



Hamilton County Schools | Facilities Master Plan

March 3, 2020

AGENDA

Hamilton County Schools

- 01 Priorities
- 02 Data
- 03 Community Engagement
- 04 Strategic Recommendations
- 05 Questions & Answers



Priorities

— VISION





Mission Statement

To create pathways to bright futures for all students in our community, by helping to equip them with the skills, knowledge and supports required to realize their full potential. **Hamilton County Schools** will become the fastest improving **district** in Tennessee.

May 15, 2019

Why does this plan support the HCS vision?

1997

Merger of Chattanooga Public Schools and Hamilton County Schools

Spring 2017

Initiated discussion of facility needs

Summer 2019

Develop Preliminary Look at Facilities Master Plan, focused on efficiency

Winter 2019

Revised Master Plan focused on academics, efficiency & community

1999

Facility Master Plan developed, focused on conditions of buildings

Spring 2019

Developed understanding of academic goals & building condition

Fall 2019

Conduct Community Engagement

Spring 2020

Potential School Board Adoption of 10-Year Plan



1937 Tyner HS built





HCS Future Ready 2023 Strategic Plan

Efficient & Effective Operations

Establish long-term plan for facilities maintenance and capital improvements.

...Our community has clearly articulated a desire for modernized buildings that are inviting spaces for students and staff. There is also population growth anticipated in the Chattanooga area that will necessitate additional school facilities to avoid further overcrowding in certain areas of the county. The district must create a capital plan to get ahead of these issues and respond to the community demand for modern facilities.

Action Steps:

- Develop a comprehensive building/maintenance plan to address deferred maintenance needs and create welcoming learning environments for all students.
- Create a long-term capital plan that accounts for anticipated growth across the district and creates a roadmap for new school construction, consolidation, and closures over the next 5-10 years.



HAMILTON COUNTY'S COMMUNITY VISION

Participants expressed an interest in providing opportunities for **academic excellence** equitably throughout the district.

Participants shared a strong preference for renovating existing facilities in order to **retain their neighborhood school**.

Participants indicated a strong appreciation for small schools because of the **close relationships with teachers**.

Participants recognized the **need for action** to address facilities issues, but they also were concerned that the community and its decision-makers will not provide the support needed to **ensure implementation** of a facilities master plan.

Hamilton County has a shared Academic Vision

The Master Plan is designed to support this vision through support of:

- Implementing 21st Century learning environments
- Provide safe and secure spaces to support all students
- Provide improved access to magnet and CTE programs throughout all of Hamilton County
- Strive for high quality environments that maintain community access
- Achievable and efficient projects that support the growth of the community



The Main Issue


The utilization, deferred maintenance, and condition of schools in Hamilton County is not sustainable:

- Capacity is a decision, not a definition
- Programmatic use of a school determines its instructional capacity, not its square footage
- Program drives the use of individual rooms.
- Grade configuration also drives the use of individual rooms, and, therefore, the programmatic use of the building.
- Square footage is appropriate in other settings, e.g. fire marshal or architectural design, but not when determining how to utilize a building for educational purposes
- Environments are to support learning and support a safe and healthy environment for all students

Reinvest in students

This is your opportunity!

- Create 21st Century learning spaces
- Provide equitable access
- Focus on student's and the community's future



DATA

— DATA FINDINGS




Gather and report data:

Project Goals

- Facility functionality and condition
- Capacity and utilization
- Facility operating costs
- Community Input and Feedback
- Educational trends and impact
 - Develop priorities
 - Create possible scenarios and budgets
 - Develop short- and long-range recommendations for planning



Historical PKI2 Enrollment and Projection




Utilization Results 2018/19

Grade Band	Low	High	Average
Elementary	51%	128%	93%
Middle	51%	104%	75%
Middle/High	53%	90%	81%
High	55%	119%	84%

