



# JOINT ASSEMBLY/JSD FACILITIES COMMITTEE AGENDA

September 26, 2023 at 12:00 PM

City Hall Conference Room 224/Zoom Webinar

---

Zoom Link: <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/81449931245> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 814 4993 1245

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

**C. ROLL CALL**

**D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. August 03, 2023 - Regular Meeting

**F. INFORMATION ITEMS**

2. Summary of August 3, 2023, meeting and 2023 committee work

a. Year in Review: 2023 Goals & Committee Work for Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee

3. Presentation by JYW/ Ericson & Associates on proposed updates to 2017 Draft JSD Facilities Master Plan

**G. ITEMS FOR ACTION**

4. Next steps towards completion and adoption of Facility Master Plan

5. Draft Matrix Key (V9.26.2023)

**H. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, TDD 586-5351, e-mail: [city.clerk@juneau.org](mailto:city.clerk@juneau.org).

# JOINT ASSEMBLY/JSD FACILITIES COMMITTEE MINUTES - DRAFT



August 03, 2023 at 12:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

---

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/81449931245> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 814 4993 1245

- A. **CALL TO ORDER** - 12:02 p.m.
- B. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** – Read by Ms. Woll
- C. **ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Mayor Weldon; Chair Hale; Ms. Woll; Ms. Sorensen; Mr. Holst; Ms. Gladziszewski; Mr. Muldoon (joined 12:09 p.m.)

City & Borough of Juneau Staff Members Present: Katie Koester, EPW Director; Breckan Hendricks, Administrative Officer;

School District Staff Present: Frank Hauser, Superintendent; Cassie Olin, Administrative Services Director;

- D. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – approved
- E. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - approved
  - 1. June 28, 2023 - Regular Meeting
- F. **ITEMS FOR ACTION** - none

## G. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- 2. Summary of June 28, 2023, meeting – Presented by Ms. Hale
  - a. 2023 Goals for Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee

Ms. Hale – It is already August and time is getting short. Would like to add a second meeting in September. There is a need to forward a prioritized plan for facilities major maintenance.

- 3. Draft School Facilities Evaluation Matrix Version 8.03.23 – Matrix key presented by Katie Koester

Ms. Koester – Introduced the key and explained the items marked with asterisk (\*) are the items with changes based on discussion at the last meeting.

Ms. Hale – Could you explain how you see the matrix being populated? Ms. Koester - Staff would work with Superintendent Hauser to create a draft to bring back to the committee for discussion.

Ms. Gladziszewski - Feels there is value in staff filling out the matrix with details and leaving less of it abstract. Ms. Hale – Time is short and there may not be time for that level of detail.

Ms. Hale – Asked Superintendent Hauser his thoughts on filling out the matrix in more detail. This could be helpful but school start is a busy time. They can start some of the work by filling out quantifiable information. It would be a heavy lift to get it completed.

Ms. Koester – Agreed with Mr. Hauser and added filling out the matrix for just two schools demonstrated it quickly gets complicated. Option B is to make sure a school from every grade level and category is included to provide a fuller picture.

- 4. CBJ and JSD Investment in Maintenance
  - a. JSD Capital Projects completed 2017-2023 – Presented by Ms. Koester

Ms. Koester explained this is the capital investment CBJ has made in school facilities over the last 6 years amounting to about \$12M. This is inclusive of the \$1M annual deferred maintenance and roof projects included recently.

Ms. Gladziszewski - Asked for explanation of the spreadsheet column labeled LEAD and for explanation of how to identify projects that are bond funded. Ms. Koester – All of the work is done by CBJ engineering. JSD lead projects means JSD staff manage the project but was covered with the CBJ \$1M. Ms. Olin – Projects labeled S02-102 are covered by the annual \$1M and S02-104 are bond funded activities.

Mr. Hauser explained the importance of shared services. If there is a potential health/safety issue, it will need to be addressed right away. This is a strength of the district having their own maintenance department. School buildings are highly used during the school year and have distinct maintenance demand/needs due to that use. When planning for maintenance, it is not equitable to compare school buildings to other city buildings by square footage because the buildings are used so differently.

Mr. Holst – How much of a change would this be considering the already excellent coordination with the CBJ? Mr. Weldon added she would like to see if there would be efficiencies.

Mr. Muldoon – The memo states “Discuss and provide staff direction on additional information.” Does staff have a clear direction going forward? Mr. Hauser – They have enough to start the conversation.

Ms. Hale – This is something to be thinking about but with the school year starting, Mr. Hauser as new superintendent, and the transition of Ms. Koester to her new position as City Manager this is not the highest priority. Asked Ms. Koester to take the lead on this item.

Ms. Koester – Noted there is a good working relationship with facilities maintenance and engineering with JSD staff. Because of the relationship, there is a synergy between CBJ building maintenance and Engineering deferred maintenance.

**b. Annual JSD Operational Maintenance Costs/Duties – Moved to next meeting**

**5. Overview of Yaakoosgé Daakahídi, Montessori Borealis, Juneau Community Charter School, and the Tlingit Culture, Language and Literacy (TCLL) Program ) - Presented by Mr. Hauser**

Mr. Hauser – The different formats are about what is best for students and what works best for student families. It is about providing choice for students. Focus is on programs that help students and provide a different approach to education to meet needs for community families.

