



*** MINUTES ***

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS AND FACILITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 15, 2016

4:30 P.M. – 6:00 P.M.

Roosevelt Elementary School

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Fager	Caro Johnson	Ashley Kosharek	Carrie Ronnander
David FitzGerald	Wendy Sue Johnson	Tim Nordin	Janet Seymour
			Ryan Weichelt

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mark Goings	Joe Luginbill	Philip Lyons	Jason Schlafer
-------------	---------------	--------------	----------------

RESOURCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Abby Johnson	Tim Leibham	Larry Sommerfeld	Heidi White
--------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

GUESTS PRESENT:

Ben Dallman

.I. Meeting Called to Order

Meeting was called to order at 4:30 pm

.II. Introductions

Everyone gathered in the IMC

Introductions were made of everyone around the tables.

.III. Roosevelt Building Tour

Ben Dallman, Principal of Roosevelt Elementary, created handouts to assist with the building tour.

Click [HERE](#) for a copy of the handout detailing a list of concerns and main priorities that face Roosevelt Elementary School.

.IV. Approval of Minutes of August 18, 2016

*Tim Nordin moved to accept the minutes. Seconded by Caro Johnson.
Carried by unanimous voice of acclamation.*

.V. Roosevelt Architect Report & Options

Larry Sommerfeld presented the six-page Architecture Design Options for Roosevelt School.

Option 1: Additions and Renovations

- 3 Section with Core Facilities for 4 Section
- This would be taking the existing building, removing the older section, and salvaging as much as possible, before adding on.
- They would like to see the school remain in this area to preserve the community and utilize the existing site.
- The addition would be south of the existing building.
- Create better site safety improvements, parking, bus areas, playground and PE areas
- Would benefit from the purchase of four residential homes to the north of the site, however, it could still work without the purchase.

Option 2: New Construction – Same Site

- 3 Section with Core Facilities for 4 Section
- This would be tearing down the old site and building a new school building on the same site.
- This option could expedite the project without having to salvage parts of building. When you try to salvage parts of an older building it costs more to move things and keep the structures secure.
- The school would remain at its current location and preserve the community and utilize the existing site.
- Create better site safety improvements, parking, bus areas, playground and PE areas
- Could benefit from the purchase of four residential homes to the north of the site

Option 3: New Construction – New Site

- 3 Section with Core Facilities for 4 Section
- Includes site procurement
- The site area once on Jeffers Road that was earmarked for a future school has been used for other purposes by the county.
- Finding a large enough site that would be ten or more acres would be challenging
- The new site would create more bussing for students who are already walking to Roosevelt.

Option 2 seems to be the most favored to keep the integrity of the school neighborhood. It was felt that going to a 2-story building, more green space would be saved. You also save on heating costs, however, you have the expense of an elevator and stairways. By having a 2-story building, we would have 8 ½ acres of green space with still wanting to obtain existing properties. A new school also has the potential of attracting interest and development, such as the new development has in downtown Eau Claire. (ie. Cannery District, Phoenix Part, etc.)

.VI. Pros/Cons Elementary Overcrowding Handout

We did not spend a lot of time going over the handout. It was provided as a resource for our new members to see the areas of study that have been researched already and what the findings were.

- Sometimes it is not an enrollment issue as much as it is a storage or classroom size issue.
- Five (5) schools with Achieving Gap Reduction (AGR), previously known as SAGE can now go from 18 students in a classroom to 22 students. Targeted class size range is 19-25. A little bigger or a little smaller doesn't matter based on the program being offered.
- It was suggested we could define schools by themes and programs. Balancing programs and making it program driven and not enrollment driven for high schools.

.VII. Other

A special thank you to Ben Dallman, Principal of Roosevelt Elementary School, for hosting the tour and providing a meeting space for our meeting.

The Debt drop-off is expected to be in 2021 and the board could possibly look at a capital referendum in 2020. At this time more buildings, such as South can be discussed more.

As a committee what is our recommendation for Roosevelt?

- Was able to get Kindergarten down to a 2-Section for this year.
- Do we still continue to offer the option of first child going to Kindergarten to go to Sherman for next year?
- Do we still have these ongoing space issues?

If the referendum passes, the work on all security entrances will have to be phased in at all identified buildings.

It was suggested that if there is a re-boundary to do for Roosevelt, such as deciding on selecting more families to ask to attend Sherman Elementary, that it be done earlier than later to help with the conversation and staffing issues.

The committee was asked about the Service Center on Hastings Way. This will be put on an upcoming agenda.

.VIII. Agenda for Next Meeting

Short-term Recommendations for Roosevelt
Long-term Recommendations for Roosevelt
Other Space Issues District Wide
Potential Areas to Re-Evaluate Boundaries

.IX. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Next Meeting Date

October 20, 2016
4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
District Office
Room 123B