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space

2028 Projected Utilization



Facility Assessment – Educational Suitability and Technology Readiness



Educational Suitability & Technology Readiness Reference Guide

Prepared for Hamilton County Department of Education
Final
 March 18, 2019

GENERAL CLASSROOMS

System	Component	Description	What to Look For
General Classrooms	Environment	The rooms should provide an inviting and stimulating environment for learning.	Spatial Configuration (immovable): Does it support the instructional program? Classrooms should have flexible spaces for group learning. Lighting: Appropriate natural light/lighting levels? Acoustics: Are there impediments to hearing the teacher? Is there noise transfer between classrooms? HVAC/Temperature: Is there proper ventilation and consistent and adequate climate control? Aesthetics: Are the room finishes/equipment worn and/or dated?
	Size	The rooms should meet the square footage standards. K-1: 850 SF with sinks 2-5: 850 SF 6-12: 750 SF	EXCEL: 90-100% of the room(s) meet standards GOOD: 80-89% of the room(s) meet standards FAIR: 65-79% of the room(s) meet standards POOR: 50-64% of the room(s) meet standards UNSAT: <50% of the room(s) meet standards
	Location	The rooms should be appropriately located for the program.	A room that is appropriately located and shielded from noise-producing activities or functions.
	Storage/Fixed Equip	The rooms should have adequate storage space and fixed equipment appropriate to the program.	Storage: Permanent casework and space for teaching materials and records. Fixed Equipment: One wall of cabinets in K-5 only , counters at age-appropriate height, sinks in K and 1st , a locked wardrobe cabinet. There should be technology equipment appropriate to the program. Visual and audio alarm system in every classroom at Hixson ES/MS/HS .

Examples of general classrooms:



Facility Assessment

Four Assessments

- Building Condition
- Grounds Condition
- Educational Suitability
- Technology Readiness

One Combined Score (50/30/10/10 Weighted Average) for prioritization purposes



Facility Assessment – Reports



Building Condition Assessment

School Name: Allen ES
Bldg. Name: Main Bldg

Uniformat Category	Rating	Score	Rep
Equipment and Furnishings		0.16	\$
Equipment		0.16	\$
E1020 Institutional Equipment	Good	0.16	

10/15/2019

Page 3 of 3



Building Condition Assessment

School Name: Allen ES
Bldg. Name: Main Bldg

Uniformat Category	Rating	Score	Rep
Interior Finishes		13.17	\$293,405.20
C3020 Floor Finishes	Good	4.89	\$10,318.93
C3030 Ceiling Finishes	Good	4.81	\$10,318.93
Services		29.36	\$1,324,480.00
Plumbing		3.98	\$480,000.00
D2010 Plumbing Fixtures	Fair	3.05	\$40,000.00
D2020 Domestic Water Distribution	Good	0.45	\$1,000.00
D2040 Rain Water Drainage	Fair	0.48	\$60,000.00
HVAC		12.77	\$563,480.00
D3000 Cooling Generating Systems	Good	3.13	\$60,000.00
D3010 Energy Supply	Good	3.38	\$70,000.00
D3020 Heat Generating Systems	Good	2.50	\$50,000.00
D3040 Distribution Systems	Good	3.13	\$60,000.00
D3050 Terminal & Package Units	N/A	0.00	\$0.00
D3060 Controls and Instrumentation	Unsat	0.00	\$27,000.00
D3070 Systems Testing and Balancing	Good	0.63	\$1,000.00
Fire Protection		2.15	\$42,000.00
D4010 Sprinklers	Good	1.86	\$40,000.00
D4020 Standpipes	Good	0.29	\$2,000.00
Electrical		10.46	\$233,480.00
D5010 Electrical Service and Distribution	Good	0.69	\$1,000.00
D5020 Lighting and Branch Wiring	Good	7.23	\$16,318.93
D5030 Communications and Security	Good	2.48	\$55,196.42
D5090 Other Electrical Systems	Good	0.06	\$1,393.85

10/15/2019

Page 2 of 3



Building Condition Assessment



School Name: Allen ES
Bldg. Name: Main Bldg

Condition Score (%): 81.61
Repair Budget: \$3,630,419
Year Built: 2002
GSF: 75,780
Stories: 1

Uniformat Category	Rating	Score	Repair Budget	Comment
Substructure		7.23	\$161,128.94	
Foundations		7.23	\$161,128.94	
A1010 Standard Foundations	Good	3.56	\$79,310.00	
A1030 Slab on Grade	Good	3.67	\$81,818.93	
Shell		25.46	\$1,676,660.89	
Superstructure		11.56	\$257,443.90	
B1010 Floor Construction	Good	0.89	\$19,792.65	
B1020 Roof Construction	Good	10.67	\$237,651.24	
Enclosure		10.48	\$961,477.00	
B2010 Exterior Walls	Fair	6.16	\$822,928.41	There are areas around this building which have excessive deterioration due to water penetration.
B2020 Exterior Windows	Good	3.94	\$87,812.48	
B2030 Exterior Doors	Fair	0.38	\$50,736.10	There are some door panels around this building that have excessive wear due to direct exposure to the elements.
Roofing		3.42	\$457,739.99	
B3010 Roof Coverings	Fair	3.42	\$457,739.99	There are areas with suspected failure in flashing and fascia that is evident in the water damage found on some of the walls and soffits.
B3020 Roof Openings	N/A	0.00	\$0.00	
Interiors		18.12	\$464,291.08	
Interior Construction		4.95	\$170,885.88	
C1010 Partitions	Good	3.30	\$73,595.22	
C1020 Interior Doors	Good	1.11	\$24,810.51	
C1030 Fittings	Fair	0.54	\$72,480.14	There are small amounts of graffiti which the cleaning/scraping and repair has worn the finish from the panel causing early deterioration.
Interior Finishes		13.17	\$293,405.20	
C3010 Wall Finishes	Good	3.47	\$77,358.62	

