




COOPERATIVE STRATEGIES

COMPLETE FINANCIAL & DEMOGRAPHIC PLANNING FOR EDUCATION

CHESAPEAKE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN |
DRAFT OPTIONS

JANUARY 2020



City of Chesapeake Project Website



<http://www.cityofchesapeake.net/page14265.aspx>

- Project summary
- Timelines
- Work completed to-date
- Links to all completed documents & presentations
- Upcoming engagement dates & locations

Community Dialogue Meetings

Community input is a vital part of creating the FTP. Community Dialogue Meetings will be held at various points throughout the process so that you can receive updates and submit comments to make your voice heard. Each meeting will be held twice to allow for you to pick the time and location that is most convenient for you.

Meeting #1 (Nov. 2019)- [View the presentation](#) from Meeting #1.

Meeting #2

The content presented at both March meetings will be identical and will build upon previous meetings.

Wednesday, March 11
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Deep Creek High School
2900 Margaret Booker Dr.

Thursday, March 12
6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Oscar Smith High School
1968 Bruins Pl.

Meeting #3

TBD

Other Meetings

The next joint City Council and School Board meeting will take place on January 23 at 5:30 p.m.

Documents

- › [Background Infographic](#)
- › [Background Report](#)
- › [Enrollment Projections Report](#)
- › [Joint Council/Board Mtg - Nov. 2019](#)
- › [Steering Comm. Mtg.1 - Oct 2019](#)
- › [Mtg. 1 Comments](#)
- › [Steering Comm. Mtg.2- Jan 2019](#)
- › [Mtg. 2 Comments](#)
- › [Futures Conference - Sept. 2019](#)
- › [Futures Conf. Outcome Report - Nov. 2019](#)

Promotes equity

- All schools will receive priority repairs with options created to provide equitable access to high-quality facilities division-wide

Created from data, drives towards the vision

- Options are created to meet the needs of each planning area as identified by the data and informed by stakeholders

Community engagement materially impacts each step

- Engagements help inform the vision, planning priorities, options developed, and the final recommendations

Transparency throughout the process

- The project website provides up-to-date documents from the process with notices of upcoming events

All options are created to be “trade-up” scenarios for students

- No option will be considered if it does not improve the learning environment for students



Outline

5 HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

7 HIGH SCHOOLS

10 MIDDLE SCHOOLS

12 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Deep Creek HS	35	263,434	1,700	1,591	94%	1,633	96%	1,793	105%
Grassfield HS	12	318,188	2,400	2,291	95%	2,440	102%	2,668	111%
Great Bridge HS	33	52,255	1,700	1,418	83%	1,891	105%	1,933	112%
Hickory HS	23	249,680	1,825	1,727	95%	1,642	90%	1,670	92%
Indian River HS	35	266,501	1,775	1,681	95%	1,843	104%	1,885	106%
Oscar Smith HS	23	307,263	2,200	2,113	96%	2,133	97%	2,106	96%
Western Branch HS	33	298,727	2,400	2,122	88%	2,370	99%	2,591	108%
Chesapeake Alternative School	63	39,657	100	36					
Chesapeake Career Center	51	69,785							
Total		2,075,499	14,125	12,979	92%	13,869	98%	14,648	104%


Summary of school age, size, enrollment and utilization; current & projected

Key factors | Projected over-utilization

High schools are currently utilized within an acceptable range, but projected to be at 99% utilization in 2023-24 and 104% in 2028-29. Great Bridge and Deep Creek are projected to be at 105% utilization in 2023-24 and 112% in 2028-29. Hickory and Indian River are projected to be at 90% and 104% utilization in 2023-24 and 92% and 106% in 2028-29. Chesapeake Career Center is in very poor condition. Of the \$200.9M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 31% (\$61.6M) is Priority 1-2.


