

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 164

**Minneapolis Public School System  
Building Needs**

**October 1963**

164

CITIZENS LEAGUE  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
O N

MINNEAPOLIS  
SCHOOL BUILDING  
NEEDS

Approved by  
Board of Directors

OCTOBER 29,  
1963

Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PART A -- ABOUT THIS REPORT	A-1
Purpose . . . . .	A-1
Background and Recent Developments . . . . .	A-1
Scope of Committee Activity . . . . .	A-2
 PART B -- GENERAL REACTIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MICHIGAN STATE SURVEY REPORT	 B-1
General Reactions and Conclusions . . . . .	B-1
Recommendations . . . . .	B-6
 PART C -- DISCUSSION OF GENERAL REACTIONS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	 C-1
General Reactions to the Survey Team's Report . . . . .	C-1
Backlog of School Building Needs. . . . .	C-3
Replacement of Obsolescent Schools . . . . .	C-4
Rate of Construction . . . . .	C-5
Financing the Program . . . . .	C-6
School Planning Staff . . . . .	C-7
De Facto Segregation . . . . .	C-8
School Attendance Area Boundaries . . . . .	C-9
School Organization . . . . .	C-9
Emerson Elementary-Junior High School . . . . .	C-11
Neighborhood Elementary School. . . . .	C-12
Size of Secondary Schools . . . . .	C-13
School Sites . . . . .	C-17
Sub-Grade Rooms . . . . .	C-21
Construction Costs . . . . .	C-21
 PART D -- DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC PROJECTS	 D-1
Projects Which Have Not Been Reviewed -- Rehabilitation and Modernization of Facilities in Existing School Buildings	 D-1
<u>Senior High Schools</u>	D-1
1. Henry Senior-Junior High School . . . . .	D-1
2. North Senior High School . . . . .	D-2
3. Edison Senior High School . . . . .	D-2
4. West Senior High School . . . . .	D-2
5. Central Senior High School . . . . .	D-2
6. Roosevelt Senior High School . . . . .	D-2
7. Southwest Senior High School . . . . .	D-3
8. Washburn Senior High School . . . . .	D-3
9. Vocational Senior High School . . . . .	D-3
<u>Junior High Schools</u>	D-3
1. Jordan Junior High School . . . . .	D-3
2. Lincoln Junior High School . . . . .	D-3
3. Jefferson Junior High School . . . . .	D-4
4. Bryant Junior High School . . . . .	D-4
5. Folwell Junior High School . . . . .	D-4

6. Phillips Junior High School . . . . .	D-4
7. Sanford Junior High School . . . . .	D-4
8. Ramsey Junior High School . . . . .	D-5
9. Nokomis Junior High School . . . . .	D-5
<u>Elementary Schools</u>	D-5
Projects Which Have Been Reviewed by the Committee . . . . .	D-5
<u>Senior High Schools</u>	D-6
1. North High School . . . . .	D-6
2. Marshall High School . . . . .	D-9
3. Roosevelt High School . . . . .	D-10
4. South High School . . . . .	D-11
5. Washburn High School . . . . .	D-16
<u>Junior High Schools</u>	D-17
1. Franklin Junior High School . . . . .	D-17
2. Sheridan Junior High School . . . . .	D-18
3. Southwest Junior High School . . . . .	D-19
<u>Elementary Schools</u>	D-20
1. Hamilton Elementary School . . . . .	D-20
2. Grant Elementary School . . . . .	D-21
3. Hawthorne Elementary School . . . . .	D-21
4. Willard Elementary School . . . . .	D-22
5. Holland Elementary School . . . . .	D-23
6. Pierce-Whitney Elementary School . . . . .	D-24
7. Sheridan Elementary School . . . . .	D-24
8. Webster Elementary School . . . . .	D-25
9. Warrington Elementary School . . . . .	D-25
10. Bancroft Elementary School . . . . .	D-26
11. Greeley Elementary School . . . . .	D-27
12. Lyndale Elementary School . . . . .	D-28
13. Mann Elementary School . . . . .	D-29
14. Seward Elementary School . . . . .	D-30
15. Agassiz Elementary School . . . . .	D-31
16. Armatage Elementary School . . . . .	D-31
17. Audubon Elementary School . . . . .	D-32
18. Fuller Elementary School . . . . .	D-32
19. Fulton Elementary School . . . . .	D-33
Removal, Transportation & Placement of Portables . . . . .	D-33
Regional Special Education Facilities . . . . .	D-34
Construction Contingency . . . . .	D-35
Site Expansion . . . . .	D-35



PART A. ABOUT THIS REPORT

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to review the Michigan State University survey team's report and recommendations on the building needs of the Minneapolis school system. Our report presents our general reaction to the survey team's report and our specific conclusions and recommendations about the school building projects recommended by the survey team.

This is not an easy report to prepare, since it comments on, and in some cases recommends against, the construction of schools which would serve specific parts of the city - construction projects which have the enthusiastic and at times emotional backing of the parents in the neighborhoods which would be served by the new schools. It is not an easy thing to say to the residents of a neighborhood that our organization believes that a new school recommended for that neighborhood should not be included in a bond program in order to avoid jeopardizing the approval by the voters of other more urgent projects, or that the new school should not be built in their immediate neighborhood because of broader educational factors which we considered more important than the neighborhood's desire for a new school located close to their homes. However, we believe it is incumbent upon us to give primary consideration to the educational needs of Minneapolis and to base our findings and recommendations upon an objective evaluation of what we believe to be in the best interest of the entire city.

BACKGROUND AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In a sense, this report is a sequel to previous Citizens League reports on Minneapolis' school building needs. In the spring of 1962, when the Minneapolis school administration proposed a \$25,000,000 school building program, the Citizens League undertook an intensive study of the administration's proposal. The Citizens League and other organizations were critical of some of the features of the administration's proposal and recommended that the proposed building program be deferred and that outside consultants be retained to develop a building program within the context of a long-range school construction program. The League's criticisms of the proposed program, which were contained in a 50-page report released in May, 1962, were directed not at the cost of the program nor at its financing but, instead, were concerned with problems such as the need to adhere more closely to the principle of providing a reasonably equal educational opportunity to each student within the city of Minneapolis; the manner in which the program was developed; and the need for standard and underlying principles upon which to base a program.

After much debate, the Board of Education finally decided to remove the proposed bond issue from the ballot and to follow the recommendation that outside consultants be retained to develop a long-range program. The Board of Education then retained Dr. Donald Leu of Michigan State University to survey the Minneapolis schools and develop a long-range school construction program, together with a recommended first phase. Work on the survey commenced early in the fall of 1962 under the part-time direction of Dr. Leu and the full-time supervision of Dr. John McNicholas.

In the meantime, the Board of Education had proposed a \$5,000,000 bond issue to "meet urgent needs" and this bond issue was submitted to the voters at the 1962 primary election. The proposed bond issue was supported by the Citizens League and most of the other organizations which previously had been critical of the administration's earlier proposal. Unfortunately, however, the \$5,000,000 bond issue was

defeated by the voters when it failed to win the necessary majority of those voting at the election, in spite of receiving the approval of over 60% of those voting on the question.

At the 1963 session, the Minnesota State Legislature made extensive amendments (supported by the Citizens League, as well as others) in the Minneapolis Independent School District Act. These amendments included some important changes in the majorities required for bond approval. As a result of the amendments, Minneapolis school bonds will henceforth require the approval of only 53% of those voting on the question, instead of a majority of those voting at the election as had been required. The law also permits the Board of Education to present a bond issue to the voters at one special election which must be held on a date before May, 1964. (At this special election, approval by 55% of those voting on the question will be required for approval of the bond issue.)

In the meantime, the Michigan State University survey team was conducting its survey of the Minneapolis school system and cataloguing the city's school building needs. On April 16, 1963, the survey team reported its tentative recommendations for a long-term school construction and rehabilitation program. In their tentative recommendations, the consultants outlined the school needs in each of ten Minneapolis communities as these communities are defined by the Minneapolis City Planning Commission. This was followed, on June 20, 1963, by a "Preliminary Draft" of the "Recommended First Steps" of a Minneapolis school construction program. The consultants explained that the recommended first steps would be subject to later modification in their final report.

After receiving the consultants' final report on August 27, the Board of Education formally requested Minneapolis citizens groups, including the Citizens League, to review the survey team's report and recommendations and to present their reactions to the Board of Education at a special meeting on October 15. Although the Citizens League's study of the specific projects recommended by the consultants had not been completed by the October 15 deadline, our President, Waite D. Durfee, Jr., appeared at that hearing to submit a 5-page statement summarizing our general reaction to the report and our conclusions about the planning guidelines which the consultants used in formulating their recommendations. The summary has been incorporated into this report and has been made an integral part of it.

#### SCOPE OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

When the survey team's final report was presented to the Board of Education on the afternoon of August 27, the Citizens League's study of the recommendations was already well under way. Having realized that other obligations would take the consultants away from Minneapolis immediately after the presentation of their final report, the Citizens League, in mid-July, had organized a 46-member Minneapolis School Construction Committee to review the consultants' report and recommendations. James L. Hetland, Jr., former Citizens League President and University of Minnesota Law Professor, served as chairman of the committee. Also appointed to the committee were: Clyde Bezanson, Samuel Bloom, Earl F. Colborn, Jr., Raymond L. Cordes, John Cummings, Richard Faunce, Harold Field, Jr., David Forester, Mrs. Ralph Forester, William E. Fox, Mrs. Martin L. Friedman, Charles Frisch, Fred Goff, Robert Helland, Rev. Rodney Hokenson, Robert P. Janes, Howard S. Kahn, Vernon Kowalsky, Prof. Richard Kozelka, Rabbi Jerome Lipnick, Greer Lockhart, Mrs. Sally Luther, Mrs. Henry Mackall, Alan MacLean, C. D. Mahoney, Jr., Mrs. J. Paul McGee, Mrs. M. D. McVay, Rabbi Albert G. Minda, Wallace E. Neal, Jr., Melvin Orenstein, John Pulver, Stuart W. Rider, Jr., Willis R. Salisbury, Prof. Terrance Sandalow, Royce Sanner, Clarence Shallbetter, Willis F. Shaw, Philip F. Sherman, Prof. Lloyd M. Short, Archie Spencer, Alan Sherr, Fred W. Thomas, Stanley T. Vaill, Thomas Vasaly and Robert Williams.

Throughout August, the Committee held weekly meetings with the consultants in an effort to learn as much as possible about the recommendations, and the reasons behind the recommendations, before the consultants left Minneapolis. By the time Dr. McNicholas moved back to Chicago at the end of August, the committee had already held five meetings with the consultants, including one 5-hour session. All together the committee held 12 meetings, and in addition to Dr. Leu and Dr. McNicholas the committee met with Dr. Adner I. Heggerston, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education; Dr. Rodney Tillman, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education; Dr. Andrew Eckert, Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs; and James Clubb, Director of Buildings and Grounds of the Minneapolis school administration, as well as Guy Tollerud, State Director of School Planning for the Minnesota Department of Education. During the course of the study, the committee members or the Citizens League staff also visited virtually every one of the schools involved in the consultants' recommended program.

In mid-September, the committee organized an agenda subcommittee for the purpose of formulating specific recommendations or conclusions for the consideration of the full committee. The 11-member subcommittee spent over 20 hours in four evening sessions devoted to the consideration of the consultants' report.

The financing aspects of the consultants' proposal were studied by the League's Taxation and Finance Committee, under the chairmanship of Willis F. Shaw, Jr. The Taxation and Finance Committee's recommendations, which were developed in the course of four meetings of that committee, have been incorporated into this report. As are all Citizens League reports, this report has been reviewed and approved by the League's Board of Directors prior to its release.

PART B. GENERAL REACTIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
ON THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY REPORT

GENERAL REACTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The following are the major guiding principles we have used in reviewing the proposals of the Michigan State University survey team:
  - a. In our May 1962 report, we stated that "First and foremost is our belief that tax savings which jeopardize the providing of adequate schools, school facilities and equipment, and a comprehensive curriculum, or which discourage the attraction and retention of competent teachers, is short-sighted economy, indeed. The general health of a community can often be judged by assessing the quality of its schools. We therefore look most sympathetically on proposed programs designed to provide and maintain an adequate educational system." We still hold this belief and we have reviewed the consultants' recommendations in the context of the foregoing statement.
  - b. In this study we were guided by the principle of "offering to each student in Minneapolis a reasonably equal educational opportunity, meaning the offering of a reasonably comparable curriculum and provision of reasonably comparable facilities and equipment."
  - c. In our review, we have put primary emphasis upon the educational needs of the entire city, rather than the desires of individual neighborhoods. We believe that the proper goal of any Minneapolis school program should be to achieve a uniformly high standard of education in every part of the city and that the proposals of the MSU team should be measured against this goal.
2. As we have stated previously, we are very pleased that the Minneapolis Board of Education chose to engage the services of outside consultants experienced in the area of school planning to make a study of the long-term and immediate school building needs of the Minneapolis school system. In our May 1962 report, which urged the Board of Education to take this step, we stated that such a study was necessary in order to expedite the early submission to the voters of the first stage of a 15-20 year long-range school construction and rehabilitation program and in order to offer greater assurance to the voters that such a program is needed. We believe that the Michigan State survey has demonstrated the needs of the school system.
3. We are favorably impressed by the Michigan State University survey team and by its report. We believe that the survey team has discharged its contract with the School District in a conscientious and capable manner and that its report should be of great assistance to the Board of Education and the school administration in planning for the future of the Minneapolis school system. The survey has provided the Board of Education, the school administration and the people of Minneapolis with:
  - a. An organized perspective view of the entire Minneapolis school system and a frame of reference which will help guide the planning of the school system for many years.
  - b. An orderly inventory of Minneapolis school facilities, including detailed information about every school in the system, presented in a consistent format which facilitates comparisons between the different schools.

- c. A list of needed improvements at each school in the system developed by the survey team by inspection of each school.
- d. A recommended first phase program, in which the consultants considered the long-range needs of the entire school system and recommended for inclusion in the first phase those projects which they considered to be the most critically needed. The listing of long-range needs could well serve as a basis for the 15-year comprehensive long-range building plan which, by law, the School District is required to formulate and revise annually.
- e. A "Recommended Planning Guide which provides the basic assumptions utilized by the team in developing its long-term and short-term recommendations.

4. Along with its virtues, we believe that the survey also has some deficiencies. While these deficiencies are not so serious as to make the recommendations invalid, they are matters which should be considered in any evaluation of the survey or the recommendations, and therefore we have listed them here:

- a. The report does not set forth the standards against which existing buildings were measured and rated and which could be used as a continuing basis for priorities and to develop a long-range program for school rehabilitation and replacement.
- b. The survey report does not call attention to the recent extensive school rehabilitation program. Recent capital expenditures at the various schools are a factor which should be considered in deciding which schools are critically in need of further work or replacement and in the development of the comparative priorities of the different schools.
- c. Although the consultants have verbally presented us with some amended enrollment projections, the projections for individual schools which are published in the report are based upon a formula method which fails to reflect fully the impact of anticipated freeway construction, urban renewal projects, or other land use changes. Also, although we appreciate the difficulties of estimating future school enrollments, it would appear that enrollments for individual school attendance areas are not projected far enough into the future in the report. The consultants' recommendations to build new schools with an anticipated life of many years appear to be based upon enrollment projections for only five years into the future.
- d. The report does not discuss the present uses of the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill (about \$1.3 million) per year Repair and Improvement Fund, nor does it appear to consider for what purposes this fund could be used in the future. In past years, a substantial part of this fund has been used for major rehabilitation projects, and it is important that expenditures from the R & I Fund, totalling over \$6.5 million during the next five years, be coordinated with any proposed construction program.

5. We believe that a substantial increase in the present rate of expenditure for school construction and rehabilitation is essential during the next several years, if the Minneapolis public school system is to provide an adequate educational

opportunity for our children. The consultants' study has convincingly demonstrated that there is a substantial backlog of school building needs in Minneapolis which must be met through an aggressive, accelerated school construction program in the immediate future. Such a program is necessary if Minneapolis is to continue to provide an attractive home for young families with children. Failure to undertake such a program can only mean that the city increasingly will become the home of only the old and the childless and those too poor to live elsewhere.

6. We are pleased that the consultants have chosen to recommend the replacement of schools in Minneapolis instead of a continuing rehabilitation of old and obsolete structures. We concur with the consultants in their findings that many Minneapolis schools have reached the point where they should be replaced, and that replacement is a better educational and financial investment than rehabilitation. The MSU study shows that meeting the city's immediate school needs is only the beginning and that a long-term school replacement program also will be needed. In programming the replacement of old schools, whether to meet immediate needs or as part of a long-range program, recent rehabilitation expenditures should be considered.

7. We concur with the consultants' recommendations (Item H on Page 25 of Volume I of the consultants' report) that the Minneapolis School District should hire on a permanent basis and at a high level within the school administration an outstanding educational facilities planner to carry out a continuing program of educational facilities planning for Minneapolis. This is an essential part of a school building program, and the Board of Education should implement this recommendation as soon as possible. Among his other responsibilities, the planner should be responsible for a continuous updating of the Michigan State survey team's report and for providing the staff work necessary to develop and revise annually the 15-year comprehensive long-range building plan required by state statute.

8. We strongly approve of the survey team's approach to the elimination of whatever de facto segregation may exist in the Minneapolis public schools and the prevention of further concentrations of minority group students in individual schools. As outlined by the consultants in Item E on Pages 17-20 of Volume I, the recommendations for action by the Board of Education include:

- a. "Active support of all neighborhood, city, state and national efforts designed to reduce segregated housing and resultant segregated educational facilities."
- b. "Redistricting of school attendance areas when consistent with good planning practices to disperse the Negro enrollment."
- c. "The development of a policy on open enrollments containing adequate controls permitting and encouraging children in overcrowded schools to attend those schools outside of their community area which are under-utilized. These controls should assist in achieving racially balanced schools."
- d. "The planning of new schools and additions to existing schools designed to disperse concentrations of Negro enrollments."

9. We strongly favor increased flexibility of school attendance area boundaries, as suggested by the consultants, and urge that these boundaries be reviewed and revised annually to assure maximum utilization of the District's educational facilities. The Board of Education should implement the survey team's recommendations on this matter by:

- a. Developing an open transfer policy which would permit students in crowded schools to transfer to under-utilized facilities.
- b. Establishing optional areas which would permit transfer from overcrowded schools to adjacent under-utilized schools.
- c. Making every reasonable attempt to use under-utilized school buildings for those students presently receiving school transportation services.

10. We accept the consultants' recommendation that the District continue its policy of using the Kindergarten to 6th grade, junior high school, senior high school (K6-3-3) form of school organization, and we believe it should be followed throughout the District, except in the most unusual circumstances. As yet, we have not had sufficient time to evaluate the recommendation that Minneapolis should establish a Community College in Phase II of the program, but we believe this recommendation is deserving of further consideration.

11. We accept the consultants' recommended size for elementary schools of 540-655 students, and we agree with the principle of locating elementary schools within reasonable walking distance of students' homes, unless there are unusual circumstances making this impractical.

12. We seriously question the consultants' recommended optimum sizes for secondary schools of 1,000-1,500 students for senior high schools and 800-1,000 students for junior high schools. In our report of May, 1962, we stated that each school should have a sufficient minimum enrollment to enable the offering of a comprehensive curriculum at an economical cost. At that time, we cited standards that junior high schools should have an enrollment of between 700-1,200 students and that senior high school enrollment should be between 1,000-1,800, with an optimum size of 1,500. Our studies since then indicate that the standards we cited in 1962 are probably too low, particularly with respect to senior high schools. We have found that:

- a. The prevailing practice in other Minnesota school systems with sufficient total enrollments appears to be to build senior high schools for 1,800-2,200 students.
- b. Senior high school buildings apparently are most economical and efficient from the standpoint of building utilization when they are designed for about 2,000 students.
- c. The per student cost of school construction and operation generally is higher for smaller schools, if comparable facilities are provided.
- d. A much wider range of courses can be offered economically at a large school than at a small school.

There is similar evidence that the most desirable size for junior high schools would be 1,000-1,400 students.

We believe that at the secondary school level, particularly the senior high school, it is more important to have schools of an adequate size than it is that the schools be located within a particular community or within walking distance of the students' homes. We have found that adequacy of enrollment has a direct and important effect on the comprehensiveness of the curriculum offering, and that the

most practical and economical way to strengthen the curriculum offering at a smaller school is to increase its enrollment. We believe that priority attention should be directed toward reducing the present substantial variation in enrollments among junior and senior high schools. At the senior high school level, for example, a long-range goal of increasing the enrollment at each school to a minimum of 1,500, with the possible exception of a consolidated Marshall-U High, is not only desirable but attainable.