10/15/2019

Page 1 of 3



Facility Assessment Results


Assessment	Low	High	Average
Building Condition	44%	97%	76%
Educational Suitability	42%	94%	72%
Technology Readiness	48%	100%	82%
Grounds Condition	16%	96%	71%

Estimated cost does not include or account for costs associated with adding capacity or costs savings associated with school closure.


Cost estimate does not include additional costs from inflation due to project phasing.

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory


Percent and Count of Schools by Assessment Type and Score Rating




Building Condition Score




Education Suitability Score




Technology Readiness Score



Site Score



Combined Scores



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT



PUBLIC INPUT

— An Engaged Community

Community Engagement

December 2019:

5 different locations/3 nights

Response to efficient plan, open forum, opportunity for crowd feedback with clicker response

January 2020:

2 different locations/2 nights

Response to updated Master Plan, Breakout sessions

Focus Groups

December 2019:

2 focus groups, parents

January 2020:

4 focus groups (2 teachers & principals, 1 hearing from magnet school parents & 1 from recommendations of school board members)

Online Surveys (2)

4,569 respondents completing every question





COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

December 2019

Participants expressed an interest in providing opportunities for **academic excellence** equitably throughout the district.

Participants shared a strong preference for renovating existing facilities in order to **retain their neighborhood schools**.

Participants indicated a strong appreciation for small schools because of the **close relationships with teachers**.

Participants recognized the **need for action** to address facilities issues but were concerned that the community and its decision-makers will not provide the support needed to **ensure implementation** of a facilities master plan.



ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY FEEDBACK January 2020

Support **equitable academic environments** throughout the county to include safe learning environments, sense of community.

Favored interested in **high academic standards** providing a small student to teacher ratios to support intimate environments.

Support **Tyner middle and high school** new and merger.

Favorability to the investment into **Normal Park** providing renovation and update.


Recognize need to address **deficiency issues of academic environments** but there is a concern there won't be community support.

Magnet Programs will remain, effort is to improve environments and increase capacity to offer opportunity to more Hamilton County residents.....

ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY FEEDBACK January 2020 CONTINUED...

Concern of unknown locations...

- CCA to be located in close adjacency to downtown Chattanooga arts resources
- CSLA need for improved academic environments
- CSAS to be located centrally to support access by families



Strategy

— Recommendations by Region



Recommendations by Western Region

Site Name	Size (Acres)	Weighted Building Condition Score	Suitability Score	Technology Score	Grounds Score	Combined Score (50/30/10/10)	2018-19 K-12 Enroll	2028 K-12 Projected Enroll	MGT K-12 Capacity (Excl Portables)	MGT 2018-19 Utilization	MGT 2028-29 Projected Utilization
Sequoyah HS	57	83%	77%	83%	80%	81%	299	297	480	62%	62%
Allen ES	15	82%	94%	98%	87%	87%	494	514	590	84%	87%
Daisy ES	See Soddy D	86%	58%	80%	90%	78%	377	334	423	89%	79%
Loftis MS	See McConn	82%	84%	58%	69%	79%	614	588	737	83%	80%
McConnell ES	50	75%	42%	51%	64%	61%	514	524	635	81%	83%
Middle Valley_Ganns ES	17	97%	86%	95%	96%	93%	784	818	869	90%	94%
N. Hamilton County ES	130	73%	72%	68%	86%	74%	374	400	459	81%	87%
Sale Creek MS_HS	12	88%	68%	73%	90%	81%	542	618	671	81%	92%
Soddy Daisy HS	65	75%	76%	90%	70%	77%	1,156	1,192	1,526	76%	78%
Soddy Daisy MS	35	66%	67%	54%	74%	66%	412	348	654	63%	53%
Soddy ES	9	91%	71%	98%	88%	85%	459	495	531	86%	93%
Dupont ES	13	63%	73%	73%	70%	68%	313	342	351	89%	97%
Hixson ES	17	78%	63%	95%	67%	74%	425	419	473	90%	89%

