

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION, EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN, OCTOBER 25, 2010
PRESIDENT CRAIG PRESIDING**

Following the Budget Hearing, President Craig called the meeting to order at 6:17 pm.

The following commissioners were present: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Johnson, Shiel, and Wogahn. Absent: Janke. Student Representative Joe Luginbill was also present.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one came forward to address the Board.

CONSENT RESOLUTION AGENDA

Com. Wogahn moved, seconded by Com. Faanes, to approve the consent resolution agenda consisting of the following items:

- New and/or Modified Positions & Responsibilities
- Adoption of the 2010-11 ECASD Budget

Consent resolution agenda items approved by unanimous roll call vote.

Special meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Patti Iverson, Board Secretary

**COMMITTEE MEETING
BOARD OF EDUCATION – EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN
OCTOBER 25, 2010**

1. Call to Order – Committee Meeting

Board Members present: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Johnson, Shiel, and Wogahn.
Absent: Janke. Student Representatives Joe Luginbill was also present.

2. Committee Reports/Items for Discussion

A. Board Work Session on Facilities Needs to be Addressed in the Upcoming Referendum

Superintendent Heilmann said Charles Kramer and Larry Sommerfeld worked with ATS&R Architects to assemble the documents the Board was presented. They provide the high degree of specificity that the Board was looking for by listing each item included in the building projects. Mr. Van De Water reminded the Board that costs are estimates at this time.

Mr. Kramer explained that ATS&R reviewed the District's current five-year capital plan to develop the list along with items suggested at Board work sessions or from the architect's review of facilities. Some of the items on the list were highlighted in yellow by Mr. Kramer as things that he felt the Board should have further discussions on or to consider such things as 'going green.'

The Board heard information about the DeLong project. It is primarily a maintenance project with a number of things coming from the deferred maintenance list. Some of the bigger ticket items include windows and skylights to allow natural lighting, new entryways, taking out wall partitions and replacing with permanent walls, and electrical/HVAC for those areas. President Craig stressed that the updates should comply with 21st century standards to make DeLong a contemporary educational facility for the foreseeable future.

Building staff will be asked to submit comments and suggestions for the project. There will likely be disruptions for staff and students, although some packages could be bid separately to allow for work to be done in the summer.

The Board talked about various aspects of the building project. It discussed improvements with the entrances noting safety concerns there. By utilizing technology, the main entrance would remain open but the other doors would lock after school starts only allowing people to exit. Also reviewed was the

\$7.7 million to replace walls, ceilings, and flooring. Mr. Kramer said that many of the replacement parts for the partitions are no longer available. Utilizing the open concept proves to be difficult with sound issues. Other factors for flooring include ease of cleaning hard surfaces and soundproofing. The need for an emergency generator was also talked about. Mr. Kramer said the existing generator has been rewired many times and there are safety issues. Without a generator there would be some code issues as well as core heat issues and safety matters if the building lost power because of the lack of natural light. All secondary buildings are designated as emergency community shelters so that is also a factor to consider.

Mr. Kramer acknowledged that although the cost for upgrades at DeLong is \$26 million, the cost for a new site, permits and square footage estimates up to \$200/SF would be much greater. DeLong is structurally sound and the exterior is in good shape but there are major HVAC system problems. The upgrade would mean decreased energy costs with the ability to control HVAC, lighting, and labor costs.

The Board asked for a way to prioritize recommendations so the Board could understand and justify the costs. One suggestion was to have breaking points by cost, i.e., cutting \$5 million, \$10 million, or \$15 million from the total costs. Another was for a categorization of items such as 1) critical facility needs, 2) projects identified as necessary on the 5-year maintenance plan, and 3) suggested/optional items.

Putnam Elementary School's referendum project would bring the building up to three sections, enlarge the west side classrooms, move the office to the main entrance, address site issues, and expand the gym. Mr. Kramer said that to keep the playground and fields safe, the maintenance program aerates, seeds, and waters them. This is the only way to keep them green and soft.

Robbins Elementary would have a larger addition. The 1950's section of the building would be razed and replaced with a two-floor addition. The project would update the entrance, service area, core facility, and cafeteria. There would be an expansion of the gymnasium to bring it up to four-section school standards. Included on the list were items highlighted in yellow. As noted earlier, these are areas the Board should discuss and consider like replacing unit ventilators and updating the entire HVAC system.

