

20/20 Vision

10/7/09 Committee Meeting Notes



ATTENDEES: Cathy Axcell, Bill Baddour, Tim Barrett, Mark Bregar, Tracy Cox, Nate Cross, Dawn Dawson, Bridget DeMonica, Kathy D’Ettore, Ken Didion, Susan Dodge, Jon Dregalla, Chuck Dubil, Kim Durbin, Jim Eadie, Becky Eberts, Tony Falcone, Lisa Forshey, Patricia Fox, Tim Freeman, Lori Gettings, Pam Griebel, Karen Herzberger, Tony Jones, Dan Kalish, Dan Keenan, Joe Koncelik, Jan Litterst, Andrew Mangels, Kim Mather, Julie McCallister, Michael Medoro, Christina Meecha, Russ Milan, Paul Misterka, Patricia Needham, Loni O’Neill, Mark Pepera, Bob Plantz, Jon Prescott, Dave Puffer, Bob Ramer, Rudy Ringwall, Kelly Roath, Carolyn Rummery, Raj Sandhu, Nancy Schill, Steve Schill, Jen Seighman, Kobe Tabbaa, Andrea Tarolli, Bud Tetzlaff, Kurt Thonnings, John Turk, Melisa Yeoman, Dave Newman

WELCOME/PURPOSE: Perspectives are critical to giving feedback and representing our community and kids. This is month 22 of starting the process of gathering data and engaging stakeholders. The committee began when the Board indicated it needed stakeholder input.

Andrea Rocco, Board President: The board agreed with the 20/20 committee agreed it was important to have educator input as part of this process. We are looking for this expanded group to building on the original committee’s input to advise on one final master plan . Important process to us that this is an issue supported by several different people in our community. Your input is critical to that aspect. What else do we need at this stage? What can we do to get us to the next successful stage? Facilities have always been an issue. Our focus in the beginning was academics. We now have an administration interested in looking at this issue additionally. This is what we need to do next to keep our schools where they need to be.

Superintendent Dr. Daniel J. Keenan Jr.: We have a vision developed from a community group. We have two plans. Our job is to finalize that plan. Once we have the idea of where we need to go as a school district, we have to understand a realistic process to get there. Therefore in addition to determining what needs done we need this committee to advise on the reality of how to get there. Funding, phasing, realistic support. Let’s look at what we need to do to help ensure Westlake continues to be a premier community.

INTRODUCTIONS: Quick introductions.

OVERVIEW OF 20/20 PROCESS TO DATE & PREVIEW OF Binder Materials: We will put together a web site to track our meetings and provide opportunities for you to ask questions and have them answered before the next meeting. We want this to be a continually engaging process to provide you information.

Cathy Axcell, PTA Council President: Original facilities focus group's purpose was to pick information apart and gave a third party objective look at the study provided by a local architect firm. After two and one-half months they reported the following: A real problem exists that needs immediate attention. We know there's an issue, maintain the schools with pride. Include a long-term maintenance plan and have a plan that reflects the community's values.

Four community forums were then held and community members were asked to consider joining a committee to give input. All who expressed interest were included. From their input a 24-member 20/20 committee was developed to look at the data and plans. Group represented public and private school parents, those with no kids in the schools, seniors, business leaders, faculty and students. Debate and discussion to get to where we are today.

During the six meetings we analyzed data, prioritized plans, discussed pros and challenges. Much debate. Everyone on the committee strongly agreed there was a problem that needed to be addressed responsibly and soon. The committee wanted to go forward with recommendations to the board of education. Put together a plan with two options. First option involved 5 buildings grade-level configured. Option 2 kept neighborhood schools. Realized it needed to go to the educators to see what they could lend to the process. Considered how to include for maintenance, including a permanent improvement levy. Recommended going forward with one issue to do it all at once to save money. The only building not recommended for demolition and new construction is LBMS.

Planning and discussions include agendas, meeting notes, past levy history, planning history, information we've gone through as a group to date. See information that came out of each meeting and how we got to this position. Packet also includes a timeline to provide background. We looked at 18 plans with first focus group. Whittled it down to 5 for the 20/20 Vision Committee, which brought it down to the final 2 options.

Our charge is to better define what this will look like.

BUILDING ASSESSMENT & MASTER PLAN OPTIONS: Todd Wroblewski, MKC architects. Bob McAuliffe of Hammond Construction, regional planning consultant, obtained through Ohio Schools Facilities Commission to do initial planning.

Todd: We came up with a third plan in response to things we saw as we walked through the buildings. Master plan is three new PK-4 buildings, renovations and additions to Parkside and LBMS and WHS. Parkside has a large gym, auditorium and planetarium. There is an initiative at the state level to go to smaller class sizes. We also considered the input from the 20/20 committee about a community with a sizable population attending private schools and wondered if we built new buildings would that attract them. This third plan allows for phasing and for expansion if needed. If that expansion is not needed then the plan also works well to support those recommended by the original committee.