Unsatisfactory/Poor	Fair	Good/Excellent
Number of schools: 5	Number of schools: 9	Number of schools: 10

3	9	12

Combined Score Key

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory

Projected Utilization Key

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space

Recommendations by Western Region

Site Name	Size (Acres)	Weighted Building Condition Score	Suitability Score	Technology Score	Grounds Score	Combined Score (50/30/10/10)	2018-19 K-12 Enroll	2028 K-12 Projected Enroll	MGT K-12 Capacity (Excl Portables)	MGT 2018-19 Utilization	MGT 2028-29 Projected Utilization
Big Ridge ES	22	84%	62%	63%	70%	74%	496	504	473	105%	107%
Hixson HS	43	72%	61%	56%	56%	66%	887	1,018	1,167	76%	87%
Hixson MS	26	89%	94%	100%	89%	92%	653	732	839	78%	87%
Alpine Crest ES	17	68%	68%	90%	68%	70%	290	287	320	91%	90%
Nolan ES	259	90%	79%	85%	90%	86%	650	752	734	89%	103%
Red Bank ES	25	85%	82%	98%	88%	86%	558	539	702	79%	77%
Red Bank HS	37	72%	82%	85%	76%	76%	793	864	1,147	69%	75%
Red Bank MS	15	89%	94%	88%	90%	91%	579	600	839	69%	71%
Rivermont ES	10	62%	42%	48%	60%	55%	317	427	392	81%	109%
Signal Mountain MS_HS	See Nolan El	89%	93%	90%	90%	90%	1,294	1,412	1,700	76%	83%
Thrasher ES	17	78%	68%	78%	65%	73%	564	601	545	104%	110%

Unsatisfactory/Poor	Fair	Good/Excellent
Number of schools: 5	Number of schools: 9	Number of schools: 10

3	9	12

Combined Score Key

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory

Projected Utilization Key

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space



Recommendations by Region

Western Region

Close:

- Soddy Daisy MS, move to current Daisy ES
- Alpine Crest ES, move students to Dupont ES
- Rivermont ES, move students to Dupont ES

Renovation and Additions:

- Big Ridge – Renovate & Add Capacity (150)
- Thrasher ES – Renovate and Add capacity (400)
- Soddy ES – Rename Soddy Daisy ES, Accommodate Students from Daisy ES, Renovate and Add capacity (377)

New Construction:

- Dupont ES – Demolish & build new K-5 ES (1200 capacity)

Repurpose:

- Daisy ES – Renovate and Convert to Soddy Daisy MS, see Soddy ES for new location of Daisy ES students



Recommendations by Region

Western Region (continued)

Renovate:

- Sale Creek MS/HS – Original part of building
- North Hamilton County ES
- Soddy Daisy HS
- McConnell ES
- Hixson ES
- Hixson HS
- Red Bank HS

Other:

- Loftis MS – Address grounds deficiencies

No Changes:

- Allen ES
- Middle Valley ES
- Hixson MS
- Signal Mountain MS/HS
- Red Bank ES
- Red Bank MS
- Sequoyah HS



Recommendations by Southern Region

Site Name	Size (Acres)	Weighted Building Condition Score	Suitability Score	Technology Score	Grounds Score	Combined Score (50/30/10/10)	2018-19 K-12 Enroll	2028 K-12 Projected Enroll	MGT K-12 Capacity (Excl Portables)	MGT 2018-19 Utilization	MGT 2028-29 Projected Utilization
Bess T. Shepherd ES	11	78%	68%	85%	76%	75%	514	534	518	99%	103%
Hillcrest ES	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	290	299	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harrison ES	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	413	458	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lakeside ES	1	66%	63%	88%	69%	67%	393	321	432	91%	74%
CSLA (K-8)	36	44%	63%	78%	49%	54%	452	473	344	131%	137%
Stem I & II	-	90%	66%	98%	80%	83%	277	298	409	68%	73%
East Side ES	10	88%	70%	98%	80%	83%	575	602	639	90%	94%
Tyner Academy (HS)	22	57%	70%	75%	16%	58%	506	489	761	66%	64%
Tyner MS	10	47%	69%	83%	39%	56%	464	494	688	67%	72%
Woodmore ES	10	71%	66%	63%	65%	68%	274	243	423	65%	57%
East Ridge ES	11	88%	81%	90%	70%	84%	959	1,061	914	105%	116%
East Ridge HS	33	59%	76%	88%	34%	64%	815	842	1,003	81%	84%
East Ridge MS	See East Rid	71%	64%	65%	57%	67%	672	722	694	97%	104%
Spring Creek ES	16	75%	58%	88%	67%	70%	627	666	702	89%	95%
Dalewood MS	21	69%	79%	98%	85%	77%	344	357	667	52%	53%
Hardy ES	1	86%	80%	98%	80%	85%	425	410	603	70%	68%
Calvin Donaldson & Annex (ES)	9	77%	75%	98%	90%	80%	414	409	446	93%	92%
Clifton Hills ES	13	78%	52%	90%	76%	71%	570	651	468	122%	139%