13. While we agree that some Minneapolis school sites are too small and should be enlarged, we do not consider the need for expanded sites to be as critically urgent as other school needs. While the minimum site standards recommended by the consultants may be desirable, they appear to be unrealistically high for a built-up city, such as Minneapolis, where school sites can be enlarged only at the expense of dislocating families, demolishing homes, removing property from the tax rolls, and making large expenditures of tax funds. We believe that:

- a. The minimum site size standards recommended by the consultants should be revised to a more attainable level.
- b. The School District should continue its policy of developing joint school-park sites in cooperation with the Minneapolis Park Board. However, the School District should recognize that it will not be possible to follow this policy in all cases.
- c. Even when schools are not located immediately adjacent to a park, the minimum site standards adopted for Minneapolis schools should give full recognition to the city's extensive system of local parks and athletic fields.
- d. Before it embarks on a program of site expansion, the School District should develop a "priority list of site expansion needs" as outlined in Item C-6 on Page 11 of Volume I. More specifically, the Board of Education should not include in the forthcoming bond program any funds for the expansion of existing school sites, unless the land to be acquired is necessary for the construction of an addition to the school.

14. We reject the survey team's standard with respect to rooms with the floor more than 30" below ground level. The survey team considered all such pupil spaces to be substandard and automatically discounted them when computing the capacities of the Minneapolis schools. We believe that each space located more than 30" below ground level should be considered individually, and that they should not be discounted unless they have a lighting, ventilating, moisture or heating problem which cannot be rectified economically.

15. Information we have obtained indicates that the survey team's estimates are considerably above the cost of comparable schools recently built in nearby school districts. We urge the Board of Education and the administration to analyze carefully these estimates before submitting a proposal to the voters. We believe that such a review will make it possible to reduce the total cost of the program recommended by the consultants without curtailing the program. We further believe that the costs which the voter is asked to approve should be set at a realistic level, in order that the voter may feel confident that the schools will be built for as low a cost as is possible, consistent with good construction practices, ease of maintenance, student safety and educational efficiency.



### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We are convinced that the backlog of school construction and rehabilitation needs in Minneapolis is so substantial that the present rate of meeting these needs is totally inadequate. We therefore strongly urge the Minneapolis Board of Education to develop and present to the community as promptly as possible the first phase of a long-range construction and rehabilitation program. We further urge the Board of Education to submit to the voters early in 1964 the question of authorizing the issuance of bonds to finance that portion of the first phase program which cannot be financed out of the discretionary non-referendum bond fund and out of the R & I Fund.

2. We urge the Board of Education to limit the first phase of the program to those projects for which an urgent need has been clearly demonstrated and where the proposed method for meeting the need has received such widespread community acceptance that inclusion of the project will not jeopardize the prospects for voter approval of the entire program. Certain projects proposed for inclusion in the first phase appear to be far more urgent than others. Some projects raise important and basic policy questions, the answers to which may not be forthcoming until well after the voters are required to make their decision. We believe that including in the first phase the less urgently needed projects and those involving basic policy questions which may not be answered at this time would be most unwise and might well cause voter rejection of the entire program.

3. After an intensive review of each of the projects recommended for inclusion in the first phase of the long-range school construction program, and based upon the criteria proposed in Recommendation 2 above, we make the following specific recommendations.

- a. We strongly urge that the following construction projects be included in the first phase of the program. We believe the need for each of these projects is both clear and urgent and that the MSU survey team's proposed method of meeting the need is the soundest approach or, at least, a clearly acceptable alternative. The total projected cost of these construction projects, based on MSU cost estimates, is \$14,940,000. The numbers in parentheses after each school indicate the page or pages elsewhere in this report where each project is discussed in detail.

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION</u>
1. Roosevelt Senior High (P D-9)	New gym & additional classrooms
2. Franklin Junior High (P D-17)	New school on new site
3. Southwest Junior High (P D-19)	New school on new site
4. Hamilton Elementary (P D-20)	New school on new site
5. Grant Elementary (P D-21)	New school on expanded site
6. Holland Elementary (P D-23)	New school on new site
7. Pierce-Whitney Element. (P D-24)	New school on new site
8. Bancroft Elementary (P D-26)	Addition to increase capacity
9. Lyndale Elementary (P D-28)	New school on new site
10. Seward Elementary (P D-30)	New school on existing site
11. Armatage Elementary (P D-31)	Two portable classrooms
12. Audubon Elementary (P D-32)	Two portable classrooms
13. Fuller Elementary (P D-32)	Two portable classrooms
14. Fulton Elementary (P D-33)	Addition to increase capacity

- b. A considerable number of the projects recommended by MSU for inclusion in the first phase are for the purpose of meeting ongoing needs to rehabilitate and upgrade the physical plant and facilities throughout the Minneapolis school system. Projects fitting this definition involve a total of 18 schools and total \$4,793,000 based on MSU cost projections. The specific projects recommended for each school may be found on Pages D-1 to D-5 of this report.

We have not reviewed these rehabilitation and upgrading projects in depth, and therefore make no recommendation on any individual project in this category. However, the need to rehabilitate and upgrade facilities is no less important than is the need to replace obsolete schools. We urge that, to the extent the school administration and the Board of Education concur with the MSU recommendations for rehabilitation and upgrading of existing building and facilities, these projects be included in the first phase of the program.

- c. We urge that the following projects be included in the first phase of the program, but in a form modified from that proposed by MSU:

1. North High School (D-6)

MSU Recommendation: Construct an addition on a new site, the addition to become the first section of a new North High, to provide a new gym, locker and shower facilities and a music suite.

Suggested Modification: Provision within the existing building of facilities for a music suite, an auxiliary gym, and expanded locker and shower space.

2. Washburn High School (D-16)

MSU Recommendation: An addition on the existing site to provide a new gymnasium, shower & locker facilities and a music suite.

Suggested Modification: An addition on the existing site to provide a music suite and additional classrooms; an auxiliary gym and expanded shower & locker facilities within the existing building.

3. Mann Elementary (D-29)

MSU Recommendation: Construction of a new school on an expanded site.

Suggested Modification: An addition to provide for increased capacity during the first phase; the addition to be the first part of a new school to be completed in the 2nd phase.

4. Agassiz Elementary (D-31)

MSU Recommendation: An addition to provide for increased capacity; modernization and modification of present bldg.

Suggested Modification: No addition; modernization and modification of present building.

- d. We have devoted more time and attention to analysis and discussion of the MSU recommendation to construct a new South Senior High on a new site than to any other single project recommended by MSU for inclusion in the first phase. (See Discussion on Page D-11) We have reached the following major conclusions:
- (1) The oldest portion of the present South High building is in such poor physical condition, in terms of the ability to provide the quality of educational opportunity to which the South High pupils are entitled, that substantial rehabilitation must be undertaken if the building is to continue to serve as a comprehensive high school. Therefore, it is imperative that a prompt decision be made on the future of this building. We believe that replacing, rather than rehabilitating this building -- certainly, its oldest portion -- is the sounder long-range educational and financial investment.
  - (2) Any plan to construct a new South High should envision the ultimate consolidation of the three high schools across the south-central belt of Minneapolis (South, West and Central) into two permanent senior high schools, each with an enrollment of at least 1,500 pupils.
  - (3) MSU recommends that the new South High be constructed on a site east of Hiawatha Avenue and south of 28th Street, but not much, if any, south of Lake Street. We vigorously oppose this proposed site as being incompatible with the long-range plan to have this school serve as one of the two larger schools serving the south-central belt of Minneapolis. A new South Senior High at the location suggested would almost certainly preclude ultimate consolidation of the three existing senior highs into two permanent schools.
  - (4) We are adamantly opposed to the construction of a new South Senior High to serve generally the Longfellow community, with a potential senior high enrollment of, at most, 1,000 pupils and perhaps somewhat less.
  - (5) We oppose the MSU recommendation to transfer to Central the approximately 400 pupils now attending South who live west of Cedar Avenue. This portion of the South High attendance area, we have been led to believe, has the highest dropout rate and therefore would benefit most by having a new school within reasonably close proximity. Moreover, we are concerned about this proposed boundary change, since it would result in transfer of most of the colored pupils now attending South to Central, a school which already has a higher proportion of colored pupils than any other senior high in Minneapolis.
  - (6) We believe that a way can and should be found to allow at least the beginning of the construction of a new South Senior High during the first phase, while at the same time assuring that the replacement building will have an enrollment of adequate size and will be suitably located to serve ultimately as one of the two larger senior high schools for the present South, Central and West attendance areas.

In order to accomplish the objectives set forth in Conclusion (6),

we urge that the Minneapolis Board of Education adopt the following course of action:

- (1) Eliminate the proposed construction of a new South Senior High from the group of construction projects to be financed out of that portion of the bond issue requiring voter approval.
  - (2) Publicly adopt, prior to the bond authorization election, the basic policy objective of ultimately serving the South-Central-West attendance areas by two senior high schools, each with enrollments of 1,500 or more pupils.
  - (3) Publicly declare, prior to the bond authorization election, its intention to proceed without delay to select and reach agreement on the most suitable site for a new school to serve the eastern half of this ultimate attendance area, such site in no event to be east of Hiawatha Avenue. The area somewhat south of the present school and perhaps slightly to the west would appear to be the most centrally located for the ultimate attendance area, although an expansion of the present site would offer certain important advantages and should not be ruled out entirely.
  - (4) Publicly declare, prior to the bond authorization election, its intention to phase out Central as a comprehensive senior high serving its immediate attendance area when capacity at the two permanent senior highs becomes available.
  - (5) Publicly pledge, prior to the bond authorization election, that sufficient financing will be made available to assure that construction of a replacement school of sufficient capacity to serve initially the entire present South High attendance area will at least get under way during the first phase. Whether the construction takes the form of an addition on an expanded site, as the first section of a new school, or whether the construction is a total new school on a new site in all probability cannot be determined until each alternative is considered in depth. The needed financing could come from the non-referendum discretionary bond fund and/or other non-bond funds, such as the R & I Fund.
- e. We urge that the following projects be eliminated from the first phase. Although a need for these projects has been demonstrated, the proposed method of meeting the need raises basic policy questions, the answers to which may not be forthcoming until well after the voters must make their decision.

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION</u>
1. North Senior High (D-6)	Addition & site acquisition
2. Sheridan Junior High (D-18)	Expanded & upgraded junior high facilities
3. Sheridan Elementary (D-24)	New school on a new site
4. Webster Elementary (D-25)	Addition to increase capacity

- f. We have found the following projects to be far less urgent than others recommended for inclusion in the first phase, and we therefore urge that they be eliminated from the first phase. In our judgment, no great hardship will result from their deferment, and their elimination from the first phase should enhance substantially the prospects of voter approval of the remaining urgently needed projects.

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION</u>
1. Roosevelt Senior High (D-9)	Site acquisition
2. Washburn Senior High (D-16)	Site acquisition
3. Sheridan Junior High (D-18)	Site acquisition
4. Hawthorne Elementary (D-21)	New school on expanded site
5. Willard Elementary (D-22)	Addition to replace below-grade classrooms disqualified from capacity figures
6. Greeley Elementary (D-27)	Addition to provide increased capacity and to replace below-grade classrooms disqualified from capacity figures
7. General site expansion (D-35)	To provide a fund for initial site acquisition at schools lacking sufficient site

- g. We urge that the following projects be eliminated from the first phase. To the extent that these projects are needed, it would be preferable that they be financed by some means other than a bond program.

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>
1. Marshall Junior-Senior High (D-9)	To plan for and provide the facilities necessary if Marshall & U High are consolidated.
2. Regional special education facilities (D-34)	To plan the provision and/or rehabilitation of appropriate spaces in existing elementary schools with excess capacity for special education units.
3. Construction contingency (D-35)	To be used by the District for those projects where unusual site problems or construction difficulties increase the estimated costs.
4. Removing, transporting, & placement of portables (D-33)	No specified use

4. We recommend that the first phase of the long-range program be scheduled to proceed at approximately the same rate of construction as that recommended by the survey team. To the extent that the total size of the first phase is reduced by the deletion of some projects, as suggested in Recommendation 3 above, there should be a proportionate reduction in the length of the first phase. For example, based upon the survey team's estimated costs, the total cost of the projects we have recommended for inclusion in the first phase would be about \$21,000,000, plus the cost of that portion of a new South High School included in the first phase by the Board of

Education (See Conclusion #5, Page B-5). A first phase of this magnitude could be completed in three or four years, if it were built at the rate the consultants recommended for their \$34,000,000 5-year program. By reducing the length of the program, together with the total amount, it will be possible to start the second phase at an earlier date than that suggested by the consultants, and, therefore, it also would be possible to complete a program as large as the total first phase program the survey team recommended within the same amount of time they advocated.

5. We urge the Board of Education to spell out what the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill Repair and Improvement Fund will be used for during the first phase and, to the maximum extent possible, to utilize this fund to finance rehabilitation and upgrading portions of projects included in the first phase. The remainder of the first phase program should be financed by School District bonds, including the "discretionary" bonds which the School District is authorized to issue without requiring voter approval. More specifically, we urge the Board of Education to allocate, to the extent possible, which first phase projects will be financed from the R & I Fund, which will be financed out of discretionary non-referendum bond funds.

6. We urge the Board of Education to take immediate steps to authorize the retention, on a permanent basis and at a high level within the school administration, of an outstanding educational facilities planner.

7. We concur with the MSU recommendation to consolidate Marshall and University High as the soundest resolution of the Marshall High problem, and, if this cannot be attained, to phase out Marshall as a comprehensive senior high. We urge the Minneapolis Board of Education and appropriate officials of the University of Minnesota to initiate and maintain discussions in depth on the specifics of the proposed consolidation, in order to reach the promptest possible decision on the future of Marshall High. Resolution of this basic policy question would do much to unblock a number of important projects, including those affecting Sheridan Junior High, Sheridan Elementary and Webster Elementary, and enable these projects to receive a high priority in the second phase.

8. We urge the Board of Education to proceed immediately to begin developing a further construction and rehabilitation program, in order that it might get under way immediately after the first phase program is completed. We believe that prompt compliance with the statutory provision requiring development of a 15-year coordinated capital improvements program for the Minneapolis school system is the best way to develop the highest priority projects for the next phase.

9. During our review of the proposed construction program, we have learned that no recommendation has been made for the ultimate disposition of the small number of regular junior high pupils (65 7th & 8th grade students in 1963) presently attending Emerson Elementary-Junior High School. We urge the Board of Education to transfer these regular junior high pupils from Emerson to some other junior high school. Whether the junior high students in the special education classes at Emerson also should be transferred to another school, or whether more special education pupils should be sent to Emerson, is a question which should be determined by the Board of Education as plans are developed for new special education facilities. We believe that, on balance, it would be preferable to overcrowd slightly an adjacent junior high, if necessary, rather than continue the operation of the extremely small junior high at Emerson.

PART C. DISCUSSION OF GENERAL REACTIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL REACTIONS TO THE SURVEY TEAM'S REPORT

The report of the Michigan State University survey team consists of two volumes. Volume II, the School Building Fact Book, provides the community with a complete inventory of the Minneapolis public school facilities. Each school in the system is described in the 700-page volume, which contains information about the construction of each school, the site, the neighborhood served by the school, the number and type of spaces in the school, the number of students in each grade in the school in September, 1962, the total enrollment at the school in each year from 1952 through 1962, the projected enrollment for the year 1967, and the rated and optimum capacity of the school. It also includes an itemized list of the needed improvements at each school in the system.

The information in the Fact Book is presented in such a way as to facilitate cross comparisons between the various schools. This permits people in the community to compare not only the adequacy of each school itself but also the relative need for improvements at each of the various schools. If it is kept current, the information in this volume will be ideally suited for use in the development of priorities for the rehabilitation and replacement of Minneapolis school buildings.

In the 200-page Volume I, the consultants have presented information about the school community, Minneapolis school enrollments in the past, expected enrollments in the future, and the educational programs in the school system, as well as their recommendations with respect to future school construction programs. The recommendations include a general evaluation of each school in the system, together with the long-range school building needs at each.

Perhaps the most important part of the consultants' report is the 16 pages in which they present their recommended first steps. As explained by the consultants, the first steps "will not solve all of the school building problems of the District, nor will they complete the upgrading of each and every building mentioned." The consultants have also outlined in general terms the projects which should be considered for inclusion in the second phase of a long-range construction program.

The consultants' "Recommended Planning Guide," included in Volume I, should be of great assistance to the community in the formulation of both a long-term and a short-term building program for the school system. Although, as the consultants point out, "During the immediate years ahead, this guide should be constantly reviewed, revised and expanded." The Planning Guide suggested by the consultants gives the District a basis for its planning. The consultants state in the report that the Planning Guide was developed by the survey team and provides the basic assumptions utilized by the team in the development of their recommendations. The guide suggests school district policies on matters such as school organization, school size, school sites, the community and neighborhood concepts, social and economic factors, school district boundaries, efficient utilization of facilities, a comprehensive 2-year community college, planning and staffing for the building program, needed legislation, and planning for change.

While we consider the consultants' report to be a big step forward in the process of planning the future of the Minneapolis schools, we believe that, along with its virtues, this survey also has some deficiencies. Although the deficiencies are not so serious as to make the recommendations of the survey team invalid, they are matters which should be considered in any evaluation of the survey or the recommendations, and it is to be regretted that they have not been covered in the survey report.

One deficiency noted by our committee is that the report does not set forth the standards against which the existing buildings were measured and rated. Inclusion of such standards in the report would have been most helpful, not only to those attempting to evaluate the consultants' recommended first steps, but also to those responsible for planning future phases of the School District's long-range program for rehabilitation and replacement of schools. It would appear to us to be highly desirable to have a published statement describing the level of school facilities we are attempting to achieve in Minneapolis. Standards of this nature are virtually a necessity if we are to determine the relative priorities of the School District's many school building needs in an objective and consistent manner. We believe that such standards should be formulated by the School District.

A second deficiency in the consultants' report is the absence of direct references to the recent and extensive school rehabilitation program which has been carried out in the Minneapolis school system. Apparently, the School District has been following a policy of renovating old schools in order to prolong their usefulness, instead of replacing old schools with new structures. In the past 13 years (1950 through 1962), the Minneapolis School District has spent almost \$16,000,000 on the rehabilitation of the school system and much of this work has been accomplished very recently.

In the listing of needed improvements at each school, the MSU study reflects the recent rehabilitation work, and undoubtedly the MSU survey team considered recent rehabilitation activity in the formulation of their recommended first steps. However, we believe that the survey should have included information about the recent capital expenditures at the various schools, since rehabilitation expenditures are a factor which should be considered by the community in the evaluation of the recommendations. Certainly, these expenditures are a factor which must be considered in the determination of priorities for the replacement or further rehabilitation of the various schools in the system.

The only projections of future enrollments at individual schools included in the report were developed by the Minneapolis public schools' Office of Research, Census and Attendance by a formula method. This method is based upon a process of "aging" the population now residing within the school's attendance area and applying various ratios to include such factors as birth rates and dropout rates. While this method is probably sound statistically, it does not appear to reflect fully the impact of sudden changes on the neighborhood, such changes as future freeway construction, urban renewal projects, and other land use changes.

In their meetings with us, the consultants have orally presented some amended enrollment projections for individual schools. Although the consultants apparently used these amended projections in the development of their recommendations, they are not published in their report.

While we appreciate the difficulties of estimating future populations and future school enrollments at individual schools, it appears to us that the estimates of future enrollments within individual school attendance areas which are included in the report do not extend far enough into the future. The report, which outlines the "long-range" building needs of the school system, apparently is based upon the projected 1967 enrollment at each school. Although the MSU team recommends the construction of schools with an anticipated life of 50-100 years, the enrollments at the individual schools have been projected for only five years into the future. In fact, it may be noted that, as recommended by the consultants for inclusion in the first phase of the program, many of the schools in the first phase would not even be built by 1967!



We believe that longer-range estimates of future enrollments should be considered in any evaluation of the consultants' recommendations. Longer-range population estimates are commonly used in the construction of other public facilities, such as sewers, water systems and highways. In fact, the Minnesota State Highway Department has even estimated the volume of traffic which will use specific segments of highways in the year 1980. Also, in other cities, such as St. Paul, school enrollments are estimated for considerably longer periods than five years into the future. Admittedly, in estimating future enrollments, one runs the risk of being wrong, but we believe that it is both feasible and necessary that such estimates be prepared. They are an indispensable tool in the development of plans to build schools which will be used for more than 50 years.

Another factor which is not discussed in the report, but which we believe should be considered in any evaluation of the report's recommendations, is the use of the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill Repair and Improvement (R & I) Fund. A little more than half (\$8,369,849) of the \$15,858,245 which the District has expended for rehabilitation in the years 1950 through 1962 has come from the R & I Fund. It would appear to us to be important that the R & I Fund expenditures, which will total over \$6,500,000 during the next five years, be coordinated with any proposed construction program.

#### BACKLOG OF SCHOOL BUILDING NEEDS

In our report of May 1962, we stated that "A substantial increase in the present rate of expenditure for school construction and rehabilitation is essential during the next several years, if the Minneapolis public school system is to provide an adequate educational opportunity for our children." This conclusion was based in part upon the finding that about one-third of all existing school buildings were constructed in the 1880's and average at least 70 years of age. Also, about half of all the school buildings in the system are 50 years or more in age. The consultants' report has substantiated that there is indeed a serious backlog of school construction and rehabilitation needs in Minneapolis, particularly at the elementary school level, and that the present rate of meeting these needs is totally inadequate.

The phrase occurring most frequently in the consultants' evaluation of the Minneapolis schools is "obsolescent educational facility." Following their evaluation of the present state of the Minneapolis school system, the consultants have suggested the replacement or demolition of about 46 of the 74 elementary schools in Minneapolis. They suggest that, as part of a long-range program, 15 of the city's elementary schools should be razed and that another 31 should be replaced with new buildings. At the conclusion of such a long-range program, if it were carried out as recommended by the MSU team, Willard School, which was built in 1910, would be the oldest elementary school left in Minneapolis.

At the present time, there are 39 elementary schools in Minneapolis which were built prior to 1910 and all but nine of these were built prior to the turn of the century. In September 1962, over 20,000 Minneapolis elementary school students attended schools which were built prior to 1910, and over half of this number were in schools constructed before 1890. (In September 1962, there were 1,066 students in the two elementary schools built in the 1870's, 11,353 in the 20 built in the 1880's, 3,709 in the eight built in the 1890's, and 4,041 students in the ten built between 1900 and 1910. However, it should be noted that most of these schools include additions which were constructed after the original construction date of the school.)

While the situation at the secondary school level is not nearly so serious, the consultants have indicated the need for replacement of several "obsolescent educational facilities" at the senior high level. West Senior High School is the only

senior high school in the city built prior to 1910. The consultants have recommended its replacement in the second phase of a long-range program. They have recommended that the second oldest senior high school, South, the original portion of which was built in 1910, should be replaced in the first phase of the program. (An earlier part of South, which was built in 1892, has already been razed.) Also, while it is not stated in the report, the consultants have orally suggested that both Central and North High Schools should be replaced as part of the long-range program. These two schools were built in 1913 and 1914 respectively.

As a group, the junior high schools constitute the newest portion of the city's school system. Three new junior high schools have been built since 1955, three were built in the 1930's and seven in the 1920's, and only one - Franklin - prior to 1920.

The survey team found little need for replacement of the city's junior high schools. Only Franklin was cited by the consultants as an "obsolescent educational facility," and only Franklin - recommended for inclusion in the first phase - was recommended for replacement in the consultants' suggested long-range program.

#### REPLACEMENT OF OBSOLESCEENT SCHOOLS

We concur with the consultants that replacement of obsolescent schools is a better educational and financial investment than continual rehabilitation of such facilities. We also concur that many Minneapolis schools have reached the point where they should be replaced. If the School District does embark upon a program of school replacement, as we believe it should, it will be a major departure from the District's previous commitment to rehabilitation. As pointed out earlier, during the past 13 years the School District has expended almost \$16,000,000 on rehabilitation of Minneapolis schools. This program has included virtually every school in the Minneapolis system.

While rehabilitation can do much to improve the appearance of a school and thereby create a better educational environment, there are some things which cannot be done through rehabilitation. One of these is the enlargement of inadequately-sized classrooms. The classroom partitions in most of the school buildings constructed prior to 1910, are load-bearing walls which cannot be moved. Therefore, in many of our old schools the classrooms are too small for modern teaching methods, particularly at the primary grade level. In contrast to the inadequately-sized classrooms, most of these old schools have enormous corridors which in some cases, such as at Warrington, appear to be larger than the classrooms adjoining them.

A more important problem with some of the older schools is that of safety. Most of the old schools are built with wooden joist construction, including wooden floors and, in some cases, even open wooden staircases. Such schools are a greater fire hazard than the newer schools. Another problem created by the wooden floors should also be noted. In some schools, perhaps Franklin is the outstanding example, the wooden floors have become extremely creaky, and a large amount of noise is produced even by one person walking normally down the corridor. One can well assume that the noise produced by such floors is a very distracting influence on adjoining classrooms. Even at Mann School, which has been extensively rehabilitated, the hallway floors have become very uneven and noisy. Apparently, this is a problem which cannot be remedied without completely replacing both the floor and the subfloor.

Also, it is often difficult and expensive to renovate adequately the plumbing, heating, ventilating, and electrical services in old schools. In some schools, again Mann may be cited as an example, the only toilet facilities are located in the

basement of a two-story building. This is quite a contrast to the newer schools where toilet facilities are located on each floor or even in each individual classroom. There are many other deficiencies in the old schools which cannot always be met by rehabilitation. These include such things as inadequate storage space in classrooms and the condition of gymnasiums and other special purpose rooms. In summary, it may be said that rehabilitation does not produce an educational facility comparable to the city's newer schools.

It has been suggested to us that replacement is a better investment than rehabilitation, if the cost of the replacement is less than three times the cost of rehabilitating the school. On this basis, it appears to us that it would have been preferable to defer some of the rehabilitation which has recently been undertaken and to replace these schools instead. As an example, between 1950 and 1962, \$245,395 has been spent for rehabilitation of Pratt Elementary School. The rehabilitation program at Pratt is one of the most complete in the city, and even includes the installation of new toilet facilities on the second floor. However, except for some work which was done on the roof, the outside of the building has not been touched. Also, the construction of the new toilet facilities has necessitated the installation of exposed pipes in the gymnasium, and when the entire project was completed we still had a school which was built in 1898 and a building which is 65 years old. As a basis for comparison, St. Paul recently built a new school with a capacity slightly higher than that of Pratt (Pratt has a rated capacity of 430 students) for a cost of \$510,000, including all equipment. Apparently, the cost of rehabilitating Pratt School is almost one-half of what it would have cost to build a new school!

Actually, the Michigan State survey team's study shows that meeting the city's immediate school needs is only the beginning and that a long-term school replacement program also will be needed. We believe that in developing such a long-term program the School District should recognize that ultimately every school in Minneapolis will have to be replaced. One should remember that it will take the school system at least 15-20 years to meet all the school needs cited by the survey team. By the end of that time, existing schools which were built in 1910 and are now 53 years old will be 78-83 years old, and it is quite probable that they, too, will need replacement. The day will come when even Olson Junior High School - the newest school in the system - will be cited as an "obsolescent educational facility" and will need to be replaced. We believe that in a school system as large as Minneapolis it is possible to develop an orderly replacement program which will not require accelerated programs to reduce backlogs of needs, and we urge the Board of Education to work toward this goal.

#### RATE OF CONSTRUCTION

As stated earlier in this report, we are convinced that the backlog of school construction and rehabilitation needs in Minneapolis is so substantial that the present rate of meeting these needs is totally inadequate and that the Board of Education should embark upon the first part of a long-range construction and rehabilitation program as soon as possible. However, after reviewing the specific projects included in the consultants' suggested first phase program, we have found that some of the projects are much less urgently needed than others and that the proposed method of meeting some of the needs raises basic policy questions which probably will not be determined until well after the voters are asked to make their decision on a bond program. Because we believe that their inclusion would seriously jeopardize the prospects for voter approval of other projects where any further delay would work a severe hardship upon the Minneapolis students, we have suggested that the less urgently needed projects and those involving as yet unanswered basic policy questions be deleted from the construction program which probably will be presented to the voters in February, 1964.

However, we also believe that the Minneapolis school system's critical construction needs should be met as rapidly as possible and that it would be unwise to slow down the rate at which the construction proceeds. Therefore, we recommend that the program proceed at approximately the same rate of construction as that recommended by the survey team. As recommended by them, the \$34,000,000 first phase would be completed in from 5-7 years, at a rate of approximately \$7,000,000 a year for a 5-year program, or about \$5,000,000 per year for a 7-year program.

If the Board of Education in early 1964 submits to the voters a program with a total cost which is less than the \$34,000,000 suggested by the survey team, there should be a proportionate reduction in the length of the program. In other words, if the Board of Education presents a \$21,000,000 program, instead of a \$34,000,000 program, it should be presented as a 3-year program, instead of as a 5-year program. Thus, it would be possible to proceed at the same \$7,000,000 per year rate of construction in meeting Minneapolis' school needs recommended by the MSU team.

If this course of action is followed, it will be possible to submit a second program to the voters at an earlier date than that suggested by the consultants and, therefore, it also would be possible to complete a program as large as the total first phase program the survey team recommended within the same five years they advocated. Such a procedure would, in effect, be nothing more than a means of dividing the consultants' recommended first phase into two programs, the first of which could be submitted to the voters - and hopefully approved - early in 1964, and the second of which could be submitted to the voters - and also hopefully approved - at a later date. It should again be emphasized that this procedure would permit the completion of the total first phase recommended by the consultants within the same amount of time they have suggested.

Such a procedure would require voter approval of two programs instead of only one; it would permit the Board of Education to make the necessary policy decisions before asking the voters to approve projects which are dependent upon as yet unanswered questions.

#### FINANCING THE PROGRAM

As implied above, we are convinced that a voter-approved bond issue will be necessary to finance a school construction program of the size needed by Minneapolis. However, we believe that there are also other funds available to the School District which should be used to finance a part of the construction program. At the present time, the District has a  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill Repair and Improvement Fund which amounts to approximately \$1.3 million dollars per year. During the past thirteen years (1950 through 1962) over \$8,000,000 from this fund has been used to help finance the District's rehabilitation program. We urge the Board of Education to spell out what the R & I Fund will be used for during the years in which the construction program is being completed and to utilize this fund to the maximum extent possible to finance rehabilitation and upgrading projects in the program. The "discretionary" bonds are another source of revenue available to the District.

By state statute the Minneapolis School District may "by a 2/3 majority vote of all the members of the Board of Education and without any election by the voters of the District, issue and sell in each calendar year bonds of such District in an amount not to exceed  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1% of the assessed value of the taxable property in such District." With a total assessed valuation in Minneapolis of slightly more than \$400,000,000 (\$413,000,000 in 1963), this provision authorizes the Board of Education to issue slightly more than \$2 million in bonds each year without a vote of the people.

That portion of the construction program which cannot be financed within the R & I Fund should be financed by School District bonds, including both the "discretionary" bonds and voter-approved bonds. As an example, if a three-year \$21 million program were to be financed entirely by bonds, it would be necessary to submit a \$15 million bond program to the voters. The remaining \$6,000,000 could be programmed out of the discretionary bond fund.

#### SCHOOL PLANNING STAFF

The consultants have recommended "the employment of an outstanding educational planner as the first step in staffing for the building program." We concur with this recommendation and urge the School District to hire, on a permanent basis and at a high level within the school administration, an outstanding educational facilities planner to carry out a continuing program of educational facilities planning for Minneapolis.

We consider this to be an essential part of the school building program, since, as stated by the consultants, "a successful school building program requires the participation of many persons, a careful coordination and scheduling of a great diversity of activities, and a sufficient time to plan carefully and execute the program." The survey team has also stated that "insuring competent, experienced, and creative educational planning is of prime importance to Minneapolis as they face the complexities of a multi-million dollar school building program." We believe that the employment of such a person is vital to the successful development of the future steps of the long-range building program, as well as being vital to the effort of meeting the immediate school needs. We further believe that the cost of such a planner and staff would be one of the wisest investments that the Minneapolis School District could make - an investment which could result in savings far greater than the cost of the planning.

In their report, the consultants have suggested requirements and qualifications for an "Administrative Director of Educational Facilities Planning," and have suggested the creation of the position of Assistant Superintendent in charge of Educational Facilities Planning. As explained in the survey team's report, the person filling this position would be responsible for the direction of educational facilities planning, the coordination of planning for school building construction and the development of a capital outlay budget.

Among other things, such a person could be responsible for keeping current the School Fact Book which was prepared by the consultants, the staff work which will be needed to complete the development of a long-range plan and to keep that plan current. A part of the 1963 amendment to the Minneapolis Independent School District Act requires the Minneapolis Board of Education to "Develop a comprehensive long-range building plan to project forward school needs at any given time for at least the next 15 years, such plans to include the needs of the District in connection with school sites, new schools and additions to existing buildings, retiring of obsolete facilities, and rehabilitating, remodeling, and equipping existing school buildings." The same amendment requires that "such plans shall be reviewed and upgraded by the school staff and the Board yearly, commencing in 1964." It also requires that "such plans shall be submitted yearly, commencing in 1963, by the Board to the City Planning Commission for its review and recommendations." Naturally, we anticipate that the Minneapolis Board of Education and the school administration will comply with these statutory requirements, but we believe that an educational planner, such as that suggested by the MSU survey team, is needed to assist in this endeavor.

"DE FACTO" SEGREGATION

As pointed out in the consultants' report, in 1960 the non-white population of Minneapolis constituted only 3.2% of the city's total population, despite the fact that the city's Negro population doubled between 1950 and 1960 and the Indian population quadrupled in the same period. While Minneapolis has a relatively small Negro population (2.4 per cent of the total population in 1960) when compared to other major cities, over half of the city's Negroes are concentrated in six of the city's 126 census tracts.

"Minneapolis," as pointed out by the consultants, "is in the fortunate position of being able to prevent any major long-term problems from developing -- if appropriate planning policies and actions are speedily taken." The consultants emphasized that "Segregated educational facilities are the resultant of concentrations of segregated housing." While stating that "the long-term solution of this problem is the dispersal of Negro and low-income housing throughout the greater Minneapolis area," they do suggest some steps which the Minneapolis School District should take in attempting to combat what de facto segregation now exists in the Minneapolis schools and to prevent further concentration of minority group population in specific schools. The principles suggested by the consultants are:

1. "Active support of all neighborhood, city, state and national efforts designed to reduce segregated housing and resultant segregated educational facilities.
2. "A policy position statement by the Board of Education stating that all reasonable efforts should be made to arrest, reduce and eliminate segregated schools."
3. "Redistricting of school attendance areas, when consistent with good planning practices, to disperse the Negro enrollment. "
4. "The development of a policy on open enrollment, containing adequate controls, permitting and encouraging children in overcrowded schools to attend those schools outside their community area which are underutilized. These controls should assist in achieving racially-balanced schools."
5. "The planning of new schools and additions to existing schools designed to disperse concentrations of Negro enrollments."
6. "Location of special education centers designed to encourage the dispersal of Negro enrollments."
7. "Continued and increased curriculum planning by the professional staff designed to further improve in-service preparation programs for teachers and administrative staff, improved curriculum materials specifically designed for disadvantaged children, and the allocations of increased human resources to those areas where culturally deprived children and youth are concentrated."

We strongly approve of the survey team's approach to the elimination of de facto segregation in the Minneapolis public schools and the prevention of further concentration of minority group students in individual schools. Certainly, with the small number of minority group residents in Minneapolis, we should be able to end de facto segregation and achieve racial harmony, if this is to be accomplished anywhere in the United States.

### SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA BOUNDARIES

In our May 1962 report, we urged the Minneapolis Board of Education to consider changes in certain school boundaries as a means of achieving more effective utilization of the capacities of existing buildings suitable for school use. We also expressed the opinion that boundary changes could be used as a means of reducing the existing substantial variation in enrollment among schools, strengthening the enrollment in the smaller schools, particularly at the senior high level, and achieving closer conformity to the K6-3-3 form of school organization.

The survey team also has recommended that "school district boundaries be reviewed and revised annually to insure maximum utilization of educational facilities." They also advocate:

1. The development of an open transfer policy under which a child from a school which exceeds its rated capacity could, through standard operating procedures, transfer to an under-utilized building. (The consultants suggested that in such cases transportation of the student should be the parents' responsibility.)
2. The establishment of optional areas between two adjacent schools which would permit "one-way transfers" from overcrowded schools to under-utilized schools. (They also suggest that every attempt should be made to prevent unnecessary transfers from under-utilized schools to overcrowded schools and that such transfers should rarely be permitted, should be preceded by documentation of the need for the transfer, and the request granted only on an individual annual basis.)
3. The use of under utilized school buildings for those students already receiving school transportation services whenever this is possible. (They suggest that special education children and elementary children located in isolated "pockets" of the city should be transported to under-utilized buildings, instead of to otherwise crowded schools, inasmuch as these children are already receiving transportation.)

We continue to strongly favor increased flexibility of school attendance area boundaries and believe that the Board of Education should implement the survey team's recommendations on this matter. More effective utilization of the city's under-utilized school buildings could diminish the school system's need for additional facilities. We also agree with the consultants' suggestion that when annual revisions in school boundaries are planned efforts should be made to permit those students previously enrolled in a school to complete their education at the original school, and that those students about to enter the school for the first time should be primarily affected by the changes.

### SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

The survey team recommends the K6-3-3-2 form of school organization for the Minneapolis public schools. In their report they state that "under this plan the schools would be organized into elementary schools, including kindergarten to 6th grade, junior high schools enrolling grades 7-9, senior high schools of grades 10-12, and a comprehensive two-year community college." Except for the recommended two-year community college, Minneapolis and most of the suburban school districts now use this form of school organization -- in other words, a K6-3-3 school organization.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the K6-3-3 form of school organization is the junior high school. The consultants' state that "The major role of the

junior high school in the K6-3-3 organization in Minneapolis is transitional, combining continued work in the basic skills and basic fields of learning with work of an exploratory character. Exploratory work should help the pupil pursue contemporary interests as well as discover interests and ability to be developed further in the senior high school. Along with this opportunity for exploratory work there is a strong guidance and counseling program available to both boys and girls in the junior high school. In general, educators believe that, to effect a smooth transition from junior high school to senior high school, the junior high school program should incorporate some of the features of both the elementary and senior high school, thus performing a function different from that of either of the other school divisions. To fulfill these functions, it is necessary that the arrangement of facilities in the junior high school be flexible and adaptable to a variety of special subjects and activities."

The consultants have also stressed the desirability of separating the adolescent junior high school students from the older senior high youths, and have said that it is not desirable to have junior and senior high students in the same building. They commented that this is more because of social problems than educational problems. They say that the child between 12-15 is going through a difficult transitional stage socially and physically, as well as educationally, and that there is a physical and psychological disparity between junior and senior high students which makes it difficult to administer a school serving the entire age range.

While the above would tend to emphasize the importance of separate junior and senior high schools, the consultants also state in their report that it may be necessary to depart from the recommended form of school organization for "good and defensible reasons." In particular, they point out that "Combination elementary-junior high schools or junior-senior high schools may be necessary as a temporary solution or as a partial solution in achieving better utilization of under-utilized buildings and thereby avoiding large expenditures of capital outlay monies."

We accept the recommendation that the District continue its policy of using the K6-3-3 form of school organization, and believe that it should be followed throughout the district except in the most unusual circumstances. The consultants' recommended first steps would further the K6-3-3 form of school organization by:

1. Moving the 9th graders now attending South Junior High School to excess capacity in nearby junior high schools.
2. Constructing a new Southwest Junior High School which would provide capacity at a separate school for the junior high students now attending Southwest Junior-Senior High School.
3. Moving the 7th and 8th graders now attending Seward Elementary-Junior High School to excess capacity in nearby junior high schools.
4. Converting the existing elementary-junior high school at Sheridan into a junior high school and building a new elementary school for the elementary students presently attending the combination school at Sheridan.

However, we also note that the program recommended by the consultants would retain several combination schools which do not conform to the recommended K6-3-3 form of school organization. These are: (1) Henry Junior-Senior High School (2) Marshall Junior-Senior High School (3) Emerson Elementary-Junior High School. All of the above, except Emerson, are discussed thoroughly in Part D of this report, and Emerson is discussed separately below.



Emerson Elementary-Junior High School

In September, 1962, Emerson Elementary-Junior High School had an enrollment of 268 elementary students and 79 students in grades 7 and 8. Of the 79 7th and 8th graders, 12 were enrolled in special education classes. The 9th graders from the Emerson attendance area attend Jefferson Junior High School.

Although the MSU team predicts a continuing downward trend in both the junior high and elementary enrollments at Emerson, they have not included any recommendations with respect to the future of the junior high students at Emerson in their report. However, in our meetings with the consultants, they have stated orally that they recognize that it is undesirable to continue a 7th and 8th grade with a combined enrollment of only 70 or so students.

We believe that the regular 7th and 8th graders should be moved from Emerson to a regular junior high school in Minneapolis. This should be done, even if it were to mean additional crowding at another school, since it would be preferable to crowd the Emerson 7th and 8th grade students into another school rather than to keep a separate junior high school for less than 70 students. However, by changing the boundaries of school attendance areas it would be possible to move the Emerson Junior High students to another school without causing an overcrowded condition. One means for accomplishing this would be to relieve the overcrowding at Jefferson Junior High School by transferring the junior high students who live in the Bryn Mawr area from Jefferson to Lincoln Junior High. Lincoln, which is actually closer to most of the Bryn Mawr area than Jefferson, probably has sufficient unused capacity for the Bryn Mawr students, but to the extent that it does not additional capacity could be provided at the new Franklin Junior High School for some of the Lincoln students. This would provide sufficient capacity in Jefferson for the small number of 7th and 8th graders in the Emerson attendance area.

