



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Task Force

#### Letter of Transmittal

Board of Education Moorhead Area Public Schools 2410 14th Street South, Ste. 1 Moorhead, MN 56560-4622

Dear School Board Members:

We are pleased to present the results of the work of the High School Facilities Task Force to the Moorhead Area School District.

In September of 2018, the school district began a five (5)-month process designed to provide the school board with recommendations concerning the capacity, adequacy, and design drivers of Moorhead High School facilities for the next five, ten, and twenty-five years. The result was the development of a set of recommendations in these areas. The specifics of this work are included in this report.

The stakeholders of the Moorhead Area School District and Moorhead High School can be assured that the Task Force thoroughly examined numerous options for future high school facilities. Task Force members were dedicated to developing recommendations that were clear, appropriate and reasonable.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact either of us.

Sincerely,

Jeff Olson, Consultant True North Consulting Partners 2408 Bradford Bay Road SW Alexandria, MN 56308 Terry Quist, Consultant True North Consulting Partners 2408 Bradford Bay Road SW Alexandria, MN 56308



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Facilities Task Force Executive Summary	1-5
Appendix 1 – Facilities Task Force Roster	6-7
Appendix 2 – Summary of Meetings       8         • September 19, 2018       9-10         • October 10, 2018       11-12         • November 14, 2018       11-12         • November 28, 2018       13-14         • December 12, 2018       15-16         • January 9, 2019       17	8-17
Appendix 3 – Hopes and Aspirations	18-20
Appendix 4 – High School Tour Observations	21-22
Appendix 5 – Pros and Cons of a Career & Technical Center	23-25
Appendix 6 – Survey Findings and Recommendations	26
Appendix 7 – Summary of Poll	27
Appendix 8 – Design Driver Statements	28
Appendix 9 – Frequently Asked Questions	29-38
Appendix 10 - Survey Predictions vs. Election Results 2016-18	39

## **Moorhead Area Public Schools**

## **Facilities Task Force**

**Executive Summary** 

The Moorhead Facilities Task Force was authorized by the school board on July 16, 2018 and was comprised of parents, community and business members, students and school staff. [See Appendix 1—Roster] The purpose of the task force was to provide the school board with recommendations concerning the capacity, adequacy, and design drivers of Moorhead High School facilities for the next five, ten, and twenty-five years. The task force began meeting in Fall 2018 and ended its work in early January 2019.

Three planning drivers guided the task force's work:

- Transparency in Planning
- Data Driven Decision Making
- Stakeholder Driven Collaborative Process

The task force met seven times over the course of five months. In the task force's work, consideration was given to the recommendations of two previous Moorhead studies, the 2015 Master Facilities Plan and the 2018 Portrait of Moorhead Graduate. Following is an outline and a summary [See Appendix 2—Summary of Meetings] of each of the seven meetings:

## Meeting #1— Wednesday, September 19

- The task force was provided an overview of the process.
- Task force members introduced themselves and shared hopes and aspirations for the task force. [See Appendix 3—Hopes and Aspirations]
- Information was shared on enrollment demographics for Moorhead Area Public Schools.
- The task force members toured the high school facility and shared observations. [See Appendix 4—Tour Observations]

### Meeting #2—Wednesday, October 10

- Brian Berg, Zerr Berg Architects, and Steve Gehrtz, Gehrtz Construction Services, presented information on:
  - An assessment of the Moorhead High School facility.
  - Estimated costs for possible high school facility solutions.
  - Trends in high school design.

## Meeting #3—Wednesday, October 24

- The task force toured three schools in Bismarck, including:
  - Bismarck Legacy High School
  - Bismarck Century High School
  - Bismarck Career and Technical Center

### Meeting #4—Wednesday, November 14

- The task force was given updated cost estimates of each of the three options that were being considered.
- A team of Moorhead teachers and an administrator provided feedback to the task force on "What elements of school design are important to today's teachers who are tasked with developing a student who fits the Portrait of a Graduate?"
- $_{\odot}$  The task force provided feedback on the tour.
- Meeting #5—Wednesday, November 28
  - Greg Growe, Ehlers, presented information on school bonding, other sources of funding facility solutions and tax impact data.
  - Brian Berg, Zerr Berg Architects, updated design drivers with the task force.
  - Information on a Career & Technical Center was shared with the task force and the task force broke into small discussion groups. [Appendix 5—Pros and Cons]

## Meeting #6—Wednesday, December 12

- Don Lifto, Springsted, Inc., shared results from the community survey that was conducted in November. [Appendix 6—Survey Findings and Recommendations]
- Steve Gehrtz, Gehrtz Construction Services, shared cost information on a potential Career & Technical Center.
- The task force provided data on the three options for a high school and the interest in having an off-site Career & Technical Center through an informal polling. [Appendix 7—Summary of Poll]

### Meeting #7—Wednesday, January 9

- Brian Berg, Zerr Berg Architects, finalized design drivers with the task force. [Appendix 8—Design Driver Statements]
- The task force identified a final recommendation through a vote on the three options including an off-site Career & Technical Center.

A community survey, conducted by Springsted, Inc., was conducted to gather feedback on various facility and district items. Results of the survey were presented to the Moorhead Board of Education on Monday, December 10, 2018 and the task force on December 12, 2018. In addition, a log of Frequently Asked Questions was kept to reflect questions and answers raised by the task force throughout the process. [Appendix 9— Frequently Asked Questions] The final recommendation, voted on by the task force, was based on data gathering, thoughtful study, and discussion by the task force.

### Moorhead Facilities Task Force Recommendations:

Over the length of the study of Moorhead facilities, the task force focused on three possible options:

- Option 1: New Building/New Site 2,400/2,600 [Core] Students
- Option 2: Building Replacement/Existing Site 2,400/2,600 [Core] Students
- Option 3: Dual Site 1,200/1,300 [Core] Students Each

In addition, the task force is recommending including an off-site Career & Technical Center to each of the options. The table below provides the total cost and tax impact, based on the average home price of \$200,000 in Moorhead, for each of the three options.

