



# **OPTION DEVELOPMENT (SHORT TERM) DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**



## Reducing Capacity Pressures at Basswood Elementary and Rice Lake Elementary: Capacity Options Analysis

	Project Cost/Budget within Anticipated Funding Stream	Alignment with Future Growth	Eliminates need for a boundary change	Maintains Current Transportation Cost	Maintains Current Transportation Ride Times	Maintains Current Operations Cost (Admin, Staffing)	Site can accommodate space for (Parking, Playgrounds, Etc.)	Move forward for future analysis against guiding principles and additional considerations? Yes/No
Option A Add space at Oak View/Garden City; boundary change								
Option B Add space at Basswood, Rice Lake, Garden City; no boundary change								
Option C Relocate elementary STEM magnet from Weaver Lake to Oak View; building addition at Weaver Lake and Garden City; boundary change								
Option D Move Rice Lake and Basswood Kindergartners to Oak View; building additions at Oak View and Garden City; boundary changes later?								



# Option A

**Merits further consideration: 7 tables**  
**Do not move forward: 0 tables**

► Forces for:

- Fits within available funding
- Simple solution; less effect on families
- Creates capacity; allows flexibility for not-yet-known enrollment growth
- Provides long-term solution
- Balanced option
- Maintains current operations costs

► Forces against:

- Expanding a school in area without population growth (Oak View)
- Boundary changes are challenging
- Not intuitive to those not on the ECMAC journey – they may not understand terms like core area capacity
- Even after expanding Garden City, projections show it will be slightly over capacity in 2 years. Is this an effective solution in the long term?
- Depending on boundary changes, there could be transportation inefficiencies or longer ride times



# Option B

**Merits further consideration: 0 tables**  
**Do not move forward: 7 tables**

► Forces for:

- Does not require boundary change
- Easier to communicate because it's a more straightforward solution

► Forces against:

- Basswood common areas are not large enough to accommodate more students
- Costs (projected at \$20 million) would exceed available funding of \$15 million
- What is the consequence for students (what would we reduce elsewhere) if we spend the extra money on this option?
- How big is too big for an elementary school? Will the school always need that much capacity?
- Does not appear to be fiscally responsible
  - there are other options



# Option C

**Merits further consideration: 3 tables**  
**Do not move forward: 2 tables**  
**No consensus: 2 tables**

## ► Forces for:

- Work of attendance area team could surface implications that would provide more information
- Can it help with the longer term solution?
- Unknown (at this time) curricular/programmatic challenges associated with moving a magnet program are not enough to disqualify
- Oak View is a more central location
- There would be more flexibility/more options for a potential Fernbrook boundary change in the future if Fernbrook were adjacent to a school with boundaries

## ► Forces against:

- Transportation complications/costs
- # of families affected
- Physical site characteristics of Oak View vs. Weaver
- What is the benefit to students?
- Change of diversity makeup?
- Programmatic challenges?
- How is this option tied to our guiding principles?
- Two schools that do not have current capacity challenges would bear the brunt of boundary changes driven by capacity challenges at other schools



# Option D

**Merits further consideration: 0 tables**  
**Do not move forward: 7 tables**

► Forces for:

- Construction at Oak View could be tailored to kindergarten students

► Forces against:

- Transition would impact our youngest, most vulnerable learners
- Not a true kindergarten center; could accommodate only some additional kindergartners
- More complicated transportation
- Not a long-term solution