While we believe that the Emerson Junior High students should be moved to another school, we recognize that there are some arguments for keeping the junior high students at Emerson. The most important of these is the situation with respect to the special education classes at Emerson. At this time, Emerson has some classes for mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children, including a few from attendance areas other than Emerson. We have been told by the principal at Emerson that the Emerson program has been developed in such a way as to coordinate the special education program with that of the regular 7th and 8th grades. He stated that it is preferable to have the special education students at a small school such as Emerson, but that it is necessary to also have regular students at the same school with the special students. He also said that the regular junior high students at Emerson benefit from the presence of the special education classes at the school through special attention and smaller classes.

In September, 1963, there were five teachers for the 65 regular 7th and 8th grade students at Emerson. This includes a half-time home economics teacher, an industrial arts teacher who also teaches industrial art classes for the elementary and special education students, and a music teacher who also teaches elementary music. This would appear to be a student-teacher ratio which is much lower than the ratio at other junior high schools in Minneapolis.

We believe that the question of whether the junior high students in the special education classes at Emerson also should be moved to another school or whether more special education students should be sent to Emerson should be decided by the Board of Education as plans are developed for new special education facilities in the city. We note that the consultants have recommended the provision of 100 spaces for special education students at the new Franklin Junior High School.

Possibly the junior high special education students at Emerson should be moved to the new Franklin when that school is built.

It would appear that most of the arguments for retaining the 7th and 8th graders at Emerson are in the nature of arguments against the K6-3-3 form of school organization and arguments for the 8-4 form of school organization. While these arguments may have some validity, we have accepted the consultants' recommendation that the K6-3-3 form of school organization should be used in Minneapolis and we believe that it will be unnecessarily expensive to provide education comparable to that available in other Minneapolis Junior High Schools to the small number of junior high students at Emerson.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

As suggested by the consultants, the ideal elementary school should be a "three unit" school with a rated capacity of 655 students and an optimum capacity of 540 students. (The rated capacity is based upon an average of 30 students in each regular classroom and the optimum capacity is based upon an average of 25 students in each regular classroom.) The ideal "three unit" school suggested by the consultants would contain eighteen classrooms, two kindergartens and the additional special use spaces needed by the students.

The consultants point out that "schools somewhat smaller than this recommended figure may be necessary in isolated pockets of the city or on a temporary basis in an area of sparse residential population or rapidly changing school enrollments." They also note that "some of the existing elementary schools in Minneapolis are considerably smaller than the recommended optimum size, but will need to serve for a number of years."

On the other end of the scale, the consultants state, "Some neighborhoods will require elementary schools considerably larger than the recommended optimum. If two elementary schools cannot be justified, and if reasonable and safe walking distances are not exceeded, then one larger elementary school may be justified." They point out, however, that the recommended optimum size is intended as a guide and not as a rigid rule, and suggest that if a larger elementary school is required it should be planned, organized and staffed into two or more "little schools" within the same building.

We accept the consultants' recommended size for elementary schools and we also agree with the principle of locating elementary schools within reasonable walking distance of students' homes, unless there are unusual circumstances making this impractical. As much as possible, the location of elementary schools within their attendance areas should be such as to reduce to a minimum the number of major streets which children have to cross in order to reach school.

In any consideration of elementary school size, it is important to note that in Minneapolis the elementary school program is carried on in self-contained classrooms in all grades from kindergarten to grade 6. This means that insofar as possible all phases of instruction in a given classroom are the responsibility of a single teacher. This factor would appear to indicate that size of an elementary school has very little, if any, effect upon the education provided in that school, either in terms of quality or content, provided, however, that the school enrollment is sufficiently large to warrant separate classrooms for the different grades.

At the elementary level, cost would appear to be the major factor affected by the size of the school. Clearly, an elementary school should be sufficiently large to fully utilize facilities such as the gymnasium and other special use rooms

while at the same time the school should not be so large as to overcrowd these special facilities and necessitate the construction of additional duplicate facilities. Apparently, a three-unit school, as suggested by the consultants, will permit full utilization of the special facilities while not overcrowding them.

#### SIZE OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS

In our opinion, the size of secondary schools is one of the most critical issues involved in the MSU survey team's proposed school construction program. We strongly believe that the Board of Education should give major attention to the basic policy question of the desirable size of the secondary schools and to the question of the number of schools which will be needed to serve future high school enrollments in Minneapolis.

In our May 1962 report, we expressed great concern about the smaller Minneapolis high schools and advocated that each school should have a sufficient minimum enrollment to enable the offering of a comprehensive curriculum at an economical cost and that there should be a minimum variation in enrollments among schools, particularly at the senior high school level. Our 1962 study indicated that size of enrollment appears to be the most important factor influencing the number and variety of courses available at each senior high school. For example, at that time a student at the largest senior high school (Roosevelt) in the city could select his course of study from an offering of courses which was almost twice as broad as that available to students at the smallest high school in the system (Marshall).

The basic reason for the relationship between the size of enrollment and the number of courses offered at a particular school appears to be that the number of teachers assigned to each high school is based upon the enrollment at that school. In 1961, each senior high school was allocated one teacher for every  $27\frac{1}{2}$  students. Apparently, the only deviation from this ratio was that some schools received an extra teacher because of the small size and some were given an additional teacher because of the socio-economic background of the student body. When a rigid teacher-pupil ratio is used for the purpose of determining the number of teachers to be employed at each school, it means that the average class size of each school will be essentially the same regardless of school size. Therefore, courses which are taken by a small percentage of the students at a school, such as a foreign language, will not attract a sufficient number of students at the small school to justify the formation of a class, even though such a course may be selected by the same percentage of the students as at a larger school.

Certainly, it would appear to us that in an age of increasing specialization it is becoming increasingly important for each senior high student to have the opportunity to select a course of study which will meet his particular needs. Within the Minneapolis comprehensive high schools we must have a curriculum sufficiently broad to meet the needs of the college-bound student, while at the same time - and equally as important - the school must offer courses which will satisfy the educational needs and desires of those who will terminate their formal education upon graduation from high school. The curriculum should also be sufficiently appealing so as to deter potential dropouts from leaving school before graduation.

"Specialization in depth" is another factor which should be mentioned in a discussion of the effect of school size upon education. At the small school, teachers more frequently have to teach courses in more than one field. The effect of this upon the quality of education is pointed out by the MSU survey team in their report. They state that "Rapidly expanding new knowledge in the physical sciences, the social studies, and other areas of the curriculum is placing increased demands for specialization in depth on the secondary school teacher. For example, no longer can most

social studies teachers double as a science teacher. The modern high school must offer both a breadth and depth in program and educational services not previously envisioned."

In our May 1962 report, we cited the following standards which were published by the Minneapolis City Planning Commission and were suggested to the Planning Commission by the Minneapolis school administration officials:

<u>School</u>	<u>Minimum Enrollment</u>	<u>Optimum Enrollment</u>	<u>Maximum Enrollment</u>
Elementary	200	500	720
Junior High School	700	800	1,200
Senior High School	1,000	1,500	1,800

Our studies since that time would indicate that the standards we cited in 1962 were probably too low, particularly with respect to senior high schools. In our studies we have found that the prevailing practice in other Minnesota school systems appears to be to build senior high schools for 1,800 to 2,200 students if the system has a total senior high school enrollment within the district sufficient to warrant the construction of that many spaces. As examples, we may cite the:

- Bloomington School District where the voters have recently authorized a \$4,500,000 bond issue to finance the construction of a new 2,400 student capacity senior high school. Bloomington's existing high school, which was built in 1957, has a capacity of 1,800 students.
- Fridley School District where the new senior high school has been planned for a capacity of 1,800 students.
- Robbinsdale School District which has let contracts for the construction of a new 2,200 student senior high school. The existing Robbinsdale High School has a similar capacity.
- St. Paul School District, which has recently completed two new senior high schools - Harding and Johnson - each of which has a capacity of 1,800 students.
- Roseville School District, where a new senior high school is being planned for an eventual capacity of 2,000 students. Alexander Ramsey, the existing Roseville High School, now has a similar capacity.

Actually, there are many more examples both within and outside of the Twin Cities metropolitan area which might be cited.

During our study we were told by Guy Tollerud, State Director of School Planning, that as far as the utilization of the building is concerned the most effective and most efficient size for a senior high school is about 2,000 students. As an example, Mr. Tollerud cited the field of industrial arts, where the State suggests that the schools should provide the following shops: (1) Drawing - architectural and mechanical. (2) Electricity and electronics. (3) Power mechanics. (4) Machine shop, sheet metal, bench metal, welding and foundry. (5) Graphic arts. (6) Wood-working, plastics, carpentry, bricklaying and plumbing.

He said that in most large new schools they are considering the possibility of offering the whole list, but that in a school of about 1,000 students some of the

shops would have to be left out and others combined. In a larger school, all of these facilities could be utilized.

Mr. Tollerud also cited other facilities, such as those for physical education, science, and business education, which would be utilized more fully in a large school. He pointed out that in a large high school you can get the specialized teachers and the specialized spaces you need to offer the course and also a sufficient number of students to take the course.

We are convinced that the per student cost of school construction and operation generally is higher for smaller schools if facilities and services are provided which are comparable to those available at the larger schools. For example, at some of the smaller Minneapolis schools there are vocational education shops which are used only one or two hours per day. These facilities - both the space and the equipment - would be just as adequate to meet the needs of a student body two to three times the size of the present enrollment at such schools. Indeed, if such facilities were utilized more fully it would become more justifiable to provide the vocational education students at such schools with better and more up-to-date equipment.

There are a number of core facilities which should be provided at every senior high school. If the enrollments of the schools are too small for full utilization of these facilities, it means that the per student costs for providing such core facilities is higher than it should be. In short, it is less expensive to build and operate one high school for 2,000 students than it would be to build and operate two high schools for 1,000 students each. Similarly, two high schools with an enrollment of 1,500 students in each would be less costly to the taxpayer than would three 1,000-enrollment high schools.

There is similar evidence to indicate that the most desirable size for the junior high school would be 1,400 students. While variety of curriculum offerings is not as important at the junior high level as in senior high schools, there should be an enrollment sufficient to offer a diverse program, particularly to the 9th graders. It is interesting to note that at some, but not all, of the Minneapolis junior high schools it is possible for the student to begin his study of a foreign language, which can then be continued at the senior high level. Mr. Tollerud has stated that, from the standpoint of the building alone, a junior high school is most efficient and effective at a size of 1,400 students.

As an example, he explained that with a school of this size you have 20 sections of shop classes. This would mean that the mechanical drawing room and the three different shops which should be included in a junior high school would each be used five hours per day. However, if you have less than 1,400 students in the junior high school, you may be able to justify only two or perhaps fewer shops and, therefore, you may have to choose between those that you should have. With a junior high school of about 700-900 students you may get into trouble because you cannot provide all of the facilities and keep them filled.

Physical education is another example cited by Mr. Tollerud. Physical education is required by State statutes in grades 1-10. In order to provide a program of physical education in grades 7-9 for an enrollment of 1,400 students, 21 class hours per day are needed. This would require four teaching stations. Four teaching stations could be provided by one gym which is divisible into two sections, plus one gymnastics gym (or auxiliary gym) plus one swimming pool. As pointed out by Mr. Tollerud, in a junior high school with 1,400 students the cost of the swimming pool is only the difference between the total cost of the pool and the cost of providing a second auxiliary gym.

It must again be emphasized that Mr. Tollerud's statements were expressed

only from the viewpoint of the efficient utilization of the facilities. He stated that the size you should build a junior high school may be modified when you take into account the area the building is supposed to serve, the distance the students have to walk and the hazards they would encounter in getting to school.

As in the case of the senior high school, we are convinced that it would be more economical to build junior high schools designed for an enrollment of at least 1,000 students and perhaps closer to the 1,400 students mentioned by Mr. Tollerud. He stated that the per student construction cost would be at about a minimum with a junior high school planned for 1,400 students.

It is interesting to note that most districts with sufficient total junior high school enrollment are building new junior highs for more than 1,000 students. Indeed, many of them are building junior highs which exceed the 1,400 student size. As an example, within the past five years, the Bloomington School District has constructed two new junior highs for a capacity of 1,750 students each, while the new Edina Junior High School will be built for an enrollment of 1,600 and the existing Edina junior high school has a capacity of 1,100 students.

In contrast to the above, the MSU survey team recommends that "junior high schools be planned with a 'rated' capacity of 800 to 1,000 students" and an "optimum of 1,000 to 1,500 for senior high schools." On the basis of the information cited above, we seriously question these recommendations.

It is interesting to note that in the consultants' report on the optimum size of senior high schools they say that "During the past decade the desired optimum size of senior high schools has been constantly adjusted upward. This modification of an optimum recommended size is the direct resultant of recent dramatic changes in our society. The American society and the American comprehensive high schools are both becoming more comprehensive and more complex."

The consultants go on to point out that "the small high school has a number of advantages that partially compensate for its limitations" and cite the following advantages:

"Teachers, students, and parents tend to know each other better."

"Coordinated staff planning becomes easier."

"Problems of student circulation are reduced."

However, they also state that "As the senior high school becomes smaller it becomes increasingly difficult to provide a comprehensive high school program in an efficient and economical manner."

It also should be noted that construction of the program recommended by the survey team would leave two senior high schools - Roosevelt and North - with enrollments of approximately 2,000 students, far in excess of the maximum size recommended by the survey team. The MSU team states that "If schools are carefully planned, organized and staffed into 'little schools', the upper limits of desirable size are extended. For example, a number of school districts are now planning senior high schools of 2,000 students or more, utilizing the 'school within a school' concept." However, they add that "It should be carefully noted that the existing Minneapolis high schools, because of their original design, do not lend themselves to this concept." The consultants also add an interesting caution: "The survey staff is not recommending large (2,000 pupils or more) high schools as the sole future solution to the School District's needs." (Underlining added)

With respect to the size of junior high schools, the survey team states that junior high schools which are smaller than their recommended 800-1,000 student capacity will "tend to be inefficient in use of specialized staff, programs and spaces." They state that "It would be difficult if not impossible to provide the breadth and depth in educational program required at this age level with fewer students. It should also be noted that small schools usually cost more, per pupil, to build and operate." (Underlining added)

However, the consultants have recommended the construction of a new junior high school (Southwest), which would have a capacity of only 600 students - 200 below their recommended minimum. Also, if their recommendations, with respect to Sheridan Junior High School are followed, the Sheridan Junior High School would have an enrollment of approximately 700 students or 100 below their recommended minimum. The other new junior high school they recommended (Franklin) would be constructed for an enrollment of only 800 students, including 100 special students. It also may be noted that the survey team has not recommended boundary shifts or anything else which would strengthen the enrollment at three other Minneapolis junior high schools which now have enrollments considerably lower than the minimum they recommend. In September, 1962, the junior high school portion of Emerson Elementary-Junior High School had only 79 junior high students. Olson Junior High School had an enrollment of 531 students and the junior high portion of Henry numbered 564 students. In fact, of the 18 junior high schools, (including combination junior-senior high schools and elementary-junior high schools) only four - Franklin, Sanford, Nokomis and Anthony - would have enrollments which are within the size range recommended by the consultants.

We believe that at the secondary school level, particularly the senior high school, it is important to have schools of an adequate size than it is to have schools located within a particular community or within walking distance of the students' homes. We feel that the School District should work toward the goal of an enrollment of at least 1,500 students in each senior high school in the city. We consider this to be an attainable goal over the long range, and in our discussion of specific projects we suggest several alternatives which could lead to the achievement of this goal.

#### SCHOOL SITES

In their report, the MSU survey team states that "Most school sites in Minneapolis are woefully inadequate." Although they cite standards recommended by the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction and the State of Minnesota Department of Education, they state that "The survey staff recognizes that in older cities, such as Minneapolis, acute congestion and high property values make the problem of purchasing a site for a new school, or expanding the existing site, extremely costly." While adding that "This is not to say that city students have less need for educational space," they continue with the statement "Recognizing the practical financial limitations inherent in site acquisition in congested central cities, the survey staff accepts for planning purposes, those minimal site standards jointly developed by the City Planning Department, School District, and Park Board. These standards are:

Elementary Schools: "Four acres minimum total site, plus one acre per hundred pupils over 200 (school-park) 1.0 acre per 1,000 population in addition to minimum total site requirement."

Junior High Schools: "Eight acres minimum total site, plus one acre per hundred pupils over 700."

Senior High Schools: "Fifteen acres minimum total site, plus one acre per hundred pupils over 1,000."

Although the site standards which are accepted by the survey staff are lower than those recommended by either the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction or the State of Minnesota Department of Education (see table on next page), the survey team notes "Only 13 of Minneapolis' 76 elementary schools meet the minimum site requirement. Anthony and Olson are the only junior high schools with 100% site adequacy. Franklin (25%) is the most critically short of land. No senior high school has a 100% adequate site. Best are Central (59%) and South (58%), while Vocational is the least adequate, having a site of only 12% of standard."



School Site Standards  
Recommended by:

	<u>National Council on Schoolhouse Construction</u>	<u>State of Minn. Dept. of Education</u>	<u>Mpls. City Planning Dept., School Dist. and Park Board</u>
<u>School</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Acres</u>
Elementary	5 + 1 per 100 students	8 to 10	4 + 1 per 100 students over 200
Junior High	20 + 1 per 100 students	20 to 25	8 + 1 per 100 students over 700
Senior High	30 + 1 per 100 students	30 to 40	15 + 1 per 100 students over 1,000

Sample Application of  
School Site Standards  
Recommended by:

	<u>National Council on Schoolhouse Construction</u>	<u>State of Minn. Dept. of Education</u>	<u>Mpls. City Planning Dept., School Dist., and Park Board</u>
<u>School</u>	<u>Acres Needed</u>	<u>Acres Needed</u>	<u>Acres Needed</u>
600 student Elementary	11	8 - 10	8
1,000 student Junior High	30	20 - 25	11
1,500 student Senior High	45	30 - 40	20

While we agree that many Minneapolis school sites are too small and should be enlarged, we do not consider the need for expanded sites to be as urgent as other school needs. Also, although the minimum site standards accepted by the survey team may be desirable, even these standards appear to be unrealistically high for a built-up city such as Minneapolis. In establishing standards for school sites, we must consider other factors in addition to the high cost of land acquisition, which was mentioned by the consultants. In Minneapolis, school sites can be enlarged only at the expense of removing property from the city's tax rolls and, more importantly, by the demolition of homes and dislocation of families.

In our evaluation of the school site standards accepted by the consultants, we have estimated that the School District would have to acquire approximately 650 acres of additional land for school sites in order to obtain school sites of the size suggested by the consultants. The estimate is based upon the consultants' description of the District's long-range school needs and upon their outline of how these needs are to be met. (As outlined by the consultants, at the conclusion of their long-range program the Minneapolis school system would consist of 59 elementary schools (plus the Dowling School), 15 junior high schools, 10 senior high schools and one community college.) On the basis of the consultants' estimate of the city-wide 1980 school enrollment, we have estimated that about 935 acres of land would be needed to meet the suggested site-size standards at the 84 elementary, junior and senior high schools. At the present time, these schools have a total site acreage of approximately 285 acres. This means that the District would have to acquire another 650 or so acres if it were to achieve the standards suggested. The District would also have approximately 75 acres of surplus land at 30 existing school sites which, in their long-range plan, the consultants have recommended for abandonment.

We have been told that the average residential block in Minneapolis contains about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres of land. On this basis, the acquisition of 650 acres of land for additional school sites would necessitate the purchase of approximately 185 blocks in Minneapolis. If we assume an average of 25 homes per block, the acquisition of this amount of land would entail the purchase and demolition of about 4,600 homes.

We recognize that the consultants have suggested that their standards should serve only as a guide. However, we believe that standards should be realistic and that they should reflect a goal which is attainable. We do not believe that the site sizes suggested by the consultants are attainable. In fact, we note that few, if any, of the sites recommended by the consultants for the new schools they are recommending are part of their Phase I program would meet their own standards. Because we consider the consultants' suggested site standards to be unrealistically high, we recommend that the minimum site standards be revised to a more attainable level.

We agree with the consultants that the School District should continue its policy of developing joint school-park sites in cooperation with the Minneapolis Park Board. However, the School District should recognize that it will not be possible to follow this policy in all cases. Also, we suggest that the minimum site standards adopted for the Minneapolis schools should give recognition to the City's extensive system of local parks and athletic fields, even though some schools may not be located immediately adjacent to a park.

The consultants have suggested that, as a guide for their long-term planning, the School District should develop a "Priority list of site expansion needs." They state "This listing of priority needs should be based upon the percentage of

adequacy for each school site when measured against the recommended minimum standards. This priority system should serve as a guide for site expansion programs with the following exceptions:

1. No site should be expanded if the school is not to be continued in use as part of the long-term plan.
2. Flexibility in site acquisition should be permitted the administration in acquiring a site not first on the priority list, when the purchase price is momentarily low and the purchase of the land would be of considerable financial advantage to the District. Conversely, sites should not be purchased when the purchase price is inflated in respect to its true value.
3. Some schools have adjoining property of such high value that the site should not be expanded even though the need is great. This is an unfortunate fact in all congested cities.

