



SECTION I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



PROCESS

Chico USD developed a District-wide Facilities Master Plan (FMP) in 2014 to ensure that the learning environments throughout the District were supporting the District’s mission and educational goals. Subsequently, that FMP was updated in 2016, and again in 2019. These prior Facilities Master Plans were focused on addressing growth in the District - growth generated by new housing, the addition of students displaced by the Camp Fire and full-day and transitional kindergarten programs. However, current demographics have changed for Chico USD, with a trend away from growth and toward a stable or flattening enrollment, depending upon location within the District and/or grade level.

The District has made significant progress on the goals established in the Implementation Plan outlined in the prior FMPs. These projects have been guided by District Educational Specifications that were also developed as part of those prior FMPs, and were influential in evaluating the adequacy of existing facilities during the condition assessment phase. Equally important was the physical condition of the facilities, identifying the significant cost of deferred maintenance that comes with aging facilities.

Additionally, the 2023 FMP is informed by the work completed by the District since the adoption of the 2014 plan. Fueled by local general obligation (GO) bonds, the District was able to address the needs of many of its schools. Community input throughout this process suggested a desire to move more quickly, addressing the needs of school equity and conditions, but also recognizing the cost of prolonged construction, both in actual dollars and disruption to occupied campuses. This feedback provided an avenue for a discussion, at the elementary schools, of replacing schools rather than transforming them via multi-phased renovation.

The District adopted five guiding principles for the 2023 Facilities Master Plan. Those principles are outlined on the following page and served to assess the priorities that are part of the proposed implementation plan.



Key to successful master plans is finding the correct balance between critical needs identified in the condition assessments, a guiding vision for the future of the campuses, and a viable implementation strategy.



The Facilities Master Planning process engaged stakeholders throughout the process, both virtually and in-person.

WHAT DO WE HAVE?

In order to assess the existing conditions, the master plan process relied on the following key information in order to guide the recommendations:

- A **data collection** phase includes gathering available data, specifically: building plans, and classroom assignments/scheduling
- An existing site **inventory** identifies the use for all spaces on campus.
- A **condition assessment** of the campus buildings and grounds was accomplished with site visits by the design and engineering team, which helped determine the areas of greatest need.

WHAT DO WE WANT & NEED?

The master planning process received **demographic** information that informed the needs assessment for the District. Additionally, stakeholders were engaged at multiple levels to give input on the desires and wants of the community. This guided the development of the facilities master plan.

- Electronic **surveys** of the community, staff and students
- In-person meetings with a **Steering Committee** representing a diverse cross-section of the District - students, community members/parents, District administrators and faculty
- **Town Hall** style meetings, both in-person and virtually
- Engagement of the **Board of Education** at various levels

WHAT DOES THAT LOOK LIKE?

And finally, the facilities master plans creates a **vision** for each campus. Including an **implementation** “road map” to convey potential impacts of working on occupied school campuses. The District made clear to all stakeholders engaged in the process that their current and available funds would not achieve the goals of the master plan, but that this long-term vision would guide their project decisions when opportunity, and funding, was presented.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

To guide the prioritization process, the design team utilized the following guiding principles that would allow a consistent and equitable approach to planning decisions. These guiding principles informed the recommendations of the facilities master plan.

1. RIGHTSIZING

Specifically addressing the elementary school capacity concerns, **rightsizing** acknowledges the significant excess capacity that currently exists in the District. Many options were discussed, including school consolidation or downsizing, and the opportunity that the excess capacity provided for interim housing during complex construction projects or as a location for other district programs. This guiding principle prompted a “model capacity” adoption - small, mid-sized and large - for the District’s elementary schools

2. KEEPING COMMITMENTS

Stakeholders at all levels recognized the need to understand and articulate any proposed changes to the District’s implementation plan, **keeping commitments** to the school sites that have been waiting for the opportunity for significant improvements. These commitments have been predominantly at the elementary school level, at least in the near term implementation schedule, and remain the priority, contingent on funding availability. The implementation plan is shared on page 6.

3. PLANNING FOR TRANSITIONAL KINDERGARTEN (TK)

Transitional Kindergarten, as a new grade level, has significant impact on facilities as requirements for the youngest learners include larger spaces (similar to traditional Kindergarten), but also ideally proximate to parent parking spaces and age appropriate outdoor learning spaces and equipment. The District has determined that a “capture rate” of 65% of the Kindergarten population is an appropriate expectation for student enrollment. Additionally, they have established a 24:1 student-to-teacher ratio.



Transitional Kindergarten, like Kindergarten, requires larger learning environments and differentiated outdoor play spaces.

4. SPECIAL EDUCATION (SPED)

Throughout the country, the special education population is growing at unprecedented levels. Due to specific requirements and design guidelines developed as part of the District’s educational specifications, and the unpredictability of the population, **planning for SPED** is a difficult facilities issue and often leads to these learners being placed in inadequate surplus spaces. The FMP identifies specific targets, per campus, for planning purposes.

5. SAFETY & SECURITY

Chico USD has been working through employing **safety and security** measures - controlled entry, fencing and gates, for example, throughout the District. They have also established criteria for new or renovated building hardware, etc. The FMP seeks to address, as campuses are modernized, key planning issues around safety and security such as parking and drop-off safety, administration location and controlled points of entry.

