

AGENDA
SCHOOL BOARD OF SANTA ROSA COUNTY
WORKSHOP
April 5, 2018-5:00 PM

Items for Review and Discussion

Superintendent Wyrosdick opened the workshop by expressing appreciation to Assistant Superintendent Joey Harrell and other individuals in the room for their work on the planning and development of the new Navarre K8 School.

A. Review of New K-8 School

For a complete word for word transcript of the public hearing, please see the video. The following presentation to the Board has been condensed.

Superintendent Wyrosdick opened the workshop by expressing appreciation to Assistant Superintendent Joey Harrell and other individuals in the room for their work on the planning and development of the new Navarre K8 School.

Mr. Wyrosdick pointed out that we must work within the constraints of what we're allowed to do. There are several issues; cost/affordability, cost per student station. It is a difficult task to address these issues in a way that meets our needs and falls within what the law says we must do. We're not there yet but will continue to work though it.

The Superintendent shared that he and Mr. Harrell recently discussed the number of additions they've built in the last four years (totaling four schools). This is a new process for them and he expressed appreciation to those in the room for the partnership we have as well as their expertise.

Mr. Harrell thanked the team of professionals who have assisted in the process. He pointed out that, from a design standpoint, this is completely different from anything we've done in Santa Rosa County before which is scary and exciting. We started with a design that we've used in the past but ended up where we are. He asked that the Board keep an open mind.

Owen Gipson with DAG Architects came forward to begin the presentation/review. Mr. Gipson thanked School Board member Carol Boston, Assistant Superintendent Bill Emerson, Director of Elementary Schools April Martin, Director of Middle Schools Floyd Smith, and Director of Instructional Technology Mike Thorpe, as well as Food Service Managers Leslie Bell and Bill McMahon for their collaboration in working through the development process.

Mr. Gipson reviewed the site analysis and talked about the site location, possibility of developments in the future as well as unique opportunities for this specific site. The site includes power line and drainage

easements as well as wetlands.

DAG Architect Sandie Taunton came forward and provided information on the beginning of the process. The initial five-year survey generated an expected school size of 192,000 square feet with 1,182 student stations. The Programming Committee knew they couldn't afford that much square footage so they began trying to identify areas that could be reduced without reducing student stations. The committee considered room functions and adjacencies as well as student circulation patterns. It was important to think about how the elementary and middle school students would interact in the building. The committee was able to reduce square footage by a total of 30,000.

Mr. Gipson presented five different schemes (schematics) of floor plans including "pros" and "cons" for each design. Each plan included square footage and building layout by grade level. The (final) design plan is the committee's recommendation and includes the following elements:

- Building placed on East side of site to minimize pavement and utilities*
- Building entrance facing Elkhart Drive to embrace the neighborhood*
- Topography naturally falls to the north for stormwater retention*
- Minimized wetland crossings at drainage easement*
- Public/private separations of the campus clearly delineated*
- Car stacking considerations for drop-off/pick-up*
- Circuitous route for cars approaching the building - safe approach*
- Separate bus/service entrance (to kitchen, custodial storage and mechanical areas) to accommodate up to 18 buses*
- Building was placed to the North to maximize distance from transmission lines*
- Isolated wetland in center of site to be filled and mitigated*
- Portion of the site to the West to be cleared/filled for future track and courts*

Ms. Taunton pointed out that the atrium is multi-functional. It will help with security and observing the students who will be going to classrooms on the second floor and will also serve as a central gathering place for students for different activities which will help build a sense of community.

Superintendent Wyrosdick asked about the space of the atrium. Ms. Taunton responded that it's approximately 3500 square feet. The Superintendent wanted to clarify that this is not classified as classroom space; Ms. Taunton responded that it is not.

Mrs. Boston commented what a great job Sandie Taunton has done pulling together ideas from different meetings with committee members.

Ms. Taunton continued by showing an example of what a typical wing might look like including restroom facilities for each grade level.

Dr. Scott asked about planning for the future and if the possibility of adding to the wings had been discussed. David Luttrell (DAG) responded that with this being a 1200-student school the idea of expansion was not considered as much as it would have been if it were an 800-student school; we probably don't want to be much larger than 1200 students.

Mr. Luttrell presented the following budget information. The budget and cost per student station is a big issue and very challenging. At the beginning of the process the committee looked at ways to reduce square footage with the understanding that program requirements must be met including accommodating educational changes and sensitivity to student circulation and separation of ages. Starting with the plant survey (192,000 SF approved) they reviewed and evaluated all spaces that do not generate student station dollars. The building size was reduced by 17% (nearly 33,000 SF) while still meeting program requirements. The site allows for development closer to existing road which reduces infrastructure into the property.

He continued with the Phase I Budget Analysis. DOE allotted us \$25,572 per student station (1182 student stations) totaling \$30,226,104. This number includes the building, site development (excluding the stormwater pond and piping), design fees, furniture, fixtures, and equipment. By subtracting the site development cost and soft fees the building cost alone is \$21,425,385. This shows a building cost of \$134 per square foot, and when adding the site fees back in comes to \$165 per square foot. Other costs not included in cost per student station (drainage, mitigation and wetlands fill, offsite utilities and road improvements) are \$1,575,000. The projected total cost is \$31,801,104.

Mr. Luttrell noted that if we had followed the plant survey (what DOE approved) then we would have had \$111 per square foot (to spend). We reduced the building size but couldn't go less than 160,000 square feet. He then shared cost data from similar schools built in other districts (building cost only). We are at the lower end of these comparisons. The data included a recent classroom addition at Chumuckla which showed a much lower cost since every student station generates construction dollars and infrastructure already exists.

Mr. Luttrell pointed out that these articles are already two weeks old. We are experiencing construction cost increases and we're unsure what the impact of recent steel tariffs will be. The formula used shows \$200 per square foot times 160,000 square feet bringing the total cost to \$32,000,000; dividing this number by 1,182 student stations shows the cost per student station to be \$27,073.

Mr. Luttrell mentioned the possibility of a trip to Tallahassee (to request DOE input for reducing costs in order to comply with the law that sets cost per student station).

Superintendent Wyrosdick summarized that DOE called for 192,000 square feet for this school in order to provide appropriate educational environment for

this number of students. Since it's impossible to build this size school with the dollars provided we began to look at ways to cut the square footage and still meet program needs. The legislature has mandated a construction cost that is unrealistic. There are parameters that are put in place if we fail to meet the mandate. Our capital projects may be monitored by an oversight committee and PECO dollars removed.

Mrs. Boston pointed out that construction costs are constantly changing. The Superintendent shared that we requested for this to be readdressed in the last legislative session but it was sidetracked. We cannot affect this today and we need to move forward with providing additional student capacity for the south end of our community. If we started today, we would open in August of 2020 (if things went smoothly).

Mr. Harrell discussed that we may request the OEF review our plans; ask if they can suggest how we might have done things any differently.

Mr. Peden asked about the safety measures included in the plan; not those in place but proposed measures. Mr. Harrell responded that there is a secure access point at the main building entrance and limited exterior doors (some are required for emergency exit).

Mrs. Granse asked if there is a timeline for response from DOE once we present our case. Mr. Harrell responded that we will go to Tallahassee but (contingent upon Board approval of Phase 1 in tonight's Board meeting) we will continue to move forward.

Superintendent Wyrosdick noted that this project began two years ago when he and Mr. Harrell visited with the Commissioner of Education; it's taken this long to get here.

In closing Mr. Gipson thanked several of those in attendance for their help in getting to this point.

B. Public Forum

The Chairman opened the floor for the public forum and asked if anyone wanted to address the Board. There was no response; the forum was closed.