Juneau charter school is nature-based education and district funded via a contract. Montessori provides pre-K through 8<sup>th</sup> grade education and follows Montessori methodology at no charge. Focuses on smaller classrooms and direct instruction. Tlingit (TLLC) is a growing program that provides cultural immersion education. They plan to grow to service K-8 students. Yaakoosge - High School alternative school provides resources and tailored instruction to help students succeed in a less traditional setting.

Ms. Gladziszewski - Is it correct that all the schools are JSD and fall under the school board? Mr. Hauser - Charter school has a contract with the CBJ and their own board. The others all fall under the School Board.

Ms. Weldon – Was not aware Montessori was tuition free. How does that work that it is free? Fewer students per teacher mean more expensive teachers. How much does each student cost? Ms. Olin – Montessori is funded separately under the legislative foundation formula funding. The others are all JSD and fall under JSD foundation formula funding. There has never been a per student per school cost developed. Ms. Weldon – Frankly, it seems the parents of Montessori are getting a better deal with fewer students per teacher.

Ms. Sorensen – The optional programs are available and have open enrollment. If an option appeals to parents, they can sign up. Ms. Gladziszewski - So is there no limit on Montessori? Ms. Olin – TCLL, Montessori and Charter school have lottery processes. The only reason a child would be on a waitlist is if there are already too many in a certain grade level. There is no waitlist at schools except Montessori. Additionally, the Pre-K program is not free.

Mayor Weldon left the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

Ms. Hale – Expressed an observation that the charter schools seem to tend to be skewed white and she felt there should be outreach to diversify.

Ms. Holst - Pointed out the school district provides the alternative school formats out of a perception that the community wants choice. He said alternative schools do cost the district a little more due to transportation costs of bringing children to the school of their choice regardless of where they live. He added the assembly has said they want families to be able to choose their children’s schools.

Ms. Olin – Montessori and YKDH are classed alternative schools and have to go through an application process to meet requirements for the classification. TCLL is a school within a school until it grows larger. Once it becomes a K-8 school, then it will apply as well.

**6. CBJ JSD Facility Master Plan: Draft Summary of Findings - Presented by Ms. Koester.**

Ms. Koester explained this was started some time ago but was never adopted. Staff are looking for guidance whether to pick this back up and finish it to current date.

Ms. Hale – Asked Mr. Holst if he had any information to add as to why it had not been adopted as he was around when it was started. Mr. Holst – The process became politicized and was dropped because it was not being used as originally intended. Ms. Gladziszewski remembered when it came about and thought it was working well and then it just dropped. She is glad to see it back before them.

Ms. Hale – Would like to recommend the committee complete the Master Plan by the end of the year.

Mr. Muldoon – Would like to see this completed but if it is not incremented, he is concerned it will end with another nearly final draft. The School Board facilities committee can work with staff to bring information to the packet going forward.

Ms. Koester – Agrees it would be best if the study is accomplished incrementally. Asked the committee to develop direction.

Ms. Hale – Jensen Yorba Lott created the original document. It may be good to consult with them for historical guidance.

**H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - none**

**I. FUTURE MEETINGS**

**7.** Future meeting topics: Continue filling out Matrix; review of past committee work and draft Comprehensive Facilities Plan

**8.** Future meeting date: Wednesday, September 6, 2023, 12:00 PM - 1:30 PM.

**J. ADJOURNMENT – 1:28 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by *Kathleen Jorgensen Business Assists (907)723-6134* 



# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** September 22, 2023, 2023

**TO:** Chair Hale and Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee

**FROM:** Katie Koester, Engineering & Public Works Director

**SUBJECT:** Year in Review: 2023 Goals & Committee Work for Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee

---

As the work of the 2023 Joint Assembly/School Facilities committee wraps up, the purpose of this memo is to reflect on the goals established at the beginning of the year and the progress made that will serve as a starting point for the 2024 committee.

## 2023 Goals & Committee Work

- Review the Charter and come to a consensus on the committee’s charge as it relates to capital funding and facility maintenance. *The committee agreed on the shared responsibility for major facility decisions, and rules of procedure as outlined in the attached memo.*
- Forward a strategy for addressing declining enrollment to the Assembly and School Board.
  - Determine the potential of repurposing space to address needs in the community, which could include childcare. *Childcare space needs were discussed at the April 17, 2023 meeting.*
  - Provide the Assembly and School Board a matrix to aid in understanding the capital improvement needs of facilities and the ramifications of closure for schools. *Draft matrix categories are included in this packet to incorporate into future decision-making processes by the committee.*
- Forward a prioritized plan for facility major maintenance to the full Assembly to ensure CBJ is making the most strategic investments. *The 6-year capital improvement plan updated annually by JSD remains the guiding document for this conversation.*
- Establish a framework for future Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee meetings. *The committee will provide guidance on how to incorporate the 2017 Draft Facilities Master plan and recommendations at the September 26, 2023 meeting.*

## Juneau School District Mission Statement

In Juneau, we partner to provide each student with meaningful, relevant, and rigorous learning experiences in order to graduate diverse, engaged citizens ready for a changing world.

**Recommendation:** Informational

Enc:

April 4, 2023, Memo “Procedures and decision-making in the context of CBJ Charter and JSD Mission”  
6-year CIP for JSD 2024-2029



# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** April 4, 2023  
**TO:** Chair Hale and Joint Assembly and School District Planning Committee  
**FROM:** Katie Koester, Engineering and Public Works Director  
**SUBJECT:** Procedures and decision-making in the context of CBJ Charter and JSD Mission

---

The purpose of this memo is to help the committee establish procedures and guidelines for how decisions are made in the context of community values and provide clarity to the charter mandate, “the Assembly and the School Board will deliberate in formulating plans and recommendations relative to school facilities.”