Home Value:	\$200,000.00		
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Total Cost	\$117,000,000.00	\$93,000,000.00	\$155,000,000.00
Annual Tax Impact	\$125.00	\$75.00	\$200.00
Career Academy Cost	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00
Combined Total	\$130,000,000.00	\$106,000,000.00	\$168,000,000.00
Combined Annual Tax Impact	\$150.00	\$100.00	\$225.00

On January 9, the task force, through a private vote, selected by a wide majority Option 2— Building Replacement/Existing Site – 2,400/2,600 [Core] Students. This option also includes an off-site Career & Technical Center. The final voting results were:

2	Votes [6%]	Option 1	New Building/New Site-2,400/2,600 [Core]
Stu	Jdents		
26	Votes [81%]	Option 2	Bldg. Replacement/Existing Site-2,400/2,600
Stu	Jdents		
2	Votes [13%]	Option 3	Dual Site-1,200/1,300 [Core] Students Each

In meeting its purpose, the Moorhead Facilities Task Force is recommending the school board consider Option 2 with a Career & Technical Center to meet capacity and adequacy needs for Moorhead High School. In addition, the task force is recommending the board consider the design drivers to guide the high school project.

### **ROSTER OF MOORHEAD HIGH SCHOOL**

### **FACILITIES TASK FORCE**

#### **Community Membership**

- 1. Jeffrey Arel
- 2. Devlyn Brooks
- 3. Rob Bye
- 4. Katie Cragg
- 5. Wes Darling
- 6. Carmen Escobar
- 7. Samantha Gust
- 8. Chad Hansen
- 9. Russ Hanson
- 10. Angie Hasbrouck
- 11. Chad Markuson
- 12. Ralf Mehnert-Meland
- 13. Amanda Midthune
- 14. Clint Rossland
- 15. Karl Stumo
- 16. Terri Trickle
- 17. Katie Violet
- 18. Jennifer Young
- 19. Kim Citrowski
- 20. Ann Hagen

#### Moorhead Area Public Schools Board Membership

- 1. Cassidy Bjorklund
- 2. Scott Steffes

#### Moorhead Area Public School s Teacher Membership

- 1. Jon Ammerman
- 2. Meagan Blake
- 3. Mike Kieselbach
- 4. Brittney Rehm
- 5. Hannah Reisdorf

#### Moorhead Area Public Schools District Employees

- 1. Kristin Dehmer
- 2. Dean Haugo
- 3. Jeremy Larson
- 4. Dan Markert
- 5. Jim Smith
- 6. Tamara Uselman

#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Administration

- 1. Angela Doll
- 2. Josh Haag
- 3. Dave Lawrence
- 4. Deb Pender

#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Students

- 1. Greta Cole
- 2. Jack Eisenzimmer



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of September 19, 2018 Meeting

The meeting started with a welcome by Superintendent Brandon Lunak. Items of business included:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for the meetings of the Task Force.
- It was agreed that the January 16, 2019, meeting be changed to January 9, 2019.
- Task Force members introduced themselves and shared their "Hopes and Aspirations" for the Task Force. A compilation of the "Hopes and Aspirations" is attached. **[Appendix 3]**
- Demographic Data from the Hazel Reinhardt Study, the November 2017 Enrollment Report and Projections, and the September 4, 2018, Opening Enrollment were shared. It was agreed that the November 2018 Enrollment Report and Projections will be shared at the November 28, 2018, meeting. (See Binder)
- Handouts were provided from recent Moorhead Area Public Schools Studies including: the 2015 Master Facilities Study and the 2018 Portrait of a Moorhead Graduate Study. **(See Binder)**
- The Task Force toured Moorhead High School. Upon returning from the tour, Task Force members were divided into groups where they identified and presented observations from the building tour. A compilation of the observations from the groups is attached.
   (Appendix 4)

The next meeting of the Task Force is set for **Wednesday**, **October 10**, **2018**, **at 5:30 p.m.** in the High School Media Center. The focus of the meeting will be a Facility Assessment, Update on Current Trends in High School Design, and Cost Implications of various Facility Solutions.



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of October 10, 2018 Meeting

Items of business included:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for the meetings of the Task Force.
- It was noted that the January 16, 2019, meeting was changed to January 9, 2019.
- Several questions were raised: How might more input from the community be gathered?; Have there been other task force groups which have addressed high school facility needs?; What is the "right size" in terms of number of students for a high school? For high school classrooms? (Specific answers to these questions will be given in a FAQ document that will be distributed prior to the November 14, 2018, meeting.)
- Brian Berg of Zerr Berg Architects presented: An assessment of the current high school building; a review of current high school facility design concepts; future site options for a new high school building in the school district; and three possible options for addressing Moorhead High School facility needs. The three options included a new building on a new site at an estimated cost of \$95,200,000; A building replacement/renovation at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$78,700,000; and, A combination of a new building at a new site and a renovated building at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$113,600,000. The single site options would be designed for 2400 students and the dual site option would be designed for 1200 students at each site.
- A number of questions were asked regarding all three options: Can the current high school handle an enrollment of 2400 students?; Why are the building options being developed for 2400 students for a single site and 1200 students per building for dual sites?; What is the square footage per student for other new or renovated high schools with enrollment similar to that of Moorhead High School?; How would students be educated if

the current school was being renovated during an academic year?; What would happen to MSHSL class competition levels in the two high school format? (Specific answers to the questions will be presented in a FAQ document that will be distributed prior to the November 14, 2018, meeting.)

The next meeting of the Task Force is a tour of Bismarck High School facilities set for **Wednesday**, **October 24**, **2018**. It was determined that the departure time be changed to **7:00 a.m.** Final details for the tour will be distributed by the school district prior to October 24, 2018.