The Board asked if accommodations were made for adequate space for art, music, and physical education in a four-section building. Mr. Dean Beeninga from ATS&R said that art and music would stay at one classroom in the current model (every other day with 10 sections). They are analyzing whether it would be feasible to add a few sections in another room.

The topic of not utilizing Little Red while adding on to Robbins was discussed. Little Red will need updates to sewer, water and classrooms. There would be a variety of transportation issues getting students to Little Red and there would be considerably more boundary shifts required. Robbins is already a three-section building so the District would have to add on one section as opposed to three sections at Little Red to accommodate the projected enrollments. If Little Red were utilized as a four-section building, 400 students would have to be moved to a new school. It was noted that Little Red is positioned for future needs should the growth in that area of the city materialize. If that growth occurs, city sewer and water would likely be available at that time. Adding on to Sherman and Robbins will have the least impact on disrupting the current educational programs.

The Sherman project would be very similar to the project at Robbins. The old 1950's section of the building would be razed and a two-story addition would be built which would add classrooms, small group rooms and core facilities. The entrance and office issues would also be addressed as well as a number of site problems with parking, bus flow, pick up and drop off.

Com. Faanes asked what it would cost to address the main entrance safety concerns at all elementary schools. Paul Erickson from ATS&R said they see a range in costs from \$20,000 to \$250,000 for these updates depending on where the main office is. Mr. Kramer said that almost every elementary school other than Longfellow needs work in this area. He noted that by addressing needs in the referendum, it could free up maintenance money to bring the rest of the schools up to these standards as well.

Another component of the referendum is a centralized early learning center. It was felt there could be as much as \$150,000 per year saved by streamlining transportation costs. Students would have much less time on the bus. Currently some four-year-olds have long bus rides. There may also be a savings with itinerant staff travel.

Mr. Leibham said that Little Red would not have enough space for the number of EL classrooms the District currently has. Enrollments are projected to grow somewhat, and a centralized location allows services to be provided in one location. Some specialized programming such as speech/language, physical therapy and hearing have to be done in different locations so there is some duplication of services. There is no ability for collaboration time or sharing of resources with staff being located throughout the District. It is difficult for an administrator to handle five different locations.

It was pointed out that the vast majority of 4K students are being provided opportunities in day care centers where there is no District transportation.

However, if a family requests transportation, they must come to a District site. With the poor economy there have been an increasing number of requests for busing to District sites. The District saved \$120,000 per year on busing when it went from six to four sites. There are now five sites with one added at Montessori but they are now at capacity. Montessori wants to grow but have had to turn students away. As enrollments grow into the secondary schools, Northstar won't be able to house EL and North will follow that trend as well.

President Craig said the District utilized the daycare model when 4K was first established to save on facility costs. Dr. Weissenburger added that when 4K was started, the goal was to have 20%-25% of students in District sites and the rest in daycare sites so that it was community based. Although students were added with both the community partners and District sites, that percentage stayed consistent until this past year when it switched to a 70%/30% breakdown. There is speculation that with the economy some parents may want transportation provided or they have decided not to have their children at the community sites for a full day. Dr. Heilmann said the District remains committed to partnering with community daycare sites.

Com. Johnson said that while acquiring additional space at Epiphany could be a great bargain, the District needs to be fiscally responsible. Two measures would be savings from reduced busing costs and having all special services at one site vs. scattered across the District. The Board asked administration to gather more information on the matter.

There was dialogue about repercussions if the referendum would not pass. Mr. Leibham said that the Demographic Trends Committee felt that students in buildings that are beyond capacity would have to be shifted from overcrowded schools to those with space available. When that is no longer possible, then fifth graders would have to move to middle schools. If no additional space is available, Little Red could be considered but it would take an infusion of money to bring it up to code to have adequate water and sewer. Boundaries would have to be adjusted. Another consideration could be year-round schooling; elementary students would be in session all year. The District would not be able to have SAGE schools or maintain targeted class sizes in three-section schools. With those programs, section schools become a misnomer. Student Transit will give an overview of how student placement software works to study these issues.

Mr. Van De Water said if the Board doesn't want to lose construction time, it should consider requests for proposals for architectural services given that the role of ATSR has been fulfilled. That way if a referendum is successful, the District could begin projects as soon as possible. The Board asked for projected costs for these services and the length of time they would remain valuable.

3. Request for Future Agenda Items
4. Other Business
5. Motion to Adjourn Committee Meeting

Com. Wogahn moved, seconded by Com. Johnson, to adjourn committee meeting. Carried by unanimous voice of acclamation.

6. Meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm.