus Carsampticen
Utitice Wote Consu"cton
```



```
Cuetocial
Mainterance - Current
Maintenance - Deferred
Site / Grounds - Maintenance
Transportation - Buxing - Cost per mile in excess of exsting route
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
63.848 \\
63,044 \\
63.844 \\
63,0.4c \\
53.344 \\
63,944 \\
63,944 \\
63,944
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(000 \%\) \\
anas \\
0.00\% \\
anas \\
200\% \\
0.006\% \\
\(0.00 \%\) \\
0.006 \\
\(0.00 \%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
50.00 \\
sum \\
50.00 \\
San 0 \\
\$0.00 \\
S0.00 \\
50.00 \\
50.00 \\
\(\$ 0.565\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\)
\(\$ 0\) & \\
\hline TOTAL CPERATIONAL COSTS & 63,944 & 0.00\% & 50.00 & - & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{7.0 \\ Recommendation}

\section*{A. Summary}

The goal of the Capacity Analysis was to determine the Most Cost Effective Remedy (MCER) based on the WSFD guidelines as currently adopted. It must be noted that the term "Most Cost Effective Remedy" does not necessary mean the lowest cost scenario. The evaluation and recommendation takes into account cost as one of the many factors in the evaluation of each scenario. Cost is balanced against factors including the most appropriate educational scenario, the best short and long term solutions, the desires of the school district and the community and most importantly, the quality of education being provided to our children.

The recommendations of the Planning Team takes into account the criteria and parameters of the WSFD as well as the concerns and desires of the School District. However, the Planning Team is required to provide its own professional assessment of the MCER. While we cannot guarantee that our recommendation is in alignment with either the School District or WSFD, we can provide assurances that it is based on a critical analysis of the data presented within this report and is a fair, unbiased recommendation.

\section*{MCER based on WSFD Guidelines for Capacity}

In summary, currently the CCSD K-12 schools show a capacity issue in which capacity is significantly exceeded by current and projected enrollments. District wide, CCSD had a significant K-6 capacity issue in AY 2011/2012 that continues to grow yearly as enrollments within the district increase. District wide in AY 2011/2012, the K-6 schools were over capacity by 444 students. AY 2012/2013 has experienced an actual enrollment increase of 220 students. It is projected that in AY2014/2015, with the inclusion of two new K-6 schools currently in planning/construction, enrollments will still exceed capacity by 365 students. Strong growth in enrollments is projected to continue up to and including year 2020. The grade level 7-8 Jr. High Schools within the district currently do not have a capacity issue, however they are projected to reach capacity in AY2015/2016. Overall, the 10-12 high school within CCSD does not have a current capacity issue. Furthermore, the high school campus is not projected to have a capacity issue through AY2020/2021

Based on an analysis of the five scenarios utilizing the WSFD methodology to calculate capacity, we have identified Scenario \#2 as the Most Cost Effective Remedy. Using the evaluation criteria detailed in Section 6 of this report we rank the scenarios as follows:

\section*{B. Most Cost Effective Remedy}

\section*{RANKING \#1 - Most Cost Effective Remedy}

Scenario \#2: MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; SOUTH CAMPUS IS 9-10, NORTH CAMPUS IS 11-12; PROVIDE RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Cost Impacts: \(\$ 92,611,082\) over an eight year time period. (Not including projected land costs)

Scenario \#2 offered the following attributes:
- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding \(9^{\text {th }}\) graders into the high school system.
- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by moving 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to \(85 \%\) utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.

\section*{Scenario \#2 represents the Most Cost Effective Remedy. It directly and positively impacts the district in several ways including:}

This scenario provides the best transition of all district schools to state mandated conformance to grade level capacity. This scenario is a system wide approach that works for all grade levels. This scenario utilizes existing district resources and excess capacity well, results in the best utilization of the existing Jr. Highs and High School, and best meets the values of the community. This is the second lowest cost scenario with its costs are spread over an 8 year time period. It was determined to provide the best educational value to the district.

This scenario:
1. Addresses Capacity Concerns: This scenario resolves the capacity issue utilizing existing facility resources through a district approved reconfiguration of grade levels in existing Jr. High and High Schools. The approach transforms 7-9 Jr. High Schools into 7-8 schools, having the effect of reducing enrollments at these schools. Ninth graders then move into the high school campus, utilizing available excess capacity. Expansion of the high school is provided as enrollments increase and justify additional capacity. New school construction is devoted to grade K-6 schools. New K-6 schools can be located in areas of need.
2. Educational Impact: This scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district. The existing Jr. High Schools can undertake renovations to provide staff planning spaces and conform to state mandated \(85 \%\) utilization.
3. Operational Impact: This scenario maximizes use of capacity at district schools, thus limiting operational impacts. This scenario does not require forced mobility of students through district boundary modifications. This scenario maintains minimal district transportation costs for busing.
4. Site Impact: This scenario maximizes current school sites.
5. Community / District Impact: This scenario maintains a single high school system but provides flexibility to migrate to a two high school system in the future. Grade level changes occur in the Jr. High and High School system. The district is in agreement with the grade level changes.
6. Cost Impacts: \(\$ 92,611,082\) over an eight year time period.

\section*{C. Ranking of Other Scenarios}

RANKING \#2
Scenario \#1: CONVERT NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO TWO INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS; MOVE 9TH GRADE INTO THE HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM; RENOVATE JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Scenario \#1 offered the following attributes:
- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding \(9^{\text {th }}\) graders into the high school system.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by moving 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to \(85 \%\) utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.

\section*{Comments on Scenario \#1}

The costs of this scenario are very similar to Scenario \#2. This scenario provides the similar transition of all district schools to state mandated conformance to grade level capacity as Scenario \#1, with the exception of transition to two independent 10-12 grade high schools. This scenario involved the transition directly to two independent high schools, rather than providing the flexibility to make the transition as enrollments grow. This scenario does not allow for community involvement in the migration to two independent high schools. This scenario is a system wide approach that works for all grade levels. This scenario utilizes existing district resources and excess capacity well, results in the good utilization of the existing Jr. Highs and High School, and meets the values of the community. This is the lowest cost scenario with its costs are spread over an 8 year time period.

RANKING \#3
Scenario \#4: CONVERT SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOL. CONVERT NORTH HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS INTO A GRADE 1012 HIGH SCHOOL. EXPAND NORTH HIGH SCHOOL TO MEET CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Scenario \#4 offered the following attributes:
- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity within high schools by converting south campus into a Jr. High.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools by creating a third Jr. High.
- Scenario allows existing Jr. High Schools to conform to \(85 \%\) utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario eliminates current split campus system and creates a single high school within the district with minimal opportunity to transform to a two high school district.
- Scenario requires significant renovations at South campus to accommodate grade 7-9 educational needs.
- Scenario requires renovations at north campus to accommodate grade 9 educational needs.
- Scenario expands north campus.

