

Facilities Advisory Committee

Meeting 08 – Minutes

Tuesday, May 25, 2021 – 6:00PM – 8:00PM

Virtual Zoom Meeting

FAC Members Present -

Rob Abbott	Steve Mahoney	Maribel Reu
Dave Geiger	Jordan Nelson	Cody Rutter
Dan Halvorsen	Robyn Newcomb	Andy Selle
Nick Hamele	Alicia Norris	
Lisa Hollenberger	Amy Oakley	
Ryan Huber	Adam Paul	
Kory Knickrehm	Chris Reed	

FAC Members Not Present: Matt Banaszynski, Dawn Blackwell, Carla Haubenschild, John Kutz, Nicole Leibman, Collin Maas, Nicole Schafer, Jill VanderMause, and Vern Zech.

Resource Team Present - Dan Chovanec (CGS - Project Lead), Sarah Dunn (CGS - Communications Lead), Nick Kent (PRA - Design), Devin Kack (PRA - Design), Rebecca Houseman LeMire (City Manager), Jason Demerath (Director of Business Services), D.J. Scullin (Director of Technology), Josh Carter (Director of Buildings and Grounds), Marissa Weidenfeller (Comm. & Community Engagement Specialist), Lisa Haas (Admin. Assistant to Supt./BOE).

District Leadership - Amy Reynolds, Leigh Ann Scheuerell, Justin Stewart, Jennifer Walden, Matt Wolf.

[May 25, 2021 Meeting Video](#)

Call to Order - Co-chair Kory Knickrehm called the meeting to order and welcomed all. Mr. Knickrehm stated this is the last FAC meeting and outlined the [Agenda](#).

[May 25, 2021 FAC Presentation](#)

Meeting Objective

Nick Kent stated this process started 20 months ago. The meeting objective is to create a long range master plan, identify viable facility solutions and prepare a body of work to be handed over to the Board of Education.

Celebration of the FAC

Process - Meetings 1-7

Devin Kack discussed where we have been. Mr. Kack thanked the FAC committee members. Mr. Kack indicated there have been 8 FAC meetings that were held at each of the school buildings. The FAC members committed

448 total hours and the resource team committed 208 total hours, a total of over 27 days. Mr. Kack thanked co-chairs Mr. Knickrehm and Mrs. Leibman.

Mr. Kack and Mr. Kent briefly discussed the 7 previous FAC meetings:

- Meeting 1 (September 24, 2019): Introduction and Organization - Toured Luther Elementary
- Meeting 2 (October 22, 2019): Existing Conditions Review & Renewable Energy Infrastructure - Toured Middle School
- Meeting 3 (November 19, 2019): Educational Space Analysis and Collaborative Learning Spaces - Toured High School.
- Meeting 4 (December 17, 2019): School Finance 101 - Toured Barrie Elementary
- Meeting 5 (January 28, 2020): Preliminary Options Review - Discussed Prioritization of Needs, Toured Rockwell Elementary
- Meeting 6 (February 25, 2020): Options Development - Scoring Matrix Developed, Toured Purdy Elementary
- Meeting 7 (April 20, 2021): Reconvening the FAC - Discussed what has and has not changed and assigned homework to review the 3 options.

Options Review

Overall Options Refresher

Mr. Kent discussed the range of options from maintenance only to replacing entire buildings.

- Option 1- Maintenance Only, Cost: \$36M
- Option 2- Renovate/Expand Luther as 6-8 Middle School, repurpose current Middle School site, consolidate to 3 Elementary Schools: Barrie, Purdy and Rockwell to be renovated and expanded; Cost: \$107-\$111M
- Option 3 - New 6-8 Middle School at Luther Site, repurpose current MS site, consolidate to 3 elementary schools, elementary schools renovated and expanded, could use phased approach; Cost: \$108-\$112M
- Option 4A - New 6-8 Middle School Near the HS site, maintenance and secure entries for Elementary Schools and High School, Cost: \$74-\$77M
- Option 4B- New 6-8 MS on Existing Site, maintenance and secure entries for Elementary Schools and High School, maintenance and secure entries for Elementary Schools and High School, Cost: \$71-\$74M
- Option 4C- New 5-8 MS on Existing Site, maintenance and secure entries for Elementary Schools and High School, Cost: \$76-\$79M
- Option 5- Modernize Existing 6-8 Middle School, Cost: \$68.5-\$71.5M
- Option 6 - Consolidate and Modernize Elementary Schools, Consolidate to 3 elementary schools: Barrie, Purdy and Rockwell with renovations and additions, Cost: \$65-\$67M
- Option 7 - Modernize 4 Elementary Schools, New 6-8 MS, possible phased approach, Cost: \$115-\$119M
- Option 8 - 4K-8 at Luther site and site near HS, consolidate to two 4K-8 buildings, close/sell Barrie, Rockwell, Purdy and MS, phased approach would be difficult, Cost: \$129-\$133M.

