

Whitefish Bay Schools  
1200 East Fairmount Avenue  
Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin 53217

**Report from the  
District Facilities Study Committee  
February 2008**

**The Whitefish Bay School District**



**An Exceptional Place To Learn**

## **Executive Summary**

The Whitefish Bay School Board in September of 2006 approved a charge to guide the formation and work of a school district facilities study committee. The charge outlined three general areas of study:

- Review of school district and community needs for curricular, athletic and recreational indoor facilities in light of current and future needs.
- Develop a comprehensive plan based on any identified needs for remodeling, repurposing and adding to facilities on school district campuses.
- Consider implications of facilities use by other community agencies, organizations and groups.

The charge also established a 15 year planning horizon that excluded the option of replacing an existing school facility.

The school district will retire its current long term debt after 2011. Therefore, some new long term debt related to facilities maintenance and enhancement is possible without increasing annual long term debt payments and limiting the impact on local property taxes.

The District Facilities Study Committee began meeting in March 2007 and completed its work in January 2008. Among the major tasks undertaken by the committee were: a comprehensive review of the infrastructure and operating systems of all school district facilities, review of current and emerging needs and challenges related to school facilities and development of proposed options for addressing maintenance and program and service related needs.

The committee considered a variety of information beyond analyses of current facilities, including emerging trends in education, input from staff and students and general information regarding current and evolving characteristics of the school district and Village of Whitefish Bay. Information provided to the committee served as a basis for analyzing options and prioritizing proposals to address identified facility related needs.

The committee found that despite the district's rigorous efforts to maintain its legacy facilities using limited budgetary resources, school buildings over time have experienced infrastructure deterioration that could threaten their long term viability. In addition, certain facilities within these buildings were designed to meet student needs 70 or more years ago and are, in some cases, inadequate, outdated and overwhelmed. The areas identified should be remodeled or replaced in order to allow the district to continue to compete with other southeastern Wisconsin school districts that often enjoy newer, more comprehensive facilities and who compete with Whitefish Bay for students.

The expense of needed improvements noted by the committee will inevitably fall to local property taxpayers - now or later. However, it is the committee's opinion that district homeowners who are asked to approve a plan at referendum will understand that protecting and improving the bricks and mortar of a district known for its educational excellence could be essential to future preservation of area property values.

The District Facilities Study Committee is presenting three recommendations for School Board consideration:

- 1) Adopt the Stewardship Option that addresses measures to improve the safety and security of school buildings, general building infrastructure needs and immediate technology infrastructure.
- 2) Seriously consider adopting the Educational Improvement Option that includes projects to improve the ability of school facilities to meet current service, program and curricular needs.
- 3) Review the Master Plan Option that includes longer term, lower priority projects and items that address future school district needs.

## **Introduction**

In the early years of the Whitefish Bay School District village residents understood the importance of investing in quality facilities to house educational programs and activities and serve the youth of the community. As a result, they funded the construction of four well built schools that have served the community and its students for more than half a century. Over the years the facilities have expanded and in the 1950s another school, Lydell, was added.

Despite their use by tens of thousands of students, the schools have stood the test of time. Good maintenance and occasional remodeling and updating have enabled these community treasures to provide a safe, healthy environment for learning and recreation.

However, the care and attention given to our facilities in the past must continue to assure their service into the future. While the school facilities of Whitefish Bay are still sound, there has not been a comprehensive review of their condition or an evaluation of current and future facility needs for more than 15 years. Yet, the growing pressure of technology, changing curriculum needs and other shifts in facility use signal the need for a thoughtful and thorough review.

Meanwhile, the current long term debt born by the school district will be retired in the next few years. Consequently, there exists an opportunity to address some high priority, long term facility related needs while limiting the impact on the local property tax levy. However, the school district must gain authority from the community through a referendum to incur any new long term debt. Assuredly, voters would want to know that careful study and thoughtful planning has been done before any such request to incur new debt is presented.