\section*{CAPACITY STUDY: CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1}
- Scenario could incorporate alternate to replace North with a new school if/when suitability needs index allowed. However it is difficult to align these schedules.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Scenario takes too long to implement remedies for current capacity concerns.

\section*{Comments on Scenario \#4}

This scenario eliminates current split campus system and creates a single high school within the district with minimal opportunity to transform to a two high school district. Committing to a single high school on one campus did not offer the district an opportunity to migrate to a two high school system in the near future. This scenario involved significant renovation of existing district resources to repurpose schools to different grade levels. There was a significant cost increase between this scenario and the two higher ranking scenarios.

\section*{RANKING \#4}

Scenario \#3:

> MAINTAIN DISTRICT GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION; NO CHANGE TO EXISTING HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS; RENOVATE EXISTING JR. HIGH SCHOOLS TO MEET CLASSROOM CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS; BUILD NEW 7-9 Jr. HIGH SCHOOL; BUILD NEW K-6 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Scenario \#3 offered the following attributes:
- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district.
- Scenario does not take advantage of available capacity at High School to alleviate capacity issues in the Jr. High schools.
- Scenario alleviates over capacity issue in Jr. High Schools through construction of a third Jr. High School.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to \(85 \%\) utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-6 schools to meet future capacity needs.

\section*{Comments on Scenario \#3}

This scenario maintains the current high school configuration and grade levels. Its major drawback was in not utilizing excess capacity within the high school campus to alleviate capacity issues in grades 7-9. This led to significantly higher costs for this scenario due to increased new construction.

\section*{RANKING \#5}

Scenario \#5: COMPLETE GRADE LEVEL TRANSFORMATION OF ALL SCHOOLS WITHIN THE DISTRICT; EXISTING K-6 SCHOOLS CONVERT TO K-5 GRADE LEVELS; EXISTING GRADE 7-9 JR. HIGH SCHOOLS CONVERT TO GRADE 6-8 MIDDLE SCHOOLS; EXISTING GRADE 10-12 HIGH SCHOOL SPLIT CAMPUS CONVERTS TO GRADES 9-12 SPLIT CAMPUS

Scenario \#5 offered the following attributes:
- Scenario reduces capacity issue at elementary schools transforming grade 7-9 Jr. High Schools into grade 6-8 Middle Schools.
- Scenario incorporates recently opened and under construction K-6 schools into available capacity.
- Scenario provides new K-5 schools to meet future capacity needs.
- Scenario does not align existing K-5 school capacity with grade level capacity needs.
- Scenario requires forced mobilization due to boundary modifications.
- Scenario allows Jr. High Schools to conform to \(85 \%\) utilization through renovations to provide staff planning offices.
- Scenario does not alleviate capacity issues at Twin Spruce and Sage Valley. Scenario only shifts \(9^{\text {th }}\) grade out and \(6^{\text {th }}\) grade in. Thus, scenario requires construction of a new middle school.
- Scenario takes advantage of available capacity at high schools by doing a grade level change and adding 9th graders into the high school system.
- Scenario maintains current split campus system and a single high school within the district, but provides flexibility to convert to two independent comprehensive high schools in the future should capacity reach a level at which this was desirable to the district.

\section*{Comments on Scenario \#5}

This scenario involved grade level modifications at all district schools. Modifying grade levels in the elementary schools resulted in a misalignment of school capacity with grade level capacity requirements. This would have the effect of leaving capacity unutilized in those schools, forcing mobility of students to other schools or undertaking significant renovations to elementary schools to realign classrooms. There were significant operational and staffing costs associated with the grade level changes due to transportation and Department of Education requirements. This scenario did not alleviate capacity issues at the existing Jr. High Schools, thus a new school was required. This was the most costly scenario.

\subsection*{8.0 Appendix}

\section*{A. Correspondence \& Meeting Notes}

\section*{MEETING MINUTES 2012-11-28}


Anomalies are identified in the list of schools that may not be included in the capacity studies, satellite schools 40 miles from Gillette.

To address 7-12 capacity issues in Gillette, the district agrees that Recluse and Little Powder K-8 schools would not be a viable option. Recluse is 35.5 miles and Little River is 44.5 miles from their transportation facility. Wright may also be excluded due to distance from Gillette.
"Big box" spaces will be evaluated to develop realistic capacities that are equitable

MOA ARCHITECTURE
across all districts. The spaces identified in Exhibit C are examples only. MOA will evaluate spaces district wide to identify any additional anomalies. Is there staff available that supports this capacity? In order to be equitable across school districts, WSFD wants a realistic calculation of capacity for these spaces, regardless of staffing. MOA suggests staffing should be a factor to consider, but not a determinant of capacity.

Information provided after the meeting: The district suggests reasonable assumptions for these large spaces would be to plan for 2 teaching spaces in the main gym and 1 teaching space in Gym II, Band, Orchestra, Drama, and High School Computer Lab.

11/28/02 Jack provided a summary of tasks (Exhibit D) and durations of tasks required for district meetings:

Task 3 Option Identification will begin after the kick-off. The design team will meet with the district as soon as 3 weeks to review these options.

Task 4 Option Feasibility will evaluate if options work, assign costs, and rank which option is the most cost effective remedy (MCER). After 4 weeks the design team will be available to review cost and feasibility with the district.

The objective of the MCER is to identify the best educational solution at the best cost. Ranking the MCER will include:

Cost of education
Cost of relationship to the community
Probable cost of option
Cost for additional staffing
(WSFD): The report should list options that were considered but not selected during the evaluation process. This will provide more information to those who want to understand how the team reached the MCER.

The District's budget presentation to the Commission will occur in late March or early April 2013. The annual facility planning meeting is scheduled in May 2013.

11/28/03
Jack summarized the" givens" that WSFD has established as for the capacity studies:
Enrollment: 10 year trailing data from 2011(Exhibit E).
Utilization factor (7-12): 85\%
(District): 75\% utilization used due to block scheduling.
Criteria for calculating school capacity are from WSFD's "Method to Calculate Building Capacity" dated June 2012 (7-12):

\section*{See attachment for SFD criteria.}

Target enrollment for study: WSFD Projection for year 2020.

\section*{Range of study: Grades 7-12}

\section*{Educational adequacy:}

How do we deal with changes to curriculum? The objective of the study is to provide consistency across all districts. The capacity study will be based on programs that existed during the facility assessment in spring 2012.

11/28/06

Reviewed the map showing schools and grade levels that represent the general scope of the capacity study for Campbell County School District 1 (Exhibit F). The design team requests input from the district on where they are the experiencing growth.
(District): Look at economic analysis for each county. Campbell County is experiencing \(2-1 / 2 \%\) growth in the district. For enrollment projections, look at demographic indicators. It can be based on history if birth rates continue.

