

**THE
CLAYTON RIDGE
FACILITY COMMITTEE**

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

**PRESENTED TO THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE
CLAYTON RIDGE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

MARCH 24, 2014

**BY THE
FACILITY STUDY COMMITTEE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Committee

III. Statement of the Task

IV. The Process

Major Steps

Weekly Minutes

VI. Final Recommendation to Board of Education

Appendix A. List of Facility Issues

Appendix B. Possible Grade Alignments

Introduction

In January 2014 the Clayton Ridge Board of Education decided to appoint a Facility Study Committee to study the facility needs of the district. It was further decided to employ Dr. Dean Meier, an educational consultant and former AEA administrator, to serve as the facilitator of the study. The Committee began its work in February 2014, meeting weekly to carry on its work. This report summarizes the work of the Committee and provides a recommendation to the Board of Education regarding the Committee's best vision of the where the district should proceed in the future regarding its facility needs.

The Facilitator would like to thank the Committee for their hard work, cooperation, and deep thinking throughout the process. The success of the past merger and the successes the district will experience in the future, the facilitator believes, will rely on the continued cooperation of the communities and peoples of the Clayton Ridge Community School District. It has been his privilege to have been part of this process.

The Facilitator also wishes to acknowledge the contributions made to this study by Superintendent Allan Nelson and Business Manager Dave Schlueter. Without their hard work providing the data and information needed in this study, the Committee would have operated with an extreme handicap.

Dr. Dean Meier

Committee Members

Dean Meier	Facilitator	Michael Finnegan	Board Member
Allan Nelson	Superintendent	John Heying	Board Member
Dave Schlueter	Business Manager	Jason Reimer	Board Member
Sara Lawrence	Teacher	Michelle Fassbinder	Teacher
Terry Jasper	Maintenance Staff	Alan Heavens	Attorney
Bill Robinson	Banker	James Feudner	Banker
Andy Reimer	Business	John Finch	Business
Bonnie Tuecke	Senior Citizen	Lowell Moser	Farmer
Scott Scherer	SIAC	Deb Preston	Booster Rep.
Alicia Helle	Parent/Young Child	Melissa Stocks-Stade	Parent/Young Child
Amy Millard	Parent/Young Child	Joan Parker	Parent/Older Child
Kim Domeyer	Parent/Older Child	Kristopher Ihde	Student
Jessica Klein	Student		

Statement of the Task

The facilitator met with the Board of Education and the District administrators in December 2013 and January 2014. From those meetings the following were identified as the tasks of the Clayton Ridge Facility Study Committee:

- Serve as an advisory committee to the Board of Education representing the best interests of the children of the district and northeast Iowa.
- Create short term and long term facility improvement plans that are consistent with a long range vision of the future of the district.
- Present a written and oral report to the Board of Education (by the end of March or early April 2014).

The Process

At the first meeting of the Committee on January 29, 2014, the Committee and facilitator outlined the following steps to be taken in the study of the facilities of the District. The Committee agreed to meet each Wednesday evening until the study was completed. Only one Wednesday evening was missed due to bad weather. The study was completed on March 12, 2014. Following the outline shown below, a brief review of each meeting's discussions and outcomes will be presented.

Major Steps of the Study

- I. Orientation and History, Other data
- II. Tour elementary and high school
- III. Review status of neighbors
- IV. Tour Middle School
- V. Create an ideal list of facility improvements
- VI. Study resources available
- VII. Face reality, prioritize needs
- VIII. Develop a recommendation for the Board of Education

Meeting Notes

I. January 29, 2014 First Meeting

At the first meeting, after introductions, the Committee agreed to a set of Ground Rules to guide their study. The ground rules included:

- All ideas have merit
- Listen to understand
- Challenge ideas, not people
- No side-bars
- Say it here, not the parking lot
- Respect others
- Right to pass

The Committee then reviewed and accepted as their work the Statement of Task already presented in this report. The meeting continued with a review of past and predicted enrollment trends for the district and a financial review of the district.

II. February 5, 2014 Second Meeting

The key activity of the second meeting was to tour the elementary and high school facilities at Guttenberg. Many issues were discovered that the Committee felt would need attention including: plumbing issues, status of the 1903 building, locker rooms, wrestling room, multi-purpose area, gym, music room(s), HVAC issues, and others.

At this meeting, the Committee also discussed neighboring districts, their enrollment trends, and any possibilities of future partnerships with those neighbors. It was the consensus of the Committee that Clayton Ridge needs to address its own needs at this time, but needs to meet those needs in a manner consistent with future whole-grade-sharing or reorganization opportunities of the future.

III. February 12, 2014 Third Meeting

For this meeting, the Committee met in Garnavillo for a tour of the middle school facilities. The Committee toured the facilities both with an eye for facility improvements needed as well as the potential of the facility to become the high school building for the district. As in the previous week, many issues were identified that would need attention, especially if the building was to serve as the high school sometime in the future.