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of November 14, 2018 Meeting

Items of business included:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for upcoming meetings of the Task Force.
- A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was reviewed. The document will be updated regularly based on questions presented by the Task Force.
- Brian Berg of Zerr Berg Architects presented a matrix of three possible options for addressing Moorhead High School facility needs. The three options included: a new building on a new site at an estimated cost of \$101,225,600; a building replacement at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$92,937,600; and a combination of a new building at a new site and a replacement building at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$132,800,640. The single site options would be designed for 2400 students and the dual site option would be designed for 1200 students at each site.
- A number of questions were asked regarding all three options: How can Fargo build two new schools at a cost less than is being presented for the two high school option?; Why are the building options being developed for 2400 students for a single site and 1200 students per building for dual sites when enrollment projections on at least one of the enrollment projections is 2330 for the 2022-2023 school year?; Can the "options matrix" reflect an "apples to apples" comparison of all amenities associated with the three high school options (ex: athletic stadium, outdoor fields, parking lots)?; Will any of the academic portions of the current high school be renovated rather than replaced? (Specific answers to the questions will be presented in a FAQ document that will be distributed at future meetings.)
- Tamara Uselman, Moorhead High School students, and Moorhead High School staff presented ideas on how Moorhead High School would be designed in an ideal setting for modern education. A summary of the presentation will be presented at the next meeting.

• Task Force members were involved in a small group activity where they identified "Design Drivers" that they would like to see in a new high school. A summary of key "Design Drivers" will be presented at the next meeting.

The next meeting of the Task Force is set for **Wednesday**, **November 28**, **2018**. The focus of the meeting will be an update on the options matrix and FAQ document, a presentation on financing options for new construction, and an opportunity for Task Force members to request any additional information they would like to see prior to voting on a recommendation for the high school solution.



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of November 28, 2018 Meeting

Items of business included:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for upcoming meetings of the Task Force.
- Greg Crowe of Ehlers Financial presented information on methods of financing the three facility options being considered. Included in his presentation were: a review of the financing tools authorized for school districts in Minnesota; the structuring of payments for bonds and the current status of interest rates for school construction projects; and an example of how the Brainerd School District combined several financing options for their construction projects.
- Brian Berg of Zerr Berg Architects provided an update on the Task Force work in developing "Design Drivers" (including building accessibility, entry, and parking) for the potential new building(s) for Moorhead High School students. The Design Drivers will be updated for the next meeting.
- Berg also presented an updated matrix of three possible options for addressing Moorhead High School facility needs. The three options included areas such as site work development, and outdoor stadiums, fields, and turf. The changes were reflected in revised costs for each option: a new building on a new site at an estimated cost of \$113,209,600; a building replacement at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$99,657,600; and a combination of a new building at a new site and a replacement building at the existing site at an estimated cost of \$149,040,640. The single site options would be designed for core space for 2600 students and academic space for 2400 students. The dual site option would be designed for a core space of 1300 students and academic space for 1200 students at each site.
- An updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was reviewed. The document will be updated regularly based on questions presented by the Task Force.

- Several questions were asked regarding the options being discussed: How can we be assured that the buildings will be big enough to handle future enrollment projections? How many students could be expected to attend a Career and Technical Education Center? What would be the program offered at a Career and Technical Education Center? (Specific answers to the questions will be presented in a FAQ document that will be distributed at future meetings.)
- Task Force members were involved in a small group activity where they identified "Pros and Cons" for the addition of a stand-alone Career and Technical Education Center as a part of the project scope. A summary of group responses will be presented at the next meeting.

The next meeting of the Task Force is set for **Wednesday**, **December 12**, **2018**. The focus of the meeting will be: a presentation on the results of the "Community Survey"; an update on Frequently Asked Questions; continued discussion on the possible addition of a Career and Technical Education Center to the scope of the proposed project; and a "dipstick" of Task Force member positions on the three options.



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of December 12, 2018 Meeting

Items of business:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for the meetings of the Task Force.
- Don Lifto of Springsted Public Sector Advisors presented the results of a survey of 400 Moorhead residents. Survey respondents were representative of the population of the Moorhead Area School District. The survey indicated strong support for a solution to address capacity and adequacy needs of the current Moorhead High School. General support for a bond to address building needs with a tax increase of \$80 -\$110 on a home valued at \$200,000 was noted. Springsted will conduct a follow-up survey in May 2019 to gauge support for the specific building solution and costs identified by the Moorhead School Board.
- An updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was reviewed. Questions regarding athletic and activity participation, and the planned student capacity of the proposed building solutions were presented.
- Brian Berg of Zerr Berg Architects and Steve Gehrtz provided updated information on the possibility of an off-site Career and Technical Education (CTE) Center and three options for addressing Moorhead High School Facility needs. The CTE Center would be designed to serve 300 + students in a renovated building at an estimated cost of \$12.88 M. The three options were: a new building on a new site at an estimated cost of \$117 M; a building renovation/replacement at the existing site at a cost of \$93 M; and a combination of a new building and a renovation/replacement building at the existing site at a cost of \$154.2 M. The single building options would be designed for a core space of 2600 students and academic space for 2400 students. The dual site option would be designed for a core space of 1300 students and academic space for 1200 students.

- Task Force members conducted a non-binding vote on both the off-site CTE Center and the three options. The results of the vote are attached (Appendix 7 Summary of Poll). As a result of the vote, the CTE Center will be included with each of the three options being considered by the Task Force.
- Task Force members requested more information regarding the possible options including: How will the single site option provide an environment designed to meet the needs of all students?; How will students and staff learn/work in a safe environment during the renovation/replacement of the current high school facility?; What is the specific tax impact of each of the options?; Is there a way to reduce the cost of the dual site option to a level that would more likely be supported by the voters of the school district?; In Option 2, how would the current 9<sup>th</sup> grade space be used?; In Option 3, would there be two identities [i.e., Spuds] for each high school? (Answers to these questions will be presented at the next meeting of the Task Force)

The next meeting of the Task Force is set for **Wednesday**, **January 9**, **2019**. The focus of the meeting will be an update on questions raised about the options, discussion of the pros and cons of the options, and a final vote on the facility recommendation that the Task Force will forward to the Moorhead School Board.



#### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Summary of January 9, 2019 Meeting

Items of business:

- A review of the Charge Statement, Purpose of the Task Force, Task Force Planning Drivers, the Decision-Making Process for the Group, and the Timeline and Activities for the meetings of the Task Force.
- A review of the Summary of the December 12, 2018, Task Force Meeting including key points from the Springsted Survey and the results of the "Dipstick" activity.
- A presentation by Brian Berg on the "Design Drivers" created by the Task Force. Based on input from the group, safety and security will be more clearly stated in the "Drivers." (Final Drivers Attached, Appendix 8)
- A presentation of an updated FAQ document. Emphasis was placed on responses to questions regarding planning for construction at an existing site, the accuracy of the Springsted Survey results, meeting the needs of all students in a large high school, and how existing space in the current high school could be incorporated into a renovated/expanded building.
- A presentation on the projected cost and tax impact of each of the three facility options being considered:
  - New Building/New Site \$117,000,000 + CTE Center \$13,000,000 = \$150 tax impact on a home valued at \$200,000
  - Building Renovation & Replacement/Existing Site \$93,000,000 + CTE Center – \$13,000,000 = \$100 tax impact on a home valued at \$200,000
  - 3. Two High Schools/Dual Site \$155,000,000 + CTE Center \$13,000,000 = \$225 Tax impact on a home valued at \$200,000
- A vote of the Task Force on which option to present to the School Board. The results of the vote are as follows: Option #1 = 2 votes (6%); Option #2 = 26 votes (81%); Option #3 = 4 votes (13%).

The next step in the process will be to forward the recommendation of the Task Force to the Moorhead School Board on Thursday, January 31, 2019. Based on School Board action, the School District will conduct a series of "Charrette" community meetings focused on identifying design elements of the proposed facility solution.

Appendix 3



### Moorhead Area Public Schools High School Facilities Study Hopes and Aspirations

- My hope is to come together to create a space to allow our kids to achieve academics, sports, technology and arts.
- Develop a flexible, excellent and affordable learning environment for students and the community of Moorhead.
- Foster community partnerships.
- Facility to meet the needs of our students.
- To develop the BEST SOLUTION for Moorhead students, staff and the community for the long-term.
- I wanted to hear different opinions and see the process, hoping to contribute where I can.
- I hope this task force is able to come to a decision which focuses on a high school which will include: accessibility, natural light, flexible learning spaces, and the potential to grow and change with time.
- Develop a thoughtful, intentional, inclusive plan for the MHS faculty, all students, and community members that utilizes its services.
- To assist with a recommendation that is best for students and the community and helps to maintain Moorhead's strong community.
- To provide what is needed for our growing community to be successful, young adults in our world...address space, academic programs and opportunity.
- Create the best education program for Moorhead students in grades 9-12.
- Consensus on a facility that best meets the needs of the students to grow and be successful.
- I want to make my school better in as many ways as possible.

- To come to a fiscally responsible decision in what is best for the community of Moorhead in terms of expansion.
- To come to a thoughtful conclusion as to how we should move forward as a school and community with our future high school.
- Obviously, need a realistic solution to long-range capacity and needs.
- Economic driver for the city.
- Develop facility that meets all handicap needs as well as meeting our continued cultural/ethnic development.
- Community facility welcoming to present and future.
- A single vision for the district to work towards that the community can support.
- Positive plan that community members will find they can get behind and support.
- To have a clear vision of what the community desires for Moorhead High School.
- A facility that accommodates all students and staff, runs smoothly and is cost effective.
- I aspire to spaces for alternative learning that reflect the needs of our students who learn differently and/or have unique learning needs.
   Alternative education in Moorhead Area School District reflects a continuum of options for learners at risk across district setting[s], including our offsite location at Vista.
- A school that is well suited to support each different student to be successful after high school.
- Sense of belonging for all students.
- School safety.
- High School needs a facelift.
- Design a space that implements the "Portrait of a Graduate," one that is safe, meets the needs of all learners, and a space for community.
- A facility that supports the "Portrait of a Graduate" plan and provides directions the community can support.
- I hope that Moorhead keeps growing and our schools grow as well.
- To provide the best possible facilities for our future students to succeed in academic achievement, activities and culture.
- The task force be open to change and forward thinking.
- To set Moorhead up for a successful future and to stand out as an emerging place within the state's community.
- Make a recommendation for a facility that won't be outdated in 20 years and serve the community for quite some time.
- To come up with a plan that is timeless and serves the community.

- A community and data-driven decision that will accommodate the citizens of Moorhead for the long-term and supports the "Portrait of a Moorhead Graduate."
- For Moorhead to grow with the amount of kids coming through our school system.
- Keep in mind safety, class sizes, and community needs.
- A facility plan that allows us to build/restructure Moorhead High School to meet the needs of our students and our growing community.
- Help shape a facility that meets the growth in the district as well as a setting that meets the future demands for my children.
- 20 years from now the students, teachers and staff will say "WOW—They Did This Right!!!"



### **Moorhead High School**

### **Facilities Task Force**

### **High School Tour Observations**

The Facilities Task Force toured Moorhead High School as a part of the September 19, 2018, Facilities Task Force Meeting. Following the tour, Task Force members made the following observations on the "state of the high school."

Frequency	Observation
9	Lighting is Poor/Dark/No Windows/Little or No Natural
	Light/Lack of Light
8	Too Small/Physical Classroom Space/Undersized Learning
	Spaces/Cramped Classrooms/Squished – Lack of
	Space/Crowded
4	Lunchroom is Undersized/Lunchroom Capacity/Safety of
	Students Leaving for Lunch
2	Dated Technology/Lacking Technology
2	Poor Wayfinding/Confusing
2	Lockers/Necessary?
2	Lack of Storage
2	Lack of Handicapped Accessibility (Classrooms, Elevators,
	Etc.)
2	Teachers and Staff Make It Work

2	No Defined Entrance/No Front Entry
2	Crowded hallways/Hallways Undersized
2	The Building is "Well-Used"/Everything is "Well-Used"
2	Teacher Work Areas Undersized/No Teacher Work Areas
1	Institutional Feel
1	Split Levels
1	Shop Classrooms Enclosed
1	"Dungeon Feel"
1	Art is on an Island
1	Building Can't Accommodate the "Small City" Every Day
1	No School Pride
1	Can Tell Newer Parts
1	Do We Need to make Classrooms Larger for Larger Classes
	or More Classrooms to Keep Classes Small?
1	No Commons Area
1	No Gathering Spaces for Students
1	Old "Mis-Matched" Furniture
1	Theatre Undersized
1	Small Lab Space for Number of Students
1	"Wear and Tear" in the Building Does Not Display the
	Standards We Feel as Students
1	The Building is Limiting to Teaching and Learning
1	Security Issues

#### **Moorhead Facilities Task Force**

## Summary of Pros and Cons on a Career & Technical Center

#### November 14, 2018

#### Group 1

	Pros		Cons
•	Opportunities for more students	- /	May direct some students to
-	Pride in great programming	(	career paths prematurely
-	Variety in career opportunities	• ]	Transportation logistics
	<ul> <li>Construction</li> </ul>	• [	Potential split of student body
	<ul> <li>Health care</li> </ul>	■ (	Conflict with M-State if they are
	<ul> <li>Hospitality</li> </ul>	r	not partners
	o Arts		
	Partnership with M-State		

#### Group 2

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Extra revenue for the district</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Challenges of transportation,</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>More course options</li> </ul>	time and scheduling
<ul> <li>Community partners</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Responsibility for equipment,</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>One location</li> </ul>	laboratory, and tool
<ul> <li>Special Education transition</li> </ul>	maintenance
<ul> <li>Career Pathways</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Question on required/not</li> </ul>
	required courses, class sizes and
	enrollment

#### Group 3

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Serves more student interests</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Costs</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Serves workforce needs</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Community partnerships</li> </ul>	

#### Group 4

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Focus on careers</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Travel/transportation challenges</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Private and public partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Increased costs for staff and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Space flexibility</li> </ul>	transportation
<ul> <li>Program flexibility</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Supports future growth</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Increased student motivation</li> </ul>	

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Focus on life-readiness skills</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Challenges of community</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>More opportunities for students</li> </ul>	grasping the underlying concept
<ul> <li>Improved sense of belonging</li> </ul>	of a Career & Technical Center
<ul> <li>Increased graduation rate</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Challenges of:</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Increased creativity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cost</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Decrease large enrollment at</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Administration</li> </ul>
one high school site	o Schedule
<ul> <li>Collaboration with higher ed.,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Transportation</li> </ul>
community, and businesses	<ul> <li>Grade prerequisites for taking</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Generate revenue</li> </ul>	desired classes

#### Group 6

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Better serves more students</li> <li>Offer more options/electives</li> <li>Generate revenue</li> <li>Private/Public partnerships</li> <li>Help with labor shortage [trades]</li> <li>Increase options for students to grow into careers</li> <li>Increase VALUE of trades</li> <li>Takes student enrollment pressure off school</li> <li>Increase community involvement</li> <li>Retain and grow population</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Challenges of scheduling and transportation</li> <li>Increased costs</li> <li>Finding and maintaining business and industry partnerships</li> <li>Finding staff that are licensed</li> </ul>

#### Group 7

Pros	Cons
<ul> <li>Access to Perkins Funds and other related funding streams</li> <li>Increase sense of belonging</li> <li>Identify for non-college bound students' areas of interest in the trades</li> <li>Increased higher tech options</li> <li>Eases population strain on main high school[s]</li> <li>New career path offerings</li> <li>Meets needs of older than average students/at risk</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Finding staff from industry with vocational licensure</li> <li>Challenges of:         <ul> <li>Distance to site</li> <li>Transportation</li> <li>Scheduling</li> </ul> </li> <li>Student behavior concerns</li> <li>Loss of partnerships including local technical schools</li> <li>Higher administrative and staffing costs</li> <li>Duplication of PSEO</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Meets needs of older than</li> </ul>	staffing costs

<ul> <li>Supports community/school</li> </ul>	
partnerships	
<ul> <li>Increased partnerships with other</li> </ul>	
districts	
<ul> <li>Supports transition and</li> </ul>	
community integration for	
learners with disabilities	
<ul> <li>Increase student engagement</li> </ul>	
and equity	
<ul> <li>More opportunity for concurrent</li> </ul>	
enrollment for college credit	

#### Findings and Recommendations

#### Springsted Inc., Community Survey

#### Findings:

- Expansion
- Support higher for expansion of current high school (68%) than for replacing with new facility (51%).
- Opinions were mixed about the necessity to keep a common mascot across separate high schools.
- Facilities levy
- Initial support at 59.8%.
- Informed support at 68.1%.
- Change in support (8.3%) is significantly over the margin of error.
- Enrollment trends drive good support levels.
- Very good support for security upgrades, classroom technology, and flexible learning spaces.
- Comparatively weaker support for building event facility, swimming pool, and indoor athletic spaces.
- Tax impacts
- Strong support for tax increases at \$80 and below.
- Support drops quickly around the \$100 impact level.
- Support among Active and Very Active voters drops below margin of error at \$115-\$120 impact.

#### Recommendation:

• Facilities levy impact should be no higher than \$115 for an average home.



#### **Moorhead Area Public Schools**

**High School Facilities Task Force** 

**Summary of Poll** 

#### Green Dot/Yellow Dot/Red Dot Building Consensus Activity

Green Dot 🔵	Dot I agree with and support the option.		
Yellow Dot 💛	I need more information before I can support the option.		
Red Dot 🛑	I am not in agreement with and do not support the option.		

#### **Option 1: SINGLE SITE- NEW BUILDING**

- 2 Green Dot
- 15 Yellow Dot –
- 8 Red Dot

#### **Option 2: EXISTING SITE – BUILDING REPLACEMENT**

- 30 Green Dot
- 2 Yellow Dot –
- 0 Red Dot

#### **Option 3: DUAL SITE – EXISTING AND NEW**

- 3 Green Dot
- 5 Yellow Dot –
- 23 Red Dot

Green Dot 🔵	I agree with and support the option.
Red Dot 🛑	I am not in agreement with and do not support the option.