To address capacity issues, the design team will look at appropriateness of existing site for expansion. We will look at recent changes to feeder schools off-line.

Information from the district's facility plan will be considered in the study (Exhibit G).
Jack opened up discussion to identify District Specific Unique Issues:

\section*{Grade configurations:}

Current grade configurations for most of the district are K-6 / 7-9 / 10-12.
Changing Jr. High to Middle school may be one option to address capacity issues.
(District): Middle school is not a system that is desirable. Moving \(6^{\text {th }}\) grade to 6-8 middle school configuration has issues related to new certifications for \(6^{\text {th }}\) grade teachers. Although certification is not required if they only teach 6th grade, isolation will limit flexibility in staffing. A review of current \(6^{\text {th }}\) grade teachers would be necessary to understand who would require a 5-8 certification. Depending on one's educational background this can be between 18 and 27 credit hours, according to information provided by the district.

\section*{School enrollment and capacity:}
(District): Prefer not to have1000 students in middle school, 950 maximum is desired. When enrollment reaches 400 students per grade level, there are fewer opportunities for students to participate in extra-curricular activities.
(District): We have concern for the number of students moving in hallways and size of the commons. Will the infrastructure be large enough to handle larger capacities?
(District): There is a difference between how the state funds staffing levels (75\% utilization, 21students / classroom, 3 teaching periods out of 4); verses how SFD will be creating classrooms ( \(85 \%\) utilization, 25 students / classroom).

Criteria for calculating classroom capacity are one of the "givens" our team has to work with to meet the objectives of the study.

\section*{Classroom utilization:}
(District): Classroom Utilization - In grades 7-12, the District functions with four periods each day with teachers teaching 3 of 4 . Students take 8 classes, 4 each day over a 2 day period. Without the off period, more space is required for setting up classrooms when class is being utilized. Changing rooms with moving carts is difficult. Utilizing off periods is a short-tern solution to address capacity issues.

\section*{Attendance policies:}

Enrollment may be impacted by on-line courses and off-campus learning but the enrollment data provided by the WSFD will not be modified to account for these issues as students generally attend the schools part of the day regardless.
(District): Additional information was provided after the meeting:
CCHS provides students with several opportunities of off campus learning. A partnership exists between Gillette College and CCHS to allow students, meeting certain criteria, to be dually enrolled. Typical of all of Wyoming's 4A schools, CCHS also allows senior students, who have met certain achievement criteria, to forego the last period of the day. Currently, 150/384 senior students do not have a 4th block class. A small number of students attend CCHS as non-fulltime students. These are students who are enrolled in online schools or home schools. Generally, these students are enrolled in CCHS elective courses that are not offered through their program of study. CCHS does offer opportunities for students to gain experience in areas of career interest off campus. These classes (Mentorship, OJT, and COE) provide supervised on the job training at partnership locations. However, a school classroom is also necessary, as the experience is not limited to off-site location.

\section*{Community growth identified in zoning}

MOA will look to counties and districts for information on growth patterns. Information like housing starts.
(District): Campbell County is around 1.4 students per household verses 1.3 average. We have a larger growth in population of children and young adults verses the State; refer to the attached census comparison between 2000 and 2010 distributed at the meeting.

\section*{Food service:}

The food service program at the junior high schools is nearing capacity. A significant increase in students would significantly impact the district's ability to serve lunch in a timely manner.

\section*{Transportation:}

The district uses a two-tier bus system. Middle school / high school students are 1 tier, elementary school second tier. More, smaller middle schools would be less distance. Some longer distance routes require transfer system. If Middle school is larger, routes will take longer and will impact ability to have two-tier system.

There is a bus service to Wright 7-12 for students who attend programs offered in Gillette. This includes the North Autism Program.
Special education - Additional information was provided by the district after the meeting:

The district has seen a \(22.4 \%\) increase of students in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) from 2007-2011. This is compared to a \(10 \%\) increase in total student enrolment in that same period.
The district has an Adapted Physical Education program located in Parish Hall. This building is expected to time-out in the near future due to building condition.

Due to space constraints, most of the SPED offices are housed at the Lakeway Learning Center. The district prefers more space be provided for psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and case managers at each school.
There are increased needs to serve students with significant medical needs that will require space for changing, showering, toileting, etc. The district suggests a fourth category be added to the state guidelines for Intensive Needs.

\section*{MOA ARCHITECTURE}

\section*{Existing site or building limitations / opportunities:}

Lakeview is being abandoned due to site size restrictions.
The district asked that costs for temporary education space and transportation be accounted for in the study of options.

Regarding temporary classrooms at permanent schools, the 2012 assessment was to assume zero capacity for spaces housed in these structures.
Need information on the district's plans for Parish Hall which may be condemned.
There is state owned land used for recreation that is being maintained by the district at North Campus.

Should North High School show a capacity related issue, the district supports examining the most cost effect remedy.

11/28/08
Meeting Schedule:
Option Identification January 8, 2013 at 2:00pm
Option Feasibility February 12, 2013 at \(3: 00 \mathrm{pm}\)
Review Draft Report TBD
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\hline PROJECT: & WSFD Capacity Study Campbell County School District No. 1 Gillette, WY & \begin{tabular}{l}
DATE: \\
TIME: \\
PROJECT NO \\
FILE: W:I201211
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { January } 82013 \\
2: 00 \mathrm{pm} \\
12128.00 \\
\text { erallProj MgmtMinues 2012-11-28 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline BY: & Jack Mousseau, MOA & LOCATION: & CCSD Board Room \\
\hline ATTENDEES: & CCSD \#1, MOA, BrainSpaces & & \\
\hline ITEM & DISCUSSION & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1. Purpose of meeting
2. Review of capacity guideline givens
3. Review of enrollment projections
4. Population growth patterns within the district
5. Listing of schools being addressed in the study
6. Summary of current capacity condition analysis per school
7. Review district unique issues - how they affect capacity options
8. Outline of potential capacity resolution strategies for discussion and development of additional options if identified
9. Agreement on options to carry forth

MOA ARCHITECTURE

\section*{DISTRICT CAPACITY STUDY EXECUTIVE MEETING AGENDA}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
PROJECT: & \begin{tabular}{l} 
WSFD Capacity Study \\
Campbell County School District No. 1 \\
Gillette, WY
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular}

DATE:
TIME:
PROJECTNO 12128
FILE: W:I2012\12128.00\General\Proj MgmtlMinutes 2012-11-28
BY: Jack Mousseau, MOA LOCATION: TBD

ATTENDEES: CCSD \#1, MOA, BrainSpaces, WSFD
1. 5 minute review of presentation to the \(2: 00\) group
2. Summary of current capacity condition analysis per school
3. Outline of potential capacity resolution strategies for discussion
4. Understanding and feedback of capacity issue identified by the study

