## **Board Proceedings**

The Board of Directors for the New Hampton Community School District met in a work session, Tuesday, November 5, 2013 in the High School Media Center. President Rasmussen called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm with directors Ewert, Rosonke, Baltes, Denner, Superintendent Jurrens, and Board Secretary Ayers present.

Director Rosonke moved to approve the agenda. Director Denner seconded the motion. Ayes: Ewert, Baltes, Denner, Rosonke, and Rasmussen. Nays: none.

The board met with Merle Rambo and Tim Hoffman from the Facilities Cost Management Group to discuss the facilities survey results. Mr. Rambo presented a review and analysis of the community survey results for long range facilities and tax management planning. Rambo informed the board that the survey clearly indicated that the respondents to the survey had a sense of ownership.

There were six questions on the survey. The district received 143 responses out of the 430 questionnaires sent out to every parent with a student attending and every 5<sup>th</sup> registered voter. Mr. Rambo then covered each of the five questions and what the responses indicated.

- Question 1. Which best represents your opinion regarding the District's current downtown Elementary and Middle School facilities?

  16.67% of respondents said the district should continue to repair and remodel annually and continue to commit the selectors as her hear done in the root. Over \$20% of all respondents supported a replacement and phosing.
  - 16.67% of respondents said the district should continue to repair and remodel annually and continue to commit the sales tax as has been done in the past. Over 82% of all respondents supported a replacement and phasing option.
- Question 2. What do you feel would be the best long term arrangement for New Hampton's school locations?

  12.23% of respondents support keeping the two present sites as such, with some noting that the current site downtown should only be used temporarily until a replacement is available. A total of about 88% showed support for moving toward using the existing high school site and/or augmenting with an additional site purchase.
- Question 3. If the District voters were to decide to adopt a long term phased plan to replace and relocate Elementary and Middle School facilities, which grades do you think should move in the first phase?

  91.8% favored an initial phase of 5-6 and 7-8 facilities including about 12.3% of these actually preferring to build a PK-4 at the same time or with equal priority to Middle School facilities. Only 8.2% suggested starting with the Elementary facilities only.
- Question 4. If the District voters were to decide to adopt any of the long term phased plans listed above to replace and relocate either the Elementary or Middle School facilities. Should some improvements for security and shared use facilities such as practice and activities areas and a school/community use auditorium be included with an initial phase of the long range plan?

  94.03% supported either directly including security and shared use facilities (practice, auditorium, etc.) either as a base part of the first phase or an option for the voters. Of this percentage about half favored offering these improvements or shared facilities as an option. 42.54% only saw this as an option or said no to it.
- Question 5. Please consider the long range costs for and Tax Management Planning options to resolve New Hampton's upcoming facilities' needs and the effects on our taxpayers as we strive to provide quality educational opportunities within reasonable operating, transportation, equipment, and overall facilities costs. How do we best proceed?

  90.37% asked to redirect as much of the sales tax as possible to a long term solution, with only about 9.6% supporting continuing to commit the sales tax to the present site.
- Question 6. Please consider the long range costs for and Tax Management Planning options to resolve New Hampton's upcoming facilities needs and the effects on our taxpayers as we strive to provide quality educational opportunities within reasonable operating, transportation, equipment, and overall facilities costs. Note that the State allows a property tax levy of up to \$4.05 per \$1,000 of net assessed valuation after rollbacks and credits are applied for District bond and building needs. How do we best proceed?

  About 87.86% of respondents favored redirecting the sales tax to a long term plan. The detail of this question indicated nearly 61% of respondents preferred a single funding approach, noting that the survey form itself outlined the tax implication.

Questions 5 and 6 took different approaches at receiving related data, giving respondents two times to contemplate options in related areas with large implications on Tax Management Planning. Mr. Rambo suggested that additional community meetings should be scheduled for more input.

The board had a discussion on the need for volunteer coaches and how many. The general consensus of the board was volunteer coaches are needed.

Director Denner moved to adjourn at 8:57 pm. Director Ewert seconded the motion. Ayes: Rosonke, Baltes, Ewert, Denner, and Rasmussen.

Attest: November 11, 2013

Son Pre

Tom Rasmussen Board President Bob Ayers Board Secretary

Bob ayer