School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Total Condition Index (TCI)	Capital Replacement Value	Capital Renewal Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Deep Creek HS	0.56	0.52	0.84	\$121,376,665	\$85,404,369	76%	\$22,863,658	\$4,473,751	\$8,167,687	\$635,307	\$36,140,403
Grassfield HS	0.32	0.74	0.40	\$146,604,456	\$103,155,422	10%	\$-	\$534,598	\$-	\$4,691,100	\$5,225,698
Great Bridge HS	0.60	0.46	0.92	\$120,837,590	\$85,025,059	43%	\$6,818,076	\$10,409,903	\$21,553,859	\$926,503	\$39,708,341
Hickory HS	0.50	0.58	0.71	\$122,789,779	\$86,398,680	-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Indian River HS	0.28	0.70	0.37	\$122,789,779	\$86,398,680	-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Oscar Smith HS	0.46	0.48	0.70	\$141,570,785	\$99,613,575	0%	\$-	\$120,000	\$11,643,407	\$32,829,893	\$44,593,301
Western Branch HS	0.43	0.52	0.64	\$137,637,841	\$96,846,234	0%	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$9,065,729	\$9,065,729
Chesapeake Alternative School	0.68	0.44	1.07	\$14,037,030	\$9,451,714	42%	\$-	\$3,972,757	\$1,560,112	\$3,821,060	\$9,353,929
Chesapeake Career Center	0.75	0.36	1.23	\$32,153,293	\$22,624,050	41%	\$5,877,332	\$2,715,792	\$10,152,221	\$2,088,674	\$20,834,018
Total				\$952,046,977	\$669,464,474	31%	\$39,360,141	\$22,226,801	\$55,615,235	\$83,662,631	\$200,864,809

Summary of school condition




Map of the schools in this planning area

Scenarios are listed vertically and are mutually exclusive; the division could only pursue one of these strategies at a time. In the example of the draft high school scenarios to the right, there are three different current possibilities (A, B, C), with a fourth option that could be added to any of the three scenarios.



Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B	Scenario 1C	Option for any scenario
Build a new 2,000 seat comprehensive high school on Centerville Road site	Replace Chesapeake Career Center on-site with new 900 seat CTE center	Replace Chesapeake Career Center on-site with new 600 seat CTE center. Build 600 seat Fine Arts Center at another location	Full renovation and additions to Deep Creek and Great Bridge HS.
\$161 million	\$93 million	\$62 million each, \$124 million	Full renovation of Great Bridge & Deep Creek HS (\$60M each, \$120M total) Addition @ Deep Creek, \$6 million Addition @ Great Bridge, \$6 million
Creates an eighth comprehensive high school. Resulting HS utilization (resulting utilizations based on 5-year projections) = 87%.	Creates a 900 capacity Career & Technical center for shared use by all seven comprehensive HS. Resulting utilization = 93%	Creates a 600 capacity Career & Technical center for shared use by all seven comprehensive HS, as well as a 600 capacity fine arts center also for shared high school use. Resulting utilization = 91%	Creates 250 student additions at Deep Creek and Great Bridge HS. Would further reduce utilization from Option A, B, or C.
Benefits			
Challenges			

Options are listed horizontally and are not mutually exclusive; the division could pursue any or all of these options. In the example of the draft middle school options to the right, there are three different current possibilities (1,2,3).



Option #	Options	Cost	Description	Benefits	Challenges
1	Build a 24-CR addition to Indian River MS. Replace Chesapeake Center for Student Success on-site (Indian River Annex)	\$24 Million	Creates additional capacity to Indian River MS. Addresses condition of the Indian River Annex facility.		
2	Full renovation and additions to Western Branch and Crestwood MS.	\$96 Million	Addresses condition and over-crowding of all facilities.		
3	Rezone Western Branch MS boundary to fill Joliff MS. Rezone Deep Creek MS to area middle schools.	-	Address over-crowding at Deep Creek, Great Bridge, Indian River, and Western Branch MS.		


Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Deep Creek HS	35	263,434	1,700	1,591	94%	1,633	96%	1,793	105%
Grassfield HS	12	318,188	2,400	2,291	95%	2,440	102%	2,668	111%
Great Bridge HS	33	262,264	1,725	1,418	82%	1,808	105%	1,935	112%
Hickory HS	23	249,680	1,825	1,727	95%	1,642	90%	1,670	92%
Indian River HS	35	266,501	1,775	1,681	95%	1,843	104%	1,885	106%
Oscar Smith HS	23	307,263	2,200	2,113	96%	2,133	97%	2,106	96%
Western Branch HS	33	298,727	2,400	2,122	88%	2,370	99%	2,591	108%
Chesapeake Alternative School	63	39,657	100	36					
Chesapeake Career Center	51	69,785							
Total		2,075,499	14,125	12,979	92%	13,869	98%	14,648	104%

Key factors | Projected over-utilization

High schools are currently utilized within an acceptable range, but projected to be at 99% utilization in 2023-24 and 104% in 2028-29. Great Bridge and Deep Creek HS along with the Career and Alternative Centers have FCIs above 0.65 and low educational adequacy scores, indicating they are potential candidates for replacement or major renovation. Of the \$200.9M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 31% (\$61.6M) are Priority 1-2.