Dave Schlueter, business manager, reviewed current funding related to facilities and the potential resources available through a bond issue. Although no conclusions were reached, the general nature of the discussion was that a bond issue would likely be needed to address the emerging issues the Committee was already identifying.

IV. February 19, 2014 Fourth Meeting

At this meeting, the Committee began to explore and discuss facility issues to be addressed. First the Committee made a list of building issues and concerns in both Guttenberg and Garnavillo. The list is presented in Appendix A.

The Committee quickly became aware that the real issue was future grade alignment with facilities. The Committee explored many possibilities, with seven emerging and considered worthy of continued discussion. Those seven possibilities are listed in Appendix B. It should be noted that the Committee, after reviewing their list of seven, observed and discussed that one option was missing, namely keeping the current grade alignment. There was strong consensus that this was a viable option that should not be lost in further discussions.

After the above discussion, similarities and differences were discussed and the committee condensed and modified the options and reduced the list to the following:

Option 1. Keep current grade alignment

Option 2. PreK-6 to Garnavillo, 7-12 to Guttenberg

Option 3. Prek-6 to Guttenberg, 7-12 to Garnavillo

Option 4. Elementary stays in Guttenberg, move 5-8 to Guttenberg and 9-12 to Garnavillo

V. February 26, 2014 Fifth Meeting

At the fifth meeting, the Committee first reviewed the four options from February 19 and the pro's and con's of each option. After discussion, the Committee took a first vote to determine if the Committee was coming together regarding the future option(s) the district should consider as it makes extensive facility improvements.

The results of the vote clearly indicated Option 1: Keep Current Grade Alignment was the desired future. However, enough interest was shown in Option 4: Elementary stays in Guttenberg, move 5-8 to Guttenberg and 9-12 to Garnavillo that this option was also to be considered at the next meeting.

VI. March 12, 2014

As the committee met for the last time, it debated at length the two final options being considered. Rationale was given for both options with many Committee members expressing that they could support either option. The key rationale for Option 1 was the population base for the district is in Guttenberg, many special facilities already exist for high school students in Guttenberg, and hence Guttenberg is the logical location for the high school. The key rationale for Option 4 was Garnavillo may be better located if the future includes a partnership with Central of Elkader and Garnavillo is not as land locked, but has ample room for expansion.

The Committee then took a weighted vote, i.e., each Committee member was given 10 points to cast for the option(s) of their choice. If they had a strong opinion, they could cast all 10 votes for one of the options. If they had a mixed opinion, they could cast part of their votes for both options. The outcome showed a strong preference for Option 1. Keep Current Grade Alignment, but many Committee members did split their vote giving some points to Option 1 and some to Option 4. The outcome of the vote was 110 to 80. The vote of an absent committee member who sent his vote by mail would have made the vote 120 to 80. The vote presents the majority preference of the Committee, but also reflects the viability of either option. Ultimately, Option 1 was judged to be the option with the most support and expressions shared at the meeting indicated a strong consensus. That is, while Option 1 is not everyone's first vote, everyone expressed that they could and would support this option.

Final Recommendation to the Board of Education

The Facility Study Committee of the Clayton Ridge Community School District makes the following recommendation to the Board of Education:

1. As the district improves its facilities for the future, the current grade alignment should be maintained: PreK-4 in Guttenberg, 5-8 in Garnavillo, 9-12 in Guttenberg.
2. The 1903 building should be demolished.
3. The District should pass a bond issue to cover the cost of new construction and remodeling.
4. The new construction and remodeling should include:

A three story addition should be constructed to replace the 1903 building in order to replace and add to the space lost by the demolition.

New locker rooms

New wrestling room

Upgraded and centralized HVAC system

Exterior improvements (perhaps to better tie together visually the numerous additions)

Remodel or replace current gymnasium

Improve commons area

Upgrade kitchen area

Create a new and safer entry system

Upgrade music facilities

Note: The committee recognizes architectural assistance is needed as well as significant continued discussion to design new construction and remodeled existing spaces to best meet the educational needs of the students of Clayton Ridge. The Committee urges that

process to begin as soon as possible with a goal to begin demolition and new construction by April 2015.

The Committee also did not make recommendations for short term projects, trusting the Board will make those decisions consistent with the longer range recommendations shown above.

Rationale for Recommendation:

The Committee expressed its belief that upgrading the Guttenberg building at this time would serve the district well into the future. If Clayton Ridge remains a district, the new and upgraded Guttenberg building would be an asset for many years. If in the future it becomes desirable to partner with other districts for a high school, the remodeled Guttenberg building would serve well as a K-8 building with the high school moved to wherever it would best be located.

The 1903 building is virtually unusable with defects in roof, ceiling, exterior, plumbing, windows, etc. The Committee believes renovation is not possible and would not result in the type of learning spaces currently needed by the district.

