

Meeting: Demographic Trends & Facility Planning Committee Workgroup

Date: May 21, 2020

Time: 4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Location: WebEx Virtual Meeting

Attendees:

Committee Members:				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alicia Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nic Ashman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Margot Dahling*	<input type="checkbox"/> David FitzGerald	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Goings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heather Grant	<input type="checkbox"/> Amanda Guo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Hartman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Caro Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> Steven Lowry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeremy Pohlen	<input type="checkbox"/> Travis Schroeder	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ryan Weichelt		
Resource (non-voting) Members:				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Josh Clements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Koller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil Lyons	<input type="checkbox"/> Tim Nordin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Darryl Petersen

*Chair

Guests:

Notes: Jennifer Knutson

The meeting was called to order by Margot Dahling at 4:34p.m. Nic Ashman seconded the motion. All in favor. Quorum was met.

- **Public Comment**
 - No public comment.
- **Approval of Minutes**
 - Heather Grant moved to approve the minutes from April 16 and May 14. Jeremy Pohlen seconded the motion. All in favor.
- **Recap of Workgroup Session**
 - Committee Workgroup May 2020 draft document shared summarizing the workgroup discussion.
 - APL was contacted, but a study cannot be completed in time for our recommendation or referendum.
 - A city of Eau Claire map was shared to show the potential boundary of water and sewer within the city’s limit. The District would incur utility costs if water and sewer are not already accessible at an approximate cost of \$1 to 5 million. Cost estimation is a broad range since location of potential land is unknown.
 - Approximate cost projections for additions to Manz and Meadowview was shared. Things to consider going forward include the possibility of shared music/art room doubling as resource rooms and additional restroom space or other facilities space may be needed with increase of students.
 - The Capacity with Additions tab from the Data from Workgroup spreadsheet was shared to project enrollment ranges of 25 to 150 additional student at the different schools if facility additions were to take place. How many south side elementary schools are we looking to add on to (1-4)?
 - Should the facility additions happen all at once or over a course of time in a tiered approach? There is a high probability that the deferred maintenance at South and Roosevelt will be on the referendum. All five projects (3 additions, Roosevelt, and South) would not be able to occur over one summer.
 - Would a new facility be a cost-effective or viable recommendation?

- **Long-Term Facility Recommendation**

- Committee discussed several options to present to the Board.
- Multiple facility additions would allow us to serve more families and offer more renovated buildings than just one new school. With a tiered remodel approach, Meadowview would need to be first.
- Committee discussed recommending additions to three schools as plan A with plan B being additions to two schools and plan C additions for only one school option. A tiered approach would be best.
- Pros versus cons for having three school additions include the positive of being able to address issues with minimal boundary changes for the long term, at least five years, and would add needed spaces (resource rooms, music/art rooms, restrooms, and other common space). A drawback would be the cost of multiple building projects at once but could also be positive financially by doing them all at the same time and bidding out a larger remodel. Even though construction costs may be better, programming could be impacted. A more immediate solution/short term solution may still be needed for Meadowview until the renovations are completed. Would we need to add a short-term solution for Meadowview? The cost for additions would be about half (approximately \$20 million) of the costs for a new school (approximately \$40 million). Multiple additions at a lower cost than one new school may be better for the referendum and positively impact more families.
- For plan B, the two-school option would be Meadowview and Putnam (versus Manz) in order to optimize the addition. Manz' biggest issue is bubble class years, but building is really land-locked as Manz is in the middle of Meadowview and Putnam.
- As we don't know what all will be on the referendum (for example, tech needs or other operation costs), it is smart to have a well thought out plan A, B, and C to recommend to the Board.

Alicia Arnold made a motion that Plan A be an addition on all three schools (Meadowview, Putnam Heights, and Manz). Margot Dahling seconded the motion. All in favor.

ACTION ITEM(S)

- At the next meeting, discuss plan B.
- Jennifer Knutson will send out a Doodle Poll for attendance and availability for a June meeting.
- In preparation for a June meeting, have Heather Grant discuss the structural capacity needs at Manz. Would Manz find relief if they had 30 to 40 less students?

Caro Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Margot Dahling seconded the motion. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 6:02p.m.