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Total Condition Index (TCI)	Capital Replacement Value	Capital Renewal Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Deep Creek HS	0.56	0.52	0.84	\$121,376,665	\$85,404,369	76%	\$22,863,658	\$4,473,751	\$8,167,687	\$635,307	\$36,140,403
Grassfield HS	0.32	0.74	0.40	\$146,604,456	\$103,155,422	10%	\$-	\$534,598	\$-	\$4,691,100	\$5,225,698
Great Bridge HS	0.60	0.46	0.92	\$120,837,590	\$85,025,059	43%	\$6,818,076	\$10,409,903	\$21,553,859	\$926,503	\$39,708,341
Hickory HS	0.50	0.58	0.71	\$115,039,538	\$80,945,371	11%	\$3,801,075	\$-	\$2,537,949	\$29,604,365	\$35,943,389
Indian River HS	0.28	0.70	0.37	\$122,789,779	\$86,398,680	-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Oscar Smith HS	0.46	0.48	0.70	\$141,570,785	\$99,613,575	0%	\$-	\$120,000	\$11,643,407	\$32,829,893	\$44,593,301
Western Branch HS	0.43	0.52	0.64	\$137,637,841	\$96,846,234	0%	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$9,065,729	\$9,065,729
Chesapeake Alternative School	0.68	0.44	1.07	\$14,037,030	\$9,451,714	42%	\$-	\$3,972,757	\$1,560,112	\$3,821,060	\$9,353,929
Chesapeake Career Center	0.75	0.36	1.23	\$32,153,293	\$22,624,050	41%	\$5,877,332	\$2,715,792	\$10,152,221	\$2,088,674	\$20,834,018
Total				\$952,046,977	\$669,464,474	31%	\$39,360,141	\$22,226,801	\$55,615,235	\$83,662,631	\$200,864,809





Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B	Scenario 1C	Option for any scenario
Build a new 2,000 seat comprehensive high school on Centerville Road site	Replace Chesapeake Career Center on-site with new 900 seat CTE center	Replace Chesapeake Career Center on-site with new 600 seat CTE center. Build 600 seat Fine Arts Center at another location	Full renovation and additions to Deep Creek and Great Bridge HS.
\$161 million	\$93 million	\$62 million each, \$124 million	Full renovation of Great Bridge & Deep Creek HS (\$60M each, \$120M total) Addition @ Deep Creek, \$6 million Addition @ Great Bridge, \$6 million
Creates an eighth comprehensive high school. Resulting HS utilization (resulting utilizations based on 5-year projections) = 87%.	Creates a 900 capacity Career & Technical center for shared use by all seven comprehensive HS. Resulting utilization = 93%	Creates a 600 capacity Career & Technical center for shared use by all seven comprehensive HS, as well as a 600 capacity fine arts center also for shared high school use. Resulting utilization = 91%	Creates 250 student additions at Deep Creek and Great Bridge HS. Would further reduce utilization from Option A, B, or C. Deep Creek & Great Bridge HS have similar designs, with significant portions of the original buildings housing classrooms that are 1/3 the size of modern classrooms (~650 square feet as opposed to 900+). Rather than continue to operated undersized classrooms, this option fully renovates the interior of the original building, enlarging the old classrooms to current standards. The additions proposed are required to keep the schools' capacities at/near their current levels.

DRAFT

Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B	Scenario 1C	Option for any scenario
Benefits			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps with capacity More bang for buck \$ Development in area Immediate relief of overcrowding (Significant 87%) Lasts Longer: Accommodates Student Capacity for 10 years New Facility = Less Maintenance Rezoning required- plans for the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates investment in a career path that doesn't get much attention New building More interest in programs / Attracts more students Increases the divisions capacity to serve students career and technical needs. No Rezoning needed. Benefits all Students. More Access. Modernization. Opportunity for business partnership. Homegrown Talent. Push for CTE center. Enhances curriculum collaboration with TCC. Galley space to showcase art. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring fine arts to the city Fine Arts Center Community Engagement Benefits all Students More Access Increased Programs Less Expensive No Rezoning Serves interest of both CTE and FA Facility can be used by community or other school-wide or district-wide events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't add much capacity to schools for a high price tag. Full renovation of Great Bridge & Deep Creek HS (\$60M each, \$120M total) Addition @ Deep Creek \$6 million Addition @ Great Bridge, \$6 million
Challenges			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating equity with rezone All schools would need to be rezoned Rezoning issues Expensive Attendance / Transportation / Accessibility issues Development in the Area Wetlands- Environmental Issues Limited to students in this zone Staffing shortages Minimal Relief Not deducting capital gains money & adding maintenance cost for new building. Addresses issues but does not fix them (Band-Aid). Over-depleting other schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not fix the capacity issue- Very specific schools. May not always be full Limited use of facility Developing interest throughout the city Minimal Relief Interim Programming during construction Staffing (certifications) Addressing a smaller school population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not fix the capacity issue- Very specific schools. May not always be full. Limited use of facility. Governor's School- changing our relationship. Creating the vision for the program. Interim Programming during Construction. Maintenance cost of new facility. Possible competing with current HS Fine Arts programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not solve Over crowding Money


Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Crestwood MS	65	121,459	625	592	95%	546	87%	508	81%
Deep Creek MS	51	122,714	775	758	98%	938	121%	1,059	137%
Great Bridge MS	47	187,303	1,275	1,363	107%	1,475	116%	1,682	132%
Greenbrier MS	19	201,164	1,250	919	74%	853	68%	913	73%
Hickory MS	20	198,847	1,500	1,282	85%	1,301	87%	1,519	101%
Hugo Owens MS	22	178,753	1,275	1,275	100%	1,303	102%	1,562	123%
Indian River MS	54	120,259	625	772	124%	790	126%	822	132%
Jolliff MS	18	190,943	1,075	687	64%	670	62%	704	65%
Oscar Smith MS	10	230,077	1,050	1,057	101%	1,017	97%	1,009	96%
Western Branch MS	51	140,675	900	904	100%	996	111%	1,121	125%
Total		1,692,194	10,350	9,609	95%	9,889	96%	10,899	105%

Key factors | Projected over-utilization and poor condition schools

Division-wide, middle schools are currently utilized within an acceptable range, but projected to be at 105% in 2028-29. However, Indian River is significantly over-utilized and Great Bridge is moderately over-utilized, with surplus capacity at Greenbrier and Jolliff. Crestwood and Indian River MS have FCI scores above 0.65, indicating they are potential candidates for replacement or major renovation. Of the \$200.9M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 37% (\$74.3M) are Priority 1-2.

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Crestwood MS	0.75	0.45	\$ 49,476,863	37%	\$ 5,568,092	\$ 5,748,881	\$ 15,531,405	\$ 3,501,831	\$ 30,350,209
Deep Creek MS	0.60	0.41	\$ 49,988,093	16%	\$ 2,719,015	\$ -	\$ 7,703,210	\$ 6,765,631	\$ 17,187,856
Great Bridge MS	0.56	0.59	\$ 76,298,708	52%	\$ 1,137,330	\$ 15,785,329	\$ 8,189,256	\$ 7,170,812	\$ 32,282,728
Greenbrier MS	0.48	0.66	\$ 81,945,048	88%	\$ -	\$ 16,635,935	\$ 305,438	\$ 1,892,225	\$ 18,833,598
Hickory MS	0.44	0.51	\$ 81,001,208	15%	\$ 2,419,226	\$ 271,006	\$ 3,450,372	\$ 12,380,357	\$ 18,520,961
Hugo Owens MS	0.48	0.50	\$ 72,815,828	25%	\$ -	\$ 3,508,245	\$ 4,540,927	\$ 6,156,375	\$ 14,205,548
Indian River MS	0.69	0.44	\$ 48,988,037	56%	\$ 8,316,748	\$ 4,256,704	\$ 2,664,407	\$ 7,344,118	\$ 22,581,977
Jolliff MS	0.48	0.56	\$ 77,781,479	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,790,675	\$ 1,690,014	\$ 17,480,690
Oscar Smith MS	0.30	0.77	\$ 93,722,887	0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,105,172	\$ 5,105,172
Western Branch MS	0.64	0.40	\$ 57,304,586	33%	\$ 3,977,241	\$ 3,980,147	\$ 5,375,103	\$ 11,047,337	\$ 24,379,828
Total			\$ 689,322,737	37%	\$ 24,137,653	\$ 50,186,247	\$ 63,550,794	\$ 63,053,873	\$ 200,928,567



Option #	Options	Cost	Description	Benefits	Challenges
1	Build a 24-CR addition to Indian River MS. Replace Chesapeake Center for Student Success on-site (Indian River Annex)	\$24 Million	Creates additional capacity to Indian River MS. Addresses condition of the Indian River Annex facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses overcrowding @ Indian River MS. • Immediate modernization of building. • Impacts more students. • Safety: Students stay in the building. • Good use of \$24 million. • Two separate Facilities- more capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crestwood's needs are not addressed. • Still need to Re-zone. • It only solves Indian River MS issues.
2	Full renovation and additions to Western Branch and Crestwood MS.	\$96 Million	Addresses condition and over-crowding of all facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modernization. • Better space utilization. • Equity. • Addresses anticipated growth. • Additional classrooms. • Updated Cafeteria. • Addresses issues in ALL facilities. • Common area Improvement at Crestwood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address actual needs of Indian River MS. • Re-zoning Needs & Effects. • Benefits limited to two schools.
3	Rezone Western Branch MS boundary to fill Joliff MS. Rezone Deep Creek MS to area middle schools.	-	Address over-crowding at Deep Creek, Great Bridge, Indian River, and Western Branch MS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero Cost. • Balance Student Enrollment. • Realty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning need. • Realty Challenge.