The HVAC system can gain much efficiency with upgraded components and a centralized system.

The current facility has handicap accessibility and safety issues that can be addressed in new and remodeled spaces.

Current locker rooms and wrestling room are not functional and need to be upgraded and/or replaced.

Additional seating capacity and space is needed in the gym to better accommodate spectators and to enable the district to attract sectional and district events.

The hot lunch kitchen needs to be upgraded with hopefully more space.

A large and modern commons area would serve students as well as adults for athletic and other events held at the school.

New construction would allow for an improvement to library facilities and better access for elementary.

APPENDIX A

List of facility issues that we hope to improve:

Guttenberg (elem & high school) facilities

- 1903 building
- locker rooms
- weight room
- kitchen
- multi-purpose room
- handicap accessibility
- temperature control
- temporary walls in high school
- music room
- expand gym size
- small motors / welding shop
- parking
- high school windows
- storage space
- security, classroom doors
- travel time of shared staff

Garnavillo (middle school)

- multi-purpose room
- gym balcony, stage, location
- electrical service panels
- storage space
- shop & choir rooms
- travel time of shared staff

Appendix B

Possible Grade Alignment with Pro's and Con's for each possibility:

1. Move PK-6 to Garnavillo and 7-12 to Guttenberg

PROs

Removal of 1903 building
More handicap accessible
New kitchen & dining facility
Improved athletic facilities
Improved fine arts facilities
Easier grade transition
More cost effective than new building
Less travel time for administration
Technology hub
Shared staff travel time

CONs

Parking in Guttenberg
Only 1 gym in Guttenberg
Shared staff travel time
Landlocked for future expansion
Community support for travel time
for small children

2. All facilities in Garnavillo

PROs

No travel time between campuses
Entice neighboring district (Central)
Space

Up to code
Less duplicity

No shuttle = reduce transportation costs
Lower costs of operation

CONs

Cost
Population distribution
Loss of investment in Athletic
Complex
Transportation
Economical impact to largest
population center
Bonding capacity
Students intermingling
Increased travel time for southern
kids / loss to open enrollment?
Alienate Guttenberg if no school
there

3. New PK-12 in Guttenberg

PROs

All children in 1 location
Less transportation cost
Teacher travel time decreased
Population base
Cost effective upkeep

May increase open enrollment in
No shuttles = more learning time
Football / track facilities

CONs

Lack of space
District separation
Funding
Lack of parking
Market values of Garnavillo
buildings
Open enrollment out may increase
Central less likely to join
No baseball / softball (shared with
Central)
Travel for opposite community

Garnavillo facilities are ok – what would we do with them?
Not popular in Garnavillo

4. Move 9-12 to Garnavillo and 5-8 to Guttenberg

PROs

Future merger
More space to add on
Might cost less
Improved parking at both sites
K-8 in one location
More floor plan space
Fewer dollars put into Guttenberg campus

CONs

No attached gym
Wouldn't be popular in Guttenberg
Football field in Guttenberg
Shop areas
Teen driving
Wouldn't be attractive to Ed-Co

5. Grades 7-12 in Garnavillo and add on

PROs

Land availability
Faculty consistency w/ 7-12 together
No need to remodel Guttenberg gym
Use current gym as practice facility
Attractive to neighbors as possible merger
Parking
No main streets for students to cross

CONs

Busing
Track / football field in Guttenberg
Doesn't address 1903 building
Cost of addition
Not popular in Guttenberg
Loss of separation of jr high students
Lack of medical facilities
Class space
Shared teachers for grades 5-12

6. Sell existing Guttenberg properties, then;

a) acquire new property/location for PK-12

b) demolish/build new on current location for PK-4 / HS

PROs(option a)

All new facilities
Bussing more efficient
Best technologies / state-of-art
Attractive for open enrollment

CONs(option a)

Cost
Faculty / staff commute
PR nightmare
Destroying good buildings – shop, home economics

Host district events
Students travel less
Ease of transition to new facilities:
no disruption due to construction

Resale value of Guttenberg property
Garnavillo parking

PROs(option b)

Ditto

CONs(option b)

Wouldn't be centrally located for open enrollment
What to do with Garnavillo facility

7. Collaborate with Ed-Co and Central in Garber area

PROs

Travel time limits
One facility = lower operation costs
Build floor plan conducive to all
Larger enrollment for sustainability
Security
Sell other facilities to developers

Long term solution
Geographical central location

CONs

Community commitment-
No one in favor of losing schools
Geographical area
Cost
Lack of emergency response
Money in existing facilities (athletic complex)
Busing time
Long term solution, not near term
Impact on communities

D. Which future visions are not worth pursuing?

[Items eliminated]

2. PK-12 in Garnavillo
3. PK-12 in Guttenberg
6. Sell downtown facilities / rebuild edge of town
7. University of Garber