



## Master Facilities Committee Meeting 1/20/2016 Feedback (Questions, Comments, Suggestions)

### Questions:

**Q: Why is there not an option that fulfills ALL of the needs of our district? It would be nice to see best/worst case scenarios.**

A: An all-inclusive needs option is outlined in the current possible project scope facility options that have been provided. Fulfilling all of the current known needs would be inclusive of all options plus the items listed under the “not included in capital referendum” column which could potentially be paid for with additional funding sources outside the referendum project.

**Q: Can we get a total grant to upgrade all the auditorium stages? They all have issues.**

A: We are always open to alternative funding options and continue to seek out grants for specific projects.

**Q: Are the items in the “not included in Capital Referendum” column covered by the normal Capital Fund bucket?**

A: There are other potential sources of funding that maybe available to pay for items not included in the project referendum. Two of those sources are the Capital Projects Fund and bonds issued inside the property tax cap.

**Q: What is the current bond debt?**

A: Outstanding Building Corporation Bonds \$35,790,000

General Obligation Bonds (including Pension Bonds) outstanding \$8,005,000

**Q: What is the difference between “Project Referendum” and “Operating Referendum”?**

A: There are two types of referendums in Indiana — construction referendum and operating referendum. A construction referendum funds major facilities projects, including new construction and building renovation. An operating referendum funds school operating expenses, which can include everything from teacher salaries to transportation expenses. An operating referendum tax rate is for a maximum of seven (7) years where as a construction referendum tax rate will be exist until bonds issued for the project have been paid off (20 years maximum).

**Q: Why is the roof replacement not included in Capital Referendum list (elementary & middle)? If we are spending money we need to protect our investment from weather.**

A: Items listed in the “not included in Capital Referendum” are not considered low priority or unimportant. These items could potentially be paid for with additional funding sources outside the referendum project. The items listed under each possible project scope option are examples and could be interchangeable within options.

**Q: Why is adding security cameras at elementary and middle schools not included in the Capital Referendum list on the possible options document?**

A: Items listed in the “not included in Capital Referendum” are not considered low priority or unimportant. These items could potentially be paid for with additional funding sources outside the referendum project. The items listed under each possible project scope option are examples and could be interchangeable within options.

**Q: What is the construction timeline for projects of this scale (assuming a 2016 referendum?)**

A: The timeframe for construction and renovations will be established once a project has been approved. The timeframe and location of students during construction and renovations would be determined based upon the scope and scale of the project.



## **Master Facilities Committee Meeting 1/20/2016 Feedback (Questions, Comments, Suggestions)**

**Q: What is being done or where is the following being addressed – classroom size for student movement at the middle schools?**

A: This is being addressed within the possible facility options that have been provided through such items as the updating of existing areas and classroom additions.

### **Comments:**

- Westlane tour-much is just maintenance and upkeep (HVAC cracks, etc.). Safety and increasing space and lighting in the ENL classroom do need attention but not mega dollars. Doing more “breezeway” classrooms should solve the space issue at minimal cost.
- Presentation was very informative. Thank you.
- We have been provided with a lot of good information. This will help with consistent messaging.
- The holding areas by the front doors seem like a serious issue.
- I believe the two new schools are necessary! This should be huge push to all taxpayers/patrons of MSD Washington Township.
- Very concerning that replacing roofs at the middle schools is not a priority. With repeated years of leaks in the classrooms, this needs to be moved to a critical need. Same thought for elementary roofing needs.
- Ongoing concern about making the middle school capacities numbers meaningful to the community when the current enrollment numbers are below these numbers. Is there a better way to explain why space needs are not met?
- Since it is indicated that two of our middle schools are the most needed buildings, have you anticipated that some people might suggest (if we get to the \$155 level) to do more at the middle schools since there will be two new elementary buildings at the \$125/155 level.

### **Suggestions:**

- Provide one document with key talking points that committee members can share with others.