\section*{B. AiM Data Worksheets}

\section*{Buffalo Ridge Elementary (No AiM data available)}

> Conestoga Elementary
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Description: \\
Building \#: \\
Gross SQ FT: \\
Tract Acres:
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CAM01 } \\
& 0301-016-0 \\
& 56,172.00 \\
& 9.77
\end{aligned}
\] & ONES & STOGA ES MAIN BLDG & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 吕 } \\
& \stackrel{3}{7}
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline & & & & BSIC & Alcs & & & & & & & Plan Dia & iagrams \\
\hline & CONFIG & \[
\underset{\#}{\text { Room }}
\] & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SQ } \\
& \text { FT }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Cap} \\
& \mathrm{Re}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 153 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 751 & 16 & 18.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 154 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 678 & 16 & 17.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 156 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 657 & 16 & 16.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 157 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 657 & 16 & 16.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 159 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 678 & 16 & 17.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 160 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 751 & 16 & 18.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 163 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 754 & 16 & 18.9 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 164 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 699 & 16 & 17.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 171 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 694 & 16 & 17.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 167 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 709 & - & 17.7 & 17.7 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 169 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 699 & - & 17.5 & 17.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 170 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 754 & - & 18.9 & 18.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 175 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 809 & - & 20.2 & 20.2 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 176 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 872 & - & 21.8 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 179 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 695 & - & 17.4 & 17.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 181 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 872 & - & 21.8 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 182 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 809 & - & 20.2 & 20.2 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 183 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 834 & - & 20.9 & 20.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 137 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 60 & 2384 & 16 & 39.7 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 166 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 60 & 709 & - & 11.8 & 11.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 144 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 855 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 147 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 981 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 136 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 819 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 143 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 604 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 132 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 426 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 134 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 462 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 135 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 426 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 145 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 458 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 155 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 366 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 158 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 366 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 165 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 378 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 178 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 695 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUC K-6 & 300 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & ss & & & 279 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 24 & & & & & 348 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Hillcrest Elementary}


\author{
Lakeview Elementary - No AiM Data Available
}

Meadowlark Elementary
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{29}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Building \#: \\
Gross SQFT \\
Tract Acres:
\end{tabular}} & CAM01
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{0301-007-01}{37,854.00} \\
& 2.88
\end{aligned}
\] & & & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{CAM01 MEADOWLARK MAIN BLDG 0301-007-0100} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 邑 } \\
& \stackrel{y}{*}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSICALCS} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plan Diagrams} \\
\hline & CONFIG & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Room } \\
\#
\end{gathered}
\] & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SQ } \\
& \text { FT }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 111 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 838 & 16 & 21.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 113 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 784 & 16 & 19.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 121 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 841 & 16 & 21.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 122 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 895 & 16 & 22.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 123 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 791 & 16 & 19.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 124 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 890 & 16 & 22.3 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 110 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 933 & - & 23.3 & 23.3 & & room is a bit too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 112 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 935 & - & 23.4 & 23.4 & & room is a bit too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 114 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 935 & - & 23.4 & 23.4 & & room is a bit too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 115 & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 851 & - & 21.3 & 21.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 125 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 841 & - & 21.0 & 21.0 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 126 & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 829 & - & 20.7 & 20.7 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 109 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 1534 & 16 & 30.7 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 201 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 660 & - & 13.2 & 13.2 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 205 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 544 & - & 10.9 & 10.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 202 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 953 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 119 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 2622 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 102 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 1211 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 103 & MULTIPURPOSEPP.E. PED & & PE & 1 & & 3177 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 206 & SPECIAL EDUCATION - SELF-CONTAINED GEN & ERAL & SS & 1 & 80 & 656 & - & 8.2 & 8.2 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 204 & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 397 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 101 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 538 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 116 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 98 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 120 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 124 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 115A & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 136 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 119B & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 107 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 19 & & & & & 277 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Paintbrush Elementary}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Description: \\
Building \#: \\
Gross SQFT: \\
Tract Acres:
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CAM01 } \\
& \underline{0301-015-01} \\
& 60,911.00 \\
& 5.69
\end{aligned}
\] & AINT & RUSH ES MAIN BLDG & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 吕 } \\
& \# \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline & & & & BSIC & ALCS & & & & & & & Plan Dia & iagrams \\
\hline & CONFIG & \[
\underset{\#}{\text { Room }}
\] & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \mathbf{S Q} \\
& \mathrm{FT} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \mathrm{Cap} \\
\mathrm{Re} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 1A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 895 & 16 & 22.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 1B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 862 & 16 & 21.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 1C & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 884 & 16 & 22.1 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 2A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 866 & 16 & 21.7 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 2B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 833 & 16 & 20.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & \(\underline{2 C}\) & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 854 & 16 & 21.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 3A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 885 & 16 & 22.1 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 3B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 895 & 16 & 22.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 3C & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 895 & 16 & 22.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 4A & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 895 & - & 22.4 & 22.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 4B & INTERMEDA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 895 & - & 22.4 & 22.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 4C & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 885 & - & 22.1 & 22.1 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 5A & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 854 & - & 21.4 & 21.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 5B & INTERMEDA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 833 & - & 20.8 & 20.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 5C & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 866 & - & 21.7 & 21.7 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 6A & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 884 & - & 22.1 & 22.1 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 6B & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 862 & - & 21.6 & 21.6 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & \(\underline{6 C}\) & INTERMEDATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 895 & - & 22.4 & 22.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 191 & PRE-K CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 629 & - & 12.6 & 12.6 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & K1 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 1029 & 16 & 20.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & K2 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 1079 & 16 & 21.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & K3 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 1039 & 16 & 20.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 214 & STUDENT ACTVITIES AREA & & ACT & ?? & & 1486 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 215 & STUDENT ACTVITIES AREA & & ACT & & & 225 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 181 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 1187 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 203 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 998 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 198 & LIBRARY CONFERENCEROOM & & LIB & & & 535 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 195 & LIBRARY INSTRUCTION ROOM & & LIB & & & 345 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 174 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 535 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 189 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 2052 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 126 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 540 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 129 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 782 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 155 & GYMNASIUM PED & & PE & 1 & & 5586 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 109 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 360 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 171 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 329 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 175 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 233 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 177 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 345 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 193 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 329 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 197 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 233 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 201 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 240 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 27 & & & & & 401 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Prairie Wind Elementary}