CBJ Charter, Section 13.8, Capital Improvements, specifies that the board [school] shall make recommendations to the Assembly on capital improvements and that decisions by the Assembly are final.<sup>1</sup> However, section 13.9, School Maintenance, gives the responsibility for routine maintenance and custodial services to the School Board.<sup>2</sup> It is clear there is a symbiotic relationship between the two bodies and a shared responsibility to provide safe and effective learning environments for Juneau’s youth.

## Procedures and Decision Making

The Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee is listed as a standing committee in the Assembly rules of procedures which establishes guidance on how agendas are set, materials are prepared by the manager, and deliberation is held.<sup>3</sup> The Committee does the committee work and is advisory to the full body. Any final decisions, including funding large capital projects, goes before the full Assembly.

---

### <sup>1</sup> Section 13.8. Capital improvements.

- (a) The board shall make recommendations to the assembly concerning the necessity for school construction and other capital improvements, site selection, employment of architects, and building plans. The board shall submit preliminary plans to the assembly for suggestions before recommending final plans.
- (b) Decisions by the assembly shall be final in all matters concerning school construction and other capital improvements, site selection, employment of architects, and building plans.
- (c) The assembly shall appoint a four-man committee from its membership which shall deliberate with the board in formulating all plans to be recommended under Section 13.8(a) of this Charter.

### <sup>2</sup> Section 13.9. School maintenance.

The board, unless specifically transferring such responsibilities to the assembly, shall provide custodial services and routine maintenance for school buildings and shall provide employees for these purposes. The assembly shall provide major maintenance and all rehabilitation, repair and construction of school buildings.

<sup>3</sup> [CBJ Assembly Rules of Procedure](#)

## Core Values

The community of Juneau places a high value on education as evidenced by the Assembly consistently funding education to the cap. The Mission of the Juneau School District is articulated in the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan:

“In Juneau, we partner to provide each student with meaningful, relevant, and rigorous learning experiences in order to graduate diverse, engaged citizens ready for a changing world.”<sup>4</sup>

The CBJ Assembly has a duty to fund public education and school facilities. However, with the power to levy taxes comes a responsibility to the taxpayers to effectively, efficiently and ethically use public dollars. This is articulated in CBJ 2023 Assembly Goal Number 3: “Sustainable Budget Organization – Assure CBJ is able to deliver services in a cost effective manner that meets the needs of the community.”<sup>5</sup>

In summary, the work of the Joint Facilities Committee will need to balance the core values of facilitating the District’s space needs to meet its educational mission and the responsibility to the taxpayers to spend a limited amount of resources in the most effective manner.

## In conclusion:

- As a standing committee, the Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee will follow the rules of procedure of CBJ standing committees as outlined in Resolution 2976, Assembly Rules of Procedure.
- The work of the Joint Assembly/School Facilities Committee is advisory to the Assembly and the School Board. Binding decisions are made by those bodies and the Joint Facilities Committee provides recommendations.
- The CBJ Assembly has the final say in all matters concerning school construction and capital improvements.
- The Joint Facilities Committee is considering the facility needs of the District to meet its educational mission within the context of finite resources for capital construction.

*Adopted at April 17, 2023 Joint Assembly/School Board Facilities Committee meeting.*

<sup>4</sup> [Juneau School District Strategic Plan 2020-2025](#)

<sup>5</sup> [CBJ Assembly Goals 2023](#)

<b>SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENT PLANS</b>								
	<b>Division</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>FY24</b>	<b>FY25</b>	<b>FY26</b>	<b>FY27</b>	<b>FY28</b>	<b>Future</b>
<b>Schools</b>								
	JSD Annual Deferred Maintenance	1	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
	JDHS Boiler Room Renovation	2	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	-	-	-	-
	JDHS and FDMS Partial Roof Replacements	3	-	\$ 2,100,000	-	-	-	-
	MDAS Exterior Entry Improvements	4	-	-	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-
	MRCS Restroom renovation and Carpet replacement	5	-	-	-	\$ 1,750,000	-	-
	KHE Gym Floor Replacement	6	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,500,000	-
	MDAS Renovation	7	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 42,000,000
	MRCS Renovation	8	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 25,000,000
	DHMS Deferred Maintenance	9	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 23,500,000
	JDHS Deferred Maintenance	10	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 19,000,000
	Riverbend Deferred Maintenance	11	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 7,500,000
	TMHS Deferred Maintenance	12	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 7,000,000
	FDMS Deferred Maintenance	13	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 5,000,000
	Glacier Valley Deferred Maintenance	14	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 4,000,000
	Harborview Deferred Maintenance	15	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 3,000,000
	JSD Maintenance Facility Deferred Maintenance	16	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 3,750,000
	JSD Central Office (Old Dairy) Deferred Maintenance	17	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 2,500,000
	Gastineau Deferred Maintenance	18	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,500,000
	AB Deferred Maintenance	19	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,350,000
	JSD Wide Security and Safety Upgrades	20	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 2,000,000
	JSD Wide HVAC and Heating Control System Upgrades	21	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 6,400,000
<b>Schools Total:</b>			<b>\$ 2,750,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,750,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,500,000</b>	<b>\$ 154,500,000</b>
<b>6 Year Improvement Totals:</b>			<b>\$ 127,903,000</b>	<b>\$ 139,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,753,000</b>	<b>\$ 97,347,000</b>	<b>\$ 95,650,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,126,320,000</b>





522 West 10th Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801 907.586.1070 jensenyorbawall.com

*Designing Community Since 1935*

September 22, 2023

**CBJ Juneau School District Facility Master Plan (JYW No. 23036 / 16040)**

Updated Executive Overview

**Introduction**

In 2016, Jensen Yorba Lott and a consultant team including educational planning and financial experts were selected to assist CBJ and the Juneau School District (JSD) to complete a Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. The initial tasks—including in-depth analysis of JSD needs and capacities—were completed with a final “Draft Summary of Findings” (hereafter referred to as the “2017 Summary”) submitted in June 2017.