DRAFT

Enrollment & Facility Data Summary


School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Chittum ES (Replacement)	-2	121,480	950	751	79%	765	81%	779	82%
Southwestern ES	45	69,436	550	543	99%	545	99%	530	96%
Western Branch IS	42	83,166	725	770	106%	965	133%	939	130%
Western Branch PS	35	68,580	650	738	114%	776	119%	788	121%
Total		342,662	2,875	2,802	97%	3,051	106%	3,036	106%

*Chittum ES capacity reflects estimated capacity of replacement school to be completed in 2022

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Chittum ES (Replacement)	0.00	1.00	\$ 42,999,178		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Southwestern ES	0.52	0.60	\$ 24,577,634	13%	\$ -	\$ 1,100,943	\$ 4,077,922	\$ 3,055,522	\$ 8,234,388
Western Branch IS	0.58	0.49	\$ 29,437,518	52%	\$ 2,152,451	\$ 3,554,999	\$ 1,722,573	\$ 3,449,082	\$ 10,879,106
Western Branch PS	0.54	0.45	\$ 24,274,643	54%	\$ 1,878,794	\$ 2,858,176	\$ 1,978,927	\$ 2,116,821	\$ 8,832,719
Total			\$121,288,973	41%	\$ 4,031,246	\$ 7,514,119	\$ 7,779,423	\$ 8,621,426	\$ 27,946,213

Key factors | Projected over-utilization and poor condition schools

Northwest area elementary schools are currently at 97% combined utilization, and projected to reach 106% combined utilization. Western Branch PS is currently over-utilized at 114%, Chittum ES replacement is planned to open in the 2021-22 school year and is projected to have surplus capacity. All area schools have an FCI above 0.5, with the exception of Chittum ES. Of the \$27.9M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 41% (\$11.5M) are Priority 1-2.



Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B
<p>Full renovation and addition to Western Branch PS & IS. Full renovation to Southwest ES</p>	<p>Boundary change for entire planning area.</p>
<p>\$60.1 million</p>	
<p>Addresses future over-crowding and facility condition at Western Branch PS & IS.</p>	<p>Addresses over-crowding at Western Branch site to utilize surplus space at Chittum and Southwestern ES. Priority 1 and 2 capital renewal repairs will be addressed at all sites.</p>
<p>Benefits</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared Footprint. • New Facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning will allow students to go to a better school. • Less expensive to meet needs. • No Cost.
<p>Challenges</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students learning during renovation. • Cost. • Re-zoning need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents become angry. • Community impact. • Re-Zoning Need.

DRAFT


Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Camelot ES	35	96,515	625	484	77%	496	79%	516	83%
Cedar Road ES	23	85,880	875	819	94%	973	111%	1,022	117%
Deep Creek Central ES	45	68,513	600	780	130%	920	153%	941	157%
Deep Creek ES	41	73,270	775	741	96%	854	110%	865	112%
G. A. Treakle ES	45	72,218	575	471	82%	491	85%	509	89%
Grassfield ES	16	96,152	900	1,011	112%	1,171	130%	1,191	132%
Total		492,548	4,350	4,306	99%	4,905	113%	5,044	116%

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Camelot ES	0.60	0.54	\$ 34,162,543	42%	\$ 2,018,969	\$ 4,338,438	\$ 6,440,517	\$ 2,329,472	\$ 15,127,396
Cedar Road ES	0.55	0.60	\$ 30,398,168	7%	\$ -	\$ 1,057,359	\$ 2,537,944	\$ 12,554,942	\$ 16,150,246
Deep Creek Central ES	0.67	0.54	\$ 24,250,928	42%	\$ 1,807,072	\$ 2,738,375	\$ 2,562,745	\$ 3,833,932	\$ 10,942,124
Deep Creek ES	0.46	0.47	\$ 25,934,720	35%	\$ 1,046,363	\$ 939,692	\$ 1,634,978	\$ 2,076,974	\$ 5,698,007
G. A. Treakle ES	0.58	0.56	\$ 25,562,353	14%	\$ 101,882	\$ 1,306,428	\$ 4,281,329	\$ 4,619,840	\$ 10,309,479
Grassfield ES	0.43	0.56	\$ 34,034,055	17%	\$ -	\$ 1,183,829	\$ 5,225,494	\$ 523,364	\$ 6,932,687
Total			\$ 174,342,766	25%	\$ 4,974,286	\$ 11,564,121	\$ 22,683,007	\$ 25,938,525	\$ 65,159,938