Description: CAM01 PRAIRIE WIND ES NEW (REPLACED STOCKTRAIL)
Building \#: 0301-033-0100
Gross SQ FT: 72,248.00
Tract Acres:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{T: 72,248.00}} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { u} \\
& \underset{7}{7}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSICALCS} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{P lan Diagrams} \\
\hline CONFIG & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Room } \\
\#
\end{gathered}
\] & Use & B Idg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { SQ } \\
& \text { FT }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & A126 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 874 & 16 & 21.9 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B111 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 865 & 16 & 21.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B112 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 940 & 16 & 23.5 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B120 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 879 & 16 & 22.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B121 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 863 & 16 & 21.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B122 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 863 & 16 & 21.6 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B125 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 761 & 16 & 19.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B126 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 843 & 16 & 21.1 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B127 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 847 & 16 & 21.2 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D103 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 1132 & 25 & 28.3 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D114 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 846 & - & 21.2 & 21.2 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D115 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 845 & - & 21.1 & 21.1 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & D116 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 860 & - & 21.5 & 21.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D119 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 870 & - & 21.8 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D120 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 885 & - & 22.1 & 22.1 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D121 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 890 & - & 22.3 & 22.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D127 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 1032 & 25 & 25.8 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D128 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 751 & - & 18.8 & 18.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & C101 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 988 & 16 & 19.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & \(\underline{C 106}\) & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 990 & 16 & 19.8 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & C113 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 1034 & 16 & 20.7 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & C120 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 975 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & C126 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 975 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & A133 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 1047 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & A125 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 1011 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & B109 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 1185 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B103 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 2547 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC K - 6 & A103 & DINING AREA / CAFETERIA & & MPR & & & 2458 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & A121 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 992 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & A124 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 1094 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & A115 & GYMNASIUM PED & & PE & 1 & & 4120 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & C116 & SPECIAL EDUCATION - SELF-CONTAINED GEN & ERAL & SS & 1 & 80 & 1043 & 10 & 13.0 & 10.0 & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & B114 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 312 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B115 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 869 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B117 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 472 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & B118 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 283 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC K-6 & \(\underline{\text { C127 }}\) & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 864 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D113 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 930 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D122 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 906 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline EDUCK-6 & D125 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 814 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 30 & & & & & 433 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Pronghorn Elementary}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Description: \\
Building \#: \\
Gross SQ FT: \\
Tract Acres:
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CAM01 } \\
& 0301-018-01 \\
& \hline 65,289.00 \\
& 10.64
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
RON \\
0
\end{tabular} & GHORN ES MAIN BLDG & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 䓃 } \\
& \underset{\# \#}{\#}
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline \multirow{42}{*}{Tract Acres:} & & & & BSIC & ALCS & & & & & & & Plan Di & iagrams \\
\hline & CONFIG & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Room } \\
\#
\end{gathered}
\] & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \mathbf{S Q} \\
& \text { FT }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Cap} \\
& \mathrm{Re}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 133 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 134 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 135 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 137 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 138 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 139 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 148 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 149 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 154 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 982 & 16 & 24.6 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 150 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 152 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 160 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 161 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 162 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 164 & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 165 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 166 & INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 982 & - & 24.6 & 24.6 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 116 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 716 & - & 14.3 & 14.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 121 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 902 & 16 & 18.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 126 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 902 & 16 & 18.0 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 193 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 935 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 211 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 715 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & \(\underline{212}\) & LIBRARY INSTRUCTION ROOM & & LIB & & & 438 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 214 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 3299 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 189 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 1090 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 190 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 1166 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 179 & GYMNASIUM PED & & PE & 1 & & 7316 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 205 & SCIENCE DEMONSTRATION CLASSROOM ES/M & MS/HS & SCI & 1 & & 1084 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 157 & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 354 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 105 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 163 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 113 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 104 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 115 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 127 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 127 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 697 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 130 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 354 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 142 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 354 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 145 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 355 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 153 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 982 & & & & & large enough for TS \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 156 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 354 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 169 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 354 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 26 & & & & & 387 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Sunflower Elementary}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Description: \\
Building \#: \\
Gross SQ FT \\
Tract Acres:
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CAM01 } \\
& 0301-017-01 \\
& \hline 56,743.00 \\
& 5.53
\end{aligned}
\] & UNFL & OWER ES MAIN BLDG & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 邑 } \\
& \underset{\#}{*}
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline & & Room\# & & BSIC & ALCS & & & SQFT & & & & Plan D & iagrams \\
\hline & CONFIG & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Room } \\
& \text { Numb }
\end{aligned}
\] & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { SQ } \\
\text { Foo }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 169 & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 735 & 16 & 18.4 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 161A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 768 & 16 & 19.2 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 161B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 845 & 16 & 21.1 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 161C & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 771 & 16 & 19.3 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 162A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 781 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 162B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 836 & 16 & 20.9 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 162C & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 780 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 172A & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 779 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 172B & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 835 & 16 & 20.9 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 172C & PRIMARY CLASSROOM (GRADES 1-3) & & 1-3 & 1 & 40 & 780 & 16 & 19.5 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 150A & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 779 & - & 19.5 & 19.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 150B & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 837 & - & 20.9 & 20.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 150C & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 784 & - & 19.6 & 19.6 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 151A & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 779 & - & 19.5 & 19.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 151B & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 818 & - & 20.5 & 20.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 151C & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 780 & - & 19.5 & 19.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 173A & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 779 & - & 19.5 & 19.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 173B & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 837 & - & 20.9 & 20.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 173 C & INTERMEDIA TE CLASSROOM (GRADES 4-5/6) & & 4-6 & 1 & 40 & 784 & - & 19.6 & 19.6 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 119 & PRE-K CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 472 & - & 9.4 & 9.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 120 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 2338 & 16 & 46.8 & 16.0 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 124 & KINDERGARTEN CLASSROOM & & K & 1 & 50 & 804 & 16 & 16.1 & 16.0 & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 158 & ART CLASSROOM & & ART & 1 & & 735 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 180 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & & CL & 1 & & 735 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 183 & LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER & & LIB & & & 3492 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 126 & MUSIC CLASSROOM & & MU & 1 & & 725 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 115 & GYMNASIUM PED & & PE & 1 & & 5178 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 143 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 523 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 144 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 499 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 145 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 552 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 146 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 556 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 164 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 118 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 175 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 88 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 181 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 269 & & & & & \\
\hline & EDUCK-6 & 182 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & & SS & & & 295 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 26 & & & & & 381 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Wagon Wheel Elementary


Sage Valley Junior High

Description:
Building \#:
Gross SQ FT:
Tract Acres:

CAM01 SAGE VALLEY JR HS (7-9) MAIN BLDG
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{0301-020-0100} \\
\hline \(183,991.00\)
21.04 & & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 吕 } \\
& \underset{\sim}{\#} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSI CALCS} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plan Diagrams} \\
\hline CONFIG & Room Number & Use & Bldg & Tag & TS & sf/st & AiM SF & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Un } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 202 & ART CLASSROOM & 100 & ART & 1 & 50 & 1,075 & - & 22 & 22 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 205 & ART CLASSROOM & 100 & ART & 1 & 50 & 1,093 & - & 22 & 22 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 226 & ART CLASSROOM & 100 & ART & 1 & 50 & 967 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 227 & ART CLASSROOM & 100 & ART & 1 & 50 & 974 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 228 & ART CLASSROOM & 100 & ART & 1 & 50 & 955 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 305 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & 100 & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 638 n & no max & 17 & 17 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 306 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & 100 & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 919 n & no max & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 219 & FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FACS) & 100 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 971 & - & 8 & 8 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 220 & FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FACS) & 100 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 823 & - & 7 & 7 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 222 & FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FACS) & 100 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,034 & - & 8 & 8 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 171 & VOCATIONAL/CTE-GENERAL LABORATOR & 100 & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,902 & 25 & 32 & 25 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 173 & VOCATIONAL/CTE-GENERAL LABORATOR & 100 & CTE & 1 & 60 & 2,274 & 25 & 38 & 25 & & room is too LARGE \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 165 & VOCATIONAL/CTE-GENERAL LABORATOR & 100 & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,449 & - & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 167 & WEIGHT ROOM CTE & 100 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,511 & - & 12 & 12 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 162 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,087 & 25 & 29 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 201 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 969 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 204 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,104 & 25 & 29 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 210 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 591 & - & 16 & 16 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 212 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 851 & - & 23 & 23 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 214 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 984 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 217 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 883 & - & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{218}\) & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 886 & - & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 223 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,099 & 25 & 29 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 224 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 976 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 301 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,626 & 25 & 43 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 302 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,100 & 25 & 29 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 303 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,119 & 25 & 30 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 307 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 809 & - & 22 & 22 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 309 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 809 & - & 22 & 22 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 311 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,286 & 25 & 34 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 312 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 902 & - & 24 & 24 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 313 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,094 & 25 & 29 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 314 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 966 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 315 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 947 & 25 & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 316 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 802 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 319 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 941 & 25 & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 320 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,882 & 25 & 50 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 323 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 100 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 871 & - & 23 & 23 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 147 & BAND ROOM MS/HS & 100 & MU & 1 & 60 & 2,593 & - & 43 & 43 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 154 & VOCAL MUSIC CLASSROOM MS/HS & 100 & MU & 1 & 60 & 1,487 \({ }^{\text {n }}\) & no max & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 160 & AUXILIARY GYM & 100 & PE & 1 & 200 & 2,813 & no max & 14 & 14 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 175 & AUXILIARY GYM & 100 & PE & 1 & 200 & 6,047 \({ }^{\text {n }}\) & no max & 30 & 30 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 132 & GYMNASIUM PED & 100 & PE & 1 & 200 & 10,017 & no max & 50 & 50 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 1 & OTHER PHYSICAL EDUCATION SPACE & 100 & PE & 1 & 200 & 3,378 & - & 17 & 17 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{126}\) & WEIGHT ROOM & 100 & PE & 1 & 55 & 1,623 & 25 & 30 & 25 & & combine 126+126A \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 308 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,119 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 310 & GENERAL SCIENCELABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,195 & - & 20 & 20 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 317 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,116 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 318 & GENERAL SCIENCELABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,132 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 321 & GENERAL SCIENCELABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,087 & - & 18 & 18 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 324 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,447 & 24 & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 325 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/HS & 100 & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,450 & 24 & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 208 & SPECIAL EDUCATION - SPECIAL VOCATION- & 100 & SS & 1 & 80 & 718 & - & 9 & 9 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 211 & SPECIAL EDUCATION - SPECIALIZED SE-F-O & 100 & SS & 1 & 80 & 732 & - & 9 & 9 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 206 & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & & & 309 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 207 & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & & & 327 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{209}\) & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & 0 & & 853 & & & 0 & & SIZE OF T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{213}\) & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & 0 & & 919 & & & 0 & & SIZE OF T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{215}\) & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & 0 & & 886 & & & 0 & & SIZE OF T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & \(\underline{216}\) & SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM & 100 & SS & 0 & & 966 & & & 0 & & SIZE OF T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 206B & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROON & 100 & SS & & & 306 & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & 55 & & & & & 1189 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

APPENDIX

Twin Spruce Junior High

Description:
Building \#:
Gross SQFT:
Tract Acres:

CAM01 TWIN SPRUCE JR HS (7-9) MAIN BLDG
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{0301-019-0100} \\
\hline \(188,563.00\)
13.41 & & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 品 } \\
& \text { \# }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSI CALCS} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plan Diagrams} \\
\hline CONFIG & Room Number & Use & FL & BSI & TS & sf/st & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { SQ } \\
\text { Footage }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re}
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 101 & ART CLASSROOM & 1 & ART & 1 & 50 & 988 & - & 20 & 20 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 103 & ART CLASSROOM & 1 & ART & 1 & 50 & 1,125 & - & 23 & 23 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 210 & ART CLASSROOM & 2 & ART & 1 & 50 & 1,523 & 25 & 30 & 25 & & room is large for use \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 203 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & 2 & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 999 no & no max & 27 & 27 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 310 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & 3 & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 987 n & no max & 26 & 26 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 106 & CLASSROOM (RELATED TO VOCATION & 1 & CTE & & & 487 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 107 & CLASSROOM (RELATED TO VOCATION & 1 & CTE & & & 1,023 & & & 0 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 209 & CLASSROOM (RELATED TO VOCATION & 2 & CTE & & & 1,509 & & & 0 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 105 & FAMLY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FA & 1 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,075 & & 9 & 9 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 206 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- GENERAL LABORA & 2 & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,839 & 25 & 31 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 207 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- GENERAL LABORA & 2 & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,645 & 25 & 27 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 209B & VOCATIONAL/CTE- INDUSTRIAL EDUCA & 2 & CTE & 1 & 125 & 786 & - & 6 & 6 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 100 & BAND ROOM MS/HS & 1 & MU & 1 & 60 & 2,287 & - & 38 & 38 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 200 & VOCAL MUSIC CLASSROOM MS/HS & 2 & MU & 1 & 60 & 1,128 & - & 19 & 19 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 134 & AUXILIARY GYM & 1 & PE & 1 & 200 & 5,706 n & no max & 29 & 29 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 132 & GYMNASIUM PEE & 1 & PE & 1 & 200 & 11,559 no & no max & 58 & 58 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 135 & AULTIPURPOSEIP.E CLS FTNESS & 1 & PE & 1 & 55 & 1,670 & 25 & 30 & 25 & & MAX applied \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 235 & OTHER PESPACE (AUX GYM) & 2 & PE & 1 & 200 & 3,330 \({ }^{\text {n }}\) & no max & 17 & 17 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 12 & WEEGT ROOM PEJAUX GYM & 4 & PE & 1 & 200 & 2,039 & - & 10 & 10 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 102 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 1 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 957 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 201 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 969 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 202 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 1,044 & 25 & 28 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 204 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 939 & 25 & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 205 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 928 & - & 25 & 25 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 212 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 784 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 213 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 999 & 25 & 27 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 214 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 1,050 & 25 & 28 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 217 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 783 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 218 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & E & 1 & 37.5 & 783 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 219 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 783 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & \(\underline{220}\) & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 783 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 221 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 783 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 222 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 2 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 792 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 300 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 977 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 301 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 1,440 & 25 & 38 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 302 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 1,044 & 25 & 28 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 303 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 999 & 25 & 27 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 304 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 965 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 305 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 984 & 25 & 26 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 307 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 999 & 25 & 27 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 308 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 1,050 & 25 & 28 & 25 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 311 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 695 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 318 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 37.5 & 792 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 306 & SCIENCE DEMONSTRATION CLASSROOI & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 993 & - & 17 & 17 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 312 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/H & 3 & ED & 1 & 60 & 1,256 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 313 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/H & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 1,252 & - & 21 & 21 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 314 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/H & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 1,549 & 24 & 26 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 315 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/- & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 1,552 & 24 & 26 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 316 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/H & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 1,440 & - & 24 & 24 & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 317 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/H & 3 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 60 & 1,213 & - & 20 & 20 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 108 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 1 & SS & & & 987 & & & & & size of T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 109 & SPECIAL EDUCATION - SPECLAL VOCAT & 1 & ss & 1 & 80 & 653 & - & 8 & 8 & & room is too small \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 102B & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 1 & ss & & & 329 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 109 A & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 1 & SS & & & 336 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 211 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 2 & SS & & & 995 & & & & & size of T.S. \\
\hline EDUC 7-9 & 216 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 2 & SS & & & 784 & & & & & \\
\hline EDUC 7 -9 & 320 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCER & 3 & SS & & & 319 & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & 48 & & & & & 1100 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Campbell County High School - North

