

Please note: The Facility Committee Meeting minutes are not representative of official Somerset Board of Education action. Appropriate board of education action will be taken at the regularly scheduled Somerset Board of Education meeting.

**SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SOMERSET
BOARD OF EDUCATION
FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING*
DISTRICT OFFICE BOARD ROOM
MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2007
6:15 P.M.**

Minutes

1. Chair Tim Witzmann called the meeting to order at 6:17 p.m.
2. Roll call, committee members present: Tim Witzmann, Allison Klis and Brian Moulton. Other board members present: Sharon Germain, Mike Connor, Catherine Cranston, Marie Colbeth. Others present: Randy Rosburg, Cherrie Wood, Rick Lange, Shawn Madden, Ryan Sicard, Kathy Brakke, Lorri Baillargeon, Tammie Wishard and Tom Hanley of SDS Architects.
3. To plan for the April 1st general election: Chair Witzmann reiterated at this evening's meeting that he would like to try to keep the Facilities Committee meeting to approximately 1 ½ hour long. He also stated that he would open up for discussion or questions from non-committee members after each topic. Chair Witzmann then introduced Tom Hanley of SDS Architects to provide information on building space options with regard to a referendum question.

Hanley reported that he met with Somerset district administrators this week and developed three options for building space (handout provided). He stated that Option A for the elementary school would not require a tremendous amount of remodeling, and would accommodate 8 sections without taking up core areas for classroom space. Option B at the middle school is similar to the elementary Option A with classroom distribution and no significant remodeling. He said this option for the high school would require some significant additions and remodeling. Discussion on administration expansion would involve an additional 4,900 square feet of space to the existing 2,000; this space would include areas such as central receiving of mail, staging, etc. Hanley stated that each of the options involves a total student body of 2,300. He said additions and remodeling at the three buildings would also require different building codes and fire separations. He felt it might be more cost effective to install sprinkler systems throughout the entire remodeling process rather than fire separators, however, he is still looking into this area.

Witzmann summarized the options by concluding that, if the high school building was expanded to accommodate up to 700 students, there would be a need in the near future to build another high school. Committee discussed the implications of building a new high school and re-arranging grades at the four buildings. Committee said they talked about this before as they agreed that, even with a new high school building, the other buildings would still require additions to accommodate

growth. Some committee members concerned that additions to buildings will take away needed parking areas. Hanley wondered about having the high school house more than 9-12 grades, such as grade 7-12. Witzmann stated everything is an option at this point. Lange felt that, with this option, the high school would become full rather quickly. Hanley said the district could look at another new elementary once the new high school became full. Lange said that the design of a high school is a key factor for a school building composed of grades 7-12, and that there would be a need to isolate students well. Committee discussed current enrollment numbers of 7-12. Core facilities are already oversized. Witzmann said area for 7-8 grade could become future tech area. Witzmann said he is concerned about the community being asked to build two schools, and felt Option A may be the better way to go. Committee members wondered if a capacity of 700 for a high school building would be large enough. Rosburg stated that a new Technology Facility Building could be able to draw grades from all three buildings, which may help to alleviate space concerns. Committee members then discussed additional options including;

	<u>Exist ES</u>	<u>Exist MS</u>	<u>Exist HS</u>	<u>New Bldg.</u>
Option D	EC - 1	2-3-4	5-6	9-12 / 7-8
	Wood wondered if this plan would make existing building underutilized. Hanley said yes. All buildings would need remodeling to accommodate for younger grades. Germain felt there may be too much remodeling involved with this option.			
Option E	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-12 / EC –JK-K
	This option would require the least amount of remodeling. Committee agreed there would be a strong need for separation of older students and younger students in one new building.			
Option F	K-2	6-8	9-12	Tech / 3-5 /EC-JK
	Colbeth stated she would like an option with the least amount of remodeling dollars involved; she didn't feel that the current high school building needs remodeling because of the success with alternative education and youth options programs, and that future high school growth could move to a new Technology Center. She would like to enhance the district's ability to do alternative school and virtual school to accommodate current buildings without adding on to existing buildings. A technology center would help alleviate the need for a new gymnasium for lower grades. Hanley said he will reconfigure Option F.			

Option G EC-1 2-4 5-8 (pull some for Tech Ctr) 9-12/Tech Ctr.
 Committee discussed pulling grades 5-8 into a technology center. Brakke concerned about special education space being available to accommodate growth in that program. Hanley stated that special education has been included in the square footage in the remodeling and is accounted for in the numbers, however, not in the newest options D-G. Hanley suggested that if the committee was serious about building a technology education center, they may want to look at three different precedents through the country, give the information to him and tell him what they would like to see in that building as far as grade sections, etc. Klis felt that a technology center based upon individual learning instead of grade level could be another approach. Cranston liked the new technology center idea and felt the community may like it. Committee discussed the need to come up with one new building option, and how best to inform that to the community.

Board members felt that Option A, B and B1 would not be viable because of major additions involved with the high school building. They felt that Options D, E, F, and G are different

configurations of a new building. Rosburg stated he e-mailed Applied Population Laboratory to receive updated demographics to review and discuss at the next Facilities Committee meeting. Witzmann felt strongly that the demographic information is needed to continue to look at building options. Rosburg asked Hanley at what point is it useful in getting more accurate building dollar figures when getting together with a general contractor. Hanley felt that number would be 10%. He stated that having a contractor on board before the referendum would help with more accurate numbers when pulling together a referendum question. Cranston stated the committee should also look at mill rate numbers along with building options—to keep this in mind if they want a referendum to pass. Rosburg asked the committee what they would like to do for a general contractor, and if they wish to go with Vonasek and Schieffer as they have worked well with the district in the past. Witzmann and other committee members felt that board members should have options for contractors for comparison, i.e., selection based on bids, etc., so that the community would know that the board looked at alternative contractors.

Witzmann concluded the meeting by stating that the next meeting's discussion will be about demographics and general information for contractor opportunities if demographic information is available by meeting date. Hanley will come forward with some configurations of options discussed at this evening's meeting.

4. Moulton moved to adjourn the meeting, with a second by Klis. Meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

*A quorum of the Board of Education may be in attendance.