

MILTON FACILITY ADVISORY COMMUNITY TEAM (FACT)

FACT MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 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, Gary Groelle, Lesley Hammer (co-chair), Dan Honold, Leo Johnson, Tina Keller, Brian Kvapil, Wilson Leong, Joe Martin, Bill O’Leary, Jill Schuerman-Fons, Bonnie Stalker, Lucille Vickerman, Patrick Weberpal, Dan Weitzel, Brendon Wilkinson

FACT Members Absent: Steve Quade, Danielle Stivarius

School Board Members Present: President Jon Cruzan, Tom Westrick, Bob Cullen, Betsy Lubke

Community Members Present: **Lance Fena, Terri Fena, Ruth Robinson, Thomas Filak**

Consultants Present: Nick Kent, PRA; Jeremy Shecterle, David Baran, Kevin Hickman, J.P. Cullen

School District of Milton (SDM) Staff and Administrators Present: Tim Schigur, Jerry Schuetz, Heather Slosarek, Jeremy Bilhorn, Matt Biederwolf, Jennifer Cramer, Stephen Schantz, Susan Probst, Mary Ellen Van Valin, Brian Hammil

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

The FACT Meeting Minutes from June 1st were discussed. Barry Brandt requested a change in wording from “law on minimum wage” to “law on prevailing wage” on the bottom line of p. 3 when Lucille Vickerman addressed this newly passed law.

The minutes are now revised to indicate “prevailing wage.” Please find the revised minutes under SDM’s FACT website.

A motion was made by Leo Johnson and seconded by Jill Schuerman-Fons to approve the June 1st minutes with the change to “prevailing wage.” The minutes were approved unanimously.

Barry Brandt asked FACT members to consider tonight’s packet handouts which include the following: two “Milton Schools’ Proposals” – a narrative and a chart written by co-chair, Barry; a revision from PRA/Cullen on Building Options #1 and #3; a June 7th estimated tax impact of 2016 bond election from Ehlers; and, a chart of Milton High School number of graduates from

2007-2014 (7 years) indicating their future plans. Mr. Brandt expressed the need for committee members to respond to the “Milton Schools Proposal” handout which provides changes to Building Option #3.

MILTON SCHOOLS’ PROPOSAL – CHANGES TO BUILDING OPTION #3 – BARRY BRANDT

Barry Brandt summarized his “Milton Schools’ Proposal,” explaining his attempt for being creative with some cuts and deferments. He reported that Building Option #3, in this proposal, is now \$85,403,283. As of June 1st, that proposal was listed as \$108,400,000.

Briefly, the proposed changes include: Eliminate heavy renovation and ADA, safety, maintenance requirements for the current middle school (do not use the middle school); defer new construction and renovations at Northside and include all district 3rd - 5th graders there; defer new tennis courts; defer renovations at the existing high school as it becomes the middle school for 6th – 8th graders; change the fieldhouse configuration in a new high school from four-stations to three-stations; defer new construction and renovations at Consolidated; reduce a new high school by 20,000 square feet; and, fund the price for half of a new pool and finance the balance with private monies. The ADA, safety, and maintenance needs would be included in this proposal for the existing high school, Northside, and Consolidated. Once again, these reductions bring the total referendum proposal to \$85,403,283.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO BARRY BRANDT’S MILTON SCHOOLS’ PROPOSAL - FACT

FACT committee members responded to the above proposal along with PRA/Cullen consultants specifying answers to questions and discussion.

Dan Weitzel: Can the new pool proposal really happen; can a pool be completed with private funding? Answer: There would be a risk factor for fundraising.

Jeff Adeo: Is FACT making a recommendation to the Board of Education that is not binding?

Patrick Weberpal: Isn’t there a three-year timeline? Answer: There is a 24-month timeline for spending referendum monies.

Mike Astin: Are the reductions to the new fieldhouse going to work for 1200 students? Answer: Cutting square footage will not necessarily reduce the number of students served. Pulling square feet from, perhaps, the cafeteria and modern learning spaces can still fulfill the needs of 1200 students. The size of the new high school in this proposal is 333,000 square feet.

Dan Weitzel: I toured Beloit schools where renovations were made, asking about costs.