Unsatisfactory/Poor	Fair	Good/Excellent			
Number of schools: 16	Number of schools: 7	Number of schools: 11	18	7	7

Combined Score Key

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory

Projected Utilization Key

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space

Recommendations by Southern Region (continued)

Site Name	Size (Acres)	Weighted Building Condition Score	Suitability Score	Technology Score	Grounds Score	Combined Score (50/30/10/10)	2018-19 K-12 Enroll	2028 K-12 Projected Enroll	MGT K-12 Capacity (Excl Portables)	MGT 2018-19 Utilization	MGT 2028-29 Projected Utilization
East Lake ES	4	87%	75%	98%	79%	84%	540	647	513	105%	126%
East Lake MS (Academy)	5	83%	77%	95%	77%	82%	597	705	572	104%	123%
Howard HS	40	84%	73%	74%	90%	80%	986	1,115	854	115%	131%
Orchard Knob ES	7	86%	80%	98%	88%	86%	468	491	576	81%	85%
Orchard Knob MS	16	57%	76%	90%	57%	66%	441	481	678	65%	71%
Barger ES	9	48%	61%	73%	46%	54%	398	386	347	115%	111%
Brainerd HS	53	63%	74%	100%	40%	68%	601	654	1,085	55%	60%
CSAS	13	56%	64%	70%	60%	60%	1,034	1,044	1,506	69%	69%
Ctr For Creative Arts_Chatt HS	34	63%	72%	65%	30%	63%	583	655	731	80%	90%
Normal Park (Lower)	3	63%	52%	58%	60%	59%	465	489	365	128%	134%
Normal Park (Upper)	8	68%	57%	67%	64%	64%	325	358	652	50%	55%
Battle Academy ES	3	90%	93%	93%	80%	90%	368	396	432	85%	92%
Brown Academy ES	3	89%	86%	83%	90%	87%	231	160	455	51%	35%
Lookout Mountain ES	4	77%	58%	65%	62%	68%	157	134	257	61%	52%
Lookout Valley ES	15	82%	60%	55%	90%	73%	288	297	320	90%	93%
Lookout Valley MS/HS	33	80%	71%	75%	90%	78%	325	312	608	53%	51%
Dawn Program	10	60%	60%	85%	43%	61%	N/A	N/A	294	N/A	N/A
Washington Alternative	18	83%	59%	90%	73%	75%	N/A	N/A	188	N/A	N/A

Unsatisfactory/Poor	Fair	Good/Excellent
Number of schools: 16	Number of schools: 7	Number of schools: 11

18	7	7

Combined Score Key

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory

Projected Utilization Key

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space

Recommendations by Region

Southern Region

Close:

- Normal Park (Upper) -Move students to CCA building, see additions
- Normal Park (Lower) -Move students to CCA building, see additions
- Lakeside ES – Close site
- Tyner MS – Close site
- CSAS – Close site – Program to move to Brainerd HS Site
- Clifton Hills ES – Close site
- Dawn Program – Close site, relocate exception education program

Additions:

- Harrison ES – Add capacity for 200
- Bess T. Shepard ES – Renovate, add capacity for 300
- Spring Creek ES – Renovate, add capacity for 300
- Calvin Donaldson ES – Renovate, add capacity for 100
- Normal Park (old CCA site) – Renovate, add capacity for 280 add grades 6-12 (total K-12)



Recommendations by Region

Southern Region (continued)

New Construction:

- Orchard Knob MS – Demolish existing building and construct new 1000 capacity MS
- Tyner MS/HS – Demolish existing building and construct new 1500 capacity MS/HS
- New CTE center - Demolish existing Barger building. Build new CTE center on site
- New ES (replace Clifton Hills) - Build new 1000 student K-5 school
- New ES – Build new 1000 student K-5 on CSLA site
- Brainerd HS – New school for 800 students on Dalewood site (Dalewood students to Orchard Knob)
- CSLA – Add K-5 & 6-12 programs at new location, new capacity 1300 students.
- CCA – Add K-5 & 6-12 programs at new location, new capacity 1300 students.
- CSAS – Add K-5 & 6-12 programs at new location, new capacity 1300 students.




Recommendations by Region

Southern Region (continued)

Renovate:

- Bess T Shepherd
- Calvin Donaldson
- East Ridge MS – move 100 students to East Hamilton MS
- East Ridge HS
- Lookout Valley ES
- Lookout Mountain ES
- Woodmore ES
- Spring Creek ES
- Lookout Valley MS/HS, address capacity by rezoning students from Howard HS
- Washington Alternative – Repurpose. Relocate alternative program to Hillcrest ES building.
- Hillcrest ES – Repurpose as alternative program



Recommendations by Region

Southern Region (continued)

Other:

- Battle Academy ES – Convert to K-2 building
- Brown Academy ES – Convert to 3-5 building

No Changes:

- Howard HS
- STEM
- Orchard Knob ES
- Hard ES
- East Ridge ES
- East lake ES
- East Lake MS



Recommendations for the Eastern Region

Site Name	Size (Acres)	Weighted Building Condition Score	Suitability Score	Technology Score	Grounds Score	Combined Score (50/30/10/10)	2018-19 K-12 Enroll	2028 K-12 Projected Enroll	MGT K-12 Capacity (Excl Portables)	MGT 2018-19 Utilization	MGT 2028-29 Projected Utilization
Brown MS	See Central I	75%	72%	68%	90%	75%	494	548	648	76%	85%
Central HS	51	74%	70%	88%	61%	73%	838	791	839	100%	94%
Hunter MS	49	84%	82%	83%	72%	82%	803	922	1,117	72%	83%
Ooltewah ES	31	88%	91%	100%	80%	89%	995	1,367	1,017	98%	134%
Ooltewah HS	45	79%	67%	63%	66%	72%	1,525	1,860	1,511	101%	123%
Ooltewah MS	47	74%	73%	95%	66%	75%	796	941	951	84%	99%
Snow Hill ES	See Hamitlo	82%	TBD	TBD	60%	TBD	502	511	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wallace A. Smith ES	31	89%	74%	70%	90%	83%	631	589	702	90%	84%
Apison ES	42	88%	81%	98%	79%	86%	546	597	630	87%	95%
East Brainerd ES	21	87%	83%	100%	89%	88%	1,070	1,267	1,089	98%	116%
East Hamilton MS_HS	80	88%	85%	100%	74%	87%	1,666	1,875	1,917	87%	98%
Westview ES	15	89%	83%	88%	90%	87%	545	550	522	104%	105%
Wolftever ES	See Ooltewa	90%	85%	98%	85%	89%	579	689	626	93%	110%
Hamilton Co. HS (Harrison Bay Voc.)	62	63%	72%	83%	80%	70%	99	N/A	375	26%	N/A

Unsatisfactory/Poor

Fair

Good/Excellent

Number of schools: 0

Number of schools: 5

Number of schools: 8

4

4

4

Combined Score Key

COMBINED SCORES	DESCRIPTION
> 90%	Excellent/Like New
80 - 89	Good
70 - 79	Fair
60 - 69	Poor
< 60	Unsatisfactory

Projected Utilization Key

UTILIZATION	DESCRIPTION
> 110	Inadequate Space
95 - 110	Approaching Inadequate Space
80 - 95	Adequate Space
70 - 80	Approaching Inefficient Use of Space
< 70	Inefficient Use of Space

Recommendations by Region

Eastern Region

Additions :

- Wallace A. Smith ES – Renovate to address suitability deficiencies, add 250 capacity

New Construction:


- New ES – new ES likely needed in southern part of Apison region to accommodate growth, 1,200 student capacity

Repurpose:

- East Hamilton HS – repurpose as East Hamilton HS following completion of East Hamilton MS in 2020.

