

MILTON FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMUNITY TEAM (FACT)

FACT MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2016

MILTON HIGH SCHOOL LMC – ROOM 121

6:00 – 8:00 PM

ATTENDANCE

FACT Members Present: Jeff Adee, Mike Astin, Barry Brandt (co-chair), Michael Dorn, Lesley Hammer (co-chair), Leo Johnson, Tina Keller, Brian Kvapil, Wilson Leong, Joe Martin, Bill O’Leary, Steve Quade, Jill Schuerman-Fons, Bonnie Stalker, Danielle Stivarius, Lucille Vickerman, Patrick Weberpal, Dan Weitzel, Brendon Wilkinson

FACT Members Absent: Gary Groelle, Dan Honold

School Board Members Present: President Jon Cruzan, Shelly Crull-Hanke (Liaison to FACT),

Bob Cullen, Tom Westrick, Betsy Lubke

Community Members Present: **Bill Maas, Al Roehl, Lance Fena, Terri Fena, Wade Hallett, Rebecca Kanable** (*Milton Courier*)

Consultants Present: Scott Kramer and Nick Kent, PRA; Jeremy Shecterle and Kevin Hickman, J.P. Cullen

School District of Milton (SDM) Staff and Administrators Present: Tim Schigur, Jerry Schuetz, Heather Slosarek, Jeremy Bilhorn, Tara Huber, Matt Biederwolf, Jennifer Cramer, Stephen Schantz, Susan Probst

MEETING WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Barry Brandt and Lesley Hammer welcomed FACT members to the meeting.

The FACT Meeting Minutes from May 11th were discussed. Jill Schuerman-Fons requested an addition from the previous discussion of a new high school being built at a completely different site. She mentioned how sports facilities, an auditorium, and practice areas were discussed as a possibility of being at the new site as well as at the existing site. A motion was made by Leo Johnson and seconded by Joe Martin to approve the May 11th minutes with the amended sentence. The minutes were approved unanimously.

A sentence was added to the end of the 7th paragraph under the heading “Questions and Answers From The Options Discussion” that reads as such: “It was also recommended that

sports facilities, the auditorium, and practice areas, of course, could be built or added right at the new site.” Please find the revised minutes under the SDM’s FACT website.

CONSULTANTS’ INFORMATION FOR BUILDING OPTIONS

Barry Brandt specified that committee members focus on two charts in May 25th’s FACT Packet designed by the consultants over the past two weeks. Both charts indicate the five Building Options that FACT members agreed upon for further investigation of pricing. The first chart lists the five options with square footage of a new high school as well as square footage for all other buildings’ additions and renovations with the total budget at the bottom of each option. The second chart, again, lists the five Building Options with prices itemized per school building along with ADA, safety and security measures, and infrastructure maintenance.

Barry precluded a discussion by stating that PRA and Cullen have given all costs as a starting point; these costs are at the “high end” which were also illustrated on a large paperboard chart from September 2015. The difference from September’s chart to the 5-options charts (in the FACT Packet) is that of a Fine Arts Center now included in the current pricing of a new high school. Everything else, with all other buildings, remains the same in square footage and price. Barry also related that PRA and Cullen priced the five Building Options to include everything on the facilities list based on FACT’s requests and that the committee must start here (at the high end) and reduce. Specifically Barry stressed, “If a news headline is ‘FACT considers a \$135-155 million option,’ that would be misleading and incorrect!”

Tim Schigur addressed information that SDM’s Administrative Team synthesized in meeting with consultants over the past two weeks: The Team analyzed the five options from the standpoint of students’ educational needs for modernized space and renovations. In considering a new high school, pricing includes space for 1200 students, expandable to 1400. The core areas, cafeteria, and Commons are priced for 1400 students. The new high school’s cafeteria includes space for 700 students over two lunch periods. A new eight-lane pool would contain its own locker facilities with seating for 450 persons. A Fieldhouse with a four-station gym, a weight room, a fitness center, four P.E. locker rooms, two team locker rooms, a wrestling area, a gymnastics area, plus large storage areas are all appraised. Pricing is included for all core teaching areas, an auditorium and a fine arts center or PAC.

The Team also discussed how the current high school could be renovated for Grades 6-8 as a middle school. (Elementary organization was also discussed and will be addressed later in these minutes).

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF FIVE SOLUTION OPTIONS

FACT committee members asked for better breakdown of pricing. PRA provided a nine-page handout of educational space needs with prices for a new Milton High School.