We not only agree that this priority list of site expansion needs should be developed by the School District, but more specifically we recommend that the Board of Education should not include any fund in its forthcoming bond program for the expansion of existing school sites unless the land to be acquired is necessary for the construction of an addition to the school. In our opinion, the suggested priority list should be developed before the District embarks upon a program of site expansion. It is only in this way that the community or even the school administration can be assured that the limited funds are being expended for the most critical needs.

#### SUB-GRADE ROOMS

In computing the capacity of the Minneapolis schools, the consultants have automatically discounted rooms which they considered to be "substandard" because the floor is more than 30" below grade or ground level. We do not believe that these rooms should be automatically rejected on the basis of what appears to be an arbitrary standard. We believe that each space located below ground should be considered individually and that such spaces should not be discounted unless they have particular lighting, ventilating, moisture or heating problems which cannot be rectified economically.

It is interesting to note that some schools in the United States are now being built without any windows, and we have been told that at least one school (in Almagordo, New Mexico) is being built entirely below ground. While it may well be true that some of the subgrade rooms are unfit for student use, we believe that each such room should be considered on its individual merits, and we suggest that the school capacity figures should be recomputed on this basis. We do not believe that additions should be put on existing schools simply to replace subgrade spaces, unless the specific subgrade spaces in that school are judged to be unfit for further use on some basis other than simply being located more than 30" below ground level.

#### CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Information we have obtained indicates that the survey team's estimates of the cost of the individual projects in their recommended first phase program are considerably above the cost of comparable schools recently built in nearby school districts. The consultants informed us that in estimating their cost they used a unit cost figure of \$1,700 per student for the construction of elementary schools,

\$2,600 per student for junior high schools and \$3,500 per student for senior high schools. While such unit costs are helpful in the formulation of rough estimates, we do not believe that they should be used as the basis of a bond program to be submitted to the voters.

First, we believe that there is ample evidence to indicate that the per student cost of the school will vary considerably with the size of the school. As we have stated earlier in this report and as we have quoted from the survey team's report, "Small schools usually cost more per pupil to build and operate." Also, the two new 1,800 student capacity St. Paul high schools were built at a total cost of approximately \$4,000,000 each. Included in this total cost are all construction costs (including a swimming pool in each school), all fees, equipment costs and the cost of site improvements. On a per student basis, the cost of these schools was approximately \$2,200 per student compared to the \$3,500 per student figure used by the consultants for senior high schools. It may also be noted that the estimated cost of the new Bloomington Senior High School, which is being planned for a capacity of 2,400 students, is \$4,500,000, including everything except site acquisition. This would result in a per student cost of under \$2,000 per student.

At the junior high school level, the new 1,600 student Edina Junior High School is being built at a total cost of \$3,427,000, including all costs except site acquisition. Unlike the new Minneapolis junior high schools recommended by the consultants, the new Edina Junior High will have a swimming pool and the cost of the pool is included in the total cost. The per student cost of the new Edina Junior High School is approximately \$2,140 compared to the \$2,600 used by the consultants. At the elementary level, both Edina and St. Paul are constructing new elementary schools at a total cost, exclusive of site acquisition, of less than \$1,200 per student, compared to the \$1,700 per student figure used by the consultants.

We urge the Board of Education and the administration to analyze carefully the consultants' estimates before submitting a proposal to the voters. On the basis of comparative costs in other school districts, such as the examples cited, we believe that such a review will make it possible to reduce the total cost of the program recommended by the consultants without curtailing the program. We further believe that the cost which the voter is asked to approve should be set at a realistic level in order that the voter may feel confident that the schools will be built for as low a cost as possible, consistent with good construction practices, ease of maintenance, student safety, and educational efficiency.

## PART D. DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC PROJECTS

Each of the projects recommended by the MSU survey team for inclusion in the first phase of the long-range construction program will be discussed in this section of our report. Projects which are essentially for the purpose of rehabilitating or modernizing facilities in existing school buildings will be found under Category I. All other projects have been assigned to Category II.

### CATEGORY I. PROJECTS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REVIEWED -- REHABILITATION AND MODERNIZATION OF FACILITIES IN EXISTING SCHOOL BUILDINGS

A considerable number of the projects recommended by the MSU survey team for inclusion in the first phase program are for the purpose of meeting ongoing needs to rehabilitate and modernize the physical plant and facilities within existing buildings in the Minneapolis school system. During the past ten or so years, perhaps half of the work of this type which has been undertaken has been financed from current operating revenues from the R & I (Repairs and Improvements) Fund. The balance has been financed through the issuance of bonds. Total annual expenditures from the R & I Fund amount to approximately \$1.3 million.

Since the MSU team has not established any point or other system for assigning relative priorities to these rehabilitation and modernization projects, it has not been possible for us to review them to determine whether those selected for inclusion in the first phase are in fact the most urgently needed. We, therefore, make no recommendation on any specific project in this category. However, the need to maintain each school building and the facilities it contains in a good state of repair, and to assure that the facilities are up to date, is no less important than replacing obsolete buildings or providing additional capacity at overcrowded schools.

Although we have not reviewed these projects, we have every reason to believe that most, if not all, should be undertaken as expeditiously as possible and, certainly, during the course of the first phase program. Late in 1960, the school administration prepared a complete list of the rehabilitation and modernization needs at each school for the ensuing 5-10 year period. Invariably, the MSU-recommended rehabilitation and modernization projects at each school represent only a fraction of those listed in the 1960 school administration report.

It should be noted that the MSU recommendations contain no rehabilitation and modernization projects for any elementary school. This doubtless will mean that heavy emphasis will have to be placed on meeting these needs in the second phase, unless a major proportion of the R & I Fund is devoted to this use during the first phase.

Following are the projects which appear to fit the above definition of rehabilitation and modernization. The dollar figure following each project is the MSU team's estimated cost. The MSU team estimates the total cost of these rehabilitation and modernization projects at \$4,793,000.

#### Senior High Schools

#### Michigan State's Estimated Costs

##### 1. Henry Senior-Junior High School

a. Upgrade plumbing and toilet facilities	\$ 20,000
b. Complete modernization of dressing rooms and shower facilities	100,000
c. Upgrade communications system	15,000
TOTAL	\$ 135,000

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

2. North Senior High School

a. Modernization and rehabilitation	\$ 400,000
(1) Industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	
(2) Art rooms (furniture & equipment)	
(3) Home economics (furniture & equipment)	
(4) Science rooms (furniture & equipment)	
(5) Lockers	
b. Limited maintenance & repair in old building	175,000
c. Upgrade communications system	15,000
d. Minor improvements	<u>100,000</u>
(1) Classrooms	
(2) Instructional materials center	
(3) Educational & custodial storage	
TOTAL	\$690,000

3. Edison Senior High School

a. Upgrade communications system	\$ 15,000
b. Improve lighting (1) gym (2) roof	5,000
c. Provide auxiliary gym	35,000
d. Repair roof	50,000
e. Upgrade kitchen and serving lines	100,000
f. Relocate art room(s)	35,000
g. Upgrade business education spaces	30,000
h. Provide automatic firing	15,000
i. Upgrade plumbing and toilet facilities	<u>35,000</u>
TOTAL	\$320,000

4. West Senior High School

a. Upgrade heating, ventilating and temperature controls	\$100,000
b. Repair roof	50,000
c. Upgrade guidance and counseling space	15,000
d. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	45,000
e. Relocate drafting room	<u>5,000</u>
TOTAL	\$215,000

5. Central Senior High School

a. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	\$ 75,000
b. Upgrade communications system	15,000
c. Upgrade clock system	10,000
d. Upgrade instructional materials center	40,000
e. Upgrade administrative suite	20,000
e.g. counseling and guidance	
f. Upgrade teachers' lounge	<u>5,000</u>
TOTAL	\$165,000

6. Roosevelt Senior High School

a. Upgrade industrial arts (equipment & furnishings)	\$100,000
b. Upgrade home economics (three stations - equipment and furnishings)	75,000
c. Upgrade clock system	10,000
d. Upgrade communications system	15,000
e. Upgrade administrative suite	<u>40,000</u>
e.g. counseling and guidance	
TOTAL	\$240,000

		Michigan State's
		<u>Estimated Costs</u>
7. Southwest Senior High School		
a. Upgrade instructional materials center	\$	10,000
b. Upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance		20,000
c. Complete auditorium		85,000
d. Install sunshades		10,000
e. Upgrade switchboard & telephone system		5,000
f. Elevate fresh air intakes		500
	TOTAL	<u>\$130,500</u>

8. Washburn Senior High School		
a. Upgrade heating, ventilating and temperature controls	\$125,000	
b. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	175,000	
c. Upgrade instructional materials center	50,000	
d. Upgrade home economics (three stations - furniture & equipment)	100,000	
e. Upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance	20,000	
f. Conversion of existing space for educational and storage needs	30,000	
	TOTAL	<u>\$500,000</u>

9. Vocational Senior High School		
a. Automation of heating plant	\$ 50,000	
b. Upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance	20,000	
c. General rehabilitation	125,000	
d. Upgrade vocational-technical equipment	250,000	
	TOTAL	<u>\$445,000</u>

Junior High Schools:

1. Jordan Junior High School		
a. Upgrade lockers and showers	\$ 40,000	
b. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	100,000	
c. Upgrade plumbing & toilet facilities	50,000	
d. Repair roof	80,000	
	TOTAL	<u>\$270,000</u>

2. Lincoln Junior High School		
a. Repair roof	\$ 45,000	
b. Upgrade plumbing & toilet facilities	40,000	
c. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	60,000	
	TOTAL	<u>\$145,000</u>

	Michigan State's Estimated Costs
3. Jefferson Junior High School	
a. Upgrade physical education spaces (auxiliary gym, showers & locker rooms)	\$ 80,000
b. Expand & upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance	30,000
c. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	60,000
d. Upgrade two art rooms	40,000
e. Upgrade home economics (three stations - furniture and equipment)	75,000
f. Provide shelving and equipment in instructional materials center	2,500
TOTAL	\$287,500
4. Bryant Junior High School	
a. Site improvements (after razing of elementary school)	\$ 50,000
b. Upgrade physical education spaces (showers, lockers, etc.)	60,000
c. Expand and upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance	25,000
d. Automation of heating plant	15,000
e. Repair roof	70,000
f. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	60,000
g. Provide shelving and equipment in instructional materials center	2,500
h. Upgrade art rooms	40,000
i. Upgrade home economics (three stations - furniture and equipment)	75,000
TOTAL	\$397,500
5. Folwell Junior High School	
a. Modernize communications system	\$ 10,000
b. Modernize industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	25,000
c. Modernize home economics (furniture & equipment)	20,000
d. Upgrade cafeteria & faculty dining room	15,000
e. Upgrade storage areas, and toilet facilities in girls' physical education spaces	7,500
TOTAL	\$ 77,500
6. Phillips Junior High School	
a. Repair roof	\$ 50,000
b. Upgrade physical education spaces (showers, lockers, etc.)	60,000
c. Expand and upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling & guidance	35,000
d. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	60,000
e. Provide teachers' lounge	5,000
TOTAL	\$210,000
7. Sanford Junior High School	
a. Upgrade cafeteria & faculty dining room	\$ 15,000
b. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	40,000
c. Upgrade home economics (three stations - furniture and equipment)	75,000
d. Upgrade plumbing and toilet facilities	40,000
TOTAL	\$170,000



	Michigan State's Estimated Costs
8. Ramsey Junior High School	
a. Expand and upgrade administrative suite	\$ 35,000
b. Upgrade home economics (three stations - furniture and equipment)	75,000
c. Upgrade two art rooms	40,000
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$150,000
9. Nokomis Junior High School	
a. Upgrade plumbing and toilet facilities	\$ 60,000
b. Repair roof	50,000
c. Automation of heating plant	15,000
d. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture & equipment)	60,000
e. Upgrade physical education spaces (lockers, showers, etc.)	60,000
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$245,000

Elementary Schools:

None

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS \$4,793,000

CATEGORY II. PROJECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE COMMITTEE

This category of projects includes all those recommended by the MSU team for inclusion in the first phase program which involve more than normal rehabilitation and upgrading of the facilities within existing school buildings. Each of the projects discussed has been reviewed as carefully as the time allotted would allow. Where uncertainties have arisen, personal visits have been made to the school itself.

In the interests of brevity and simplicity of presentation, we are limiting our discussion to the most significant observations about the projects recommended at each school. On the same basis we are not presenting the vast amount of statistical data which was compiled by the Citizens League staff and which was of invaluable assistance to committee members in reaching their conclusions.

The opening statements under each school, outlining briefly the MSU recommendations for that school, represent our best effort to summarize the MSU proposal. We have been somewhat limited in our ability to restate the MSU recommendation because the MSU report contains no narrative explanation or detailed discussion of the specific projects recommended. A considerable amount of the information presented here has been obtained from the MSU team on an oral basis during the approximately 12 hours MSU team members spent meeting with the members of our committee. We have tried, and hopefully have succeeded, to present the MSU case as objectively as possible.

Although we have questioned elsewhere in this report the seemingly high cost estimates, we have used the MSU team's figures in discussing the projects at each school. It should be noted that we have expressed the view that many, if not most, of these estimates can and should be reduced before they are submitted to the voters.

Our review has been limited to an evaluation of those projects recommended by the MSU team for inclusion in the first phase program. The projects cited by the MSU team as among those which should be considered for inclusion in the second phase program have not been spelled out in sufficient detail to permit any meaningful

analysis. We therefore can express no opinion on whether any of these second phase projects are of sufficient urgency to warrant inclusion in the first phase. And, of course, we have been unable to make the kind of analysis of school building needs which might disclose urgent needs not included in the first or second phase recommendations by the MSU team.

The projects are discussed below in the order presented in Volume I of the MSU team's report.

### Senior High Schools

#### 1. North Senior High School

#### Michigan State's Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 300,000
b. First addition	500,000
(1) Gym, lockers & showers	
(2) Music suite	
c. Modernization and rehabilitation	400,000
(1) Industrial arts (furniture and equipment)	
(2) Art rooms (furniture and equipment)	
(3) Home economics (furniture and equipment)	
(4) Science rooms (furniture and equipment)	
(5) Lockers	
d. Limited maintenance and repair in old building	175,000
e. Upgrade communications system	15,000
f. Minor improvements	<u>100,000</u>
(1) Classrooms	
(2) Instructional materials center	
(3) Educational and custodial storage	
TOTAL	\$1,490,000

MSU Recommendation: Replace the present North High building with a new school during the second phase of the long-range school construction program (1970-1975). The new school would be erected on land between the existing school site and North Commons, which is two blocks away. During the first phase land would be acquired adjacent to North Commons and a new building erected to house a complete gymnasium, locker and shower facilities, and a music suite. In this way, maximum advantage would be made of the school-park concept. This new building would comprise the first portion of a complete new school.

The urgency for construction during the first phase is based on the need to provide the additional physical education and music facilities necessary for an enrollment in excess of 1,900 pupils. The other recommended projects at North, which are for work to be undertaken within the existing building, are for the purpose of rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities in order to provide a better curriculum offering.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: Although we concur in general with the MSU appraisal of needs at North High, we urge that the proposed addition at the location suggested be eliminated from the first phase. We urge instead consideration of less permanent undertakings designed to meet the most critical needs for physical education and music facilities. Specifically, we urge that these be provided within the existing building.

North, the third oldest senior high in Minneapolis, was erected in 1914, and additions were constructed in 1921, 1923 and 1939. Since 1950, approximately \$550,000 has been spent in rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities at North. A school administration report made public in late 1960 indicated further unmet needs of this type, without mentioning the proposed new gym and music suite, totalling just in excess of \$600,000. MSU rates the capacity of North at 2,054 and indicates a 1962 enrollment of 1,857. MSU projects the 1967 North High enrollment at 2,074. The school is generally well located for its attendance area.

We concur with the view of the MSU team that the existing gym, locker, shower and music facilities at North are inadequate to serve properly its enrollment of more than 1,900 pupils. We regard the need for upgrading and expanding the locker and shower facilities & providing auxiliary gym facilities and music facilities as the most critical needs. Less urgent would appear to be the need for a complete new full-size gymnasium with seating capacity for the public. Action certainly should be taken during the first phase to meet the most critical of these needs.

The addition is proposed as the first section of a complete new school adjacent to North Commons. We understand that this proposed location is to maximize the advantages offered by a coordinated school-park site. In order to accomplish this objective, the building doubtless would be erected in such a way as to best utilize those facilities provided by the school and those provided by the park and which would be used in common. This would mean location of the gymnasium and physical education facilities adjacent to North Commons. It would certainly seem unsound to place the physical education facilities at the opposite end of the school building and two blocks away from North Commons. If we proceed on these assumptions and also on the assumption that the remainder of the proposed new school will be completed during the second phase of the school building program, satisfactory answers have thus far not been provided to several important questions:

- a. What are the inconveniences which would result from having the gymnasium and music suite facilities located almost two blocks from the existing building during the intervening years between the construction of the addition and the completion of the entire building?
- b. Can we be assured that the site for the proposed new school would be the most advantageous one ten years from now when the school is scheduled for completion? Would another location, perhaps with similar connections to North Commons, be better? Will it be possible to obtain the necessary approval from the Minneapolis City Council to close the two or three north-south streets which must be closed in order to use the site designated?
- c. If the new school were to be constructed all at one time, would the music facilities most logically be placed in the proximity of the physical education facilities?
- d. Would the music and physical education facilities be substantially the same as now proposed should a decision be made to make boundary adjustments, thereby decreasing the attendance at North to perhaps 1,500?

These questions serve to demonstrate the reasons why we prefer, if there is any other way, not to construct a new school in two or more phases. We doubt that answers to these questions can be made at this time with the degree of certainty which is desirable and perhaps essential.

Let us assume, on the other hand, that it becomes necessary to continue use of the present North High building for the next 15-20 years. This eventuality is by no means beyond the realm of possibility. Implementation of the MSU recommendation itself might prove to be a significant factor in lengthening the period of future use of the existing plant. With the most serious needs at North having been met during the first phase, and this certainly will be the case under the proposed expenditure of \$1,400,000 at that school, it will be exceedingly difficult to maintain a high priority rating for replacement of the present building during the second phase. The completion of the new building during the second phase is totally dependent on the willingness of the voters to approve the expenditure of funds for those projects given a higher priority. This is, at best, an unknown quantity. If the present building is to continue in use for an indefinite period of time, then the proposed location of the addition will prove to be most inconvenient. Certainly, such a location would never have been selected under those circumstances.

The question then becomes one of determining whether some other way exists to meet the most critical needs at North without making the premature and irrevocable decisions that are inevitable if the MSU recommendation is implemented. We believe that such an alternative is available.

We are convinced that, through careful analysis and planning of the present space in the existing building, adjustments can be made to provide upgraded and expanded locker, shower, auxiliary gym and music facilities within the present building. An auxiliary gym is a large classroom used for gymnastics, tumbling, and various other physical education activities. MSU, in recommending such an auxiliary gym for Edison High, estimates its cost at \$35,000.

If, in the unlikely event that there simply is no way to provide for these expanded facilities within the existing building, consideration might be given to a slight boundary change resulting in the transfer of from 100-200 North High pupils to Henry. The present boundary is actually closer to Henry than to North. This would free several classrooms, permitting, through an adjustment of space, the necessary expanded facilities to be provided.

We would further urge that, prior to making the decision of when and where to construct a new North High, careful consideration be given to the most desirable attendance area to be served by this school. We specifically suggest consideration of a substantial boundary adjustment between North High and Henry, resulting in substantially equal enrollments at both schools. Based on present enrollment figures, this would require transfer of about 400 North High pupils to Henry. This change would bring about a number of important objectives: (1) It would strengthen the enrollment at Henry Senior High without materially weakening North High, and would accomplish the goal of having approximately equal enrollments throughout the senior highs. A boundary change of this kind would not extend appreciably the walking distance from school for those North High students who would be transferred to Henry. (2) It would result in the physical and administrative separation of the junior and senior high at Henry, in conformance with the desired K6-3-3 form of school organization. (3) It would make possible the combining of Henry Junior High and Olson Junior High at Olson, increasing its enrollment to 1,000-1,100.