The 2017 Summary found that JSD facilities had excess capacity and that projected decreasing student enrollments would exacerbate the situation into the foreseeable future. Although the 2017 Summary suggested possible alternatives to reduce facility capacity, the planning team was not authorized to develop the recommendations into a final Plan. The 2017 Summary was not formally approved or adopted by CBJ or JSD.

In September 2023, JYW was contacted to determine if and how the 2017 Summary could be updated and developed into an adoptable Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. Understanding that updating all the detailed information in the 2017 Summary with current data could be a significant undertaking, JYW recommended first providing a more limited review. This Updated Executive Overview reviews the 2017 Summary, highlighting important data points and updating some information. Intended to be a companion to the 2017 Summary rather than a replacement, this Overview will refer to the Sections and page numbers of that original document.

To keep this Overview effort to a minimum, JYW completed the work without the assistance of the other experts from the 2017 consultant team. In addition, we did not perform any site visits or interviews with JSD, so there certainly may be minor errors in this Overview which could be corrected if the 2017 Summary was to be updated.

**Section 1: Executive Summary**

See Conclusion at the end of this Overview.

## Section 2: JSD Budget Overview

Current JSD budgets were not analyzed for this Overview.

2017 Budget Summary: In 2017, 12% of the total JSD budget went to facilities-related costs. At the time of the 2017 Summary, JSD had made significant cost-reduction and energy-saving efforts and did not anticipate finding significant additional operational savings in future years (page 5).

## Section 3: Enrollment

Enrollment Summary: The actual student enrollment in the 2016-2017 Academic Year when the 2017 Summary was developed, was 4,695.

2017 Projections vs. Reality: The enrollment projections in the 2017 Summary were taken from the 2017 Erickson & Associates Enrollment Forecast prepared for JSD in February 2017. Erickson's projections for the 2022-2023 Academic Year were 4,308 (low), 4,612 (medium), and 4,815 (high). The 2023 Erickson report shows that the **actual enrollment for 2022-2023 was 4,204, 104 students fewer than the 2017 low-end projections.**

The reduction of 491 students from 2016 to 2022 was a significant decrease from the projections used in the 2017 Summary, which anticipated a range of possible change from +24 to -191 students (page 11). Obviously the pandemic and other factors made this period a very challenging one for education and education enrollment forecasting, but overall, the Erickson forecasts provide very helpful information. See Erickson's reports for more detail about methodology and forecast accuracy.

Future Scenarios: Erickson & Associates anticipates enrollments will continue to decline over the forecast period, with **projected reductions of 700 students over the next ten years.** Projected enrollment in 2032-2023 is 3,504 students.

Erickson & Associates forecasts are based on demographic factors, assuming no material change in Juneau's future economy (see 'Caveat – The steady state assumption,' the final section of the Feb. 23 Enrollment Forecast). JEDC and other analysts see possibilities for more optimistic population forecasts, but specifics are difficult to quantify. However, even a significant positive event—like the USCG locating an icebreaker in town—would likely not provide the 500 students needed to bring enrollment back to 2016-2017 levels in the near future.

Enrollment Takeaway: *Enrollment has fallen since 2017. Future projections show enrollment continuing to decline.*

## Section 4: Projected Funding vs. Operational Expenditures

Current state funding levels were not analyzed for this Overview. It has been well reported that state funding levels have not been increasing with need.

2017 Funding Summary: The 2017 Summary noted that Projected Operational Expenses were already higher than Projected Funding at even the high-end enrollment projections. A \$2M fund balance from prior years was being used to balance the 2018 budget (page 41). The funding gap got worse as future enrollments decreased (see chart, page 42).

## Section 5: Facility Educational Assessment

Current educational assessments were not analyzed for this Overview.

2017 Facility Educational Assessment Summary: The 2017 Summary evaluated all the school facilities through several qualitative and quantitative processes. A Long-Term Viability Matrix compiled all the analysis into a single score as follows (page 72). It should be noted that some upgrades to the facilities (such as the new roof installed at DHMS and Kaḡdigoowu Héen) may impact the Matrix scores.

- 2.0 Mendenhall River Community School
- 2.3 Marie Drake
- 2.7 Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School
- 3.0 Floyd Dryden Middle School
- 3.0 Kaḡdigoowu Héen (formerly Riverbend) Elementary
- 3.3 Juneau-Douglas High School: Yadaa.At Kalé
- 3.3 Sayéik: Gastineau Community School
- 3.7 Sít' Eetí Shaanáḡ - Glacier Valley Elementary School
- 4.0 Auke Bay Elementary
- 4.0 Thunder Mountain High School
- 4.7 Harborview Elementary

An important component of the Matrix scores were the qualitative educational assessments of the physical layout of the schools (summarized on page 43). Rectifying these issues will be expensive or even impossible. All of the schools were ranked 80% or higher in this analysis except for 3:

- 55% Marie Drake, due to a restricted outdoor site, lack of special program spaces, and no Commons
- 65% Floyd Dryden Middle School, due to a lack of small group instruction areas, no large Commons, and limited daylighting in the classrooms.
- 67% Mendenhall River Community School, due in large part to the lack of designated space for dining/Commons and Gym.

