

MOTHER LODE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
FACILITY MASTER PLAN OPTIONS REVIEW MEETINGS-FEBRUARY 2016
QUESTION CARDS & RESPONSES

PLEASE NOTE: *These questions were generated during the process when 5 Options were available (see Presentation). Since the creation of **this** document our Board of Trustees have elected to proceed with Option #1 or Option #4 depending upon the outcome of the June 2016 (Local Bond) and November 2016 (State Bond) Election.*

Q 1). Why not combine the HGMS and District Administration/MERC Buildings to open up parking space?

Response: This proposal would add additional parking availability to the site, and would also significantly improve traffic circulation. Given the HGMS site space limitations, the combined building would need to be two stories with the associated required stairway(s) and an elevator. At the Board's direction, we can provide a cost estimate for this option; however this may be more costly endeavor that would take away from other improvements that can be made in other student areas on campus.

Q 2). If we go with Option #3, could the three current K portables go to HG to replace the oldest portables (there)?

Response: The three current Kindergarten portables at ICES are only about 5 years newer than those at Herbert Green, and therefore it is likely they could not be successfully moved to the HG site. In addition, they are the wrong dimensions and configuration needed to replace any of the current portables at HGMS.

Q 3). What would it look like if we occupied Charles Brown instead of ICES?

Response: If Charles Brown ES were reopened and reoccupied as a TK-4, it would require significant additional work. In addition to initial ADA work for the permanent buildings identified in the original Facilities Master Plan (approximately \$3.1M), occupying the site as a TK-4 instead as the original envisioned TK-2 campus would require modernizing the permanent building for student occupancy; and permitting and paving the District's property across Oak Dell Road as additional site parking. In addition, State School Bond funding eligibility for Charles Brown ES totals approximately \$490,000; State School

Bond funding eligibility for Indian Creek ES is approximately \$1,862,000. We would be forfeiting approximately \$1,370,000 in potential State matching fund with this option.

Q 4). We may need an additional K class allowance for the Option #2 on the back of the (ICES) campus.

Response: This can be included in the Option #2 scope and cost; it would add approximately \$235,000 to the cost of the option.

Q 5). Please include an adult bathroom in the area of Rms. 14-26 at ICES.

Response: This can be included in the potential modernization project scope for the site. These items could be a part of the design scoping and budget process for the site.

Q 6). Per Option #2; Can we revamp two K classrooms w/bathrooms and attach a “mini-gym” so that we could have a theater extended day/PE/morning going on instead of other places? This would be located on the K playground.

Response: I think what is being asked for here is an additional structure (including a bathroom) so that the activities noted can be done within the new Kindergarten complex. This can possibly be done, but would require additional ground space and add significant additional cost to the option.

Q 7). Needs (at ICES); How about improved drainage on grass playgrounds?

Covered parent pickup area?

Provide covered walkway by Rooms 25 & computer lab

Response: See Question/Response #8 below. The covered parent pickup area and walkway can be included in the potential modernization project scope for the site. These items could be a part of the design scoping and budget process for the site at an additional cost.

Q 8). Students often do not use the (ICES) fields (upper & lower) because they are wet. An expansion of the blacktop would be a great improvement, and make Option #2 more attractive.

Response: We can have the civil engineer look at field drainage as a part of the civil work for the site, and determine potential causes and solutions. Implementing any solution would need to be prioritized as part of the project site budgeting process.

Q 9). (Verbal expressed at ICES. Not submitted via cards but notable to have a written response as we were not able to address at the meeting) Paraphrase-“I would not vote for Option #2, or any option or bond expenditure, unless I knew exactly how many square feet of playground and play area would be included, and the location, in Option #2. This also shouldn’t affect the other students’ use of the playfields.”

Response: This question, as asked, cannot be fully answered until Option #2 is selected by the Board, and the Kindergarten site is fully designed. The estimated costs for buildings, playgrounds and pickup/drop-off areas are included in the Option #2 cost estimate; however, the District’s consultants are doing a preliminary design “takeoff” for the option, using CDE design standards and requirements, to determine exactly how many square feet of play area, parking and parent/bus drop-off would be needed, and what the potential configuration might be. The final answer would lie with the design team retained after passage of the State and local bonds.