The following questions and discussion points were initially made.

Brian Kpavil- Is the total square footage of 418,516 needed for a new high school? Leo Johnson questioned this again at a later time.

Brendon Wilkinson- What can be incorporated into a \$60 million referendum? What are the "must haves?"

Scott Kramer- Should the approach be phased-in referendums? What is best for the tax payers?

Steve Quade-The districtwide items of ADA, safety and security, and infrastructure maintenance (top 3 items on second chart) should have been accomplished eight years ago.

Michael Dorn- The maintenance and repairs must be done. What about two separate referendums – one for repairs and one for a new building?

Mike Astin- The structure of a referendum(s) is up to the Board of Education. I agree that the districtwide repairs are a "must."

Dani Stivarius- We must invest in our schools which is also an investment in the community. We cannot "do nothing."

Brendon Wilkinson- What about \$60 million for a new high school and \$10 million for repairs?

Brian Kpavil- What is the threshold the community will support? The survey indicates they will not support \$100 million. They would support between \$25 million and \$45 million.

Bonnie Stalker- A "band aid" is not good enough. This is the best time to look at an inclusive referendum. We need to have buildings of which we can be proud.

Lesley Hammer stipulated a need for direction from FACT; Barry Brandt recommended that FACT inspect the five Buildings Options charts once again and decide what options should continue to be considered and, perhaps, deny other options.

Jeff Adeo noted how repairing the current high school would not be much cheaper than building a new one. Scott Kramer agreed that repairing/adding onto the current high school would be less efficient than building a new one. A motion was made by Joe Martin and seconded by Tina Keller to eliminate Option #4 because it cites expanding and renovating the existing high school (which would be inefficient). The motion was not called and questions and discussion ensued.

Steve Quade asked the cost for remodeling the current high school to make it workable as a middle school. Jeremy Shecterle noted this would cost \$10.8 million.

Tim Schigur estimated between \$9 and \$11 million would replace all needed boilers and ADA requirements as well as some, but not all, safety and security issues. Steven Schantz indicated that this amount would limit some restrooms and stairways for safety measures, but ADA

requirements would be fulfilled. Bonnie Stalker asked if some operational budget could be used for renovations; she also wondered what the timeline would be to have renovations completed. Nick Kent responded that, by statute, if this was part of the referendum, the renovations would need completion within three years; however, renovations of \$9 million to \$11 million could be completed within two summers.

Next, an amended motion was made by Joe Martin and seconded by Dani Stivarius to eliminate both Options #4 and #8 due to cost prohibition (\$86 million) of renovating the existing high school. Barry Brandt called the motion by voice vote and it was passed. Brian Kvapil opposed the motion.

Joe Martin then asked Tim Schigur if Option #3 or Option #6 would best meet the needs of SDM students due to the differences in grade level configurations. Mr. Schigur described the discussions of the Administrative Team: A 9-12 high school, a 6-8 middle school, 3-5 intermediate school(s), and PK-2 elementary schools (4 buildings) with some PK community sites would best fit the needs of SDM students. With this concept in mind, a motion was made by Bonnie Stalker and seconded by Jill Schuerman-Fons to eliminate Option #6 in order to support the needs of students and the administration's recommendations. (Option #6 called for a PK-3 and 4-5 configuration). Barry Brandt called the motion by voice vote and the motion was unanimously passed.

BUILDING OPTIONS #1 AND #3 REMAIN FOR DISCUSSION

At this point, Building Options #1 and # 3 remain on the table for further discussion; both options present a new high school building, renovating the existing high school as a middle school, organizing Grades 3-5 as intermediate levels, and renovating elementary buildings as PK-2.

Steve Quade asked what building and program capacities are included in the existing high school for the make-over to a middle school that costs over \$10 million. PRA and Cullen responded that currently the building is "corridors and boxes (classrooms)." The renovation costs would involve opening up some of the corridors and classrooms for modern and flexible learning space; classrooms would be enlarged and the Technology Education area, culinary arts, and cafeteria spaces would be remodeled. Lucille Vickerman asked whether or not smaller class size could be considered for middle level students, thereby eliminating the need for enlarging classroom space. Scott Kramer explained that this could be a possibility; however, this would lead to additional faculty and render staffing implications. Bill O'Leary emphasized how the community might interpret this; would a modern space be required for the community to see the fruit of their investment? Tim Schigur asked if FACT would like to consider a minimal side of renovating the current high school into a middle school, and Steve Quade indicated an affirmative answer. PRA and Cullen will look at different pricings for the next meeting.

