

MILTON FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMUNITY TEAM (FACT)

FACT MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2016

MILTON HIGH SCHOOL LMC – ROOM 121

6:00 – 8:00 PM

ATTENDANCE

FACT Members Present: Jeff Adee, 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, Steve Quade, Jill Schuerman-Fons, Bonnie Stalker, Lucille Vickerman, Patrick Weberpal, Daniel Weitzel, Brendon Wilkinson

FACT Members Absent: Mike Astin, Danielle Stivarius

School board Members Present: President Jon Cruzan, Shelly Crull-Hanke (Liaison to FACT), Bob Cullen, Tom Westrick

Community Members Present: **Bill Maas, Lance Fena, Terri Fena, Al Roehl, Rebecca Kanable** (*Milton Courier*), **Jake Magee** (*Janesville Gazette*)

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

School District of Milton (SDM) Staff and Administrators Present: Tim Schigur, Jerry Schuetz, Mary Ellen VanValin, Heather Slosarek, Jeremy Bilhorn, Tara Huber, Laura Jennaro, Matt Biederwolf, Jennifer Cramer, Stephen Schantz, Brian Hammil

MEETING WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

A motion was made by Tina Keller and seconded by Bonnie Stalker to approve the FACT Meeting Minutes of April 27, 2016. The minutes were approved unanimously.

A motion was made by Brian Kvapil and seconded by Steve Quade to have no underlining of information and statements in future FACT Meeting Minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

Barry Brandt began the meeting by announcing that tonight's agenda would focus on group members' ideas of listing options for possible situations that could become referendums. He asked committee members to think about the total School District of Milton's learning space/

facility needs and to brainstorm conceptually with not a lot of detail at this time. Barry's request came from the culmination of the April 27th FACT Meeting when members were given the homework assignment of reviewing and studying the "Options Development" in the FACT binder presented previously by Scott Kramer, PRA. (Information on the existing facilities, the educational space study and the different options are under Tab #2 in the binder). Besides appraising the options in the binder, FACT members were also urged to think about adding new options and/or deleting options already given. The idea for producing such a list would be for subsequent ranking/prioritization discussions along with pricing.

LISTING OF OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING AND RENOVATIONS

Barry Brandt facilitated the whole group discussion and listed options on the whiteboard as committee members collaborated, asked questions, and received answers from SDM administrators and from the District's consultants, Scott Kramer, Nick Kent, and Jeremy Shecterle. The listing of these options for additional building and renovation was the essence of the total meeting time along with questions and answers.

FACT Committee members suggested numerous ideas as to how building/renovations and grade level configurations could look with added discussion about each. A total of nine (9) options was built into the chart on the whiteboard.

These nine (9) building options are explained on the last page of the minutes, indicated as **APPENDIX A**. In some of the options, the chart shows the building of a new high school which describes this construction on the property adjacent (west) to the existing high school. One additional option was explored, that of the SDM purchasing land elsewhere in the near vicinity, suggesting a completely different site for the construction of a new high school.

PRA and J.P. Cullen consultants estimated that, hypothetically, to build a new high school on a different parcel of land, it would cost about \$96 million without including the price of 40-50 acres for the land. This price tag, however, would include sports facilities. The \$96 million is approximately \$15-\$16 million more than if the SDM built a new high school on the existing adjacent property. (This concept will be addressed again in the next section, Questions and Answers).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM THE ABOVE "OPTIONS" DISCUSSION

First, Patrick Weberpal asked how grade-level configuration would/should look when listing additional building and renovation options, especially that of Grades K-5. Tim Schigur informed FACT that different configurations for K-5 would be appropriate. For example, looking at 9-12 for a high school and 6-8 for a middle school, the elementary configurations could be K-2 and 3-5 or K-3 and 4-5.

Brendon Wilkinson identified a possibility of a 10-12 senior high school. Tim Schigur noted that ninth grade classes count for graduation credit and 6-8 middle school classes do not, so it appears most appropriate to include ninth grade in a 9-12 comprehensive high school. Tim and

Bill O'Leary concurred that taking ninth grade out of the high school would be a challenge for sports activities since the Badger and most other conferences include grades 9-12.

A FACT member asked how the "lay of the land," sloping vs. flatness, would affect the design of a new high school, looking at such items as snow removal and drop-off and pick-up. Scott Kramer and Nick Kent both stated that building on a slope can be accomplished; this would be a doable challenge to work out during the design of the building. Also, they confirmed that the size of a new high school building (100,000 sq. ft.) would dictate two stories.

Jeff Adey questioned the possibility of selling the Administration Building. Two options on the chart specify this idea (Option #3 and #6). These two options show the inclusion of an Administration Center in the existing middle school along with Milton-Edgerton-Clinton Alternative Schools (MECAS).

Bonnie Stalker asked about the most appropriate way to address the MECAS. Tara Huber justified that an offsite location for an alternative school is most ideal because individual entrances and other partitions (barriers) would be necessary if the alternative school is included with other grade levels.

Tina Keller proposed that the Pre-K classes be placed in all of the options listed which would also mean bringing children into the District from Small Wonders Pre-School. Jennifer Cramer addressed this idea by remarking that the four-year-old programs were built in a community collaboration. Some families require the wrap-around care that the SDM does not provide. As a consideration, Pre-K programs were added to the Options list. The four elementary buildings could have a PK-2 or a PK-3 configuration.

Dan Honold commented further on the cost of a new high school at a different site. He stated that a new site could have the biggest economic impact. Jill Schuerman-Fons asked how reasonable a new site would be. Jeff Adey stressed that utilities would be the major cost factor; consultants agreed. It was indicated, also, as one idea, that sports facilities, practice areas, and perhaps the auditorium could be kept at the existing site to help save money, but build the high school elsewhere. Brian Kvapil emphasized that such a scenario would mean busing students from the new site to the existing site, and this issue was discussed earlier when the possibility of using the YMCA pool was considered. (The busing concern previously was not popular).

Two prospective places for a new high school site were briefly examined. 1) If a new high school was built adjacent to the existing one and that building became the middle school, Schilberg Park, being across the street, would help provide a very nice "campus" for Grades 6-12. 2) Building a new high school outside of town, toward Highway 26, would indicate a total commuter school. There is no neighborhood currently out there, but the economic impact could be very positive. Consultants made the observation that studies might need to be done to consider traffic patterns and to find out how many students would actually commute as opposed to how many are currently commuting. They cautioned that this would add

operational costs plus take more time. Tim Schigur noted that once a referendum is passed, work needs to start within a certain amount of time, or there may be consequences.

Steve Quade believed it would not be profitable to close a building. Consultants confirmed that the middle school and both East and West Elementary were in equal disrepair. Harmony and Consolidated are in good shape, and the “bare bones” of the high school is good (not space). Tim Schigur conveyed that the middle school could become a Pre-K Center as another option. FACT agreed to eliminate Option #2 which included closing the middle school. The committee also agreed to delete Option #5 which called for razing the current high school. Members advised the District should not spend money “tearing down” a building.

Lesley Hammer underlined the need to consider options for long-term use, at least 20 years in the future or more. Also, could long-term planning accommodate a 20% increase of students? Scott Kramer advised that additions to new or existing buildings could be considered further “down the road” depending on enrollment projections and needs. Option #8 basically expands and renovates all the existing schools, but does indicate reconfiguration of grade levels. Lesley suggested taking “Option 8 “off the board;” however, Brian Kvapil thought it would be important to “cost out” this option. Option #8 was left for consideration.

FACT members also agreed to remove Option #7 (The existing high school would be too big for the proposed 2 grade levels and MECAS.) and Option #9 (All existing schools would remain status quo). Explanations for deletion of the four options are also incorporated into the chart in **APPENDIX A**. For the May 25th FACT meeting, Scott Kramer, Nick Kent, and Jeremy Shecterle will price Option #1, #3, #4, #6, and #8 on **APPENDIX A**. They will also figure pricing for a hypothetically new high school on a different site. FACT members would like the consultants to consider ADA and safety issues in their pricing. Brian Kvapil questioned whether or not the maintenance budget would have to be increased.

The FACT meeting was adjourned 10 minutes early.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, May 25, 2016

Milton High School LMC – Room 121

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

FACT Recording Secretary,

Judith R. Schmitz, Ed.D.