Bob: Hammond is a construction management firm. We represent the Ohio schools Facility Commission (OSFC), responsible for statewide application for facilities processes for the Ohio Department of Education. Our charge is to administer adaptations of analyzing what each district has and mapping that

into what they could or should have based on straightforward regulations. Issues are fundamentally how many students you have and how many square feet are allocated to each student.

OSFC does not tell you where to build, how to build, exactly what to build. Districts reach out to OSFC. Assess the district's plans by sending an architectural firm to assess facilities as to what it has and what it will take to make it like new. We look at enrollment projections through a professional demographics firm, DeJong & Healy.

Look at the cost of the work to do and compares it to what's going on in the world, how to make budgets work. Since the first project in 1998, \$1 worth of construction has escalated to \$1.41. OSFC incepts the project you undertake will take 3 years.

Building assessors looked at ever component: HVAC, roofs, venting, etc. The state is funding school construction from the poorest district in Ohio to the richest (real property wealth divided by # of students). Westlake's ranking of 612 districts in the state is in the 95th percentile (95% local share, 5% state share).

Todd: There's been no commitment by the district to use OSFC. That's something this group will discuss. We asked OSFC to get involved because of a lot of free information and to maintain the dsitric's ability to take advantage of any support funding. We're looking at them as a 3rd party benchmarking tool.

Bob: Looking at the cost of renovating the same space. OSFC recommends at the 2/3 point, when cost of renovating hits 2/3 the cost of replacement, you replace the building. If you keep a building over the 2/3, you can't go over 100%. For all Westlake buildings, the building's renovation costs to replacing that same square footage, based on OSFC program, Dover is at 72%, Hilliard 68%, LBMS at 50%, WHS fight at the 2/3 point. OSFC does require a LEED silver certification, including LEED energy and atmosphere in construction and renovations.

Todd: OSFC projections do not include costs of additional space to accommodate needs of that building. The data clearly shows that these buildings are well under capacity by OSFC standards. MKC assessed all buildings, comparing renovation to new construction costs. Just under \$94 million in renovation costs to just bring the buildings up to where they need to be per OSFC standards.

[Requested information: renovation v. new building costs for each school; table for renovated square footage costs v. new building costs.]

Todd: Costs do not include LFI's (locally funded initiatives). Costs for renovation and new construction are straight out of the box OSFC costs. Does not include any additional footage driven by curriculum or other needs.

Bob: These are all-in costs, pays for architect, testing services, surveys, soil borings, building permits, builders risk insurance, everything it takes to do the whole project. Not exactly corollary to construction costs. It does include all new furnishings and walk in. District provides computers. Includes new desks, new equipment in cafeteria, interior wiring, networking, buildings (projectors, drop screens).

PROCESS GOING FORWARD:

Steve Miller, Educational planner with MKC. District administration participation will be limited, mainly to help answer questions. They want this group to weigh the issues and come up with solutions. We have 2 master plans. Consensus will be reached through communication. We ask you to take everything into consideration. Apply your logic to these plans and help us develop this plan.

20/20 group felt input of educators in the buildings was key. We went to all buildings and asked the staff about the two master plans. Feedback showed more support for Option 2, neighborhood configuration. Potential size of buildings appeared to be a concern in Option 1. Number of transitions students would have to make in Option 1 was also a concern. However, it was understood that both could be effective, more information would be needed for strong support for number 1. Worked with administrative team and asked about program spaces and what was needed to deliver the curriculum.

Dates and topics. By Dec. 2 we intend to ensure you'll have enough information to help us reach consensus on what the community will support. Tonight you saw some information on the scope and budget of master plans. Next meeting, Oct. 21, we want to talk about educational considerations and operational considerations (transportation), site considerations. Nov. 4 looking at LFIs (things the OSFC does not co-fund) and identify what the district needs and what the community needs. Nov. 18 talking about funding options and hone down to which master plan. Dec. 2 is the critical time.

Questions:

- Have the educators seen Option 3?
- Talk about funding earlier
- Will there be a permanent improvement levy or dedicated funding source to maintain new buildings?

BREAK-OUT SESSION: Individually filled out reactions to scope and budget, educational considerations, operating issues, site considerations, co-curricular considerations and funding options. Attendees were also asked what other information they need to select a master plan.

Groups conversations about break-out questions.

THANK YOU & MEETING CONCLUSION: There is a lot to talk about. Different groups of people with base knowledge. We've had 23 communications to our community, through news items or newsletters. A lot of the focus is going to be on funding. We have to develop that vision and plan and how to make it real. The plan is where we need to go. We have 3 plans the 20/20 group has worked on. There are meeting notes. We will probably post things online in between meetings, but if you want something in hard copy, let us know what you need and we'll work to get it to you. The idea of the web site is when you are talking to someone in the community, the information is there. Lesko and OSFC reports are available online to reference from summary report. We need a closer to our process. The Board knows it needs to move and they want to put something on the ballot in the spring.

Next meeting is **Oct. 21 at WHS**. Tour at 6:15pm, meeting at 7pm.