*Facility Assessment Takeaway: Marie Drake, Mendenhall River, and Floyd Dryden are at the bottom of facility assessment lists for reasons that may be expensive or impossible to correct.*

## Section 6: Energy Use

Current energy use assessments were not analyzed for this Overview. Energy use is discussed on page 89.

## Section 7: Capital Improvement Project

Current CIP lists were not analyzed for this Overview. The major projects from 2014 CIP List (page 133), including a \$22.6M renovation of Mendenhall River Community School, and a \$36.2M renovation of Marie Drake have not been undertaken. Smaller projects, including the roof replacement of Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School have been completed.

## Section 8: Design Capacity

Current Design Capacities were not analyzed for this Overview. However, we do not believe any major building reconfiguration has occurred since the 2017 Summary although the relocation of the Juneau Community Charter School to JDHS appears to have occurred after the report was written.

As identified on Page 135, there are several ways to calculate building capacity. The most sophisticated method calculates that each classroom space is taken up by a class meeting the district’s Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR). This method typically results in lower capacities for each building than the “DEED Capacity” which is calculated on an overall building area. PTR and DEED capacity will be summarized below with additional information and alternative capacities available in each building’s information starting on page 137.

Notes: “2017 Actual” are modified enrollments which put Tlingit Immersion into HBV, Charter into JDHS, JYS into TMHS, and Montessori and Yakoosge into Marie Drake to match current program locations (program locations in 2017 were slightly different). Totals also include Pre-K in each school, so total enrollment is 4,734 (4,673 + 91 Pre-K).

	<u>DEED</u>	<u>PTR</u>	<u>2017 Actual</u>	<u>Difference</u>	
Auke Bay Elementary	424	<b>398</b>	387	11	97%
Sayéik: Gastineau Community School	386	<b>302</b>	276	29	91%
Sít’ Eetí Shaanáx - Glacier Valley Elem. School	453	<b>440</b>	367	73	83%
Harborview Elementary	578	<b>424</b>	370	54	87%
Mendenhall River Community School	503	<b>398</b>	353	45	89%
Kaxdigoowu Héen (formerly Riverbend) Elem.	499	<b>408</b>	310	98	76%
Dzantik’i Heeni Middle School	634	<b>589</b>	490	99	83%
Floyd Dryden Middle School	447	<b>538</b>	452	86	84%
Juneau-Douglas High School: Yadaa.At Kalé	1156	<b>1091</b>	671	420	62%
Thunder Mountain High School	1023	<b>753</b>	737	16	98%
Marie Drake	396	<b>454</b>	272	182	60%
 TOTAL	 6,499	 <b>5,795</b>	 4,734	 1,061	 82%

*Capacity Takeaway: There was excess capacity in 2017 even prior to recent enrollment decreases. Balancing overall district capacity with individual building layouts, grade divisions, separate program needs, and geographic boundaries are very complex issues.*

**Section 9: Boundary & Housing Trend Summary**

Current Boundaries and Housing Trends were not analyzed for this Overview.

**Conclusion**

The 2017 Summary concluded that wide-scale changes might be needed to align district facilities with district needs. Changes in enrollment and funding since 2017 have likely just exacerbated the issues highlighted in 2017.

Possible initial solutions were outlined in the Executive Summary (page 2). These solutions included potential facility reorganization/closure and even changes in the divisions between the different grades levels in each type of school. The proposed solutions all created difficulties and complexities with none providing an easy path forward.

It is hoped that this Overview can re-start the conversation about how to move towards adoption of a Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan to guide future decision making and capital project planning. Some possible future steps may include:

- Updating the 2017 Summary to include current data.
- Creation of economic forecast models which detail out pure financial costs of different facility options, including repair, reconfiguration, deactivation, or even demolition.
- Examination of the areas required for administration and other functions which are also taking up spaces in district buildings.
- Creation of a more comprehensive School Facilities Matrix for facility evaluation which combines the Long-Term Viability data from the 2017 Summary with other qualitative and quantitative variables as identified by the decision-making team. See “Draft School Facilities Evaluation matrix Version 9.26.23” memo from Katie Koester.
- A planning project which explores whether the community could use some educational facilities for different uses, public or private.
- Creation of a process to bring options to the public and decision-makers for discussion and exploration. Determine how to develop consensus on these difficult issues.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Back Ground

Jensen Yorba Lott and consultants DLR Group and Aurora Corporate Enterprises were hired by CBJ/JSD to provide research and information to form the basis of a comprehensive facility master plan slated to be completed in a subsequent phase of work.

The team's expertise and services for this project are as follows:

Jensen Yorba Lott is a Juneau Architectural firm providing project management and facility master planning.

DLR Group is an International Architectural firm providing educational planning and educational facility master planning.

Aurora Corporate Enterprises (ACE) is a management and operations consultant primarily for Alaska School districts. ACE is providing funding projections, operations and capital improvement project consulting.

The following tasks describe the scope of work.