Renovate:

- Brown MS
- Central HS
- Ooltewah MS
- Ooltewah HS
- Hamilton County HS



Recommendations by Region

Eastern Region (continued)

Other:

- Hunter MS – address grounds deficiencies

No Changes:

- East Hamilton MS
- Apison ES
- Wolftever ES
- Westview ES
- Ooltewah ES
- East Brainerd ES
- Snow Hill ES



Recommendations for Phase 0

PHASE	SITE NAME	RECOMMENDATION	NEW CONSTRUCTION/ ADDN FOR CAPACITY	SCHOOL TOTAL
PHASE 0				
0	CSLA (K-12)	Relocate CSLA program to new school at new site	1,300	\$ 11,000,000
0	New site for CSLA	New site		\$ -
0	Lakeside ES	Close, students to new Harrison.		\$ -
0	Harrison ES	Addition, balance utilization with Hillcrest and Lakeside.	200	\$ 3,000,000
PHASE 0 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL				\$ 14,000,000

Recommendations for Phase I

PHASE	SITE NAME	RECOMMENDATION	NEW CONSTRUCTION/ ADDN FOR CAPACITY	SCHOOL TOTAL
PHASE 1				
1	Alpine Crest ES	Close, merge with Dupont and Rivermont at DuPont site		\$ -
1	Clifton Hills ES	Close, students to new school (Clifton Hills site)		\$ -
1	Normal Park (Lower)	Close, students to renovated CCA site		\$ -
1	Normal Park (Upper)	Close, students to renovated CCA site		\$ -
1	Rivermont ES	Close, students to new Dupont		\$ -
1	East Ridge HS	Renovation		\$ 31,311,400
1	East Ridge MS	Renovation, balance utilization with East Hamilton MS		\$ 10,501,400
1	New ES, replacement for Clifton Hills	New, students from Clifton Hills, balance utilization with Eastlake	1,000	\$ 35,421,600
1	New ES site, Clifton Hills replacement	New site, verify Clifton Hills location		\$ -
1	New elementary school on CSLA site (K-5)	New ES, students from E. Brainerd ES, Woodmore, Eastridge, and Barger	1,000	\$ 35,421,600
1	New downtown site for CCA	New site		\$ -
1	Orchard Knob MS (includes Dalewood)	Replace with New MS, balance utilization with Dalewood and East Lake	1,200	\$ 49,808,700
1	Tyner Academy (HS)	Replace to 6-12, students from Tyner MS	1,500	\$ 74,287,500
1	Tyner MS	Close, students to new Tyner 6-12		\$ -
1	Wallace A. Smith ES	Renovation Suit Only and Addition, balance utilization with Ooletwah ES	300	\$ 13,955,600
1	CCA / New Normal Park	Repurpose, Renovation for Normal Park, Renovate and Addition new K-12.	280	\$ 37,501,300
1	New School for CCA	New School K-12 program.	1,300	\$ 46,048,100
1	Dupont ES	New/Replace, consider land purchase. Students from Alpine Crest and Rivermont.	1,200	\$ 42,505,900
1	New Apison region elementary site	New site		\$ -
PHASE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL				\$377,859,437

Recommendations for Phase 2

PHASE	SITE NAME	RECOMMENDATION	NEW CONSTRUCTION/ ADDN FOR CAPACITY	SCHOOL TOTAL
PHASE 2				
2	Bess T. Shepherd ES	Renovation		\$ 6,238,400
2	Woodmore ES	Renovation, balance utilization with East Ridge and Barger		\$ 7,478,600
2	Hamilton Co. HS (Harrison Bay Voc.)	Renovation, Regional CTE Ctr		\$ 9,789,200
2	Hillcrest ES	Repurpose, Renovation		\$ 12,857,460
2	Lookout Mountain ES	Renovation		\$ 7,153,100
2	McConnell ES	Renovation		\$ 8,253,700
2	Sale Creek MS_HS	Renovate old section of building (66%)		\$ 5,518,200
2	Big Ridge ES	Renovation and addition	150	\$ 11,936,600
2	Brainerd K-12 (New CSAS)	Repurpose to CSAS, New Campus for CSAS students K-12. Brainerd students to new school at Dalewood site.	1,300	\$ 54,056,900
2	Dalewood MS (New Brainerd)	New Brainerd HS	800	\$ 33,265,800
2	Hixson ES	Renovation		\$ 8,642,900
2	Hixson HS	Renovation, new gym		\$ 50,736,100
2	Loftis MS	Renovation Grounds Only		\$ 1,820,700
2	Lookout Valley ES	Renovation Suit and Tech Only		\$ 2,092,400
2	N. Hamilton County ES	Renovation		\$ 6,122,300
2	Ooltewah MS	Renovation, balance utilization with New East Hamilton MS.		\$ 11,718,700
2	Thrasher ES	Renovation and Addition, balance utilization with Nolan	400	\$ 23,124,200
PHASE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL				\$260,805,260