\section*{Description:}

Building \#:
Gross SQ FT:
Tract Acres:

\section*{Description:}

Building \#:
Gross SQ FT:

2012

CAM01 CAMPBELL COUNTY HS (NORTH) MAIN BLDG
0301-023-0100
302,523.00
57.3

CAM01 CAMPBELL COUNTY HS (NORTH) G BLDG

\section*{\(\frac{0301-023-0}{28,320.00}\)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 邑 } \\
& \stackrel{2}{7} \\
& \#
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSI CALCS} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plan Diagrams} \\
\hline Bldg & BSI & TS & sf/st & AiM SF & \[
\begin{array}{c|}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\mathrm{Re} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Un } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP & Code & Issues \\
\hline N-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 1,570 & 25 & 25 & 25 & & \\
\hline N-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 957 & - & 15 & 15 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 980 & - & 16 & 16 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 997 & - & 16 & 16 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CL & 0 & & 296 & & & & & too small for TS \\
\hline N-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 967 n & no max & 26 & 26 & & no max \\
\hline N-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 1,009 & no max & 27 & 27 & & no max \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,070 & no max & 29 & 29 & & no max \\
\hline N-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 530 n & no max & 14 & 14 & & no max \\
\hline N-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 817 n & no max & 22 & 22 & & no max \\
\hline N-M & CTE & & & 903 & & & & & \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,835 & - & 15 & 15 & & \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,290 & - & 10 & 10 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 60 & 890 & - & 15 & 15 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 60 & 882 & - & 15 & 15 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,298 & - & 22 & 22 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 60 & 1,032 & - & 17 & 17 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 4,480 & 25 & 36 & 25 & & \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 2,962 & - & 24 & 24 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 2,493 & - & 20 & 20 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 2,379 & - & 19 & 19 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-G & G & 1 & 125 & 3,956 & 25 & 32 & 25 & & \\
\hline N-G & G & 1 & 125 & 2,226 & - & 18 & 18 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-G & G & 1 & 125 & 2,144 & - & 17 & 17 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-G & G & 1 & 125 & 4,160 & 25 & 33 & 25 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 649 & - & 17 & 17.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,075 & 25 & 29 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,073 & 25 & 29 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,340 & 25 & 36 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,125 & 25 & 30 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,034 & 25 & 28 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 883 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,558 & 25 & 42 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,558 & 25 & 42 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 971 & 25 & 26 & 25.0 & & \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 882 & - & 24 & 23.5 & & room is nearly too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 812 & - & 22 & 21.7 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 840 & - & 22 & 22.4 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 637 & - & 17 & 17.0 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 647 & - & 17 & 17.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 642 & - & 17 & 17.1 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 708 & - & 19 & 18.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 673 & - & 18 & 17.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 647 & - & 17 & 17.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 763 & - & 20 & 20.3 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 805 & - & 21 & 21.5 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 821 & - & 22 & 21.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 821 & - & 22 & 21.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 821 & - & 22 & 21.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 816 & - & 22 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 821 & - & 22 & 21.9 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 817 & - & 22 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 817 & - & 22 & 21.8 & & room is too small \\
\hline N-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 751 & - & 20 & 20.0 & & room is too small \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Campbell County High School - North (continued)