Jeff Adeo: The building proposals for Milton, though, are much more comprehensive for the amount of money being considered.

Dan Weitzel: How would the price from a 2015 construction for a Beloit middle school change for Milton’s needs? Answer: A high school is more expensive due to the lab requirements and other space needs.

Michael Dorn: It is not a good idea to cut back on a new high school; we must build for the future and focus on the best learning environment to meet the needs of our students. What are the needs of the community and the students?

Patrick Weberpal: If we propose close to \$100 million, a referendum vote will be “No.” If we propose “too big,” according to community members I’ve talked to, a referendum vote will not pass, even if our proposal goes down to \$90 million.

Dan Weitzel: We must address balance between what the community will fund versus the District’s total needs. Can additions be done later? Answer: Yes, lab and technology education spaces are expensive; classrooms can be built at standard size with the idea of adding in the future when more money is available.

Lesley Hammer: What exactly is our job? What must we recommend to the BOE? We should recommend a \$ amount, then let the Board make the “calls” on what is included in the construction/renovations.

Jeff Adee: I was frustrated last week, so I researched the DPI website over the past ten years and found what other school districts passed as referendums: Beloit in 2012 - \$70 M, Janesville in 2007 - \$71 M for renovations only, Sun Prairie in 2007 - \$96 M for a new high school, and New Richmond - \$92.5 M. The difference between a \$70 M and a \$90 M referendum is about \$100 per household per year. How much do people spend on entertainment in a year; also what do they spend on cable TV, cell and smart phones, cigarettes? There’s a \$2 a week difference in proposing a larger referendum.

We have a much more important goal of serving the needs of students; we must take a closer look at what the schools need. The FACT group must do marketing and public relations work.

Brian Kvapil: The difference between the other schools’ referendums cited and Milton’s is the mill rate increase in debt service. The other cities’ increase on their tax bills has been minimal.

REGROUPING – WHAT SHOULD A RECOMMENDATION CONVEY? – BARRY BRANDT

At this point in the question-and-answer discussion, Barry Brandt concluded that FACT members were close in ideas and added that it was time to re-summarize. He indicated what could/would be accomplished: new high school with compromises, 6-8 configuration in existing high school with more space for middle school, 3-5 in one building, PreK-2 elementary schools, elementary schools with the exception of Consolidated to have new construction and renovations, and ADA, safety, and maintenance items completed. Leo Johnson asked what the administration needs/wants for recommendations. Barry commented that, in discussions with Mr. Schigur and other administrators, they need a “solution” and a “number.” In other words, FACT should indicate an amount of \$ for a referendum and state what items should be included in that number. Leo then asked how many referendum questions would be proposed. Tim Schigur mentioned that there would be two questions – one on operational upgrades and

another for the referendum amount (capital). He also indicated that, at this time, the interest rate is favorable at 3% by presenting the 6-7-2016 Ehlers' chart.

Jeff Adee: What are reasonable next steps? What does FACT want to include and not include in this package? Given a number, what can we get?

Leo Johnson: For \$85 million, we could propose a new high school for \$75 million and \$15 million for renovations and maintenance requirements.

Tina Keller: Would the "Black Box" space be included in this amount? Answer: No, this would be an extra \$1.5 million. Jeremy Shecterle requested that FACT check the bottom of the PRA/Cullen handout, and Nick Kent specified that the BOE needs "one lump sum," not a breakdown for each site.

Michael Dorn: In ten years, it would cost more to build an additional station (total of 4) for the fieldhouse.

Dan Weitzel: I appreciate the work of the consultants. If FACT proposes how much to spend and to generally state what the solution is, can the consultants do the rest? We all realize we need to compromise. Answer: This can be done "to an extent."

Patrick Weberpal: Could we keep a four-station court and cut \$2 million?

Barry Brandt: There are four gym stations in our existing spaces, and a new three-station gym would meet our needs. (This includes the stations for both the middle and high school).

Michael Dorn: Will this meet the needs of the future?

Bonnie Stalker: From a scheduling viewpoint, will fewer gym spaces and no pool limit the number of student sections? Jeremy Bilhorn answered: It would be "tight" with three stations at the high school. There are three physical education teachers; however, a Specially Designed Phy. Ed. class needs space as well.

Jeff Adee: Currently, three gyms are barely adequate, much less planning for the future. FACT started with \$155 million; now we are at \$85-\$90 million. More cuts will not meet the needs of the future. We are currently in the "ballpark" of where we need to be.

Bonnie Stalker: I appreciate Barry's work on the school proposal; my concern is the word, "defer." This district has deferred too often in the past. Could deferments be placed in the operational budget? Tim Schigur answered: This might be able to be done within an annual budget or at the end of the year.

Jeff Adee: We are just catching up with \$28 million. Milton does not invest much money in our schools or students.

Jill Schuerman-Fons: What is best for students? The reality is that all constituents cannot afford a \$90 million referendum. I like Barry's plan. Leo Johnson answered: For an \$85 million referendum, it would cost taxpayers about \$25 per month.

Michael Dorn: We could defer items that would be high interest or more motivating for fundraising.

Jeff Adee: If we propose an \$85 million referendum, should we actually budget for \$90 million? Answers by Jeremy Shecterle and Nick Kent: Contingency funds are currently factored in the current cost projections; hopefully, as the budget moves along, decisions can be made about what else can be included so contingency would not be needed.

Dan Weitzel: Who owns the contingency funds? Answers by Jeremy Shecterle and David Baran: The contingency funds belong 100% to the SDM; Cullen gives the district constant feedback on the budget as the process moves along.

Leo Johnson: How does co-mingling of referendum funds and private funds work? Answer: consultants have dealt with this previously. As an example, the "Black Box" could be funded as a shell through the referendum, and the equipment could be purchased with private funds. Co-mingling of funds works out just fine. Moving forward, the money gets refined, and other items can be "brought back into the fold."

Jeff Adee: As the building process moves along, too, there would be time to get people to "step up" to donate privately.

Dan Honold: Would a three-station gym hold enough people for indoor graduation? Answer: Yes. Patrick Weberpal: Could we just have the shell for a fourth station in the gym and add the court, etc. later? Answer: You either have to build the space for three- or four-station gym.

Bill O'Leary: Can the old pool be fixed? Answer: Check the bottom of the PRA/Cullen handout; the total cost impact for "no new pool" is a reduction of \$4.4 million. Jill Schuerman-Fons: The space problem for lane usage and spectators will still exist.

Mike Astin: In 1966, when the current high school was built, we saved \$25,000 on the gym (not that much); it will cost more in the long run if we cut now. We need to get as much space or "box" as we can get now.

Lucille Vickerman: We need building construction, equipment and operation now with a school referendum, but will this compete with a fire station referendum? Answer by Brian Kvapil: Right now, the advantage of Barry's plan is that the debt service is lower and it should be easier to pass.

MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS - FACT

A motion was made by Jill Schuerman-Fons and seconded by Joe Martin to approve, as stated, Barry Brandt's "Milton Schools' Proposal" of a reduced Building Option #3 for a capital project recommendation of \$85,403,283. The motion was not called.

Leo Johnson: Could this motion include the building of a footprint for a four-station fieldhouse without all the functions and add more at a later time? Bill O'Leary: I support this statement.

Bonnie Stalker: What about the music department? It seems we are ignoring them after staff was here to make explanations last week. We cannot minimize their needs. Tina Keller: I agree.

Michael Dorn: We definitely need storage space.

Jeff Adee: Can we change the capital project recommendation to \$89 million?

A motion was made by Jeff Adee and seconded by Dan Honold to amend the above motion to a cap of \$89 million, keep the high school upgrades and withdraw the deferments in order to give the consultants a capital project number with which to work. The motion was not called.

Patrick Weberpal: The \$89 million is too close to the \$90 million that got bad reviews. I like the \$85 million better.

Tim Schigur: There would be more than \$4 million eliminated from the middle school.

Dan Weitzel and Barry Brandt: We need to be more concise. We need a solution along with the \$ amount for the BOE. We need to say exactly what we want/recommend.

Mike Astin: We need to consider two questions. Whether we decide on \$85 million or \$89 million; we also need to figure in the five-year \$2.5 million for operating costs and programming. I'm concerned we will not get the things done that we need.