Four years ago a committee comprised of staff and community members reviewed external facility and land use issues and needs faced by the school district. The work of the committee led to the redevelopment of the athletic stadium on the high school site. Through the financial support of many alumni, community members and supporters of the school district and local youth programs, this project was successfully completed. Additionally, the recommendations of the Land Use Study Committee resulted in a multi year lease of the Armory property by the village to the school district for educational, recreational and athletic uses. This space, too, has been developed into a flexible outdoor facility, again with the support of private funding. These projects have provided important relief to green space pressure throughout the village and allowed high school athletic teams to return to school district facilities for practice and competition. Partnerships also allow Dominican High School access to the stadium as a "home" field for football and provide a quality outdoor facility for youth soccer and football programs.

Improvements in external facilities have drawn even more attention to the need to review and address the challenges faced by school district facilities that support core academic programs as well as indoor educational, recreational and athletic activities.

The School Board, mindful of this history and its responsibility, in 2006 decided to form a study committee to review the current status of school district facilities and identify high priority, long term facility related issues and projects that should be considered. This report presents a summary of the committee's work, findings and recommendations.

## **Charge to the Committee**

The School Board in September 2006 approved a charge for a soon to be formed School District Facilities Study Committee. (See Appendix 1) The charge outlined three general areas of study:

- Review of school district and community needs for curricular, athletic and recreational indoor facilities in light of current and future needs.
- Develop a comprehensive plan based on any identified needs for remodeling, repurposing and adding to facilities on school district campuses.
- Consider implications of facilities use by other community agencies, organizations and groups.

Further, the committee was charged with using a planning horizon of the year 2021. This roughly 15 year span from the formation of the committee was intended to encompass immediate, near term and mid range facility issues and needs. It further recognized the difficulty of predicting long term educational trends, needs and events that might impact facility uses and needs farther into the future.

The committee charge also included a parameter that all current facilities be maintained. However, remodeling and additions to facilities could be considered if study and analysis supported such projects.

The charge limited the financial implications of the core committee recommendation to not significantly exceed current long term debt annual payments by the school district. This aspect of the charge recognized the upcoming retirement of long term debt and the opportunity to incur a limited amount of new debt without significantly increasing local property taxes. Yet, the charge did not limit the committee from bringing to the attention of the School Board additional needs and potential projects that would enhance the ability of school district facilities to serve important educational, recreational and other community needs.

The School Board empowered the committee with a budget to engage outside expertise, including architectural and other facility evaluation and planning services. This aspect of the charge was intended to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the committee's work without replacing the judgment and insight of committee members.

The committee also was charged to complete its work by January 2008. The timeline, while short, was intended to provide appropriate urgency to the work and allow the School Board ample time to study the findings of the committee and decide the best course of action in response.

Subsequent to adoption of the charge, the School Board, in February 2007, asked the Facility Study Committee to consider safety and security issues and to recommend steps to improve these aspects of school distinct facilities. While this dimension of the study was intended in the original charge, the School Board direction made safety and security an explicit aspect of the facilities study.

## **Committee Make-Up**

The School Board directed that membership of the School District Facilities Study Committee be balanced with community and staff representatives. The original committee membership was intended not to exceed 15. However, the task of finding reasonable representation and balance resulted in a final committee membership of 22.

Two School Board members served on the committee. Parents and community members representing each level of education, a variety of programs and activities and parent support groups were included in committee membership. Teaching staff, principal representatives and several administrative and support staff with facility related responsibilities also served on the committee. Committee membership further included representatives of the School District Curriculum Evaluation Committee. (See Appendix 2)

The committee was co-chaired by Sandy Murphy, parent and member of the Whitefish Bay Public Education Foundation, and Tom Scrivner, parent of former students and past member of the School Board. The District Administrator, Jim Rickabaugh, served as an Ad Hoc member of the committee.

The committee met 19 times between March 2007 and January 2008. Meetings typically were held twice monthly on Monday evenings.

## **Study Process**

At the first meeting of the District Facilities Study Committee members were provided with a variety of materials containing background information intended to assist in the study process. Among the background materials provided were:

- A summary of the School District Focus Plan
- Enrollment projections for the near and intermediate term indicating stable or a potentially slight decline in enrollment in the next five to seven years
- A description of the organizational structure of the school district
- A summary of the general financial condition of the school district, including school district indebtedness
- An overview of the educational program offered by the school district
- A profile of the economic condition of the community
- An overview of the demographics of the community
- A collection of articles on facility planning and recent trends

Early in its work the District Facilities Study Committee decided to engage the services of Bray Associates Architects, Inc. to assist in evaluating the status and maintenance needs of current district facilities and assist in the design development and evaluation of any potential remodeling, additions and other facility related projects identified as a result of facility analyses. In response, representatives of Bray Architects participated in all subsequent committee meetings, conducted thorough structural and operational evaluations of each school district facility and provided written and photographic reports to communicate their findings. Bray Architects also developed design options in response to committee identified facility needs and

enhancements. As committee discussions progressed, designs were modified and clarified to reflect growing areas of consensus.