Prioritization Refresher

Mr. Kack discussed a more detailed prioritization refresher.

- District-wide maintenance upgrades - Be proactive, no rush orders
- Safety/Security - Secure entry sequences, close off area of the building, outdoor security
- Learning Environments - Built to current model, adaptable, usable, acoustics appropriate, adequate air quality and lighting
- Equity - Special Education equitable opportunities across buildings, flexibility, at grade level and every school
- Sustainability - Fiscal, enrollment, and environmental

Three Final Options Review / Phasing

Mr. Kack discussed the option evaluation matrix which was used previously to decide the top three options, which included Option 3, Option 7 and Option 8. Mr. Kent discussed weighing the three options using the PRO/CON analysis for each option and looking at safety/security, learning environments, maintenance, equity, how many school buildings, location, implementation, future flexibility - enrollment, and cost. The committee will use the 1-2-4-All exercise to look at each of the 3 options (Option 3, Option 7, Option 8) individually. Mr. Kent reviewed the three options:

- **Option 3** - New 6-8 Middle School at Luther Site, Current Luther site becomes new 6-8 Middle School, repurpose current MS site, consolidate to 3 elementary schools, elementary schools renovated and expanded, could use phased approach; Cost: \$108-\$112M
 - Mr. Kack discussed the option 3 phasing: New Middle School(MS) & District Office at Luther \$50M, 3 Elementary School Renovations: Barrie \$19.5M, Purdy \$18.5 M, Rockwell \$18M, HS \$5M
- **Option 7** - Modernize 4 Elementary Schools, New 6-8 MS, possible phased approach, Cost: \$115-\$119M
 - Mr. Kack discussed the option 7 phasing: New MS \$52M, 4 Elementary School Renovations: Barrie \$14.5M, Luther \$17M, Purdy \$18M, Rockwell \$11.5M, HS \$5M
- **Option 8** - 4K-8 at Luther site and site near HS, consolidate to two 4K-8 buildings, close/sell Barrie, Rockwell, Purdy and MS, phased approach would be difficult, Cost: \$129-\$133M.
 - Mr. Kack discussed the option 8 phasing: 4K-8 at Luther site \$61M, 4K-8 near HS \$66M, HS \$5M, condensing to 3 schools.

FAC Exercise: Weighing the Options

Pro/Con Analysis to Aid School Board Review

Mr. Kent stated we are to develop a pro/con analysis of each of the remaining options to forward on to the school board.

Exercise 1-2-4 All for each option

FAC members were separated into breakout groups to discuss the pros and cons of each of the three options starting with Option 3.

Group 1: Rob Abbott, Robyn Newcomb, Cody Rutter, Dan Halvorsen

Group 2: Dave Geiger, Ryan Huber, Adam Paul, Steve Mahoney

Group 3: Amy Oakley, Jordan Nelson, Alicia Norris, Chris Ree, Lisa Hollenberger

Group 4: Kory Knickrehm, Maribel Reu, Andy Selle, Nick Hamele

Option 3 Pros:

- Definite need for a new Middle School (MS) and district office.
- Doing anything at the existing MS site does not improve its location.
- Unusual with the district office being in an elementary school and then another elementary school across the street.
- In favor of one distinct middle school.
- Luther is the least historic building in the district
- Savings on long term maintenance costs with one less school building.

Option 3 Cons:

- Concern whether there is enough space for the new MS building to be on the Luther site, in addition to fields and parking and traffic flow concerns.
- Concern regarding whether option 3 positions us for growth in the future (one less building).
- Cost is a concern even though it is the lower end of 3 options, will the community support it.
- With one less elementary school there would be a loss of community space (gyms, soccer fields, track).
- One less elementary school would create an imbalance (right now we have 2 elementary schools on the north side and 2 on the south side).
- Concern regarding construction during the school day.
- Luther was once a MS and now is an elementary school. The community may see this as a step back with it becoming a MS again.
- The MS being near the High School (HS) would make more sense.
- Concern regarding empty buildings/space in town (Middle School).
- Life cycle costs of buildings. Is it more efficient to renovate elementary buildings or build additions/new construction? (At this time in reference to the elementary buildings the renovation costs do not exceed 50% of the cost of new construction, but it is something to consider. Site sizes may limit ability to do additions/new construction.)