This would permit a much improved curriculum offering at Olson at probably a less expensive per pupil cost than at present. (4) It would allow fuller utilization of the splendid facilities at Olson Junior High, which was just opened in 1962. This school was built with core facilities for an enrollment of at least 1,000, including a swimming pool. Additional construction at Olson would be confined to approximately 250 academic classroom spaces and, perhaps, an auditorium. We have been able to find only two legitimate objections to this proposal: (1) Access to Olson will be somewhat difficult for those pupils living immediately south of the complex of railroad tracks. However, access to junior high schools in other parts of the city is in several instances at least as difficult, if not even more difficult. Further, the MSU team itself recommends that junior high pupils now attending Seward be transferred to Phillips Junior, which is a considerably further distance than would be the case at Olson, and is at least equally difficult in terms of access. We do not believe this factor to be a controlling influence over an otherwise sound approach. (2) At present, probably all of the pupils now attending North who would be transferred to Henry are white. This would increase the ratio of colored pupils at North. We believe concern of this type is exaggerated. It is our understanding that the present proportion of colored pupils at North is considerably smaller than is commonly assumed, probably at or below 10% of the total enrollment. A boundary change of the type we have suggested would cause an insignificant increase in this ratio. If a result of this type were allowed to be controlling under similar circumstances at other schools, a number of the MSU projects recommended for inclusion in the first phase would have to be carefully re-examined and, perhaps, rejected. If the proportion of colored pupils at North was substantially higher than it actually is, then, of course, a boundary change of the type we are suggesting should not be made without first considering carefully the possible impact of a further increase in this ratio.

2. Marshall Senior-Junior High School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

(The survey staff recommends allocation of \$250,000 to plan the appropriate spaces for conversion of this facility to a public school-university cooperative unit.)	TOTAL    \$   250,000
--	-----------------------

MSU Recommendation: Marshall High should be consolidated with University High, forming a combined school. If and as this can be accomplished, the \$250,000 would be spent to make the necessary physical adjustments to accommodate this type of enrollment. No specific breakdown of the type of work necessary has been indicated. If the recommended consolidation of the two schools proves not to be attainable, then Marshall should be phased out, with its enrollment transferred to other schools.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase. To the extent the expenditure becomes necessary during the first phase, it would be preferable to finance it by some means other than a bond program.

We concur with the MSU survey team's view that the proposed consolidation of Marshall with U High would be the most advantageous way of resolving the problems facing Marshall, with its senior high enrollment of approximately 500 pupils. We also agree that Marshall must be either phased out or strengthened in some other way if the proposed consolidation cannot take place.

This project is totally speculative. From what we have been able to learn, there is little prospect that final action on the proposed consolidation of these two schools can or will be attained for some time, and almost certainly not before the voters are asked to approve the first phase program. Even if the proposed consolidation is approved ultimately, there is considerable doubt that the recommended \$250,000 of work at Marshall would be required during the first phase. We are reluctant to have so uncertain a project submitted to the voters and have some doubt also as to whether this type of rehabilitation work would not more appropriately be programmed through the R & I Fund.

If the Board of Education should decide to include this project in the first phase, it would appear advantageous to assign it to the discretionary non-referendum bond fund, since, if the money proved not to be needed for the Marshall-U High consolidation, it could then be spent for some other purpose. If it is included among those projects submitted to the voters, it would have to be spent for the purpose stated and, if not, could not be spent at all.

3. Roosevelt Senior High School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 200,000
b. Four science labs (equipment and furnishings)	175,000
c. Eight classroom addition	175,000
d. Provide new gym, shower and locker rooms	400,000
TOTAL	\$ 950,000

MSU Recommendation: These projects are for the purpose of providing additional classrooms and gym facilities for an enrollment which is above the rated capacity of the school. The proposed site acquisition would replace the land which will be used for the construction of the new gym and auxiliary physical education facilities.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of these projects in the first phase.

MSU rates the capacity of Roosevelt at 2,116. The current enrollment is approximately 2,400. Actually, the rated capacity of Roosevelt is presently somewhat below 2,116, because parts of several classrooms were lost by the recently completed construction of two stair towers. The eight additional classrooms which are proposed would restore the previous capacity and, perhaps, increase it by about 120 spaces.

Without question, the present enrollment at Roosevelt overtakes the existing facilities. We have found few reasonable alternatives to providing the needed additional capacity at Roosevelt. A number of Fort Snelling residents have been attending Roosevelt High on a tuition basis. However, effective this year, they have been transferred to Richfield High. Some easing of the capacity problem at Roosevelt would be accomplished if the approximately 130 pupils living in the South High District and who have elected to exercise the option of attending Roosevelt were to be transferred to South High. Actually, this is what is proposed by MSU, if and as a new South High is constructed. Capacity for these pupils would be available in the existing South High building if the MSU recommendation to transfer the South High 9th graders to Phillips Junior High is implemented. The boundary on the north of the Roosevelt district is already considerably closer to Roosevelt than it is to South High. Therefore, it would not appear feasible to make the type of boundary adjust-

ment which would result in the shift of a sufficient number of Roosevelt High pupils to South to bring Roosevelt enrollment down to or below 2,000.

We understand that the additional classrooms would be constructed as a second floor to the existing music suite addition and, therefore, would not require additional land. It is also our understanding that the new gymnasium would be constructed between the existing building and the athletic field on school property. Until such time as a priority system can be developed for the site needs of the Minneapolis school system, we urge that additional site not be acquired at Roosevelt.

4. New South Senior High School	Michigan State's <u>Estimated Costs</u>
a. Site acquisition (12 acres	\$1,200,000
b. New building	3,850,000
(1) 1,000 pupils	
(2) Special education facilities for 100 pupils	
TOTAL	<u>\$5,050,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: The South High building is obsolete and is poorly located for its future attendance area. Future freeway construction will take a substantial part of its athletic field. The existing building should be replaced by a new senior high school to be located on a new site south and east of the present school.

Boundary adjustments within the South High district would be made, resulting in a future enrollment for the new South High of approximately 1,000 pupils. Those pupils presently in the South district generally west of Cedar Avenue (about 400) would be transferred to Central. The 130 South High pupils who have been allowed to exercise the option of attending Roosevelt would be required to attend the new South High. The net effect of these shifts would produce approximately 1,000 pupils for the new South Senior High. An additional 100 spaces would be provided in the new school for special education classes.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: South High is the second oldest senior high school in Minneapolis. The first section, which was erected in 1892, has been razed. The present building was erected in 1910, with additions constructed in 1916, 1926 and 1939. Since 1950, about \$563,000 has been spent on rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities at South. The 1960 school administration report indicates additional needs of this type in excess of \$600,000. The MSU report adds a number of further needs. We have received estimates of the cost of a total rehabilitation and upgrading of South ranging upwards to \$1,000,000.

MSU rates the capacity of South at 1,602. The 1962 enrollment at South was 1,478, including 220 9th graders and 29 special class students. The projected enrollment for 1967 is 1,474. If and as the MSU recommendation to transfer the 9th graders at South to Phillips Junior High is implemented, the senior high enrollment at South would be reduced to 1,250.

In order to make meaningful decisions on the future of South High, it is necessary to understand and interrelate the total senior high situation across the south-central belt of Minneapolis. MSU recommends, in addition to a new South High at a location south and east of the present school, the consolidation of Marshall with University High, and if this is not attainable the phasing out of Marshall and the transfer of its enrollment to other schools. MSU

proposes replacement of the West High building with a new school during the second phase, and recommends replacement of the Central High building within the next 10-15 years. Therefore, important policy decisions will have to be made concerning the future of all four of these schools within the next several years.

In 1962, South, Central, West and Marshall had a combined senior high enrollment of 3,852. MSU enrollment projections indicate that by 1967 the total will be slightly less than this figure. The total capacity of these four schools is just in excess of 6,000 spaces. The present total enrollment at these schools is around 4,400, including the 9th graders at South and the junior high pupils at Marshall. This means that the combined enrollment at these four schools is about 73% of the total capacity of these schools.

Even under the MSU-recommended optimum size range for senior high schools (1,000-1,500), which we regard as too low, there are not enough senior high pupils in these attendance areas to support the long-range continuation of four separate senior high schools. With three of these four schools scheduled for demolition within the next 15 years, and the fourth perhaps being phased out of existence, it is imperative that any proposed construction of a new South High be interrelated to the future of these other schools.

We believe that any plan to construct a new South High should envision the ultimate consolidation of the three high schools across the south-central belt of Minneapolis (South, West and Central) into two permanent senior highs. This would mean two schools, each with an enrollment of between 1,600 and 1,700 senior high pupils. Should the Marshall-U High consolidation not prove attainable, then Marshall probably should be phased out with its enrollment being divided between Edison and the nearest of the two schools serving the south-central belt. This would mean the addition of between 150-200 Marshall High pupils, thereby increasing the enrollment at each of these two schools to about 1,700.

It is in this context that we have evaluated the MSU recommendation for the construction of a new South Senior High. We find that the proposed location for the new school would be an extremely poor one, if the school is to serve as one of the two larger schools serving the south-central belt of Minneapolis. In fact, a new South Senior High at the location suggested very likely would preclude the consolidation of the existing three senior highs into two permanent schools. If this permanent solution is precluded, it would mean a future enrollment for the new senior high of, at most, 1,000, and probably less. This, we are convinced, would prove to be an exceedingly costly mistake. The initial construction cost of a small school is proportionately much higher than for a larger school. Future operational costs will prove to be relatively high, and the curriculum offering relatively poor. In other words, the taxpayers of Minneapolis would end up with a comparatively high cost operation and the pupils at the new South would receive a comparatively low value educational offering.

Much of the discussion in support of immediate construction of a new South High has centered on the issue of the relatively high dropout rate at that school. It has been explained that a new high school located in the community with extensive facilities for industrial arts and other vocational-oriented courses would have a highly beneficial effect. Although we agree in general with the logic of this line of reasoning, we fail to understand how the construction of a proposed new South Senior High in the Longfellow community will accomplish this objective. We have been told that the highest proportion of dropouts at South High is among those pupils living west



of Hiawatha Avenue. Under the MSU recommendation, most of the pupils living in this area would not attend the new school, but rather would be transferred to Central. The Longfellow community, except for the Seward area, is a relatively stable area and, in general, its residential neighborhoods are not dissimilar to those in other high school attendance areas. And, if the plans to rehabilitate the Seward area through an urban renewal program are approved, as expected, then even this area should assume an entirely different characteristic.

The proposed transfer of those South High pupils generally living west of Cedar Avenue is disadvantageous from another standpoint. The vast majority of colored pupils presently attending South High live in that area. Although we have been unable to obtain specific figures on the proportion of colored pupils at Central High, we have been led to assume that Central has the highest proportion of colored pupils of any senior high in Minneapolis. In the absence of other important educational objectives which would warrant a decision to the contrary, and we do not believe such objectives exist in this case, we believe the proposed transfer is both unnecessary and undesirable. In our opinion, the simplest and probably the soundest way to provide maximum protection against de facto segregation at the high school level is to have schools serving a larger enrollment and a broader attendance area.

Under the assumption that the ultimate solution will be to replace the three existing schools with two permanent and larger senior high schools, we have given careful consideration to several alternatives which would be compatible with the long-range objective. These alternatives include:

- a. Put a sufficient amount of money into rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities at South to continue the school in use until West and Central Highs can be replaced.

This would mean using the present building for, at most, 15 years and probably not less than 10. Based on various estimates of the cost of the type of rehabilitation which would be required under these circumstances, we would guess that an expenditure of at least \$500,000, and perhaps considerably higher, would not be unrealistic. We do not favor this alternative. However, this alternative might have to be re-examined if insufficient funds are available to undertake a substantial program of replacing our most obsolete school buildings.

- b. Close South High and divide its enrollment between Marshall & Central.

Under this alternative, the pupils now attending South who live east of Hiawatha would, in the main, attend Marshall, and those living west of Hiawatha would, in the main, attend Central. Capacity for this number of senior high pupils is presently available at Central and sufficient capacity could be available at Marshall by closing the junior high and shifting the Marshall junior high pupils to Sheridan and Sanford. This alternative offers a number of advantages:

- (1) It would be by far the most economical in terms of short run costs, because no new construction would be required at any of the schools affected.
- (2) It would allow implementation of the K6-3-3 form of school organization at both Marshall and Sheridan, by making Marshall exclusively a senior high and Sheridan exclusively a junior high.

- (3) It would strengthen substantially the senior high enrollments at Marshall and Central, both of which are comparatively small senior high schools.
- (4) It would utilize the substantial amount of existing unused capacity at Marshall and Central and would utilize the vast amount of unused capacity which will become available at Sheridan, once that school becomes exclusively a junior high.
- (5) It would permit South High pupils to attend schools with relatively good physical plants.

The principal disadvantages of this alternative are:

- (1) Marshall High is not conveniently located in terms of distance and ease of access for many of those South High pupils who would be transferred to that school. However, the savings in operating costs, not to mention the savings in capital and interest costs, which would accrue from use of the excess capacity at these schools would be so substantial that transportation could be provided for these pupils and still leave a net saving in dollars.
- (2) In the long run, it probably would be preferable to have two larger senior high schools serving the present South-Central-West attendance areas, and therefore the combining of the South High pupils east of Hiawatha with the Marshall pupils would not be a permanent solution.

No positive decision in favor of this alternative is possible at this time, nor will it be possible until a final decision is reached on the proposed consolidation of Marshall and U High. If that consolidation takes place, and the answer to this will not be known prior to the time the voters will have to make their decision, then this alternative would no longer be available.

- c. Temporize by performing limited maintenance and rehabilitation of the present South High building during the first phase, while the basic decisions which are essential to a soundly-conceived replacement school are determined.

This alternative would be preferable to prematurely making the wrong decision. The capacity at South is 1,602. The enrollment, once the 9th graders are transferred to Phillips, as proposed by MSU, would be about 1,250. With so substantial an amount of extra capacity at South, it would seem reasonable to close down the oldest and poorest section of the building immediately.

It should be noted that not all of the South High building dates back to the original construction of the school in 1910. Only the north portion of South High, representing not more and probably less than half the total space, was built in 1910. The more recent part of the building is in comparatively good condition, and a considerable portion of the building has been rehabilitated and its facilities upgraded. While we agree that replacement, rather than rehabilitation is the sounder long-run investment, we do not agree that the major sections of this school are in such deplorable condition that the school must be closed within the next few years. In fact, if the decision was made to acquire additional land adjacent to the present site on which to construct a new school, the logical way to proceed would be to construct the new school in stages,

closing down the oldest portions of the present building and continuing to use for some further time the more recent portions of this building. This procedure would result in a substantial reduction in the cost of this project during the first phase.

- d. Undertake during the first phase construction of a new school at a location which anticipates ultimate use of the new school as one of the two new senior highs serving the present South-Central-West attendance areas.

This alternative, under the proper circumstances and with sufficient time for careful planning, has such important advantages that we urge the Board of Education to make every effort to assure that substantial progress toward construction of the new school will be undertaken during the first phase. Among its important advantages are:

- (1) The uncertainty about the future of South High would be ended. Both teachers and pupils would know that within five years they would have a new school.
- (2) The costs of further rehabilitating the present South High building, which would be necessary under any temporizing decision, would be saved.
- (3) It would be possible to retain the continuity of the present South High attendance area. The transfer of South High pupils to Central, as contemplated under the MSU proposal and under Alternative b. above, with the resulting negative aspects discussed earlier, would not take place.
- (4) From a political standpoint, it would provide a way to unite community organizations in support of the entire program. This should substantially enhance the prospects for voter approval at next year's bond authorization election.

Under this alternative, the replacement school would have sufficient capacity initially to serve the present South High attendance area. Then, when West High is replaced (MSU recommends its replacement within the next 10 years), sufficient additional capacity should be provided at West and at the new South, and probably at Washburn, to allow the coordinated phasing out of Central High. Other uses then could be found for the Central High building. Such uses might include a second vocational school, a community or junior college, an administration building, or other educational uses. Or, if the MSU recommendation for its replacement as a school building within the next 15 years is followed, the site could be sold for some other use.

Since a substantial majority of the enrollment in the ultimate attendance area will live west of Hiawatha, and since this is also the part of the future attendance area which would most benefit from having a new school situated within easy access of the pupils' homes, an obviously centrally-located site would be directly south and perhaps a few blocks west of the present school. However, an expansion of the present site would offer certain important advantages and should not be ruled out entirely. These advantages would include a substantially reduced cost of construction during the first phase and less disruption of homes and businesses for site acquisition for the new school. The initial cost would be less, because less additional site would be required and because only the first portion of a new school would be constructed during the first phase. The more recently constructed

portions of the present South High Building would continue to be used for at least several more years before the remainder of the new school was completed.

We believe that Alternative d. above should and can be implemented during the first phase of the construction program. However, its implementation will require that the Board of Education reach agreement on the necessary basic policy decisions and make them public prior to the bond authorization election. Moreover, it will require considerable planning of the specifics. For example, until a determination can be made on whether to expand the present site, it is not possible to estimate the type of construction and the cost which will be required during the first phase. In view of the Board of Education's announced plan to submit a specific first phase program to the Minneapolis Planning Commission by November 12, we can see no possible way to include the proposed construction of a new South High among the projects to be financed out of voter-approved bond funds.

We urge that the Board of Education formulate the necessary basic policy decisions and the specific implementation which would flow from these decisions during the course of the next few months. The general plan for construction of the new school could then be outlined prior to the bond authorization election and assurances given that sufficient funds will be made available from non-referendum discretionary bonds and/or other funds to assure at least the start of construction of a replacement school during the first phase, with sufficient capacity to serve initially the entire present South High attendance area.

If the right kind of basic decisions cannot be made and the specifics firmed up prior to the bond authorization election, then we see no alternative but to propose temporizing as discussed in Alternative c. above. Under either Alternative c. or d., we would envision completion of the necessary initial construction within the next five years. Assuming a 3-year first phase program, under Alternative d., funds would be allocated out of the non-referendum discretionary bonds to finance site acquisition and probably start construction during the first phase. Construction would be completed during the 4th and 5th years and would be financed either out of funds made available for the 2nd phase program or out of the non-referendum discretionary bond funds and/or current financing. The completion date would be essentially the same under Alternative c., with the exception that site acquisition and construction probably would not be undertaken until the beginning of the 4th year. Should the Board of Education decide to proceed with a 5-year first phase program, then the timetable and the source of funds for site acquisition and construction would be essentially the same as under the 3-year first phase program.

5. Washburn Senior High School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 200,000
b. Provide new gym, lockers & shower rooms	400,000
c. Provide new music suite	100,000
TOTAL	<u>\$ 700,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Washburn has capacity for 1,401 students, and the current enrollment is over 1,900. Through boundary adjustments, up to 500 Washburn students would be transferred to adjacent schools, leaving Washburn with an enrollment of 1,450-1,500. Between 250 and 300 Washburn students would be transferred to Southwest Senior High and about 200 to West or Central. No specific information is available to indicate just where these boundary adjustments would be made.

The proposed construction of additional physical education and music facilities in a new addition would increase slightly the capacity at Washburn. No academic classrooms would be added unless they could be provided within the existing building. The addition would be constructed on the existing site and the proposed acquisition of additional site would be to offset the land lost through construction of the addition.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: Relief for the serious overcrowding at Washburn must be provided in the first phase. The present music facilities are deplorable. The physical education facilities are inadequate, certainly for the present enrollment and probably for the proposed reduced enrollment. Meeting these needs at Washburn is of urgent priority.

We concur with the MSU proposal to resolve the serious overcrowding problem at Washburn by reducing its enrollment, rather than by providing sufficient additional capacity to accommodate adequately its present enrollment. However, we do so, not because we believe that a smaller enrollment will be helpful to Washburn from an educational standpoint. We agree with the proposal because of the important benefits that will accrue to the other schools affected, particularly Southwest Junior and Senior High, without seriously adversely affecting Washburn.

We question whether Washburn, with a projected future enrollment of approximately 1,500 under the MSU recommendation, needs a complete new gymnasium in addition to its present boys' gym and girls' gym. Other high schools in Minneapolis - with substantially similar enrollments - Edison, for example - with comparable facilities to those now existing at Washburn apparently have sufficient gym facilities for their programs. On this basis, we suggest consideration of providing an auxiliary gym (a large classroom equipped for gymnastics and other physical education programs), similar to the one proposed for Edison at a projected cost of \$35,000.

Since even the reduced enrollment of about 1,500 students at Washburn would tax its capacity, we do not believe that the necessary music facilities can be provided within the existing plant. We therefore suggest consideration of constructing an addition similar to that at Roosevelt High. This addition should then make it possible to rearrange space in the existing building to provide for the additional physical education needs.

At the time this music suite addition is constructed, we believe it important to review carefully the academic classroom needs at Washburn. It seems

quite possible that at least a few additional academic classrooms might be needed and, if so, they could be provided, as they have at Roosevelt, in the new building.

It is not necessary to acquire additional site on which to construct the addition. Until and unless a priority list of site needs for all schools in the city is developed, we do not believe that additional site should be purchased at Washburn.

### Junior High Schools

#### 1. New Franklin Junior High School

#### Michigan State's Estimated Costs

a. New site (8 acres)	\$ 800,000
b. New building	2,080,000
(1) 700 pupils)	
(2) Special education facilities for 100 pupils	
TOTAL	<u>\$2,880,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: The present structure is obsolete and, in addition, is poorly located to serve its future attendance area. A new Franklin Junior High should be constructed on a new site adjacent to the Hall Elementary School. With some slight boundary adjustments between Lincoln Junior High and Jordan Junior High, the enrollment at Franklin would be built up to approximately 600 pupils. In addition, regional special education facilities for about 100 pupils would be incorporated into the new Franklin School.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Franklin Junior High was initially erected in 1874 and burned almost to the ground in 1912. The school was rebuilt in 1917 and an addition was added in 1924. Since 1950, this school has had relatively little done in the area of rehabilitation and upgrading of facilities. The 1960 school administration report indicates rehabilitation and modernization needs at that school during the ensuing 10 years totalling nearly \$400,000. The MSU report adds other undertakings to this list. Thus, a decision either to spend a substantial amount of money to rehabilitate this school or to replace it must be made during the first phase. On balance, and particularly in view of its present poor location in terms of its future attendance area, we agree with the MSU team that the school should be replaced rather than rehabilitated.