In association with evaluations of current facilities, the District Facilities Committee toured each school to see firsthand the condition of the schools, observe limiting aspects in need of attention and explore options for enhancing facilities in response to identified needs. Each tour was followed by a committee discussion to share observations, consider options in response to facility needs and generate ideas to enhance the functioning and usefulness of the buildings. These tours provided an important shared understanding for committee dialogue, analysis and, eventually, prioritization of facility related projects and options.

During late May and early June the staff at each school was surveyed regarding building needs and areas in which enhancement would be particularly important. In addition, voluntary focus groups were held at each school for staff to provide direct input regarding facility related deficits and offer ideas for the Facilities Study Committee to consider. The results of the survey and focus groups were compiled and shared with the committee. The information also was used to guide attention and verify results of the technical analysis of building facilities. (Copies of completed survey forms and notes from staff meetings are available in the office of the District Administrator.)

Students at Whitefish Bay High School who were members of the National Honor Society were invited to participate in a focus group near the end of the 2006-07 school year. Student input also was used to inform the committee and support its work.

A number of priority issues were identified by staff and students. More flexible space to accommodate large groups of students to supplement undersized cafeterias at the elementary level surfaced as a priority. Improved performing arts space at the high school was noted as a crucial need. Increased access to a wide variety of technology surfaced as an issue at all levels. The need for more electrical outlets in classrooms was noted in every level and school. An increased need for science classroom/laboratory space related to increasing science enrollment was documented. Further, the need for air conditioned buildings was voiced widely. However, the timing of the survey and focus groups late in the school year when temperatures were high may have had an impact on the urgency of this need.

A significant portion of one early committee meeting was devoted to emerging trends that might impact facility planning. Representatives of Bray Architects reported from their experience and research. In addition, members of the committee offered observations and insights. Among the most significant trends noted in the discussion was an increased emphasis on environmentally responsible buildings. Strategies such as energy efficiency and building materials that are friendly to the environment were noted. Recent energy saving efforts by the school district were noted as already realized progress in the direction of reducing energy usage by district facilities.

Curricular related trends also were discussed. Among the items noted were increased emphasis on health and exercise, growth in special education services, increased flexibility in grouping of students for instruction, and the need for greater integration of technology into all curricular areas.

Another recent highlighted trend was the creation of smaller learning environments, especially at the secondary school level. The purpose of this effort is to create a more personal learning environment for students. However, the trend is most prominent in schools significantly larger than found in Whitefish Bay.

Among other trends noted were greater availability and integration of technology with the instructional program, sound enhancement systems in classrooms and enhanced classroom lighting. It was noted that some of the trends, especially those related to building configuration, operating systems and materials, might have a lesser impact on the work of the committee since they tend to be more pronounced in new construction and can be prohibitively expensive in projects that primarily involve remodeling.

During the next phase of the committee's work attention was given to the emerging picture of maintenance and infrastructure needs among the buildings. The analyses of the schools show that they have been well maintained and are in excellent condition despite their ages. In fact, a conclusion of the facilities review was that the four oldest buildings, with proper attention, can provide service to the community for many decades to come. However, the middle school will need to be replaced well before the elementary schools and high school.

A number of important maintenance and infrastructure needs were identified as requiring attention to assure the health and usefulness of the schools into the future. A more detailed discussion of these needs will be provided later in this report.

Questions regarding the status of Lydell School surfaced repeatedly during the committee's work. Despite the fact that Lydell was built in the 1950s, well after the other four facilities were constructed, it presents a number of maintenance and remodeling needs to be addressed if it is to serve well into the future. Additionally, Lydell School does not have as clear an educational mission as the other four facilities. Consequently, the committee struggled with how to prioritize its needs and plan for its long term functioning.