#### Task 1

- A. Compile low medium and high enrollment projections.
- B. Based on enrollment projections, compile projections of low medium and high operations funding to be received from the state based on State based student allocation.
- C. Analyze how funding will impact JSD's ability to provide appropriate facilities for the existing educational programs which includes work to:
  - a. Identify the number of students at each school
  - b. Identify the number of classrooms
  - c. Create a school long term viability matrix
    - i. Interview District staff (Teaching & Learning)
    - ii. Provide an educational adequacy assessment.
    - iii. Complete matrix & outline recommendations.
- D. Identify/analyze critical funding thresholds that will trigger forced adjustments to current educational delivery.

**Jensen Yorba Lott Architects**  
**DLR Group, Aurora Corporate Enterprises Inc.**

#### Task 2

- A. Review facility operation data provided by CBJ/JSD.
- B. Identify Strategies for reducing facility operations cost, that do not compromise current educational program delivery (ie cannot lose programs, activities, staff or teachers)
- C. Identify Strategies for increasing efficiency of school district operation, that do not compromise current educational program delivery (ie cannot lose programs, activities, staff or teachers)

#### Task 3

- A. Based on CBJ provided information, develop a priority list for future CIP projects
  - a. List needs to acknowledge the lack of state funding over the next 5 years
  - b. List needs to acknowledge the school districts growing back log of deferred maintenance projects.
  - c. List needs to prioritize work at essential facilities.

#### Task 4

- A. Evaluate the design capacity of each facility, current enrollment and current attendance area.
- B. Analyze current and future housing trends to assist the school district to more efficiently align attendance area boundaries with facility capacity.

#### Task 5

- A. Compile findings. Meet with CBJ/JSD to review findings, discuss conditions, ideas, options. Occurred March 1, 2017. Solicit Comments. Address comments.
- B. Prepare a Draft Summary of Findings.
- C. Meet with CBJ/JSD to review summary of findings and discuss completion of the Master Plan.

**CBJ JSD Facility Master Plan**  
**Draft Summary of Findings**

### Report Format

On March 1<sup>st</sup> the initial meeting with the CBJ/JSD facilities committee was held to present and discuss the data collected.

This draft summary of findings includes spread sheets and graphs developed to assimilate and analyze the data which was presented in a power point at the March meeting. A copy of the power point presentation is included at the end of the draft summary of findings. To assist in correlation of the data in the draft summary, with that presented in the power point presentation, all spread sheets and graphs which formed the basis for the slides presented in the power point presentation, are noted with reference to the specific power point sheet number.

In response to comments at the March Meeting additional information has been included in this report, specifically; revised school capacity spread sheets and graphs for each school, information identifying housing development locations and Capital improvement priority guidelines.

### Finding Considerations

#### Enrollment & Facility Capacity

The Juneau School District is currently experiencing a drop in enrollment. Enrollment projections do not show a significant increase in enrollment with high enrollment projections and low enrollment projections reflecting enrollment continuing to decline. Over the next 5 years, total enrollment in the District is not expected to increase more than 34 students, and projections show a possible decrease of 191 students.

With low enrollment, there is capacity within several facilities to make changes.

Many of JSD's facilities ranked high on the Education Assessment. Education delivery is enhanced by high quality facilities. We recommend that adjustments to facility use include consideration of the high performing schools and how to make maximum use of them.

**Jensen Yorba Lott Architects**  
**DLR Group, Aurora Corporate Enterprises Inc.**

Possible paths to consider:

1. Incorporation of the Charter School into JSD facilities.
  - a. This improves the education facilities for the Charter School, maximizes use of the JSD education facilities and is a financial benefit, bringing charter funding to JSD operations.
  - b. This also increases operation efficiency on a cost per student basis for each school.
  - c. Several elementary schools have the capacity to incorporate the Charter School under current boundary allocations; Harborview, Riverbend and possibly Mendenhall River Community School if classroom utilization is modified. The configuration of Riverbend lends itself most readily, with the possibility of one wing being dedicated to the Charter School.
  - d. JDHS, with its low enrollment, is also a facility that could easily house the Charter School.
2. Reorganization of functions within the district to place the maximum number of students possible in higher performing facilities.
  - a. This might take the form of relocation of Montessori Borealis out of Marie Drake and into another facility. This would leave space for all JSD administrative functions currently located in JDHS & TMHS to be located on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of Marie Drake.
  - b. Montessori Borealis could relocate to a wing of TMHS with shared use of the Riverbend playground.
  - c. There is also capacity within Harborview in which case they would continue to share the playground and could continue to use the Marie Drake Gym.
  - d. Reorganization to consolidate education functions and office functions would seek to increase efficiency within the JSD Administration and possibly reduce utility, custodial and maintenance costs for Marie Drake. Further study is needed to determine financial benefits.

