



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
AS A RESULT OF THE  
SMALL GROUP WORK ACTIVITY  
Session #1 •Tuesday, March 28, 2017

The first Richland CUSD 1 FACTS community engagement session was held on March 28, 2017 hosted by FACTS Tri-chairs Darin Blank, Lauren McClain and Jon Racklin.

Todd Cyrulik, of BLDD Architects, delivered an information presentation regarding a professional assessment of district facilities. Following the participation, participants worked in 11 small groups to complete the three tasks. Following is an Executive Summary of this work.

**TASK #1: GREATEST SURPRISE/GREATEST CONCERN**

In the first task, participants were asked to reach agreement on their great surprise from the information presentation. Following that, they were asked to list their great concern. A few tables mentioned surprise at the overall cost of improvements at the elementary and middle school level.

**GREATEST SURPRISE**

By a wide margin, the most commonly mentioned “surprise” was the overall condition of the buildings — especially of the high school building.

**GREATEST CONCERN**

Two categories of responses were most often made with respect to concerns. First, and most frequently mentioned, were various issues with the high school — accessibility, restrooms, locker rooms, the roof, safety concerns and gym space. The second most frequent response had to do with costs — where money would come from for repairs, whether repairs would become more expensive down the road, and other cost-related concerns.

Verbatim responses from each table are included in the March 28, 2017 CES-1 Verbatim Response Document\*.

**TASK #2: PHYSICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT/FUNCTIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

In the second task, participants were asked evaluate types building improvements as either having a high, medium or low priority. These improvements were divided into two categories — physical needs and functional needs. Following the ranking of each item, participants were asked to reach consensus as to the three most important improvements in each category.

**PHYSICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

With respect to physical needs, the three types of improvements ranking highest in priority were building envelope improvements (roofs exterior walls, window), followed by life/safety work (exiting, alarms, safety) and building infrastructure work (electrical, heating/cooling, plumbing).

**FUNCTIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Top rated functional improvements were facility accessibility, safety issues such as controlling accessing and providing a secure environment, access to technology, and instructional spaces for programs such as tech/career prep, arts, and physical education.

For purposes of rating each item, a scale was put together using the following scoring. The results of this scoring are presented below. The rankings by table are included in the CES-1 Verbatim Response Document.

**RATING SCALE**

Highest	1 Bonus Point
High	3 Points
Medium/High	2.5 Points
Medium	2 Points
Low	1 Points

<b>PHYSICAL NEEDS</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>
Building envelope (roofs, exterior wall, windows)	43
Life Safety requirements (exiting, alarms, safety)	39
Building infrastructure (electrical, heating/cooling, plumbing)	37
Energy efficiency	21
Interior finishes (flooring, ceilings, walls, etc.)	21
Site paving and playgrounds	17
Maintaining building equipment (cabinets, lockers, bleachers)	16
Air conditioning	15
Sustainable construction (low energy, recycled, natural daylight)	12
Other: Gym Space	4
Other: Athletic facilities and outbuildings	2

<b>FUNCTIONAL NEEDS</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>
Facility accessibility (to meet the ADA/IAC requirements)	39
Ability to control access; secure environment	34
Ability to provide technology access	32.5
Spaces for specialty instruction (tech/career prep, arts, PE)	29
Lower operating costs	24
Flexibility to accommodate changing instructional approaches	23
21st century accommodations (student centered environment)	20.5
Ability to control the environment (heat, light, humidity)	18
Maximize student services	17
Ability to accommodate community functions	12
Other: Extra curricular activities	3
Other: Gym/Multipurpose Space	2
Other Gym Space	0
Other: Cafeteria space - HS	0
Other: Traffic Flow/Safety of Students	0

### **TASK #3: FUTURE READY FACILITIES AND FINANCE**

For the third task participants were asked what questions they would like answered in future presentations — on future ready facilities and on finance.

#### **INFORMATION ABOUT FUTURE READY FACILITIES?**

With respect to future ready facilities, the most commonly mentioned information desired as “need” — what need is there in the district to modify facilities to make them future ready. Some mentioned technology improvements as a specific category regarding need. Several tables mentioned wanting to see examples of future ready facilities. Another common theme was questions about whether the existing high school could be modified to become future ready.

#### **INFORMATION ABOUT FINANCE?**

By a large margin, the most common information desired regarding finance had to do with funding options — how can improvements be paid for – whether by property taxes, state or federal grants, etc. Almost half the tables mentioned wanting information about the option for a county sales tax to support facility improvements. Also mentioned was information regarding the cost of improvements and the impact of that cost on taxes.

Verbatim responses from each table are included in the March 28, 2017 CES-1 Verbatim Response Document.

**\*For a complete listing of all responses  
see the March 28, 2017 CES-1 Verbatim Response Document found at**

<http://www.rccu1.net>