This dilemma was presented to the School Board in October 2007 for guidance to the committee. After consideration, the School Board directed the committee to give attention to infrastructure needs that would preserve the integrity of the building envelope, but not attempt to identify and prioritize further building needs at this time. Nevertheless, the School Board left open the possibility that subsequent to the completion of the study and at a point when the future mission of the facility becomes clearer, this issue might be revisited. In response to the direction of the School Board, the committee included Lydell School in basic maintenance and infrastructure projects, but refrained from considering further steps to improve the facility.

The next phase of the committee's work focused on the needs of and strategies to enhance the facilities in response to current and future needs. The status of each school was considered in light of current service, program and curricular needs and the ability of the facility to respond effectively. Similar attention was given in light of future service, program and curricular needs. Information from staff and students, insights from committee members and guidance from educational trends were reviewed to identify aspects of facilities that should be given priority

attention. Initial design concepts were identified and sketches were developed by Bray Architects to capture the issues and address the needs as identified. Subsequently, the committee engaged in a cycle of review, discussion and design modification to clarify needs and refine design responses. As the options became increasingly clear, cost estimates were developed and refined.

In the final stage of the committee's work maintenance and infrastructure needs, needed building enhancements and long range master planning elements were grouped, studied and prioritized to respond to the School Board's charge to the committee. Efforts also were made to identify issues and needs beyond the charge that are worthy of careful consideration by the School Board. This final cycle of review resulted in the structure of a set of recommendations to the School Board. These recommendations are detailed later in this report.

## **Review of Current Facilities**

As noted in the previous section, one of the first tasks of the District Facilities Study Committee was to review the status of current school district facilities. To accomplish this task Bray Architects conducted a comprehensive analysis of each building, including:

- ❖ Architectural review of building infrastructure
- ❖ Plumbing systems
- ❖ HVAC systems
- ❖ Electrical systems
- ❖ Building envelope (roofing and walls)

A list of identified issues and needs for each building were compiled in reports to the committee. The committee reviewed each analysis in detail with the architects to gain a thorough understanding of the condition of each facility and identify projects to be considered as priorities.

In general, the architects reported that the schools are in remarkably good condition in light of their ages. They complimented the school district on the care and attention the buildings have received over the years. Nevertheless, as with any older structures, a number of systems and building components will require attention to protect their integrity and continue their usefulness.

The architects identified several issues common to all or almost all of the schools. The issues fall into three general categories: 1) building maintenance issues, 2) American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and 3) building code issues, and educational and general building upgrades. (See Appendix 3) Following are some of the most common items found in these categories:

### Maintenance Issues

- Abatement of asbestos floor tile
- Carpet replacement
- Ceiling and lighting replacement
- Plumbing pipe replacement

- Need for more electrical outlets
- Roofing replacement
- Tuck pointing of exterior walls

#### ADA and Building Code

- Upgrade fire alarm systems
- Provide secure interior area of rescue
- Replace noncompliant door hardware
- Upgrade some plumbing fixtures to ADA standards
- Provide proper ADA clearance for some doors

#### Educational and General Building Upgrades

- Remodel entrances to increase security
- Increase access to technology within classrooms
- Replace chalkboards with marker boards

Additionally, a number of issues were identified specific to one or two schools. Examples of recommended improvements include:

#### Cumberland and Richards Schools

- Provide additional large group space for cafeteria and other large group activities
- Relocate health/nurses room closer to the administrative offices
- Improve and expand library/instructional media center support spaces
- Increase special education instruction space
- Provide space for small group instruction and small conferences
- Provide ADA compliant ramp and power assist doors at the main entrances and ramps to playground

#### Whitefish Bay Middle School

- Reconfigure the old gym for fitness or additional classroom space
- Provide additional space for kitchen and cafeteria
- Relocate health/nurses room nearer to administrative offices
- Improve acoustical separation for music spaces

#### Whitefish Bay High School

- Increase science department laboratory space
- Improve music wing facilities, including acoustical separation
- Provide ADA compliant access to some inaccessible areas of the building (e.g., third floor study hall)
- CD classroom space

See Appendix 3 for more detail regarding the analysis of the condition and needs of each school.

Please note that the analysis of the high school swimming pool structure and operational systems is not included in this report due to its unavailability in time for our committee's

consideration prior to our submission date. Analysis of the high school swimming pool structure and operational systems will be brought independently to the School Board at a later date.