**CBJ JSD Facility Master Plan**  
**Draft Summary of Findings**

3. Reorganization of grades to allow facility closures: JSD and the Committee have indicated that this is not an option that would serve this community well and will likely not be pursued. The following documents the ideas floated and thoughts regarding this approach.
  - a. Grade reconfiguration of Pk-6/7 or 7/8-12 were proposed, to allow closure of at least one of the middle schools.
  - b. The proposed closure would be Floyd Dryden based on the comparative rating on the education assessment.
  - c. This would maximize enrollment in the high schools and elementary schools increasing operation efficiency on a cost per student basis.
  - d. This was perceived as disruptive and divisive for the community.
  - e. Closure would have a large impact on the neighborhood.
  - f. The greatest cost savings would come in the form of reduced staff.
  - g. Facility cost savings would be less significant. The facility though closed, would continue to need to be maintained at some level. Closure would likely increase security and vandal prevention costs. Utility costs would continue, though they could likely be cut in half.
  - h. Facility cost and responsibility would be transferred to CBJ.
4. Reorganization from a two high school community, to a one high school community. JDHS has a capacity of 1151 and TMHS has a capacity of 793, if JSD Administrative functions did not occupy classrooms in these schools. Current enrollment at JDHS is 591. Current Enrollment at TMHS is 728. While both schools have excess capacity, consolidation of the two schools results in a current enrollment of 1319, which exceeds the capacity of either school. A revision of the Pupil Teacher Ratio of 24.5 pupils increased to 27 pupils, would create a capacity in JDHS that would allow consolidation of the two high schools. This would only be viable at higher PTR and continued lower enrollments. At this point in time we do not think consolidation is a good option. However, if enrollment continues to decline it should be considered.

Jensen Yorba Lott Architects  
DLR Group, Aurora Corporate Enterprises Inc.

Reorganization of age groups as noted in item 3 would also open the opportunity for consolidation of all 10-12 graders into JDHS. TMHS does not have the capacity to become the sole high school for Juneau.

Both JDHS & TMHS scored well on the education assessment, and each offer unique types of educational space. Both facilities should continue in use for educational purposes, even if different age groups, or different programs are housed in them, such as Yaa Koos Ge Daakahidi, Montessori Borealis or Charter, all of which are currently housed in lower performing facilities.

#### **Facilities Operations:**

Facilities require ongoing maintenance and repairs:

JSD's current energy program is yielding results and should be continued.

Energy Engineering study results should be implemented, especially those high priority Energy Efficiency Measures that will result in cost savings with little capital investment.

Additional operational savings should be explored with reconfiguration of building use, consolidation of JSD administration and maximized capacity in each school.

#### **Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)**

Capital improvements are funded from sources other than the operations budget. With State and local budget cuts funding sources for the next few years will be limited.

A capital improvement priority list should take into consideration the approach CBJ/JSD plans to take as a result of this study. This will inform which facilities and projects rise to the top of the priority list. Until such decisions are made by the committee, following are priority guidelines for selection of Capital Improvement Projects:

Priority 1: Address any life safety issues.

Priority 2: Address any maintenance issue that will result in deterioration of the facility beyond daily wear and tear (roof leaks, pipe leaks etc).

CBJ JSD Facility Master Plan  
Draft Summary of Findings



Priority 3: Address issues preventing use of any portion of the facility, for it's intended educational purpose. For example a damaged, buckling gym floor may prevent standard gym activities from safely taking place.

Priority 4: Address issues that will result in financial savings, such as reduced energy consumption, reduced staffing, reduced maintenance cost.

**Design Capacity & Boundaries**

In this section of the report we discuss the methods for determining capacity. There is flexibility in these calculations. Though JSD targets Pupil Teacher Ratios (PTR) that they feel offer the best educational outcomes, there is nothing requiring JSD to adhere to these numbers. This flexibility should be used to the maximum benefit of the school district. JSD should understand what space they have available to them and make use of it to the maximum benefit.

It may be that many JSD facility uses are a result of inertia more than planned decisions about where to put personnel or classes. Consideration should be given to this when discussing possible changes to facility use. Both functional and administrative efficiencies could be explored with changes in use. For example, JDHS is operating at the lowest capacity of all the school facilities, yet they occupy space in adjacent Marie Drake. TMHS and JDHS have performed well on the education assessment yet, several classrooms are used for administrative functions rather than for education.

District Boundaries appear convoluted at first glance. However, school capacities and number of students within the boundary are fairly closely aligned. Future housing development, which may be constructed in the next several years, is actually fairly evenly spread throughout the district. Socio-economic considerations might be a factor when discussing boundary placement and distribution of students. Currently all elementary school boundaries encompass one of the large trailer parks except Auke Bay School.

# Juneau School District

## Facilities Master Planning

### Long-Term Viability of Facilities Matrix

School	Needed Bldg. Repairs	Replacement Value	FCI	RANK	Qualitative Adequacy	Space Adequacy	Educ Adequacy	Educ RANK	Building SF	Energy cost	Operational Efficiency \$/SF	Efficiency RANK	enrollment	DEED capacity	Space Avail	% occupied	TOTAL
Auke Bay	\$ -	\$ 15,189,746	0%	5	74%	77%	76%	3	49,000	\$ 62,000	1.27	4	405	424	19	95.5%	4.0
Gastineau	\$ 940,838	\$ 13,947,931	7%	5	72%	65%	69%	2	45,000	\$ 68,000	1.51	3	279	386	107	72.3%	3.3
Glacier Valley	\$ 2,858,459	\$ 16,117,500	18%	5	64%	62%	63%	2	52,000	\$ 71,000	1.37	4	376	453	77	83.0%	3.7
Harborview	\$ 2,248,580	\$ 20,351,030	11%	5	71%	92%	82%	4	66,000	\$ 70,000	1.06	5	308	578	270	53.3%	4.7
Mendenhall River	\$ 17,053,884	\$ 17,806,000	96%	1	54%	81%	68%	2	58,000	\$ 91,000	1.57	3	346	503	157	68.8%	2.0
Riverbend	\$ 6,504,195	\$ 17,650,351	37%	4	68%	96%	82%	4	57,000	\$ 118,000	2.07	1	315	499	184	63.1%	3.0
Dzantik'i Heeni	\$ 22,955,600	\$ 32,235,000	71%	2	64%	78%	71%	3	105,000	\$ 168,000	1.60	3	485	634	149	76.5%	2.7
Floyd Dryden	\$ 3,417,863	\$ 23,174,202	15%	5	52%	64%	58%	1	75,000	\$ 110,000	1.47	3	442	447	5	98.9%	3.0
Juneau Douglas	\$ 15,310,590	\$ 66,526,900	23%	4	64%	86%	75%	2	217,000	\$ 276,000	1.27	4	591	1156	565	51.1%	3.3
Thunder Mountain	\$ 6,104,854	\$ 51,834,494	12%	5	75%	92%	84%	4	169,000	\$ 268,000	1.59	3	728	1023	295	71.2%	4.0
Marie Drake	\$ 20,175,528	\$ 22,145,445	91%	1	44%	42%	43%	1	72,000	\$ 76,000	1.06	5	94	100	6	94.0%	2.3