We are concerned about the fact that the future enrollment at a new Franklin will be less than the minimum recommended by MSU for junior highs. We therefore spent considerable time attempting to see if there were reasonable alternatives which would warrant construction of a larger junior high. Because of the location of other junior highs on the north side, and their existing capacities, we find it would be difficult to make boundary changes to increase substantially the enrollment at Franklin Junior.

We also spent considerable time reviewing the question of the need for swimming pools in junior highs, since the MSU recommendation failed to include them in the two new junior highs proposed. We are convinced that a swimming pool is a desirable, if not necessary, physical education station in any junior high. If a junior high is of sufficient size to serve between 1,000 and 1,400 pupils, then a swimming pool can be justified without reservation

as one of the four needed gym stations. There is a greater difficulty, from a financial and programming standpoint, to make the same unequivocal case for a swimming pool in a school with only 600 pupils. We are not at all happy about the situation which will exist in the Franklin community. That community has used the swimming pool in the existing Franklin Junior High building for many years and to great advantage. This community will now be in the unenviable position of having to lose its swimming pool because of the construction of a new school.

2. Sheridan Junior High

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 300,000
b. Provide auditorium	125,000
c. Modernize classrooms for junior high use	50,000
d. Upgrade home economics (3 stations - furniture and equipment)	75,000
e. Upgrade industrial arts (furniture and equipment)	30,000
f. Relocate and upgrade choral and instrumental music rooms	10,000
g. Relocate and upgrade administrative suite e.g. counseling and guidance	50,000
h. Expand and upgrade lunchroom facilities	125,000
i. Upgrade communications system	10,000
j. Upgrade instructional materials center	25,000
k. Upgrade ventilation system	75,000
l. Upgrade teachers' lounges	5,000
m. Upgrade physical education spaces	25,000
n. Upgrade art rooms	40,000
TOTAL	<u>\$ 945,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: This school, which is presently a combination elementary and junior high school, should become a junior high, with the elementary pupils being transferred to a new Sheridan Elementary School proposed for construction in the first phase. Other than for proposed site acquisition and an auditorium, most of the recommended projects at this school are to rehabilitate and upgrade the facilities in the present building.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

The rated capacity of Sheridan Junior High is 755, and the elementary 400, resulting in total capacity for 1,155 pupils. The present junior high enrollment is about 650 and the elementary enrollment about 500. Since the area is expected to continue somewhat stable, the total enrollment at Sheridan, once it becomes solely a junior high, would be about 650.

The concept of separating elementary and junior high pupils is sound and we therefore agree that Sheridan should not be continued indefinitely as a combination school. We also presume that most of the proposed rehabilitation and upgrading work would be desirable if and as a decision is reached to make this a junior high. It is somewhat unusual, however, that in the case of Sheridan the MSU recommendations for rehabilitation and upgrading exceed in dollar amounts the figures estimated in the 1960 school administration report. In that report, the administration estimated the unmet needs over the next 5-10 years at approximately \$300,000. MSU proposed expenditures of approximately \$645,000 for this type of work.

A decision on whether Sheridan should become exclusively a junior high in the future is inextricably interrelated to the Marshall decision. Under the MSU recommendations, Sheridan would continue to have an enrollment substantially less than their own minimum standards. Capacity at Sheridan would be perhaps about 500 above the enrollment of 650. The present Marshall junior high enrollment is approximately 550, making a total enrollment for the two schools of about 1,200. Both schools are below the recommended minimum size for junior high schools.

If Marshall should be closed as a school and its students transferred elsewhere, then a decision would have to be made about the disposition of the junior high pupils at Marshall. Would they be transferred to Sheridan Junior? Sheridan Junior is not well located to serve that total area. Or, on the other hand, might Marshall be continued as a junior high? If so, perhaps it would be preferable to discontinue Sheridan Junior and have the combined enrollment attend Marshall Junior. Or, if South Senior High was to be closed and its enrollment divided, with part going to Marshall, then how would the junior high students in the Sheridan-Marshall area be served? Perhaps a new, more advantageously located junior high of approximately 1,200 pupils would be the most desirable solution. It is not possible to reach meaningful conclusions on any of these alternatives until the Marshall situation has been resolved.

We find that the per pupil maintenance and custodial costs are exceptionally high at any school where the facilities are substantially under-used. This certainly would be the case at Sheridan, with a capacity of over 1,100 and an enrollment of less than 700. We therefore hope that a way can be found to utilize a high proportion of its capacity.

Although considerable work is necessary at Sheridan Junior High, the school is relatively new and is in comparatively good condition. It would seem far sounder to temporize and continue Sheridan Junior-Elementary School in its present condition until the Marshall problem has been resolved.

3. New Southwest Junior High School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 500,000
b. New building	1,560,000
(1) 600 pupils   (2) Unusual site problems	
TOTAL	<u>\$2,060,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Construct a new 600-capacity junior high school adjacent to Pershing Field, thereby connecting the present Southwest Junior-Senior High with Pershing Field. The present Southwest Junior-Senior High would become a senior high only, and the senior high enrollment would be strengthened through transfer of up to 300 Washburn senior high students. Approximately 100 Southwest Junior high students would be transferred to Anthony Junior High though a boundary change.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

This recommendation would accomplish four important objectives: (1) It would relieve the serious overcrowding at Washburn. (2) It would implement K6-3-3 form of school organization by separating, administratively and physically, the junior high from the senior high students at Southwest. (3)



It would strengthen substantially the relatively low enrollment at Southwest Senior High. The capacity at Southwest is 1,480. The present enrollment of about 1,000 would be increased to approximately 1,300, with some further growth still anticipated in this attendance area. (4) It would strengthen the enrollment at Anthony Junior High and would utilize some of the excess capacity at that school. Anthony has capacity for 1,029 pupils, with a present enrollment of slightly over 800.

The recommendation to construct a new and separate Southwest Junior High has one disadvantage. It would result in the construction of another junior high with an enrollment considerably less than the MSU recommended minimum of 800. We have reviewed all factors carefully in an effort to discover some other way of accomplishing the four important objectives without having to accept the one deficiency. We have found no preferable alternative, and we therefore support this recommendation.

One possible alternative which might be explored further would be to consolidate the Southwest junior high pupils at Anthony Junior High. This would increase the enrollment at Anthony to just over 1,500, and would require an addition at Anthony. However, the site at Anthony appears to be adequate, the school is quite modern, and the cost of an addition at Anthony would be considerably less expensive than the cost of the proposed new junior high at the Southwest location. The principal disadvantage of this alternative would be the greater distance which those students living in the north section of the present Southwest district would have to travel to reach Anthony.

#### Elementary Schools:

##### 1. New Hamilton Elementary School

#### Michigan State's Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 400,000
b. New building	850,000
(1) 390 Hamilton pupils (est.)	
(2) 110 McKinley pupils (est.)	
TOTAL	<u>\$1,250,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Hamilton is an obsolescent educational facility, poorly located to serve its neighborhood. A new school to serve the Camden neighborhood should be developed in conjunction with a park in the geographical middle of this area. The new site would be south and east of the present school.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Hamilton was built in 1889, with additions constructed in 1899, 1908, 1911 & 1925. This school has thus far had very little rehabilitation and modernization. The 1960 school administration report indicates rehabilitation needs at this school of about \$250,000. The MSU report adds further needs, making the likely total cost of rehabilitating this school in excess of \$300,000. The MSU estimated cost of the new school is \$850,000.

A decision on whether to rehabilitate or replace this school cannot be further deferred. In view of its poor location and the fact that rehabilitation costs would exceed one-third of the cost of building a new school, we believe it would be a far sounder investment in the long run to construct a new school

It is our understanding that approximately 100 Hamilton pupils living north of Shingle Creek would be transferred to Lind. Lind, a relatively new school, has a rated capacity of 690, and its enrollment is at the capacity. The area

is relatively stable and the addition of 100 Hamilton pupils could well result in a permanently increased enrollment at Lind. We urge the Board of Education to consider inclusion in the first phase of an addition or portable classrooms at Lind to increase its capacity by up to 100.

2. New Grant Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 400,000
b. New building	1,615,000
(1) 850 Grant pupils (est.)	
(2) 100 Hay pupils (est.)	
TOTAL	<u>\$2,015,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Grant is an obsolescent educational facility. It should be replaced on an expanded site. The new school should be planned to serve part of the present Hay and Blaine attendance areas.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Grant was built in 1889, with additions constructed in 1908 and 1914. Nearly \$250,000 has been spent in rehabilitating and modernizing this school since 1950. The 1960 school administration report indicated \$80,000 of further rehabilitation work necessary during the next 5-10 years. The MSU report adds further rehabilitation needs for the school.

An urban renewal project for the Grant area has now received federal government approval and, if the Minneapolis City Council approves, the land around Grant School will be cleared within the next few years. Therefore, a decision should be made at this time about the future of this school.

Grant has a rated capacity of 645, with a present enrollment of approximately 750. The projected enrollment five years from now is estimated by the MSU team at 867. The adjacent schools are overcrowded. Blaine Elementary School is in a declining enrollment area and in the path of freeway construction and will be closed within the next five years. The Grant School area is one of high density, which is likely to continue.

An alternative would be to leave the old Grant School as it is and construct another new school very close to Grant. In view of the rather high proportion of minority group population in the area and in view of the density of population, it would seem preferable to construct a single new large school to serve a broader area. This would not appear to violate the neighborhood concept for elementary schools. However, it would result in an elementary school with a future enrollment in excess of 1,000. We believe that, on balance, the MSU recommendation to construct a single large school is the preferable alternative.

Since the additional site to be acquired for the new Grant School will doubtless be cleared land purchased from the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, it would seem that substantially less than the proposed \$400,000 would be sufficient for the acquisition of the necessary land.

3. New Hawthorne Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 400,000
b. New building (1) 700 Hawthorne pupils (est.)	1,190,000
TOTAL	<u>\$1,590,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Hawthorne is an obsolescent educational facility with quite limited acreage. It is poorly located in its neighborhood. A new school to serve the Hawthorne neighborhood should be developed adjacent to Farview Park.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: Although we concur with the MSU recommendation that this school should be replaced at a new site within the near future, we do not believe this project should be given an urgent priority. We urge that it be eliminated from the first phase.

Hawthorne was erected in 1883, with additions constructed in 1903 and 1912. MSU rates its capacity at 495, with a current enrollment of about 700. Since 1950 approximately \$235,000 has been spent to rehabilitate and upgrade facilities at this school. The 1960 school administration report indicates just under \$100,000 in remaining rehabilitation needs, with the MSU report adding a few further needs.

MSU, in rating the capacity of this school at 495, disqualifies 2 kindergarten rooms, one regular classroom and one special use room because these rooms on the ground floor are more than 30" below grade. Thus, more than 150 pupil spaces have been disqualified on this basis. The school administration has previously rated the capacity of this school at 750. We have personally visited this school and have found that the below-grade classrooms have substantial window space above ground. We believe these rooms can continue to be used without causing hardship to either the teachers or the pupils. If these ground floor rooms are counted toward capacity, the school has sufficient space for its enrollment.

The school appears to be in far better condition than any other school recommended for first phase replacement. Little in the way of additional rehabilitation must be accomplished during the next several years. The classrooms appear to be substantially larger than at other schools built before 1900. School personnel at Hawthorne express no feeling of urgency about the need to replace this school within the next few years.

We believe it would be far sounder to continue this school for several years in order to recapture some of the extensive investment in rehabilitation. Replacement should be scheduled some time after the first phase, possibly within the next ten years. The elimination of this project from the first phase program would, in our opinion, cause no hardship at Hawthorne, and would materially improve the prospects of obtaining voter approval of other more urgently needed projects.

4. Willard Elementary School Addition	Michigan State's Estimated Costs
a. Site acquisition	\$ 100,000
b. Additional facilities	306,000
(1) Willard pupils - 710 (est.)	
(2) Willard capacity - 530 (need 180)	
TOTAL	\$ 406,000

MSU Recommendation: Willard Elementary School is an adequate building on a limited site. It is overcrowded. Additional acreage and facilities are needed.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

MSU rates the capacity of Willard at 530, with an enrollment of just over 700. In computing the capacity of this school, MSU disqualifies three regular classrooms, one library, one kindergarten room, one elementary playroom, one special education shop, one special education room, and one special use room because they are more than 30" below grade. If these rooms were not disqualified from the rated capacity figures, the capacity of this school would be adequate to handle its enrollment. We have personally visited these classrooms. The windows in each room are either totally or mostly above ground. We noted no particular problems arising from use of these rooms. We see no urgent need to construct an addition in order to discontinue use of these rooms.

We note that Lowell Elementary, immediately to the west of Willard, is overcrowded. However, the MSU report makes no mention of the contemplated transfer of any Lowell pupils to Willard. No such transfer should be necessary, since Cleveland Elementary, immediately to the north of Lowell, has unused capacity.

	Michigan State's <u>Estimated Costs</u>
5. New Holland Elementary School	
a. Site acquisition	\$ 300,000
b. New building	722,500
(1) 300 Holland pupils (est.)	
(2) 25 Sheridan pupils (est.)	
(3) 100 Prescott pupils (est.)	
	<hr/>
	TOTAL \$1,022,500

MSU Recommendation: Holland Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility on an extremely poor site. Additional acreage should be acquired and this inadequate building replaced.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendations and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Holland is a 3-story building erected in 1886, with additions constructed in 1905 and 1916. Since 1950 approximately \$140,000 has been spent to rehabilitate and modernize this school. Just over \$90,000 in remaining needs was indicated in the 1960 school administration report, and the MSU report adds a considerable number of further needs of this type.

Most of the rehabilitation at Holland School was done in the early 1950's. The school is most unimpressive in appearance. The roof is in poor condition and needs further work. Considerable rehabilitation work will have to be done at this school during the next few years. The hallways and stairways are of wood construction. The rooms are quite small. Two rooms on the third floor are used for classes for the mentally retarded and no toilet facilities are available on this floor.

Although in general we prefer to capitalize the rehabilitation investment over a somewhat longer period of time, it would seem unwise to spend the necessary additional money on further work at this school. The better alternative would appear to be to replace the school during the first phase.

Even with the 100 pupils presently attending Prescott, the enrollment at Holland will be only 425. We assume that an addition will be necessary when Prescott School is closed during the suggested second phase and its pupils transferred to other adjoining schools. This would increase somewhat the ultimate enrollment at Holland.

6. New Pierce-Whitney Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 400,000
b. New building	1,020,000
(1) 300 Pierce pupils (est.)	
(2) 200 Whitney pupils (est.)	
(3) 100 Pillsbury pupils (est.)	
TOTAL	<u>\$1,420,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Pierce Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility. It should be replaced on a site adjacent to the Northeast Athletic Field. Highway developments will intensify planning problems in the present Pierce attendance area. Whitney Elementary School burned on September 18, 1962, and has been razed. This site should be sold. The Whitney School population should attend the new school adjacent to Northeast Athletic Field.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Pierce School was constructed in 1900 and has a rated capacity of 260. Its present enrollment is slightly over 300. Five portable classrooms were attached to the building, two in 1923 and three in 1926. These are wooden portables and are in very poor condition. Approximately \$122,000 of rehabilitation and modernization funds have been put into this school since 1950 and, according to the 1960 school administration report, approximately \$86,000 of this type of work remained. The MSU report adds a number of further needs. The school has wooden stairways and wooden fire escapes and in general is a most unimpressive looking school. It is poorly located for its future attendance area.

Something must be done during the first phase to provide additional space within reasonable walking distance for Whitney pupils. If the wooden portables are removed, as they certainly should be as promptly as possible, Pierce would require additional capacity for its own enrollment. We believe the MSU recommendation is the soundest approach to resolving the problems for these two school attendance areas, and we therefore urge that this project be accomplished as soon as possible.

7. New Sheridan Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 400,000
b. New building	637,500
(1) 325 Sheridan pupils	
(2) 50 Holland pupils	
TOTAL	<u>\$1,037,500</u>

MSU Recommendation: Sheridan Elementary School should vacate its space in the junior high school building. A new elementary school should be planned contiguous to Bottineau Field as part of a neighborhood school-park center.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

We concur with the MSU recommendation that the consolidated junior high-elementary school at Sheridan should be discontinued. However, until a decision is reached on the future of Marshall Junior-Senior High, it is not possible to reach a clear decision on the ultimate best use of the existing building. The building itself is not old, nor are the Sheridan Elementary pupils suffering any undue hardship, other than having to attend a consolidated elementary-junior high school. Under these circumstances, we believe the sounder alternative would be to await a decision on Marshall before making irrevocable commitments to construct a new Sheridan Elementary School at a new site.

Although the MSU report does not so state, we understand from the consultants that the proposed new Sheridan would ultimately have a larger enrollment than the suggested 375, since this school could eventually accommodate some or all of the Schiller students when that school is closed. The MSU team fails to indicate any target date for closing Schiller School.

8. Webster Elementary School addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 300,000
b. Additional facilities (1) 200 Sheridan pupils (est.)	340,000
TOTAL	\$ 640,000

MSU Recommendation: The addition at Webster is needed to provide capacity for students presently attending Sheridan who live south of Broadway. For the long range, MSU calls Webster an obsolescent educational facility with a very inadequate site. Additional acreage should be acquired and a new school plant constructed to serve the old St. Anthony neighborhood. Only the addition is recommended for the first phase and completion of the new school is not recommended during the second phase.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: Since the additional capacity is not needed until a new Sheridan Elementary is constructed, and since we urge that the new Sheridan Elementary be eliminated from the first phase, the Webster addition should also be eliminated from the first phase.

Although it is not so stated in the report, it is our understanding that this addition at Webster would become the first section of the proposed new school. The second phase, however, does not include completion of a new Webster. We have some concern about construction of part of a new school so far in advance of completion of the balance.

9. Warrington Elementary School

MSU Recommendation: Warrington Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility, sharing a very inadequate site with Bryant Junior High School. The school population should be assimilated in the new facilities at Lyndale, Mann, Bancroft and Agassiz. The building should then be razed.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: We concur with the MSU recommendation to raze this school and to disperse the Warrington enrollment among adjacent schools, and we urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Warrington was erected in 1898 and an addition added in 1903. Three portables were attached to the building in 1959. MSU rates its capacity at 505, after

disqualifying from capacity figures one special education room and one kindergarten playroom, because they are more than 30" below grade. The 1962 enrollment at Warrington was 567, with an increase projected.

Approximately \$70,000 has been spent since 1950 in rehabilitating and upgrading facilities at Warrington. About \$165,000 of needed additional work of this type was projected by the 1960 school administration report. The MSU team adds a considerable number of further needs.

Although the three portable classrooms attached to the school are fine appearing, they cause considerable problems. They were added as a temporary measure, pending a final decision on what to do with the school. In order to heat these portables during the winter, it apparently is necessary to overheat the main building.

If the building is to be retained, an addition would be required to provide sufficient capacity for its enrollment. A freeway will divide the Warrington attendance area, and the school is located quite close to the freeway. The colored enrollment at Warrington has been estimated at between 80-90%.

An early decision on what to do with this school is important. The school is in very poor condition. If it is to be retained indefinitely as a school, rehabilitation work should get under way without further delay. We believe that, under the circumstances, rehabilitating this relatively old building and constructing an addition to it would not be a wise investment.

We, likewise, agree with the MSU recommendation to disperse the Warrington enrollment among adjacent schools, rather than to construct a new Warrington somewhat to the south and east of the present site to serve the existing attendance area. About 180 Warrington pupils would be transferred to Bancroft, a similar number to the new Lyndale, about 90 to Agassiz and about 150 to Mann. No specific boundary changes have been suggested to accomplish this objective, and it is possible that the proposed allocation might prove somewhat difficult because of the freeway which will have to be crossed by a considerable number of Warrington pupils. Although some of the Warrington pupils who would attend Bancroft will have a considerable distance to walk to school, the proposed dispersion would not seem to violate the neighborhood concept for elementary schools.

10. Bancroft Elementary School Addition	Michigan State's Estimated Costs
a. Additional facilities	\$ 178,500
(1) Bancroft pupils 650 est.)	830
(2) Warrington pupils 180 est.)	
(3) Bancroft capacity 725 (need 105)	
TOTAL	\$ 178,500

MSU Recommendation: An addition should be added to Bancroft to accommodate the approximately 180 Warrington pupils who will be transferred to Bancroft when Warrington is closed. Approximately 105 additional spaces are needed at this school.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase with a further review to determine if portables might be a preferable alternative.