## **Identification of Priority Projects**

The committee utilized the information collected from staff and students, the results of the facility analyses and information on educational trends to develop an array of potential maintenance and remodeling projects for further consideration. A number of the ideas were discussed, evaluated and abandoned as either cost prohibitive or not representing a priority need within the planning time frame outlined in the committee's charge. Other projects were reduced, refined and included in a comprehensive list of projects to be considered by the School Board. Some of the items addressed needs that are of importance and urgency sufficient to be addressed immediately. Other projects might be postponed for attention later as resources become available or the passage of time increases their urgency.

The general framework used to make these decisions included consideration of current and future service, program and curricular needs. Those items that address the most important current needs were given higher priority than projects that will be important to address future needs.

The project list was further organized to cluster infrastructure needs, such as building maintenance, code compliance and current technology needs and group building improvement projects that would respond to identified needs.

Next the committee prioritized each project into three groups:

- 1) The Stewardship Option that addresses measures to improve the safety and security of buildings, general building infrastructure needs and immediate technology infrastructure;
- 2) The Educational Improvement Option that includes projects to improve the ability of school buildings to meet current service, program and curricular needs;
- 3) The Master Plan Option that includes longer term, lower priority projects and items that address future needs.

The committee further prioritized the three groupings of projects. The Stewardship Option was assigned highest priority as it addresses the task of protecting the viability and usability of the buildings, improves the safety and security of the environment, including code related changes, and addresses access to key technology resources. (See accompanying report from Bray Architects) Following are examples of projects in the Stewardship Option:

- Security improvements through office and lobby remodeling
- Fire alarm upgrades and replacement
- Screen, projectors and wiring for technology, including Smart boards
- Lighting upgrades
- Chalkboard replacement with whiteboards

- Carpet replacement
- Toilet and locker room remodeling
- Roof replacement
- HVAC system repair and replacement
- Galvanized plumbing pipe replacement
- Clock system replacement

The total project cost for the Stewardship Option is \$14,100,000.

The second highest priority was assigned to the Educational Improvement Option. This option addresses current service, program and curricular needs. (See accompanying report form Bray Architects) Examples of projects included in the improvement option are:

- Addition of cafeteria/multi purpose rooms to Cumberland and Richards schools
- Remodeling of vacated space at Richards and Cumberland schools to increase special education, art and general music classrooms
- Relocate the health and guidance office at Richards and Cumberland schools to adjoin the administrative offices
- Replace the floor in the middle school west gym to increase safety and usability
- Construct a fitness center adjacent to the current west gym at the middle school
- Relocate the middle school orchestra room to larger, more appropriate space
- Add a music wing at the high school
- Remodel vacated space at the high school to accommodate science laboratories and create a special education classroom

The additional cost of the Educational Improvement Option is \$13,600,000 beyond the Stewardship Option.

The Master Plan, as noted earlier, includes other projects deserving attention, but represent lower priority projects within the planning time frame available to the committee. (See Appendix 5) Examples of projects included in the Master Plan Option include:

- Addition of new library/media centers above the cafeteria/multi purpose rooms at Cumberland and Richards schools
- Remodeling of current library/media centers at Richards and Cumberland schools to accommodate art, special ed and fourth and fifth grade classrooms
- Reconstruction of the old gym at the middle school to accommodate music classrooms
- Construction of a new gym on the west side of the middle school
- Reconstruction and expansion of the cafeteria and kitchen at the middle school
- Replacement of bleachers in the high school fieldhouse
- Construction of additional performing arts support spaces on the north side of the high school auditorium.

The additional cost of the Master Plan Option is \$12,800,000 beyond the Stewardship and Educational Improvement options.

## **Recommendations**

The charge to the District Facilities Study Committee directs that the core recommendation of the committee not significantly exceed the school district's current annual long term debt payment. Calculations indicate that the school district could incur approximately \$14.1 million in new long term debt and still meet the committee's charge.

Consequently, the first recommendation of the District Facility Study Committee is that the School Board adopt the Stewardship Option outlined above and seek authority from the community to incur debt to fund the projects contained in this option. Implementation of the Stewardship Option would ensure that current district facilities are well maintained and provide useful service well into the future. In addition, this option would support remodeling of district schools to increase safety and security of students, staff and others. Further, the Stewardship Option supports greater access to technology infrastructure and in turn better integration of technology with the instructional program.