CONCLUSIONS

The previous Facilities Master Plans included a multi-phased implementation of the goals set forth in the plans. Like the 2019 FMP, this update also has a focus on the elementary schools as the immediate next phases of improvement. The FMP identified, through the demographic information from King Consulting, that there exists surplus capacity at the elementary schools, as well as at the Junior High School and High School levels, for the long term. The significance at the elementary school level, however, is key as the surplus capacity is equivalent to an entire mid-sized school. A summary of those elementary projections is shown here, along with the proposed model capacity as developed as part of the 2023 FMP; a more detailed discussion of district-wide demographics is included in Section 2. The following recommendation, specific to the elementary schools are important next steps, and are specifically addressed as they represent the highest priority projects in the FMP.

- Prioritize a renovation of Citrus ES based on the condition assessment findings. The historic school is overdue for renovation. Additionally, this site would be “rightsized” to 320 students, allowing pressure for student support program space to be addressed.
- Apply model capacity to all elementary schools. Model capacity begins with the assumptions for TK/K and ensures a consistent “cohort” can be housed at each school. The model capacities are shown here.
- Replace four schools: Parkview, Rosedale, Chapman and Sierra View. These schools, when originally built, were prototypical and therefore have similar needs that were identified during the condition assessment, requirements that will likely push renovation costs close to the cost of replacement when phasing implications and mandated code upgrades are considered. This will also provide the opportunity for these schools to adequately address TK/K planning, SPED planning as well as the new model capacities.
- The remaining schools are either newly renovated or will have small requirements such as the addition of TK classroom(s).
- Assume that Shasta ES will not house a TK program due to site size and enrollment pressures in grades K-5.

ENROLLMENT										
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	MODEL TARGET CAPACITY	SURPLUS CAPACITY
Chapman	300	304	301	288	292	286	281	280	320	40
Citrus	341	355	357	374	379	362	366	364	320	(44)
Emma Wilson	565	552	549	554	541	531	551	553	672	119
Hooker Oak	291	283	275	268	262	265	264	265	320	55
Little Chico	431	429	436	452	467	467	480	493	496	3
Marigold	570	610	639	654	650	641	652	660	672	12
McManus	415	406	407	419	419	413	424	425	672	247
Neal Dow	335	348	363	353	365	359	363	364	320	(44)
Parkview	406	438	462	463	456	476	470	470	496	26
Rosedale	543	549	560	569	568	567	570	571	672	101
Shasta	647	648	673	698	709	682	674	665	496	(169)
Sierra View	456	443	443	439	440	448	441	438	496	58
Elementary School Totals	5,300	5,365	5,465	5,531	5,548	5,497	5,536	5,548	5,952	261

The master plans for both junior and senior high schools remain similar to those identified in the 2019 FMP. However, the 2023 FMP provides discussion on interim housing requirements and other actions that may be required to “make ready” the sites for the renovation plans. Minor modifications to the Athletics master plans for both high schools resulted from the engagement of key stakeholders. Major renovation at junior and senior high schools are anticipated in later phases; another update to the FMP is likely prior to that time.

MODEL CAPACITY: ELEMENTARY

The model capacity discussion was a result of a detailed discussion regarding the Kindergarten and new Transitional Kindergarten demographic needs. Evaluation of the existing schools identified a potential misalignment between the number of Kindergarten students served and classrooms provided for grades 1-5. These model capacities align these numbers.

The Loading Standards shown are Chico USD's target loading standards. The numbers are conservative and represent desired averages by grade level so that facilities needs are met. The result is a model capacity for a smaller campus, with smaller demographic projections, a mid-size and a large campus.

The Special Education department at the District level identified a need for 2 mild/moderate special education classrooms at each Elementary Campus. Eight sites will require two moderate/severe special education classrooms. Those rooms are not shown in the model capacity, but the rooms are identified in the master plans for the following elementary school sites:

- Chapman ES
- Emma Wilson ES
- Little Chico Creek ES
- McManus ES
- Neal Dow ES
- Parkview ES
- Shasta ES
- Sierra View ES

The elementary schools include two "flexible" or "flex" rooms to accommodate a variety of programs - art, music, science - or other site-specific needs, ideally larger than traditional classrooms. The plan includes one "surplus" classroom to address a potential grade-level "bubble" that may occur; identified as an unloaded classroom space. The assumption is that new campuses will adequately respond to the needs for student support services in permanent, specific facilities and classrooms will not be required to meet those needs.

Model Capacity 1: **SMALL**

320 Students

GRADE	#	LOADING	TOTAL
TK	1	24	24
K	2	24	48
1	2	24	48
2	2	24	48
3	2	24	48
4	1.5	28	42
5	1.5	28	42
SPED	2	10	20
Flex	2	0	0
TOTAL	17		320

Model Capacity 2: **MID-SIZE**

496 Students

GRADE	#	LOADING	TOTAL
TK	2	24	48
K	3	24	72
1	3	24	72
2	3	24	72
3	3	24	72
4	2.5	28	70
5	2.5	28	70
SPED	2	10	20
Flex	2	0	0
TOTAL	23		496

Model Capacity 3: **LARGE**

672 Students

GRADE	#	LOADING	TOTAL
TK	3	24	72
K	4	24	96
1	4	24	96
2	4	24	96
3	4	24	96
4	3.5	28	98
5	3.5	28	98
SPED	2	10	20
Flex	2	0	0
TOTAL	28		672

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The implementation plan shown below has guided the use of facilities funding between 2013 and 2023. Understanding future phases will require a reliable source of funding - local general obligation bonds, state school facilities funding, and/or development fees - the implementation plan has been revised to acknowledge the shifting priorities of transitional kindergarten, demographic changes and guiding principles. Of particular note is the identification of some smaller projects addressing restroom upgrades, safety and security improvements, as well as the Citrus Elementary School renovation, aligning remaining local bond funds with priority projects that can be accomplished within those remaining funds.