Recommendations for Phase 3

PHASE	SITE NAME	RECOMMENDATION	NEW CONSTRUCTION/ ADDN FOR CAPACITY	SCHOOL TOTAL
PHASE 3				
3	Barger ES (New regional CTE)	Closed/Repurpose as New Regional CTE Site. Fine arts students to new CCA, Neighborhood students to new ES at CSLA/Woodmore		\$ 18,994,000
3	Soddy Daisy MS	Close, students to new Soddy Daisy MS on Daisy ES site.		\$ -
3	Calvin Donaldson & Annex (ES)	Renovation		\$ 6,249,100
3	New Apison region ES (Evaluate)	Balance utilization with East Brainerd, Wolftever, Bess T Shepherd	1,200	\$ 42,505,900
3	Brown MS	Renovation		\$ 9,733,500
3	Central HS	Renovation		\$ 16,562,800
3	Daisy ES (New Soddy Daisy MS)	Renovation, Repurpose to Soddy Daisy MS, students to Soddy Daisy ES		\$ 13,674,200
3	Howard HS	In Progress and Addition, balance utilization with Lookout Valley MS/HS	250	\$ 11,435,200
3	Hunter MS	Renovation Grounds Only		\$ 2,105,100
3	Lookout Valley MS/HS	Renovation, Balance utilization with Howard HS		\$ 8,903,700
3	Ooltewah HS	Renovation, balance utilization with East Hamilton MS/HS		\$ 25,048,500
3	Red Bank HS	Renovation		\$ 22,041,100
3	Soddy Daisy HS	Renovate		\$ 21,904,700
3	Soddy ES	Rename Soddy Daisy ES and Addition, students from Daisy ES.	377	\$ 14,689,400
3	Spring Creek ES	Renovation and Addition, balance utilization with Eastridge.	250	\$ 18,148,200
3	Washington Alternative	Renovation, Repurpose and relocate		\$ 7,896,300
PHASE 3 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL				\$239,891,700


Summary by Phase

PHASE	SITE NAME	RECOMMENDATION	NEW CONSTRUCTION/ ADDN FOR CAPACITY	SCHOOL TOTAL
PHASE 0				
			PHASE 0 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL	\$14,000,000
PHASE 1				
			PHASE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL	\$376,763,100
PHASE 2				
			PHASE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL	\$260,805,260
PHASE 3				
			PHASE 3 RECOMMENDATIONS TOTAL	\$239,891,700
			ALL PHASES TOTAL	\$891,460,060


Summary

Action	Quantity	Schools
New Building	11	CSLA, New ES (Clifton Hills), New ES (CSLA site), Orchard MS (Dalewood students), Tyner HS/MS, CCA, Dupont (Alpine Crest & Rivermont students), New ES (Apison region), CSAS (Brainerd site), Brainerd HS (Dalewood site), Regional CTE (Barger site)
Renovation	27	East Ridge HS, East Ridge MS, Normal Park (CCA), Bess T Shepherd ES, Woodmore ES, Hamilton Co. HS, Hillcrest (repurpose), Lookout Mountain ES, McConnell ES, Sale Creek MS/HS (66%), Hixson ES, Hixson HS (new gym), Loftis MS (grounds), Lookout Valley ES, N Hamilton Cty ES, Ooltewah MS, Calvin Donaldson, Brown MS, Central HS, Daisy ES (new Soddy-Daisy MS), Howard HS, Hunter MS, Lookout Valley MS/HS, Ooltewah HS, Red Bank HS, Soddy Daisy HS, Washington Alt (repurpose)
Increased Capacity (Addition/Renovation)	6	Harrison ES, Wallace A Smith, Big Ridge ES, Thrasher ES, Soddy ES (Daisy ES students) rename Soddy Daisy, Spring Creek ES
New Location/Sites	4	CSLA, CCA, New ES (Apison region), CSAS
Closed Sites	9	Tyner MS, CSAS, Alpine Crest, Rivermont, Lakeside ES, Normal Park (Upper), Normal Park (Lower), Dawn Program, Soddy Daisy MS


What Does Change Look Like?




2028 Master Plan Implemented Projected Utilization



What Does Change Look Like?



Combined Scores Post Master Plan Percent and Count of Schools by Rating





THANK YOU

The MGT Difference