If Warrington is closed and its pupils dispersed to adjacent schools, then

without question Bancroft must absorb a substantial number of these pupils. MSU rates the capacity at Bancroft at 745 in Volume II and at 725 in Volume I. The present enrollment at Bancroft is about 750, with a projected decline to 710 by 1967. Since the MSU report indicates that 650 Bancroft pupils will continue to attend that school, it seems apparent that between 60 and 100 Bancroft pupils will be transferred elsewhere, probably to Standish immediately to the east of Bancroft.

Probably the only practical way to handle the capacity problem at Bancroft is to construct the addition proposed by the MSU team. However, we have reservations about constructing a permanent addition to a school which is now over 50 years old and which is not centrally located to serve its attendance area. It is our assumption that Bancroft will continue to serve for an indefinite period of time much of the Warrington area and most, if not all, of the Bancroft area. Perhaps a better location, when the time comes to replace this school, would be adjacent to Phelps Field to the south and west of Bancroft.

11. Greeley Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional facilities

(1) Greeley pupils 660 est.

\$ 323,000

(2) Greeley capacity -470  
need 190

TOTAL \$ 323,000

MSU Recommendation: The Greeley Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility. A new building to serve the present attendance area of Greeley and parts of Clinton, Adams and Irving should be constructed on the fine school-park site at Greeley. An addition should be added to Greeley during the first phase to provide capacity for its enrollment. This addition would become the first part of a new Greeley School, which then is recommended for completion in the second phase.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

Greeley was erected in 1888, and an addition was constructed in 1912. Nearly \$190,000 has been spent since 1950 in rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities. About \$50,000 of work remained, according to the school administration's 1960 report. The MSU team has added a considerable number of further rehabilitation needs. MSU rates the capacity of Greeley at 470, after disqualifying from its capacity figures one special education room and one kindergarten room, both of which are more than 30" below grade. The 1962 enrollment of Greeley was 632.

We concur with the MSU recommendation that Greeley should be replaced in the not too distant future. The MSU recommendation to close several schools adjacent to Greeley during the second phase and transfer a considerable part of their enrollment to the new Greeley has not been spelled out sufficiently to permit careful analysis. Apparently, the new Greeley School would ultimately have an enrollment in excess of 1,000 pupils, considerably above the optimum size MSU recommends for elementary schools. Perhaps this deviation is justified in this case, but we simply have not had sufficient data to form a judgment.

In general, we dislike the idea of constructing a school in two stages unless there is no reasonable alternative. According to the MSU report, the



urgent need to begin construction of the new school during the first phase is to provide additional capacity for the present Greeley enrollment. We have visited Greeley School and do not agree that the two ground level classrooms, which have been disqualified from capacity figures, should not continue in use. Moreover, we have found that the extraordinarily large kindergarten room on the ground level has been subdivided into two separate kindergarten rooms of fairly good size. If these three ground level rooms are counted, the capacity of Greeley would reach about 600. Our information indicates that this year's enrollment is just about 600. On this basis, we can see no justification for constructing an addition during the first phase. It would be far sounder to continue the existing building as is until the school is replaced, and at that time construct the new school in its entirety.

12. New Lyndale Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition (to the east)	\$ 400,000
b. New building (to the east)	901,000
(1) Lyndale pupils (est.) 660	
(2) Warrington pupils (est.) +180	
	<u>840</u>
Capacity of 1915-1927 -310	
need 530	
c. Modification of 1915-1927 building	
	<u>30,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,331,000

MSU Recommendation: Lyndale Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility on an inadequate site. This school should be moved eastward to a new school-park development in the center of the Lyndale neighborhood. The new school would initially serve 290 of the 660 pupils presently enrolled at Lyndale, plus about 180 pupils from the Warrington School. About 310 Lyndale pupils would continue to attend the old Lyndale School, using that portion of the building which was constructed in 1915 and in 1927. The 1915-27 portion of the existing Lyndale School apparently would be continued at least through the second phase of the building program.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase.

Lyndale was erected in 1883 and additions were constructed in 1899, 1915 and 1927. It is the seventh oldest school in the city. Just over \$160,000 has been spent since 1950 in rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities at this school. The 1960 school administration report estimated an additional \$185,000 of this type of work would be necessary. The MSU report adds a number of further needs. MSU rates the capacity of this school at 630 with a 1962 enrollment of 666. It appears that this school will have to absorb some of the Warrington enrollment when Warrington is closed. Lyndale presently is not well located to accomplish this objective, nor is it centrally located for its own attendance area. If the Warrington pupils were to be added to this school and the school continued in operation, either an addition or a number of portable classrooms must be provided.

We believe that on balance it would be preferable to construct the major portion of a new Lyndale on a more advantageous site during the first phase. Although our preference is to construct a school in its entirety, rather than doing so in stages, we agree with the MSU team that the newer sections

of the existing Lyndale should be continued for some time, in order to capitalize the investment.

We have some concern about access for Warrington pupils to cross the freeway to get to the new Lyndale School. We likewise have some concern about the likely high maintenance and custodial care costs of continuing to operate a part of the existing Lyndale building. We hope that the oldest section of the existing Lyndale School can be closed or torn down, in order to keep these costs at a minimum.

13. New Mann Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Site acquisition	\$ 200,000
b. New building	1,258,000
(1) 590 Mann pupils (est.)	
(2) 150 Warrington pupils (est.)	
TOTAL	<u>\$1,258,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Mann Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility on a very inadequate site. Additional acreage should be acquired and a new building constructed. In addition to the problem of obsolescence, additional capacity must be provided for the approximately 150 Warrington pupils who are to be transferred to Mann when Warrington is closed.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that, rather than replacing Mann School on an expanded site during the first phase, an addition be constructed in such a way as to become the first part of a new Mann School, which would then be completed within the next ten years.

Mann was erected in 1886, with additions constructed in 1905 and 1916. It is a 3-story building with the 3rd floor closed off. The 3rd floor cannot be used unless a complete sprinkler system is installed. Since 1950, just in excess of \$170,000 has been spent to rehabilitate and modernize this school. The 1960 school administration report estimates the remaining work of this type at about \$90,000. The MSU team has added a number of further needs. MSU rates the capacity of Mann at 460 after disqualifying one classroom which is more than 30" below grade. In 1962 the enrollment was 548.

It is obvious that the existing capacity at Mann, even if the below-grade classroom is counted, cannot accommodate the approximately 150 Warrington pupils who will be transferred to Mann when Warrington closes.

Although this school has received substantial rehabilitation, we are convinced that it should not be continued beyond the next 10 years. The classrooms are quite small. Toilet facilities are provided only in the basement. Stairways and corridors are of wood construction. The building has no sprinkler system. These inadequacies, and others not mentioned, lead us to the conclusion that the sounder decision is to replace this school rather than put in additional money on further rehabilitation. However, we are concerned about capitalizing on the substantial amount of rehabilitation already put into this school. We doubt that the school would have been included in the 1st phase if the additional capacity required for the Warrington pupils were not essential. Although we dislike building a new school in stages, we believe that this school is one that lends itself to this type of treatment. We urge that the first phase program include the construction of an addition in order to provide the needed capacity. The addition should be constructed in such a

way as to form the first section of a new Mann School. The remainder of the new school would then be completed during the second phase.

14. New Seward Elementary School

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. New building	\$1,530,000
(1) 550 Seward pupils (est.)	
(2) 350 Monroe pupils (est.)	
TOTAL	<u>\$1,530,000</u>

MSU Recommendation: Seward School, which serves as a 7th and 8th grade center as well as a K-6 unit, is an obsolescent educational facility. Its present inadequate site is being expanded to meet the needs of a modern school-park development. A new building should be constructed to accommodate the present K-6 pupils and those Monroe students who live south of Franklin Avenue. The antiquated facilities should then be razed. Seward 7th and 8th grade students should be assimilated by Phillips, Sanford, and Folwell Junior High Schools. The Monroe pupils remaining north of Franklin should be transferred either to Emerson or Motley.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We concur with the MSU recommendation and urge that this project be included in the first phase.

Seward was erected in 1887 and additions were constructed in 1901, 1910 and 1916. Two stair towers were added to the building in 1960. Approximately \$242,000 has been spent since 1950 to rehabilitate and upgrade the facilities at this school. About \$200,000 of additional work of this type remained, according to the 1960 school administration report. The MSU report adds a considerable number of further needs. MSU rates the elementary capacity at 460 and the junior high capacity at 524. The 1962 elementary enrollment was 562 and the junior high enrollment 264. The proposed new school would accommodate 900 pupils, with 550 coming from the present Seward attendance area and about 350 from the Monroe School area, once Monroe is closed.

For a number of reasons, a decision on the future of this school should not be postponed. (1) The Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority is planning an urban renewal project for this area and hopes to secure the necessary approval to allow the project to get underway within the next few years. A decision on the future of this school should be coordinated with the urban renewal project. (2) A substantial sum still needs to be spent for further rehabilitation and modernization work if this school is to be continued. (3) It is important to separate the elementary school pupils from the junior high students. (4) The per pupil cost of maintenance and custodial care for this school is exceedingly high, principally because of the substantial amount of unused capacity.

All things considered, we believe that the preferable decision is to construct a new Seward Elementary School during the first phase.

15. Agassiz Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional facilities		\$ 102,000
(1) Agassiz pupils	340 (est.)	
(2) Warrington pupils	90	
(3) Lyndale pupils	10	
	<u>440</u>	
Capacity	<u>-380</u>	
Need	60	
(Above assumes removal of portables)		
b. Modernization and modifications of present building		<u>50,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 152,000

MSU Recommendation: An addition should be constructed to accommodate the increased enrollment which would result from the transfer of approximately 90 Warrington pupils and 10 Lyndale pupils when Warrington is closed. The special education classes in Agassiz should be relocated at another school. The classrooms presently being utilized for special education students would be converted to regular classrooms.

Committee's Findings and Recommendations: We see no need for this addition and therefore urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase. However, we urge that the funds necessary to convert the special education classrooms into regular classrooms should be provided in the first phase.

MSU rates the Agassiz capacity at 280, with a 1962 enrollment of 334 for regular classes. Thirteen special education classrooms used by the hearing handicapped are less than 600 square feet in size and are therefore disqualified from the capacity figures.

We personally visited this school and can see no reason why the existing capacity at Agassiz should be inadequate to accommodate the projected 440 pupils, once the special education pupils are moved elsewhere. The 13 undersized special classrooms are divided regular classrooms and we know of no reason why the dividing walls cannot be knocked out and these six classrooms restored to their original size. This would increase the capacity at Agassiz by approximately 180 pupils, which should be sufficient to handle the proposed enrollment. This would also allow dismantling of the wooden portable classroom attached to this school.

16. Armatage Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional facilities (2 portables	TOTAL	\$ 50,000
---------------------------------------	-------	-----------

MSU Recommendation: Construct two portable classrooms to provide needed additional capacity for Armatage's attendance area.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase.

The MSU team rates capacity of Armatage at 870. The 1962 enrollment was 973 with a projected drop in enrollment to approximately 843 by 1967. In view of the projected drop in enrollment to a figure slightly less than the rated capacity of this school, we concur with the MSU recommendation that portable classrooms are the best temporary solution.

17. Audubon Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional facilities (2 portables)	TOTAL	\$ 50,000
--	-------	-----------

MSU Recommendation: Construct two portable classrooms to provide needed additional capacity for the enrollment at this school. Audubon Elementary School is a good building on an inadequate site. Additional portable facilities should be provided for the overload at both Audubon and Lake Harriet. A new school-park complex should be developed in the future in the center of the Linden Hills neighborhood to serve the present Audubon and Lake Harriet attendance areas. The portables are recommended during the first phase, but no recommendation is made to replace either or both of these schools during the second phase.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase.

MSU rates the capacity at Audubon at 380, with a 1962 enrollment of 407. A slight increase in enrollment is projected for 1967. MSU rates the capacity of Lake Harriet at 320, with a 1962 enrollment of 379. The projected 1967 enrollment at Lake Harriet is 468. Without question, something must be done during the first phase to relieve the overcrowding at these two schools.

Audubon was erected in 1924 and an addition was constructed in 1955. Expenditures since 1950 for rehabilitation and upgrading facilities have been approximately \$53,000. A 1960 school administration report indicates additional needs of about \$70,000. The MSU report cites a number of additional needs.

Lake Harriet School was erected in 1906 and additions were constructed in 1908 and 1911. The school has been rather thoroughly rehabilitated and upgraded, with expenditures of \$247,000 since 1950. The 1960 school administration report estimated additional needs of this type at just under \$75,000, and the MSU report cites some further needs. Within the next 10-15 years this school probably should be replaced on a new site.

Finding the proper answer is not easy, since every elementary school in the southwest community is presently overcrowded. But the MSU recommendation to construct additional portables is doubtless the preferable alternative until permanent decisions can be reached for the schools in this area.

18. Fuller Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional facilities (2 portables)	TOTAL	\$ 50,000
--	-------	-----------

MSU Recommendation: Fuller Elementary School is an obsolescent educational facility on a very inadequate site. Additional acreage should be acquired, a new building constructed and the old facility razed. The portables are recommended during the first phase, with construction of a new school recommended during the second phase.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase.

Fuller School was erected in 1896 and additions were constructed in 1909 and 1915. Approximately \$110,000 has been spent at this school since 1950 in

rehabilitating and upgrading the facilities in this building. The 1960 school administration report indicated remaining needs of this type at just over \$200,000 and the MSU report cited a considerable number of additional needs.

The MSU team rates capacity of Fuller at 440. 1962 enrollment was 541. Projected enrollment in 1967 is 502. In view of the crowded conditions at this school, and in view of its age and the substantial amount of rehabilitation needs remaining, it would appear that erecting portables during the first phase will provide the best solution. Limited maintenance and rehabilitation work should be continued during the first phase and the building replaced at a not too distant date.

19. Fulton Elementary School Addition

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

a. Additional Facilities	TOTAL	\$ 153,000
(1) Fulton     841 (est.)		
Capacity <u>-750</u>		
Need     90		

MSU Recommendation: Fulton Elementary School is a poor building on an inadequate site. Additional acreage should be acquired and additional facilities constructed. Only the addition is recommended for the first phase.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge inclusion of this project in the first phase with a further review to determine if portables might be a preferable alternative.

The MSU team rates the capacity of Fulton at 650 after disqualifying two kindergarten rooms which are more than 30" below grade. If these two disqualified rooms had been counted, the capacity would have been 750. The 1962 enrollment was 840, with a projected 1967 enrollment of 967,

We do not believe the below-grade classrooms should be disqualified from the rated capacity. However, the enrollment is nearly 100 above the rated capacity after including these two classrooms. With the projected further increase by 1967, it would appear that steps must be taken during the first phase to increase the capacity at Fulton.

We are somewhat concerned about erecting a permanent addition at a school which was constructed in 1915 and which MSU states is a poor building. We urge consideration of the possible alternative of using portables until the basic decisions can be made about Fulton and several other schools in this area.

Removing, Transporting and Placement of Portables

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs  
\$ 50,000

MSU Recommendation: No specific use for these funds has been outlined.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

MSU has specifically proposed portable classrooms at three schools and has projected a cost estimate of \$50,000 at each school. We would assume that

those cost projections include the cost of removing, transporting and placement of the portables. If not, it would seem preferable to adjust those cost estimates to reflect the entire amount. If there is another school where portables are proposed, then we believe the project should be spelled out and a specific cost estimate attached.

In general, we question the desirability of issuing bonds to pay for removing, transporting and placement of portables. This type of expenditure would seem more properly allocated to a current expenditure fund, such as the R & I Fund. Until or unless this project is made more clear, we don't believe it fits the description of an urgently needed project.

Regional Special Education Facilities

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

(The survey staff recommends allocation of \$150,000 to plan the provision and/or rehabilitation of appropriate spaces in existing elementary schools with excess capacity for special education units.)

\$ 150,000

MSU Recommendation: "In the Minneapolis public school system there are many students who, for one reason or another, are unable to profit from the instructional opportunities offered in regular classes. Included among these special groups are those who are hard of hearing or deaf, partially sighted or blind, crippled, low in academic aptitude, and those with emotional disturbances of some kind. A modern American school system provides the special instruction necessary to help these pupils. At the present time, the special education program in the Minneapolis schools is not extensive. Certain philosophical and practical questions must be answered before decision-making can begin. There are major problems with regard to the number and location of special education facilities. It will be necessary to develop additional policies prior to school building recommendations which would designate the location and the type of facility to be designed."

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase. We further urge that the Board of Education take prompt steps to implement the specific recommendations made by MSU to develop basic policies and to select appropriate schools, in order that this project can be given a high priority rating during the second phase.

We note that the recommended first phase program, in addition to proposing the \$150,000 item discussed here, includes 100 spaces at the new South High and 100 spaces at the new Franklin Junior High for special education classes. The information we have been able to obtain has been too limited to warrant drawing any meaningful conclusions about the adequacy of these spaces. We also have been told that the special classes at Agassiz Elementary School will be moved elsewhere when Warrington is closed and about 90 Warrington pupils are transferred to Agassiz. This probably will not take place until at least the third year of the first phase.

In view of the need to reach basic policy decisions before committing funds to specific schools, it would seem far preferable to eliminate this proposed expenditure from the first phase and fit it in on a high priority basis during the second phase. Any emergency needs in the meantime can be met out of the R & I Fund.

Construction Contingency

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

(The survey staff recommends allocation of \$340,000 to be used by the District for those projects where unusual site problems or construction difficulties increase the estimated costs.)

\$ 340,000

MSU Recommendation: Invariably, unusual site problems develop or some other unanticipated problem arises in any building program as substantial as is proposed. The \$340,000 is simply 1% of the recommended total cost of the program.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

At least until or unless the present rather comfortable estimates of the cost for each project are revised downward to a much more stringent level, there would appear to be no justification for an additional general construction contingency fund. Actually, we would prefer tight estimates for each proposed project, with a separate contingency fund. This would provide better assurance to the voter. However, this is not the situation, at least thus far, and we therefore object to a separate construction contingency item.

Under circumstances where a considerable number of building projects are included in a single bond proposal, and where no funds are available other than those included in the bond issue submitted to the voters, then a contingency fund becomes exceedingly important. Such is not the case here. The Board of Education, should unusual circumstances arise, can look to both the R & I Fund and the non-referendum bond fund if cost estimates for specific projects should prove unduly conservative.

We regard reassurance to the voter that any funds authorized will be frugally spent as the prime consideration, in order to maximize the prospects for voter approval. We believe any of these contingent funds, as well as comfortable cost estimates, might well harm the prospects for passage of the bond issue and therefore should be avoided.

Site Expansion

Michigan State's  
Estimated Costs

(The survey staff recommends allocation of \$500,000 to initiate the first steps in providing somewhat more adequate sites for schools.)

\$ 500,000

MSU Recommendation: Only a handful of Minneapolis schools have sufficient site based on generally accepted standards. A priority list of site expansion needs should be developed. This listing of priorities should be based upon the percentage of adequacy for each school site when measured against the recommended minimum standards. The \$500,000 is merely a starter in getting a long-range program of site acquisition under way.

Committee's Findings and Conclusions: We urge that this project be eliminated from the first phase.

As we have stated elsewhere in this report, we do not consider the need for expanded sites to be as critically urgent as other school needs. While the minimum site standards recommended by the MSU team may be desirable, they



appear to be unrealistically high for a built-up city, such as Minneapolis, where school sites can be enlarged only at the expense of dislocating families, demolishing homes, removing property from the tax rolls, and large expenditures of tax funds. Before it authorizes the expenditure of funds to begin a program of site expansion, the School District should first develop more realistic site standards and should develop a priority list of site expansion needs. No steps have thus far been taken to develop this type of priority list, and it doubtless will be some time before this can be accomplished.

We regard it as somewhat misleading to think in terms of the proposed program including \$500,000 for the beginning of a site expansion program. Actually, over \$7,000,000 out of the total proposed \$34,000,000 first phase program is for the purpose of site acquisition. We have recommended that the first phase program eliminate any funds for the expansion of existing school sites, unless the land to be acquired is necessary for the construction of an addition to a school or for the construction of a new school on a new site. Even with this proposed reduction in expenditures for the purpose of site acquisition, a substantial amount of money will be spent during the first phase for the purpose of acquiring land.

We have already discovered considerable confusion throughout the community on what is intended in the way of acquisition of land for the first phase program. Some people believe that funds are included in the program to bring school sites throughout the city up to the recommended minimum standard. The mere interjection of this issue has opened the door for the criticism that an excessive amount of land will be taken off the tax rolls. From the political standpoint alone, it would seem unwise to introduce the site acquisition issue into the referendum campaign through inclusion of a general amount of \$500,000 for this purpose.

From the standpoint of sound programming, we also believe it would be far preferable to develop a priority list of site needs which then would be integrated into the long-range capital improvements program required by statute. If and as site needs can attain the necessary priority rating to justify the early expenditure of funds, they then can be programmed during the second phase.