Option 7 Pros:

- The four elementary schools provide balance in the community.
- Updating elementary schools for modernization, safety and security.
- Need new Middle School.
- Allows for flexibility with phasing. Could build middle school more immediately and then do elementary schools at a later date when needed/necessary.
- Least amount of change. Same 6 buildings.
- Demolition costs to remove existing middle school building included in the cost of construction bid.
- The middle school being located near the high school would allow for shared community use of facilities (fields, pool, gyms).
- Four elementary schools provide greater flexibility in programming decisions.

Option 7 Cons:

- Cost. Ability to secure this much financing.
- Space concerns on building sites.
- Finding a location near high school or another location and traffic flow concerns.

- Concerns whether additions/updates at Elementary Schools would provide sufficient space for the future. Site size limitations for additions. (Capacity is not as much a concern with maintaining the 4 elementary buildings.)
- Concerned with life expectancy/structural considerations of the elementary buildings 40-50 years from now as they are already old buildings.
- Empty Middle School building.
- Long term maintenance costs higher due to having 6 buildings.
- Concern regarding no option of building on current middle school site. (Current Middle School site has challenges regarding circulation, location in community, site size and the land being filled with geothermal wells.)

Option 8 Pros:

- Lowest long term maintenance costs with only 3 buildings and grounds to maintain and them all being newer buildings.
- Opportunity for empty building sites to become something to benefit the community such as a new community athletic facility, or a new park or buildable lots as there is limited real estate available in Fort Atkinson. Sell as a true community piece/community betterment.
- Potential dynamic shifts in educational delivery. Programmatically could share opportunities such as tech ed facilities and foreign language teachers.
- More cohesive K4-8 system. Programming benefits.
- Transportation savings regarding bussing.

Option 8 Cons:

- Numerous unknowns.
- Big change in educational model.
- Lose neighborhood school feel, more big city feel.
- Could be challenges in selling this level of change to the community.
- Numerous empty buildings.
- With so much new at once, potential for numerous items breaking down at the same time in the future.
- Unable to be phased, would need to build all at once.
- Significant cost.
- Possible parent concerns with dropping off a 4 year old in the same building as a 14 year old.
- Possible inequity if one of the 4K-8 buildings is located near the HS and can share some of the academic and facilities opportunities, whereas the other location not near the HS would be unable to share in those opportunities.

General Concerns:

Mr. Selle, the city engineer, expressed concerns regarding where the cost of the vacant buildings or redevelopment of buildings is placed into these estimates.

Mr. Paul expressed concern regarding the significant cost associated with these 3 options. What is the next step if the community is not in support of any of these options? (Mr. Kent replied we have the maintenance plans to fall back on if the community is not interested in the bolder options.)

Mr. Kent stated that we have narrowed down the options prior to providing them to the board and we will do a broad-based community survey to get an idea of where the broad-based community mindset is.

Mr. Selle expressed as a parent and looking at the graph of dollars invested and student achievement, he would be more willing to invest if there is a clear connection with achievement and improvement. (Dr. Abbott responded that the board is currently in the process of revisioning, remissioning and moving towards a results based strategic plan. We need to be competitive in program, results, facilities and opportunities for our students. There is a need to grow and attract new students.)

Conclusion of the FAC

FAC presentation to the School Board

Mr. Kent expressed the next step is to prepare the presentation for the full board which the FAC co-chairs will present to the board. FAC members are encouraged to attend the meeting once it is scheduled.

Future FAC Involvement

Mr. Kent stated the FAC meetings have concluded but the work is not done. We will continue to look to the FAC to offer guidance and insight. FAC members are encouraged to be present at Community Engagement sessions. Speak to your neighbors and friends regarding this conversation and encourage them to become informed citizens.

Next steps for the School Board

Board Review/Possible Narrowing of Options

Mr. Kent stated we will bring this forward to the board to begin reflecting on the work and narrow down the options.

Community Survey Development

Mr. Kent said we will narrow down the options and develop more specifics including the costs associated with the options. The community survey is a vital piece of information for the board. It is important to consider what the community's voice is telling us.

Consider Decision to Proceed to Facilities Referendum Question

Mr. Kent stated that if the results of the survey indicate "No," we then need to decipher what we do next and look closer at the maintenance report. If the decision to proceed is "Yes," then we would draft the resolution for the board to consider and the board would need to adopt the formal resolution. It would then be put to a public vote at a regularly scheduled election. Mr. Kent thanked the FAC committee members.

Dr. Abbott thanked PRA, C.G. Schmidt and those who attended the meetings. We will potentially provide information to our board in August for the board to then inform us what direction to move next.

Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.