\section*{Campbell County High School - South}

Description:
Building \#:
Gross SQ FT: Tract Acres:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{0301-027-0100} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 鹃 } \\
& \text { \# }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \(208,219.00\)
56.8 & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{56.8} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BSI CALCS} & \\
\hline Configuration & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { Room } \\
\text { Number }
\end{array}
\] & Use & Bldg & BSI & TS & sf/st & AiM SF & \[
\begin{array}{c|}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Re }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Cap } \\
\text { Un }
\end{gathered}
\] & CAP \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 326 & ART CLASSROOM & S-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 1,708 & 25 & 28 & 25 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 327 & ART CLASSROOM & S-M & ART & 1 & 62 & 1,708 & 25 & 28 & 25 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 137 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 0 & & 272 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 149 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 1,712 & no max & 46 & 45.7 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 178 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & no max & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 319A & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 0 & & 408 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 319B & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 594 & no max & 16 & 15.8 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 354 & COMPUTER LABORATORY & S-M & CL & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & no max & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 324 & FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES (FACS) KITC & S-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,718 & - & 14 & 13.7 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 317 & LAB SPACE - OTHER & S-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,602 & - & 13 & 12.8 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 169 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- GENERAL LABORATORY & S-M & CTE & 0 & & 615 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 336 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- GENERAL LABORATORY & S-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,962 & - & 16 & 15.7 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 337 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- GENERAL LABORATORY & S-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,896 & - & 15 & 15.2 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 156 & VOCATIONAL/CTE- INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION LA & S-M & CTE & 1 & 125 & 1,962 & - & 16 & 15.7 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 179 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 180 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 181 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 182 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 183 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 184 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 191 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 192 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 193 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 194 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 866 & - & 23 & 23.1 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 195 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 861 & - & 23 & 23.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 196 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 854 & - & 23 & 22.8 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 197 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 854 & - & 23 & 22.8 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 247 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,051 & 25 & 28 & 25.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 316 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,293 & 25 & 34 & 25.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 348 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 349 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 350 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 352 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 353 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 360 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 361 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 362 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 878 & - & 23 & 23.4 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 364 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 861 & - & 23 & 23.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 365 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,155 & 25 & 31 & 25.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 367 & MS/HS CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & 1 & 37.5 & 1,138 & 25 & 30 & 25.0 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 220 & ORCHESTRA ROOM MS/HS & S-M & MU & 1 & 60 & 2,947 & - & 49 & 49.1 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 251 & DANCEIAEROBICS (Aux. Gym) & S-M & PE & 1 & 200 & 4,307 & no max & 22 & 21.5 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 203 & GYMNASIUM PED & S-M & PE & 1 & 200 & 20,736 & no max & 104 & 104 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 249 & WEIGHT ROOM & S-M & PE & 1 & 55 & 2,713 & 25 & 49 & 25 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 155 & BIOLOGY LABORATORY & S-M & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,752 & 24 & 29 & 24 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 154 & CHEMISTRY LABORATORY & S-M & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,752 & 24 & 29 & 24 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 161 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORA TORY MS/HS & S-M & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,737 & 24 & 29 & 24 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 163 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORA TORY MS/HS & S-M & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,752 & 24 & 29 & 24 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 164 & GENERAL SCIENCE LABORATORY MS/HS & S-M & SCI & 1 & 60 & 1,962 & 24 & 33 & 24 \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 304 & IN SCHOOL SUSPENSION OR DETENTION ROOM; & S-M & SS & & & 751 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 188 & MS/HS CLASSROOM - ESL CLASSROOM & S-M & ED & & & 879 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 187 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & SS & & & 861 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 320 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & ss & & & 506 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 339 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & ss & & & 1,896 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 351 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & ss & & & 878 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 355 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & ss & & & 608 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 357 & MS/HS CLASSROOM - SPED RESOURCE & S-M & ED & & & 861 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 358 & MS/HS CLASSROOM - SPED RESOURCE & S-M & ED & & & 879 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 359 & TUTORING/SMALL GROUP/RESOURCE ROOM & S-M & SS & & & 608 & & & \\
\hline EDUC 10-12 & 140 & TV/RADIO; VIDEO/CCTV/MEDIA PRODUCTION ST & S-M & TV & 1 & 62 & 1,157 & - & 19 & 19 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Totals by Building} & & & 47 & & & & 1264 & 1182 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plan Diagrams} \\
\hline Code & Issues \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & not a teaching station \\
\hline & no max \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & not a teaching station \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline & CAPACITY SPACE \\
\hline & TOO SMALL FOR TS \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & \\
\hline & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is nearly too small \\
\hline & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & room is too LARGE \\
\hline & music capped at 50 studen \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & COULD BE TS \\
\hline & COULD BE TS \\
\hline & \\
\hline & COULD BE TS \\
\hline & COULD BE TS \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline & room is too small \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Totals by Building

\section*{C. Terminology}

\section*{Class Size}

For the purposes of calculating school capacity, class size refers to the number of students assigned to a given classroom or teaching station.

\section*{Gross Building Area}

The total area of the entire building as measured in square feet. It typically includes everything within the outside face of the building's exterior walls, and includes all interior spaces regardless of use, all circulation spaces (corridors, lobbies, vestibules, stairs and elevators), toilet rooms, mechanical rooms, and the area occupied by internal and external walls.

\section*{Net Area (individual space)}

The usable area within a room or space, as measured in square feet. Net area is typically measured from the inside face of the room's walls, and thus includes area for fixed storage, casework and equipment.

\section*{Net Building Area}

The total area of all usable spaces, both teaching and non-teaching, as measured in square feet. It includes everything except circulation spaces (corridors, lobbies, vestibules, stairs and elevators), toilet rooms, mechanical rooms, and the area occupied by internal and external walls.

\section*{Non-Capacity Space}

An instructional space within a school that is NOT assigned student capacity when establishing the enrollment capacity of the school. For example, resource room (pull-out) or a sign-out computer lab.

\section*{Program Capacity}

Program Capacity reflects the specific program offerings of a school. This can vary each year (or more frequently) as program changes happen within a school or within the district as a whole. Program Capacity makes the comparison between schools more meaningful than simple classroom counts. Due to program space needs, a school providing more specialty programs may have lower student program capacity than a school of equal physical size whose students require fewer of these programs.

\section*{Pull-Out}

Pull-out spaces support programs used to enhance students' ability to do well in regular classroom curriculum. Pull-Outs are needed for programs that pull students out of regular teaching stations to work on skills that will help them succeed in the regular education classrooms' curricula and to be contributing members of society. For example, ELL is taught not primarily for its own sake but rather to help students succeed in regular
classrooms and in the larger community. The Pull-Outs are required because the programs they primarily support are required.

\section*{Regular Classroom}

A space for elementary home-base or middle school core curriculum courses, typically accommodating activities dealing directly with the interaction between teachers and students that do not require content-specialized furniture, fixtures, or equipment, and that can take place in a typical classroom-sized space.

\section*{School Capacity}

Also referred to as "functional capacity", School Capacity is a function of four factors: the number of regular teaching stations; the average or typical number of students per class; the utilization factor; and the limiting factor of infrastructure (kitchen/lunchroom capacity, gym, lockers, hallways, etc.)

\section*{Student Membership}

The actual number of students enrolled in and attending district schools. Historically, the official membership for the new school year is taken on the last school day in October.

\section*{Target Class Size}

Also "standard" class size refers to a District-defined number of students per section, per grade for regular education.

\section*{Teaching Stations}

Learning environments regularly scheduled to support a class of students for home-base, core curriculum and elective courses. The term is often used interchangeably with "classrooms" however it also includes learning environments other than typical classroom-sized spaces (i.e. art, music) as well as spaces that can be scheduled for multiple classes of students such as the gymnasium (gyms usually count as 2 teaching stations).

\section*{Utilization Factor}

A decimal fraction equal to the average proportion of time that a teaching station is in use. More applicable for middle and high schools, this factor accounts for teacher planning, schedule flexibility, enrollment bubbles, teacher preps, etc. Utilization factors vary widely depending on the specific situation, usually falling somewhere between \(70 \%\) and \(90 \%\).```


[^0]:    LEGEND
    For the use of the space as designated in the SFD's AiM database:GREEN $=$ the space size aligns with SFD guidelines
    YELLOW = the space is minimally smaller or larger than SFD guidelinesRED $=$ the space does not align with SFD guidelinesWHITE $=$ the space is a non-capacity space