The second recommendation of the District Facilities Study Committee is that the board give serious consideration to the adoption of projects contained in the Educational Improvement Option. These projects respond to current service, program and curricular needs. While school facilities have been well maintained, they were not constructed to accommodate the needs of a 21<sup>st</sup> century curriculum and the programs and services that are an integral part of co-curricular and community activities in today's schools. Implementation of the Educational Improvement Option would also increase the ability of the Whitefish Bay Schools to compete with other Southeastern Wisconsin school districts that often enjoy newer more comprehensive facilities and who compete with Whitefish Bay for students.

The third committee recommendation is that the board review the items included in the Master Plan Option for future funding as resources are available and the urgency of the needs they address become greater.

## **Additional Considerations**

Throughout its work the committee was mindful of the context within which the facilities study was conducted. Whitefish Bay is fortunate to have facilities whose original construction was of quality. The schools clearly were built to last. Yet, with the passage of time even the best constructed facilities require attention and updating. The fact that our school buildings need an investment in maintenance and remodeling is a reflection of the passage of time and evolving needs. Just as most homes in the Village of Whitefish Bay are tended to, an investment in maintenance and updating is a responsible action.

The committee also was mindful of the aesthetics of the schools in Whitefish Bay. The remodeling projects and additions discussed in this report were done with an eye to preserving current aesthetics while preserving and enhancing usability. Obviously, the design and construction of building additions need to consider complementary materials and architectural lines. In some cases, these considerations may marginally increase costs. However, the committee is convinced that the long term benefit of maintaining the aesthetic integrity of the school buildings is worthwhile.

Further, the committee recognized the competitive nature of school enrollment today. In communities that are fully developed such as Whitefish Bay, the ability to attract students and families of the community is an important aspect of maintaining financial stability. A healthy student enrollment also can protect a full range of educational options and opportunities for students. In addition to the importance of well maintained facilities to attract and retain students, carefully selected and planned facility improvements can accommodate the special educational and co-curricular interests of students and support a learning environment that is attractive and well equipped.

The committee recognized the role school facilities play in the broader life of the community. Community residents rely on the schools as gathering places for social activities, recreation and continued learning. The recommendations presented by the District Facilities Study Committee are intended to maintain and expand opportunities for community members to access school facilities and enjoy the recreational and education opportunities the schools can provide.

### **Final Comments and Conclusion**

Members of the District Facilities Study Committee wish to thank the School Board for the opportunity to engage in the important work of studying and planning for the future of school facilities. Members were reminded of the foresight and determination of the community by the historic school photographs on display in the committee's meeting room. Indeed, without past community support for facility improvements, there would be no gymnasiums at the grade schools, no full size auditorium or fieldhouse and new pool at the high school, and no middle school at all.

The committee considers it a privilege, after months of due diligence, to present to the board a vision of improvements needed for the future, knowing that an investment in the maintenance and enhancement of treasured school facilities is a responsible act if done carefully and thoughtfully. The committee wishes the School Board and community well in their important deliberations.

Respectfully submitted,  
District Facilities Study Committee

**To:** Board of Education  
**From:** Jim Rickabaugh  
District Administrator  
**Re:** Development of and Charge for a Facilities Planning Committee  
**Date:** September 20, 2006

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Recommendation:** That the School Board approve the formation of a committee and development of a facilities needs study and plan to serve the school district through 2021.

**Background:** The School Board requested in the summer of 2006 that the administration develop a proposed charge, parameters and timeline for the work of a facilities planning committee. The formation of a facilities planning committee at this time is driven by a need to review, update and potentially expand existing facilities to accommodate curricular, athletic and recreational programs and services to meet current and future needs.

Current district facilities were constructed between the 1920s and 1950s. Some additions have been completed over the years. Most recently, in the mid 1990s Henry Clay School was converted to a middle school. Also, in the early 1990s general aesthetic improvements were made to several district facilities. However, comprehensive school district facility planning has not been done in more than 15 years.

Meanwhile, the school district's long term debt will be completely retired over the next few years. Consequently, the school district has an opportunity to address some long term capital facility needs by incurring new long term debt without necessarily increasing the long term debt related property tax levy. However, authority to incur long term debt requires voter permission through a referendum. Certainly, voters will want to see a well developed long range plan before granting authority to incur additional long term debt.

