

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 10, 2007
6:00 P.M.**

Minutes

Facilities Committee Chair Tim Witzmann* called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken with the following members present: Tim Witzmann, Allison Klis, and Brian Moulton. Others present were Marie Colbeth, Randy Rosburg, Jan Carlson, Cherrie Wood, Rick Lange, Shawn Madden, Kathy Brakke, and Tom Hanley from SDS Architects.

Committee members discussed planning for the April 1st general election. Members looked at long-term space options in conjunction with the recently received demographic study data from Applied Laboratory. Members agreed to use the 10-year, 2,300 student model for the years 2008-2017 when discussing building or remodeling options. Witzmann felt the district faces an overbuild versus under build challenge. He asked members if they felt the community would like to see the district build looking ten years out, or be conservative looking out only five to six years. Rosburg said building for five years out would require two years of actual build time, therefore, the district would be building for only three years out, which was something the members may need to consider when reviewing build options and time. Looking at the Applied Laboratory demographic study data, along with current building issues, members pulled together the following list of options:

	<u>Option D</u>			
	<u>Exist Elem</u>	<u>Exist M.S.</u>	<u>Exist HS</u>	<u>New Bldg.</u>
<i>Grades</i>	EC-1	2-4	5-6	7-12
<i>Current Capacity</i>	600	480		
<i>Students 10 yrs out</i>	400	443	339	1127

Committee notes on Option D: Members felt that creating a 5th through 6th grade building in the existing high school would provide the least efficient use of space. Existing high school building would need to be retrofitted to fit with younger grades (i.e., lower water drinking fountains, smaller bathrooms, etc.), together with creating a new 7-12 high school building could pose a costlier option. Members felt this option was not cost effective.

	<u>Option E</u>			
	<u>Exist Elem</u>	<u>Exist M.S.</u>	<u>Exist HS</u>	<u>New Bldg.</u>
<i>Grades</i>	1-3	4-6	7-8	EC /Kdgn & 9-12
<i>Current Capacity</i>	600	480	400	
<i>Students 10 yrs out</i>	432	488	397	262 730
	w/Kdgn 574			120 – ECs

Committee notes on Option E: The least amount of remodeling would need to be done with this option, and the best blend of grade level exists in this model, however, at some point, a new high school building would still need

to be built in the future. Rosburg stated that at a recent elementary communications forum, elementary staff was not excited about including EC and Kdgn students in a building with grade 9-12 students. Members then discussed whether or not it made sense to add on to the existing high school with this option. If a new elementary building was added, it would need to be built near the existing elementary building to share recess areas for more cost effectiveness. Members discussed moving EC and Kdgn to existing elementary building, then constructing an addition to the existing elementary. Some members felt it would be best to keep EC and Kdgn together with grades 1-3 at the existing elementary building.

Option F

	<u>Exist Elem</u>	<u>Exist M.S.</u>	<u>Exist HS</u>	<u>New Bldg.</u>
Grades	K-2	6-8	9-12	3-5 and Tech Center
Current Capacity			730	
Students 10 yrs out				

Committee notes on Option F: Committee members felt Option F should be removed as an option because ten years out a new high school building would not meet the needs of future enrollment according to the demographic study. Keeping the existing high school building and adding on for future enrollment would be a costly option, since a new high school building would be needed at year eleven.

Option G1

	<u>Exist Elem</u>	<u>Exist M.S.</u>	<u>Exist HS</u>	<u>New Bldg</u>
Grades	EC-1	2-4	5-8	9-12 and Tech Ctr.
Current Capacity				
Students 10 yrs out	400	443	736	

<u>Option G2</u>	EC-2	3-5	6-8	9-12
	543	451	585	730
2-yrs out (w/new high school)			383	481

<u>Option G3</u>	EC-2	3-5	6-7	8-12
	543	451	376	939
2-yrs out (w/new h.s.)	570	385	255	609

Committee notes on Option G1: Witzmann asked if the existing high school building would work for grades 5-8. Lange said he felt it could work, depending upon facility heights, lavatories, etc. for younger 5th/6th grade students.
Notes on Option G2: Committee felt that enrollment numbers for grades 6-8 is a detriment with this option.
Notes on Option G3: Committee felt grades 8-12 in one building would not work, and remodeling for two lower grades to accommodate younger, smaller students would be too costly.

Committee chose to eliminate the following options: Option A; Option B; Option C; Option D (options made available at previous committee meeting); Option F; Option G1; Option G2, and Option G3.

Members looked at Options E through G3 and discussed pros and cons of each. Witzmann asked what the percentages were of high schools throughout the State of Wisconsin at grades 9-12. Lange said about 95% of high schools throughout Wisconsin encompass grades 9-12. Committee members discussed consequences of eliminating grade 9 from the 9-12 high school to include it within a middle school setting. Doing so would entail taking high school credits into account for 9th graders, sharing of staff and equipment between buildings and grade levels, as well as staff licensing issues. Committee members agreed that, based upon concerns with sharing of staff and equipment between buildings and grade levels, and Wisconsin teacher licensing issues, they wish to stay with a grade 9-12 high school building setting.

Witzmann asked elementary principal Wood what she thought the elementary would like in two years; Wood stated she is anticipating seven sections of Kdgn with the next school year. Members asked Hanley to work with Wood on Option E2 and to have those figures available for this option at the next Facilities Committee meeting. Hanley stated he will meet with Wood to discuss remodeling options for the elementary building. In addition to building concerns, Hanley stated he spoke with Athletic Director Brad Nemecek about future needs for outside items as, at some point, the district will need to look at what is needed outside items with regard to athletic fields. He stated there may also be a need to look at secondary driveway for the schools. Klis stated that the middle school kitchen and roofing area remain issues that need to be addressed as well. Committee asked what operational costs may be for an E2 Option. Rosburg thought operational costs could run approximately \$300,000 a year.

Hanley provided members with a handout listing a matrix of industry terms and methods used in selecting a general contractor for construction projects. Committee discussed the options available and which would best fit district building and/or remodeling needs. After review and discussion, Witzmann asked Hanley, based on Hanley's experience, which method he felt provided the most success. Hanley recommended the "Negotiated General Prime Contractor" option; he stated this is a good method if the district wishes to have a highly coordinated project, along with a tight construction dollar figure available before a referendum question. Hanley said this type of method would also allow SDS Architects to work very closely with a general contractor. Rosburg stated that the general contracting firm of Vonasek & Schieffer has done five construction projects with the district in the past, and each time they have done a very good job and have completed projects ahead of schedule. Committee members felt it would be best to have construction numbers as tight as possible before a referendum vote. Witzmann stated he would like to move forward with recommending Vonasek and Schieffer as the negotiated general prime contractor for an action item on the December 17th Board of Education agenda. Witzmann asked Hanley how valuable a service it is to have a general contractor before a referendum is passed. Hanley stated that most contractors would absorb costs and use them as marketing if a school's referendum doesn't pass.

Witzmann said he would like to have the Facility Committee agenda focus on a referendum question at their January 7, 2008 Facilities Committee meeting. He would also like to discuss short-term options at that time.

Committee then agreed that the evening's discussion on general contractor information will be brought forward to full board meeting in December. A referendum question will be presented to the full board at its January meeting; Hanley will provide a presentation of all building/remodeling options reviewed thus far at the regular board meeting in January. This presentation will also be made available to the general community.

Klis moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m., with second by Moulton. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned.

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