Bonnie Stalker: We must consider the needs of the students; we need to put the money into them.

Gary Groelle: We must address public relations. The 20 FACT members can do that; we each talk to 10 people; that's 200. Those 200 people talk to 10 more, now we have 2,000 people covered. Those 2,000 talk to 10 more for 20,000!

Joe Martin: If we use \$89 million as a figure, that's \$19 a year difference from \$85 million. We need to "amend to amend" by listing the options with a price of \$89 million.

WITHDRAWAL OF PREVIOUS MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS, NEW MOTIONS - FACT

Jill Schuerman-Fons, Joe Martin, Jeff Adee, and Dan Honold agreed to withdraw their previous motions from the table. Jeff Adee asked Joe Martin to state, in a motion, the building solutions (without the amount of money).

A motion was made by Joe Martin and seconded by Michael Dorn to make a recommendation to the Board of Education in order to meet the long-term facility needs of the School District of Milton in such a manner:

1. Build a new high which includes
 - a. The “shell or footprint” of a four-station fieldhouse,
 - b. A swimming pool,
 - c. A “Black Box” space for performing arts, but
 - d. No full auditorium;
2. Provide new construction and renovations (as stated in building Option #3 of the PRA/Cullen Handout dated 6-1-16) to the existing high school, intended to become the middle school, also, to Milton East, Milton West, and Harmony Elementary Schools and complete ADA, safety, and maintenance in all of these buildings (as listed in the same Handout);
3. Provide no new construction or renovations to Consolidated Elementary or Northside Intermediate, but complete ADA, safety, and maintenance items in these buildings (as outlined in Building Option #3 of the PRA/Cullen Handout dated 6-1-16);
4. Provide **no** construction, renovation, ADA, safety, or maintenance to the current middle school, in other words, do nothing to the current middle school;

in order to give the Board of Education flexibility in writing referendum questions.

A roll call vote was taken by Co-chair, Barry Brandt. The motion passed unanimously.

****Please note:** The wording inside of parentheses in the above motion was not verbally stated by Joe Martin; however, it is added in the minutes for specificity.

Discussion of the motion: Mike Astin requested that FACT take the next two weeks to consider the wording of this proposal for accuracy and organizational purposes. Patrick Weberpal suggested that all committee members talk to as many community members as possible about this motion. Lesley Hammer stated that FACT members need to relate to the public that the \$90 million, from the December survey, was only for the new high school, complete with all the “bells and whistles.” However, the committee is now recommending a more comprehensive plan, a total solution that will address the needs of all district schools. Lucille Vickerman and Joe Martin emphasized the need to discuss Building Option #3 with community members, how it was reduced, and how other construction and renovations are added to other district buildings. Dan Weitzel requested the referendum proposal amount from 2008, and it was given by Mike Astin as \$69.4 million for a new high school and \$7.3 million for middle school renovation. This was a total of \$76.7 million. Currently, FACT is asking for more detailed, comprehensive building construction for \$85-\$89 million.

A second motion was asked for to propose the total referendum \$ amount. Tina Keller proclaimed a compromising amount between \$85 million and \$89 million.

A motion was made by Tina Keller and seconded by Brendon Wilkinson to recommend to the Board of Education a referendum amount of \$87 million.

A roll call vote was taken by Co-chair, Barry Brandt. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Lesley Hammer asked for input from Wilson Leong and Gary Groelle. Wilson related how he purposely stayed silent due to his prior participation. He conveyed how proud he was of FACT for confirming valuable information to the Board. Gary emphasized his agreement and commended the process FACT completed along with excellent conversations.

NEXT STEPS

FACT decided to meet again in two weeks to determine satisfaction with the wording of the two motions. Barry Brandt disclosed that the next step is presenting FACT's proposals to the Board of Education. The target date, according to Tim Schigur, was set as June 27th; however, he confirmed that a July 11th date could work as well. A BOE presentation will be addressed in two weeks, and Barry requested that committee members also be ready to discuss the community education process. Barry Brandt concluded by thanking all committee members for their participation in FACT and the work that was completed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016

Milton High School LMC

6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith R. Schmitz, Ed.D.

FACT Recording Secretary