Option #1 shows that Grades 3-5 would be housed in the current middle school as well as Northside Intermediate; whereas, Option #3 indicates Grades 3-5 only in Northside

Intermediate. A question was asked of Tim Schigur whether or not it is beneficial for all Grades 3-5 to be housed in one building. Mr. Schigur and Heather Slosarek both concurred that having Grades 3-5 in one building would be advantageous for students as well as staff. Curriculum and instruction would be positively impacted for third-fifth graders with better communication and collaboration among teachers. It was asked if costs for Northside could be reconsidered by PRA and Cullen since this building is the newest in the district. Consultants expressed that an addition to Northside now is priced at \$6 million. Less square feet is needed for younger students as well as smaller furniture. Consultants will price out an added cafeteria, added science and art space, an expanded band room, and a new stage. They believe 10 classrooms per grade would be needed for Grades 3-5.

Leo Johnson advised that PRA and Cullen re-look at the amount of square footage for a new high school. What building and/or program capacities could be considered to decrease square footage and cost? First, the size of a Fieldhouse was discussed as is currently designed: The full student body of 1200 or more would be applicable. There are four basketball courts – two wood courts in the center and two synthetic end courts. Around the courts is a six-lane synthetic track. The courts are multipurpose for other uses such as volleyball. Brian Kvapil asked about the advantages of an indoor track. Could there just be an outdoor track? Answer: The overall utilization of a Fieldhouse is significant. Inclement weather and community use of an indoor track must be considered. Could the weight room, wrestling area, and gymnastics space be priced separately? Another question was asked as to whether or not materials and equipment in the existing high school could also be used in the new building. For sports, especially, separate materials and equipment would mean that practices could be finished earlier in the evening; sharing equipment between buildings would maintain the current issues and utilization of space would be inefficient.

FACT members continued to check the nine-page PRA handout in order to ask consultants for further itemized pricing along with square footage. It is already known that a new eight-lane pool with seating for 450 people, locker rooms, and the mechanics would cost approximately \$7 million.

Next, the core curriculum areas were questioned. Are there any spaces currently “over the top?” PRA confirmed that core classrooms are considered standard. Brian Kvapil examined the square footage of the graphic and applied arts areas. According to PRA and other FACT members, the submitted art spaces are needed.

Looking at the Performing Arts areas, would it be a workable situation for the new high school and the existing high school (the future middle school) to share an auditorium? Once again, Jeremy Bilhorn discussed the scheduling issues that could arise. Currently \$12 million is included for a Performing Arts Center. FACT members would like the consultants to separate costs on the PAC information.

Looking at the library/IMC area, a district server room for the Technology Department is designed for the new building, and FACT members would like a breakdown of the 2500 square feet. Tim Schigur stressed that if the server room were to stay in the existing building, a back-up would still be needed at Harmony. A server room in the new high school would be more efficient.

FACT members supported the space required for special education needs. An elevator is also confirmed for the new high school. The administration/pupil services space was supported as currently designed. A question was asked as how the administration space would look in the existing building since not as much space would be required for middle school staff. Consultants stated that light renovations would be necessary. Leo Johnson thanked PRA and Cullen for the high school educational space needs handout and stressed that a “middle of the road” approach be considered for square footage. Lesley Hammer suggested that consultants bring comparable information of other high schools regarding square footage for 1200-1400 students. Tina Keller requested that music department teachers be present at the next FACT meeting.

Lastly, the elementary buildings for Options #1 and #3 were addressed. FACT members would like a fresh look at the renovations in each of the four buildings; how would the space be modernized? Can ADA requirements and safety and security measures be priced separately for the next meeting? Lesley Hammer asked if costs for Harmony could be reconsidered by PRA and Cullen as well; current cost is listed as \$327,800.

NEXT FACT MEETING

Time is of essence. There are two scheduled FACT meetings left to be held. Will this be enough time for FACT to complete its goal? Tim Schigur remarked that a fall referendum would be better than waiting until spring. A motion was made by Bill O’Leary and seconded by Tina Keller to meet next week as well. The motion carried.

The next FACT meeting will be held Wednesday, June 1, 2016 at 6:00 pm at Milton High School in the LMC – Room 121. PRA and Cullen consultants will bring further breakdown of information related to square footage and pricing for Options #1 and #3.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith R. Schmitz, Ed.D.

FACT Recording Secretary