Key factors | Projected over-utilization and poor condition schools

North-central area elementary schools are currently at 99% combined utilization, and projected to reach 113% in 2023-24 and 116% in 2028-29. Deep Creek Central ES is the most over-utilized area school, and has the highest FCI at 0.67 indicating it is a potential candidate for major renovation or replacement. Of the \$65.2M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 25% (\$16.5M) are Priority 1-2.



Option #	Options	Cost	Description	Benefits	Challenges
1	Full renovation and 6 classroom addition at Deep Creek Central ES	\$20 Million	Addresses facility conditions and over utilization. Increases capacity to 750 students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Facility. • Helps overcrowding in other schools. • Addresses facility conditions and over utilization. • Increases capacity to 750 Students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough seats are being added to address capacity. • Larger capacity will be needed in the future. • Must address over-crowding. • Re-Zoning still must be done.
2	Build new K-5 Elementary at 900 capacity	\$39.8 Million	Build on existing “Culpepper” site owned by the Division. Addresses over-crowding for all ES in this planning area. Requires area rezoning of elementary boundaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheaper price per seat. • Build on existing "Culpepper" site owned by the division. • Addresses over-crowding for all ES in this planning area. • Requires area rezoning of elementary boundaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic / Transportation • Access to school (ways in and out). • Rezoning. • Must address DCCE

DRAFT


Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
B. M. Williams PS	39	83,326	725	801	110%	785	108%	788	109%
Crestwood IS	56	95,958	700	695	99%	714	102%	709	101%
G. W. Carver IS	61	85,615	600	561	94%	574	96%	564	94%
Portlock PS	44	71,711	575	564	98%	581	101%	583	101%
Rena B. Wright PS	43	65,552	400	310	78%	313	78%	314	79%
Thurgood Marshall ES	23	77,832	500	468	94%	460	92%	459	92%
Truitt IS	85	53,703	350	286	82%	271	77%	264	75%
Total		533,697	3,850	3,685	96%	3,698	96%	3,681	96%

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
B. M. Williams PS	0.56	0.54	\$ 29,494,151	32%	\$ 1,742,205	\$ 1,991,065	\$ 417,000	\$ 7,627,610	\$ 11,777,880
Crestwood IS	0.72	0.52	\$ 33,965,386	48%	\$ 7,074,693	\$ 1,738,317	\$ 793,780	\$ 8,753,426	\$ 18,360,217
G. W. Carver IS	0.71	0.58	\$ 30,304,368	19%	\$ 2,693,339	\$ 1,098,017	\$ 9,778,562	\$ 6,017,628	\$ 19,587,547
Portlock PS	0.68	0.56	\$ 25,382,895	52%	\$ 830,563	\$ 7,610,422	\$ 3,491,499	\$ 4,388,092	\$ 16,320,575
Rena B. Wright PS	0.70	0.59	\$ 23,202,849	41%	\$ 2,144,792	\$ 3,716,911	\$ 1,710,029	\$ 6,614,297	\$ 14,186,029
Thurgood Marshall ES	0.59	0.49	\$ 27,549,490	39%	\$ 958,272	\$ 4,797,598	\$ 3,354,457	\$ 5,526,444	\$ 14,636,771
Truitt IS	0.68	0.68	\$ 19,008,766	10%	\$ 661,194	\$ 268,610	\$ 4,384,745	\$ 4,014,929	\$ 9,329,479
Total			\$ 188,907,906	36%	\$ 16,105,059	\$ 21,220,940	\$ 23,930,072	\$ 42,942,426	\$ 104,198,498

Key factors | Poor condition schools

Northeast-1 area elementary schools are currently at 96% combined utilization, with area enrollment projected to remain flat. All area schools have a FCI above 0.5, with 5 above 0.65, indicating they are potential candidates for replacement or major renovation. Of the \$104.2M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 36% (\$37.3M) are Priority 1-2.