#### **Option: CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER – OFF SITE**

- 33 Green Dot
- 2 Yellow Dot –
- 0 Red Dot

Appendix 8



## **Moorhead High School Key Design Driver Statement**

- 1. Provide welcoming, engaging, and fully accessible spaces throughout the school in an environment that Supports connectivity and social interaction, reinforces positive behavior and identity, and enhances occupant safety and security.
- 2. Provide **flexible/adaptable/versatile learning spaces** that can support **multiple modes of learning** from traditional lecture to small group activities, active learning, collaboration and peer-to-peer learning.
- 3. Spaces must support **personalized**, **student centered learning** within **Small Learning Communities**; school within a school.
- Provide access to natural light throughout with an appropriate level of transparency between common areas and circulation spaces to learning spaces.
- 5. Provide an entry that projects community and school pride.
- 6. Provide spaces that **support and enhance** the 8 characteristics in the *Portrait of a MHS Graduate.*
- 7. Make building systems and finish decisions that will support durability, sustainability, and operational efficiency.

#### **Moorhead Area Public Schools**

#### High School Facilities Task Force

#### Frequently Asked Questions

#### January 31, 2019

#### 1. What building options are being considered for Moorhead Area Public Schools?

- a. Option 1 New Building/New Site 2,400 Students
- b. Option 2 Building Replacement/Existing Site 2,400 Students
- c. Option 3 Dual Site 1,200 Students Each

# 2. What would be the grade organization in Option 3 with dual high school sites? What would be the attendance boundaries for each school in the two-school high school option?

In a two-high school solution, students would attend one of four K-4 elementary schools with an approximate enrollment of 750 students in each school. After elementary school, all students would attend Horizon Middle School with its enrollment capacity of 2,600 students. Students would then move into two high schools based on the following elementary attendance boundaries:

- Current Moorhead High School—Dorothy Dodds and Robert Asp
- New High School—Ellen Hopkins and S.G. Reinertsen

#### 3. Can the current facility handle the projected enrollment of 2,400 students?

The current facility would be very crowded with 2,400 students. A number of new classrooms have been "created" in former locker bays. In addition, classrooms are located in the Sports Center connected to the high school. In order to handle the projected enrollment, several options could be considered, such as

- class sizes could be increased,
- all classrooms and spaces could be used during every instructional period with teachers "giving up" their prep time work spaces, and,
- other spaces, such as the media center, could be re-purposed.

## 4. What are the building options or amenities being proposed for 2,400 students at a single site and 1,200 students per building for two sites?

We have created a spreadsheet matrix showing the components of each. Some of these items are not fully determined. For instance, there may not be a pool at each if the dual site option is selected. It would be much more cost effective for the district to construct one shared pool for both schools. Another example would be the possibility of a shared career/tech education center. Standard amenities such as an auditorium, multi-station competition gymnasium, auxiliary gymnasium space, commons, etc. would all be included at any site regardless of number of students. Some of those components would be scaled up to accommodate the larger student population at a 2,400 student single site.

5.	What is the square footage per student for other high schools similar to Moorhead?
----	--

Community/High School	Actual Enrollment	Enrollment Capacity	Square Footage
Alexandria ■ Alexandria HS	1,288	1,400	285,000
Saint Cloud <ul> <li>Tech HS—NEW</li> <li>Apollo HS</li> </ul>	1,544 1,470	1,600 NA	318,000 NA
Edina • Edina HS	2,746	NA	557,600
Sartell <ul> <li>Sartell HS—NEW</li> </ul>	1,191	1,350	290,000
<ul> <li>Bismarck</li> <li>Bismarck Leg.</li> <li>Bismarck Cent.</li> <li>Bismarck HS</li> </ul>		1,200 1,200 1,600	280,000 280,000 300,000

#### 6. How would students go to school during a renovation of the current building?

New construction would most likely occur to the north of the existing school building and west of the Jim Gotta Stadium complex. This will displace a significant amount of parking during construction. Parking could be added to the field west of the high school prior to the start of construction to ease the disruption. New construction would need to be completed prior to removal of any existing building. Renovation to any existing areas would likely occur during the summer months. There will certainly be challenges working on an active school site, but the design and construction team will work with the district to make sure disruption is minimized and students are kept safe. The recent work at Horizon Middle School West is a good example of how active site management can minimize disruption. Safety is the number one priority in a case like this.

## 7. What would be the estimated operating and staffing costs in each of the three scenarios?

- a. Option 1 New Building/New Site \$13.2 million
- b. Option 2 Building Replacement/Existing Site \$13.2 million
- c. Option 3 Dual Site \$17.0 million [Over the course of a 25-year bond, the total cost would be \$145,837,057 based on an annual increase of 3 percent for each of the 25 years.]

## 8. How many acres is the current Moorhead High School site? What site size would be required for a new high school facility?

The current high school site is approximately 53 acres. Generally, 40 acres plus one [1] acre for every 100 students would be recommended for a new high school.

#### 9. What would it cost to tear down all of or part of Moorhead High School?

The cost to remove the existing building would be around \$1 to \$1.2 million.

## 10. What would be the construction schedule for each of the three options being considered?

A successful November 2019 referendum would allow for construction to start in the spring of 2020. A new school of this size will require 20-24 months to construct. Extensive renovations would need to occur over the summer months. New buildings and renovations would be complete Fall 2022.

## 11. What has been the enrollment and square footage at Moorhead High School by decade?

Year	Students	Square Footage
1968 (Opening)	1,559 (10-12)	238,800
1978	1,542 (10-12)	238,800
1988	1,413 (9-12)	238,800
1998	1,832 (9-12)	243,869
2008	1,630 (9-12)	334,385
2018	1,849 (9-12)	334,385

• Totals include non-instructional spaces such as food service, mechanical and custodial areas

• 2004 addition added 75,766 sq. ft. 9th grade center, cafeteria, fieldhouse, scene shop

<sup>•</sup> Sports Center is an additional 131,555 sq. ft. (not included above)

<sup>• 1991</sup> addition added 5,069 sq. ft.

<sup>• 1999</sup> addition added 14,750 sq. ft. West shop expansion, East orchestra room, health, LSS rooms

#### 12. What are the enrollment projections for Moorhead High School?

Moorhead Area Public Schools has utilized both external resources and internal enrollment processes to project future enrollments.

Year	Rinehart Study [5 Year Increments]	MAPS Projection For MHS	MHS Actual
2014-15	1,591		1,725
2015-16			1,811
2016-17			1,887
2017-18			1,911
2018-19		1,976	2,013
2019-20	1,702	1,995	TBD
2020-21		2,108	TBD
2021-22		2,227	TBD
2022-23		2,330	TBD
2023-24		NA	TBD
2024-25	2,198	NA	TBD

Actual enrollment at Moorhead High School has regularly surpassed projections made in the 2015 Rinehart Demographic Study and the annual projections made by Moorhead Area Public Schools.

#### 13. How will facility improvements impact learning?

Facility design elements can promote collaboration, problem solving, and critical thinking — key skills that students need to be successful when they graduate from high school. In addition, having flexible learning spaces facilitates personalization and authentic hands-on learning experiences.

#### 14. How can we ensure that all of the options meet the future Grade 9-12 enrollments?

At this time, planning for a 2,400-student high school or two 1,200-student high schools is a fluid process. A number of variables may result in future adjustments in those numbers. Certain known variables would make either 2,400 or 1,200 students workable:

- Currently, more than 100 students attend Moorhead's Area Learning Center.
- Facility design factors allow for more efficient use of space by reducing hallway square footage, locker bays or other design variables.
- Core spaces, such as lunchrooms, commons, auditoriums, etc., in a 2,400 student high school would be designed to house 2,600 students, or in a 1,200 student high school would be designed to house 1,300 students.
- The building would be designed to allow for easier expansion or addition of academic wings.

In any size high school, a key to programming is to create small learning communities within the school to assist with transitions and to ensure that each and every student feels connected to the school and to an adult. Planning and implementation is currently underway through the implementation of the "Portrait of a Moorhead High School Graduate" to implement curriculum and instructional methods designed to be interactive, paced and tailored to the individual student.

Title	Years	Purpose/Result
Future Focused Initiatives	2000-01	<ul><li>2002 Bond Referendum</li><li>District Reorganization</li></ul>
Strategic Planning	2006-07	<ul> <li>Plan Adopted by Board in August 2007</li> </ul>
Community Engagement Initiative	2012-13	<ul> <li>Developed Strategic Initiatives</li> </ul>
Facilities Task Force	2014-15	<ul> <li>Recommended by 2012-13 Community Engagement Initiative</li> <li>Facilities Master Plan</li> <li>2015 Bond Referendum</li> </ul>
MHS's 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Academic/Instructional Program	2016-17	<ul> <li>Developed Mission and Belief Statements</li> <li>Developed MHS's "Portrait of a Graduate"</li> </ul>

#### 15. What studies has Moorhead Area Public Schools commissioned in recent years?

#### 16. Under the Minnesota State High School League guidelines, what classes would Moorhead's high school compete in with Option 3 with dual high schools?

Under current MSHSL guidelines, each high school of 1,200 students would compete in the same classes in all activities, except for hockey, that the high school currently competes in. In boy's hockey, the schools could opt up to Class AA. In certain activities, the two high schools may have to combine teams to field teams that are able to compete.

#### 17. What are some of the benefits of a Career and Technical Center?

The development and implementation of a Career and Technical Center within Moorhead Area Public Schools could address several needs within the school district and across the Moorhead community and region. Among those needs are:

- meeting the responsibility of readying all Moorhead graduates for career, college and life choices;
- implementing Moorhead's "Portrait of a High School Graduate";
- assisting in meeting workforce needs in Moorhead and across the region, and;
- partnering with business organizations, governmental entities and higher education.

The following planning assumptions could guide the development and implementation of a Career and Technical Center:

- The Career and Technical Center would be located separately from a school site.
- A Career and Technical Center would be included in all three of the options currently being evaluated by the Facilities Task Force.
  - The inclusion of a separate Career and Technical Center will not increase the cost of any option.
  - Each option would allow for a reduction in square footage due to a number of students being at the Career and Technical Center.
- A portion of the cost for buying, renovating and equipping a Career and Technical Center may be covered through fundraising efforts of the Moorhead Schools Legacy Foundation.
- Moorhead Area Public Schools may partner with other educational agencies or higher education, such as the Clay County school districts, M-State, Lakes Country Service Cooperative, etc.
- Programming will be determined by Moorhead Area Public Schools but will reflect local and regional industry partners.
- Regional schools could access the Career and Technical Center through tuition agreements with Moorhead Area Public Schools.
- Workforce training opportunities could be offered to adult learners via the district's Community Education program through a fee structure.

#### 18. What is the purpose of the by-pass project and how is it being funded?

The project will reconstruct and realign the intersection of Main Ave/20th Street/21st Street intersection. Streets will pass under new bridges carrying railroad tracks, and a wye track will be added. The wye will eliminate delays at downtown crossings from trains backing up.

Benefits of the project outlined by the City of Moorhead are to improve safety and congestion for vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians and emergency services, and to improve freight operations and efficiency.

Budget figures provided by the City of Moorhead at its May 29, 2018 presentation include:

- As-bid cost: \$65,858,747
- Potential project modifications could drop costs to \$63,858,747
- Funding sources for the \$63.9 million:
  - State funding: \$46.262 million (72.4 percent)
  - BNSF: \$5.74 million (8.9 percent)
  - Municipal State Aid: \$3.96 million (6.2 percent)
  - County Road & Bridge: \$500,000 (.78 percent)
  - Special Assessments: \$1.1 million (1.72 percent)
  - General property tax debt levy: \$4.3 million (6.75 percent)
  - To be identified: \$2.038 million (3.25 percent)

Total construction which will last approximately three years began in 2018. During the first two years, the Main Ave/20th Street/21st Street intersection is closed to most or all traffic. During the third year, the primary impact is on First Avenue South.

