

Board Work Session - October 27, 2015

**Q: Will there need to be a tax increase?**

A: Not if the income tax option is selected and extended for a period of twenty (20) years.

**Q: Will Interest rates change?**

A: Possibly, if the Board of Education waits, but it is not a major factor if the project moves forward in the next 6-12 months.

**Q: Is it likely that inflation will increase the cost?**

A: Inflation has increased an average of 3% a year for the last 5 years. Inflation is included in the OFCC projected costs of the project.

**Q: Is it like likely that the State will give the district more money if the district waits?**

A: If the district waits, they may see an increase of 1% state share, but enrollment becomes an issue. If the district continues to wait, enrollment will negatively impact the ability to use OFCC funding for two buildings. Cost of construction is currently escalating and is expected to increase in the future.

**Q: Could any renovations be done to the MS/HS?**

A: Yes, but only as a local funded initiative paid for by the taxpayers of the Valley.

**Q: Can the past enrollment of each elementary be researched?**

A: Yes, the information is located in the District Offices.

**Q: Which option will lead to smaller class sizes?**

A: Each option can lead to smaller class sizes, but one building would possibly cause the need for a locally funded initiative for more classrooms.

**Q: What is the drop dead date for approval of the master plan option?**

A: As soon as possible according to the OFCC representative if the Board of Education wants to go on the ballot in March of 2016. The OFCC representative for the district is planning to take the district to the January OFCC meeting. Next opportunity would be the April Commission meeting.

**Q: If the district waited until April, how would enrollment be calculated?**

A: Commission would need to update the enrollment projections and it could effect being able to build two buildings using the OFCC funding.

**Q: Can option 3 be eliminated as a viable option?**

A: Option 3 is no longer a consideration.

**Q: What has been concluded on staff operating cost?**

A: Teaching staff would be dependent on the number of students in each grade level. Administration would need to be reviewed based on desired layout of each of the buildings. Food service and custodial maintenance may be reduced by building one central elementary school.

**Q: Would gas/electrical operating cost be less for any of the options?**

A: Cost of operating one elementary is estimated to be approximately \$7,000 cheaper per year to operate over two elementary schools.

**Q: What is the impact to the cost of transportation?**

A: Transportation to one central elementary building would cost approximately \$100,000+ a year more than keeping the same transportation pattern currently being used for two buildings.

**Q: Can the enrollment projections be used to estimate teacher staffing for both (1) vs (2) elementary schools?**

A: Yes, but it would be an approximation. We would use the 2019/2020 planning year to project necessary staffing.

**Q: Has the Board of Education considered the tax and utility cost impact to the two villages?**

A: These issues have been considered, but focused more on the educational impact on students.

**Q: Were enrollment changes factored into long term operational cost?**

A: The Board of Education has taken into consideration the long-term operational projections costs.

**Factors Driving the Discussion:**

1. The urgency of moving forward.
2. The community support for option #2 - two buildings.
3. The need for more information about various factors in the process.