Scenario 1A	Option to add to Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B
<p>Convert all schools to K-5 grade configuration. Build one (1) new K-5 school. Rebuild Crestwood IS, Portlock PS & Rena B Wright PS on-site. Close Truitt IS & Carver IS</p>	<p>In addition to Option A, Convert B.M. Williams as a Pre-K center and redistrict area elementary students.</p>	<p>Keep current grade configuration with no facility additions. Boundary change for entire planning area.</p>
<p>\$159.3 million</p>		
<p>Building one K-5 school on Rena B Wright PS current location (closing Truitt IS). Build one K-5 school on Portlock PS current location (closing Carver IS). Rebuild Crestwood IS at current location. Build new K-5 school on Clearfield site. Addresses all facility conditions and decreases operational costs.</p>	<p>For Scenarios 1A-1B, conversion to K-5 unifies elementary grades in one facility, promoting operational efficiencies and collaborations between primary and intermediate grades. K-5 options were considered division-wide when poor facility conditions demand significant investment & current sites would allow for new construction.</p>	<p>Addresses utilization discrepancies between all locations. Priority 1 and 2 capital renewal repairs will be addressed at all sites.</p>
<p>Benefits</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuity and Consistency for students and parents • Improved transportation- decreases shuffling • New Facility, modernization • K-5 Model • Reinforce skills & relationships between students and staff for a longer period of time (6 years vs. 3 years) • "Better bang for our Buck \$" • Could revitalize community- K-5 gives us that • Improves FCI for more buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Pre-K students in one facility • Opening classes at Portlock and Rena B • Students getting same foundation at one location • Would create equality • Provide an improved education environment conducive to the growth of elementary children • YES! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheaper
<p>Challenges</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving the Truitt and Carver students out of their neighborhood/ community. Community attachment to Truitt/Carver. • Zoning needs to be done equitably. • Scope of project. • Logistics and timing for transportation. • Closed buildings- uses?/Historic? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-K students would not go to schools where they are zoned. • Logistics and timing for transportation. • Bussing this part of pre-K students from all areas of the city is not ideal. • Students are separated from their siblings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary Change- Band-Aid, not a fix. • Age of buildings. • Alone, this option does not improve FCI concerns.

DRAFT


Enrollment & Facility Data Summary

School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Georgetown PS	36	91,904	750	753	100%	763	102%	762	102%
Greenbrier IS	27	77,867	775	670	86%	759	98%	701	90%
Greenbrier PS	31	62,731	650	703	108%	724	111%	727	112%
Norfolk Highlands PS	41	46,899	325	317	98%	307	94%	307	94%
Sparrow Road IS	35	70,856	600	503	84%	543	91%	503	84%
Total		350,257	3,100	2,946	95%	3,096	100%	3,000	97%

Key factors | Projected over-utilization and poor condition schools

Northeast-2 area elementary schools are currently at 95% combined utilization, with area enrollment projected to moderately increase. All area schools have a FCI above 0.5. Of the \$48.8M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 19% (\$9.4M) are Priority 1-2. Norfolk Highlands and Georgetown Primary currently serve grades PK-3 and feed into Sparrow Road Intermediate for grades 4-5; they are the only schools in the Division with this grade configuration.

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Georgetown PS	0.56	0.54	\$ 32,530,429	14%	\$ 1,405,431	\$ 129,654	\$ 8,311,863	\$ 1,280,390	\$ 11,127,338
Greenbrier IS	0.59	0.54	\$ 27,561,879	41%	\$ -	\$ 6,137,945	\$ 2,449,186	\$ 6,328,853	\$ 14,915,984
Greenbrier PS	0.53	0.51	\$ 22,204,325	11%	\$ -	\$ 1,078,068	\$ 5,086,603	\$ 3,438,928	\$ 9,603,599
Norfolk Highlands PS	0.56	0.46	\$ 16,600,415	7%	\$ 265,426	\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ 5,236,588	\$ 5,622,014
Sparrow Road IS	0.55	0.50	\$ 25,080,258	3%	\$ 79,639	\$ 173,031	\$ 5,952,102	\$ 1,327,905	\$ 7,532,677
Total			\$ 123,977,306	19%	\$ 1,750,496	\$ 7,638,699	\$ 21,799,754	\$ 17,612,663	\$ 48,801,613





Scenario 1A	Scenario 1B
<p>Convert all schools to K-5 grade configuration. Modernization and additions to Georgetown PS and Sparrow Road IS making them each 800 capacity elementary schools. Close Norfolk Highlands PS.</p>	<p>Keep current grade configuration with no facility additions. Boundary change for entire planning area.</p>
<p>\$52 Million</p>	
<p>Modernization and additions to Georgetown PS and Sparrow Road IS. Close Norfolk Highlands PS. Addresses all facility conditions and decreases operational costs.</p>	<p>Addresses utilization discrepancies between all locations and does not close Norfolk Highlands PS. Priority 1 and 2 capital renewal repairs will be addressed at all sites.</p>
<p>Benefits</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce skills and relationships for longer periods of time (6 years vs. 3 years) • K-5 Community • Curriculum bonus when we are together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No cost • Solves issues
<p>Challenges</p>	<p>DRAFT</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics and timing for transportation • Closing of a historic building 	