## 19. Will participation in sports and other activities be limited by having one high school instead of two in Moorhead?

In a one high school option, participation in some varsity activities, such as hockey, basketball and volleyball, could be limited. However, participation numbers for all activities would likely be greater in a one high school setting. As an example, as enrollment increased over the last five years at MHS, the district has placed a priority on adding activities and levels of activities to serve the 9-12 student population. Activities have been added in Nordic Ski, Debate, Robotics, Weight Lifting, Skills USA, Adaptive Bowling, Lacrosse and Trap Shooting. Additionally, even though there can only be one varsity level team per activity per MSHSL rules, lower level teams have been added to programs, such JV2 for both Girls and Boys Soccer, and additional 9<sup>th</sup> grade teams have been created based on the number of participants in some activities.

#### 20. What are some additional factors that should be considered in the area of cocurricular activities with one high school versus two high schools in Moorhead?

First, in a two high school format, there would not be two high school programs in all activities. Currently, MHS offers thirty [30] MSHSL sponsored activities in fine arts and athletics. In a two high school district, it is projected that there would need to be one cooperative in nine [9] of the thirty [30] activities based on current and anticipated participation numbers in those activities.

Second, MHS operates as an independent and has no conference affiliation. It is challenging to create a schedule for each of the thirty [30] activities due to travel and schedule concerns for many of the schools willing to compete against MHS. With two high schools, the difficulty in scheduling would likely be an even greater challenge.

#### 21. What are the cost comparisons between the Moorhead and West Fargo projects?

		West Fargo HS		Moorhead HS
Total SF	205,000 SF		257,800	
	e	xcl. athletic complex	e	cluding pool and field
Cost per SF		\$203/SF		\$220/SF
Total Students		1,000		1,200
SF per Student		205		200/215 incl aud.
Subtotal	\$	44,780,000	\$	56,716,000
		incl. A/E, Conting., FFE	\$	6,805,920
Total High School Cost	\$	44,780,000	\$	63,521,920
2 year escalation	\$	3,582,400		included
discount for # of students		n/a		83%
Cost Comparison	\$	48,362,400	\$	52,723,194

## 22. How are we ensuring that a 2,400 student and a 2,600 core building will meet the future enrollment of Moorhead High School?

Year	High School Enrollment Projections	PSEO Projections	ALC Projections	Career/Tech Ed Projections	Actual High School Projection	High School Capacity	Remaining Capacity
2021-22	2,227	33	129	223	1,842	2,400	558
2022-23	2,330	34	135	227	1,934	2,400	466
2023-24	2,459	35	143	232	2,050	2,400	350
2024-25	2,496	36	145	236	2,079	2,400	321
2025-26	2,533	36	147	241	2,109	2,400	291
2026-27	2,571	37	149	246	2,139	2,400	261
2027-28	2,610	38	151	251	2,169	2,400	231
2028-29	2,649	39	154	256	2,200	2,400	200
2029-30	2,689	40	156	261	2,232	2,400	168
2030-31	2,729	41	158	266	2,263	2,400	137

Notes:

High School Enrollment Projections

- PSEO Projection participation factored by 2.5% increase using 2018-19 as initial number
- ALC Projection factored t 5.8% increase
- Students with Career/Technical Ed Projections factored at 2% increase
- Note: Career/Technical Ed Projections are based on current courses being offered at MHS. It is assumed that new additional courses will be added that will draw additional student enrollment, such as agriculture, architecture, auto collision, aviation, carpentry, horticulture, medical services, etc.

#### 23. What are the key findings and recommendation from the Springsted survey?

#### Findings:

- Support higher for expansion of current high school (68%) than for replacing with a new facility (51%).
- Very good support for security upgrades, classroom technology and flexible learning spaces.
- Strong support for tax increases at \$80 and below.
- Support drops quickly around the \$100 impact level.
- Support among Active and Very Active voters drops below margin of error at \$115-\$120 impact.

#### **Recommendation:**

• Facilities levy impact should be no higher than \$115 for an average home.

## 24. How accurate are the survey results in terms of predicting successful referendums? (Refer to appendix 10)

Between 2016 and 2018, 16 of 18 ballot proposals were successful. Twelve elections (67%) fell within or better than the survey's margin of error. Six elections (33%) had support lower than predicted by the survey. [See Appendix 10 - Survey Predictions v. Election Results: 2016-2018.]

## 25. How can we ensure that all student and staff needs are being met in a large high school of 2000 plus students?

The Moorhead Area School District is committed to implementing strategies that will create effective learning and teaching environments for all students and staff. Through the implementation of the "Portrait of a Moorhead Graduate," emphasis will focus on a place where all students and staff connect and feel safe. Some of the areas of focus will include increased personalized learning, relevance and rigor of coursework, teacher collaboration, and smaller learning communities within the school to help with transitions and make sure each student feels connected to and is known by a caring adult.

#### 26. What is the specific tax impact of each of the options?

Home Value: \$200,000.00			
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Total Cost	\$117,000,000.00	\$93,000,000.00	\$155,000,000.00
Annual Tax Impact	\$125.00	\$75.00	\$200.00
Career Academy Cost	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00
Combined Total	\$130,000,000.00	\$106,000,000.00	\$168,000,000.00
Combined Annual Tax Impact	\$150.00	\$100.00	\$225.00

#### 27. In Option 2, how would the current 9th grade space be used?

The current 9<sup>th</sup> grade space and field house will be incorporated as key focal points in the future high school design. This design will occur in the next phase.

#### 28. Is there a way to reduce the cost of the dual site option?

In order to reduce the cost of the dual site option, there would be a need to have minimal changes to the existing high school. A commitment of the school district is to have equitable facilities that reflect the design drivers established by the task force.

#### 29. In Option 3, would there be two identities [i.e., Spuds] for each high school?

In communities that have opted to have multiple high schools, each high school has had a separate identity.