Age	Rank 1-5 with 1=60+ years, 2=60-46, 3=45-31, 4=30-16, 5=15-0
Ed Adequacy	Rank 1-5 with 1=59% or less, 2=60-69%, 3=70-79%, 4=80-89%, 5=90-100%
Efficiency	Rank 1-5 with 1=1.81+, 2=1.8-1.61, 3=1.6-1.41, 4=1.4-1.21, 5=1.2-1.0
FCI	Rank 1-5 with 1=81+%, 2=80-61%, 3=60-41%, 4=40-21%, 5=20-0%



# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** September 26, 2023  
**TO:** Chair Hale and Joint Assembly School District Facilities Committee  
**FROM:** Katie Koester, Engineering & Public Works Director  
**SUBJECT:** Draft School Facilities Evaluation Matrix Version 9.26.23

---

The purpose of this memo is to provide a framework for future Joint Assembly/School District Facilities Committee work. It is the intent of the 2023 committee that these variables frame the basis for a matrix through which to consider any repurposing of school facilities. It should be noted that the majority of these variables will need to be updated annually.

## Quantitative

This section reflects numbers and metrics that can be used in analysis. The definitions below attempt to help provide narrative and context to the figures.

### **Enrollment versus capacity (as a percentage).**

This category reflects how many students are enrolled in the school versus the capacity according to the Uniform Building Code.

**Capital Cost of Renovations:** This figure is pulled directly from the JSD 6-year CIP. The 6-year CIP is based on the renewal and replacement schedule submitted to DEED annually. It is not a comprehensive condition assessment.

**School size and impact on funding formula:** This figure reflects the annual loss in state funding after a four-year step-down. It is based on current enrollment and will change annually.

**High School Graduation Rate:** The high school graduation rate divides the number of graduating seniors by the total enrollment of freshmen four years prior. Also referred to as a completion ratio. This information is only readily available for high school students.

**Predicted future enrollment by grade level:** This category uses state demographer data to predict how many students will be enrolled in that grade level based on historical information.

**Demographic Diversity:** This category captures ethnic diversity and the number of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

**Maintenance and Operations (non-instructional):** This figure reflects the maintenance and operations line item in the JSD budget for this facility. If this facility is consolidated into another, some of those expenses will be transferred to the new facility.

## Qualitative

This category helps decision-makers think about the variables that are more difficult to measure but no less important. Some of these uses are determined by the Pupil Teacher Ratio set by the Board of Education each year, others are determined by the number of students identified with special needs and the associated federal regulations, and others are set by the special programs housed at individual school sites.<sup>i</sup>

**Special Services:** Schools serve programmatic and educational needs and buildings are used for special education classroom use, related services (OT/PT, SLP, School Psychologist) needs, small group instruction, etc. This category reflects the classrooms reserved for those purposes.

**Classrooms Used for Instruction:** *Outstanding work: Staff needs to present a revised definition of instructional use that meets the committee’s intent of how often a classroom is used for student instruction throughout the day.*

**Cultural Impact:** Often a school has a strong identity and sense of place; students, faculty, teachers, and community members develop a culture rooted in the facility and what it represents. Any changes need to be considered the cultural impact.

**Impact on Quality of Education:** Speaks to the JSD mission statement “In Juneau, we partner to provide each student with meaningful, relevant, and rigorous learning experiences in order to graduate diverse, engaged citizens ready for a changing world.”

**Impact on the Neighborhood:** School facilities are often used outside the school day and are key gathering spaces for community functions. What impact would repurposing a facility have on those uses?

**Pupil-teacher ratio:** The pupil-teacher ratio is set by the Board of Education annually and varies by grade level.

**Opportunities**

**Alternative Facility Needs:** This reflects alternative facility needs in the community this facility could serve.

**Can it be Repurposed and at what Cost?** This figure reflects the cost of reconfiguring a building to meet an identified community need.

**Recommendation:**

Forward Draft School Facilities Evaluation Matrix as a framework for future committee work.

---

<sup>i</sup> The committee discussed using a Likert scale, or similar tool, to help provide numbers to the qualitative variables. A Likert scale is a rating scale used to measure opinions, attitudes, or behaviors. It is commonly used in survey research, marketing and social sciences. Using a 5-point quality scale as an example, “how would you rate this variable on a scale of 1-5: 1. Very poor, 2. Poor, 3. Sometimes, 4. Often, 5. Always. If the committee would like to apply numbers to the qualitative factors, thought will need to go into the most strategic way to make that meaningful.