Enrollment & Facility Data Summary


School	Average Building Age	Square Feet	CIP Capacity	2018-19 Enrollment	2018-19 Utilization	2023-24 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2023-24 Projected Live-In Utilization	2028-29 Projected Live-In Enrollment	2028-29 Projected Live-In Utilization
Butts Road IS	27	77,867	875	654	75%	680	78%	731	84%
Butts Road PS*	44	64,650	600	532	89%	611	102%	617	103%
Great Bridge IS	28	77,867	850	677	80%	762	90%	837	98%
Great Bridge PS (Replacement)	0	90,808	675	566	84%	630	93%	636	94%
Hickory ES	55	63,589	525	463	88%	471	90%	498	95%
Southeastern ES*	48	79,789	725	777	107%	953	131%	1,013	140%
Total		454,570	4,250	3,669	86%	4,107	97%	4,332	102%

*Butts Road PS and Southeastern ES capacity numbers reflect reduced capacity for full day K implementation

School	Campus FCI	Educational Adequacy Index	Capital Replacement Value	Percent Capital Renewals that are Priority 1-2	Priority 1 Capital Renewals	Priority 2 Capital Renewals	Priority 3 Capital Renewals	Priority 4 Capital Renewals	Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals
Butts Road IS	0.57	0.56	\$ 27,561,879	43%	\$ -	\$ 5,569,964	\$ 4,071,990	\$ 3,232,536	\$ 12,874,491
Butts Road PS*	0.58	0.60	\$ 22,883,576	83%	\$ 91,205	\$ 5,949,005	\$ 126,924	\$ 1,078,611	\$ 7,245,745
Great Bridge IS	0.59	0.54	\$ 27,561,879	66%	\$ -	\$ 9,252,481	\$ 1,517,946	\$ 3,234,879	\$ 14,005,306
Great Bridge PS (Replacement)	0.00	1.00	\$ 32,142,487		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Hickory ES	0.58	0.64	\$ 22,508,024	15%	\$ 590,144	\$ 848,388	\$ 511,178	\$ 7,413,625	\$ 9,363,336
Southeastern ES*	0.71	0.48	\$ 28,242,192	34%	\$ 3,074,251	\$ 209,377	\$ 2,380,718	\$ 4,093,580	\$ 9,757,926
Total			\$160,900,036	48%	\$3,755,600	\$21,829,215	\$ 8,608,757	\$19,053,232	\$53,246,804

Key factors | Projected over-utilization and poor condition schools

Southeast area elementary schools are currently at 86% combined utilization, with area enrollment projected to increase. New Great Bridge Primary opened in 2019-20. All other area schools have a FCI above 0.5, with Southeastern ES being the highest at 0.71, indicating it is a potential candidate for replacement or major renovation. Of the \$53.2M in Priority 1-4 Capital Renewals, 48% (\$25.6M) are Priority 1-2.



Option #	Options	Cost	Description	Benefits	Challenges
1	Add Addition to Southeastern ES	\$11.6 Million	Increases capacity to 900 students. Addresses future over-crowding to facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• YES!• Improves over-crowding issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cost• Does not improve FCI

DRAFT



INITIAL DRAFT COST ESTIMATE RANGE



	Condition Needs		Current Total Estimate Range	
	P1-2		Low	High
HS	\$	61,586,942	\$ 154,586,942	\$ 310,086,942
MS	\$	74,323,900	\$ 98,323,900	\$ 175,023,900
NE - 1	\$	37,325,999	\$ 37,325,999	\$ 168,788,999
NE - 2	\$	9,389,195	\$ 9,389,195	\$ 59,216,195
NW	\$	11,545,365	\$ 11,545,365	\$ 60,100,365
NC	\$	16,538,407	\$ 31,993,407	\$ 71,793,407
SE	\$	25,584,815	\$ 25,584,815	\$ 37,184,815
	\$	236,294,623	\$ 368,749,623	\$ 882,194,623

Total estimate ranges include P1-2 condition renovations for all schools not being proposed for major renovation or closure.

The estimates in the “Low” column reflect the least expensive scenario/option for each planning area, while estimates in the “High” column reflect the most expensive by planning area.

DRAFT

Current cost estimates are considered rough order of magnitude estimates and subject to revision throughout the process. These estimates are shown in 2020 dollars.