The formation of a facilities study committee represents a first step in the process of determining the extent and nature of facility needs. Fortunately, adequate time exists to conduct such a study and present facility needs and plans to local taxpayers before the current debt and property tax levy expires.

**Proposed Charge to the Committee:** The administration recommends the following charge be given to the Facilities Planning Committee:

- Review school district and community needs for curricular, athletic and recreational indoor facilities in light of current and future needs.
- Develop a comprehensive plan based on any identified needs for remodeling, repurposing and adding to facilities on school district campuses.

- Consider implications of facility use by other community agencies, organizations and groups.

**Work of the Committee:** The administration offers the following as representative tasks for the Facilities Planning Committee:

- Review student enrollment trends and projections for the next 15 years.
- Review current uses of school district facilities and consider trends and forces that may change the way facilities are used in the future.
- Review the impact of technology on the future of educational facilities.
- Review current research and thinking about the construction, remodeling and repurposing of educational facilities.
- Evaluate the current condition of school district facilities in light of current educational, athletic and recreational uses and future trends.
- Review uses of school district facilities by community agencies, organizations and groups.
- Consider educational, athletic and recreational activities that currently cannot be accommodated by existing school district facilities.
- Review current debt service schedule and financial limitations.

**Proposed Parameters and Operating Assumptions:** The administration recommends the following parameters and operating assumptions to guide the work of the Facilities Planning Committee:

- No existing school district facility will be replaced before 2021.
- Facilities might be added to and/or remodeled, but current core facilities will be maintained.
- Any resulting financial implications from the facilities plan will not significantly exceed current long term debt annual payments.

**Proposed Committee Composition:** The administration recommends that the Facilities Planning Committee be comprised of between 12 and 15 community members, parents, activity support group representatives and staff. The School Board might choose to appoint the Chair or Co-chairs of this committee. Among the individuals and groups represented on the committee could be:

- Two School Board representatives
- Fine arts support groups
- Athletic support groups (Duke Pride)
- Community leaders
- Parent support groups, including elementary and middle school PTO's and the High School Parent Advisory Committee
- Shawn Yde
- Gary Siegman
- John Gustavson
- Tony Frontier/representatives of the Curriculum Evaluation Committee
- Representatives of building principals

➤ Teaching staff

**Outside Expertise:** The administration recommends that the Facilities Planning Committee be allocated a reasonable budget to gain access to the services of appropriate outside expertise, including architectural and other facility evaluation and planning professionals.

**Timeline:** The administration recommends that the Facilities Planning Committee be charged with providing a report of its findings and a presentation to the School Board no later than January 1, 2008.

## District Facilities Study Committee Membership

<u>CATEGORY FOR MEMBERSHIP</u>	<u>NOMINEE</u>
Co Chairs:	Sandy Murphy & Tom Scrivner
School Board (2):	David Kern Nancy LeGrand
Fine Arts Support Group:	Doug Armstrong (HS Music Parents)
Athletic Support Group:	Harry Mouloupoulos (Soccer/Basketball)
Parent Support Group:	Carlynn Alt (Exceptional Ed Parent) Katie Commer (Cumberland PTO) Ed Corrigan (Richards PTO)
Representative from Curriculum Eval Comm:	Sara Alter (RI teacher) Ron Kuramoto (parent)
Principal Representatives:	Lisa Gies Jayne Heffron Bill Henkle Mark Tenorio
Teaching Staff:	Bob Bruch (HS) Brad Hampel (MS) Nathan Joynt (CU)
District Representatives:	Tony Frontier John Gustavson Gary Siegman Shawn Yde
Ad Hoc	Jim Rickabaugh

JRR:eao  
1/24/07

# Appendix 3

CUMBERLAND AND RICHARDS SCHOOLS  
 WHITEFISH BAY SCHOOLS  
 Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin  
 (Bray Project No. 2856)

April 16, 2007

## CUMBERLAND AND RICHARDS SCHOOLS

Possible Maintenance Upgrades	Code	Building Upgrades	Educational
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Abatement of limited asbestos floor tile and maintenance remaining</li> <li>▫ Replace carpeting (mainly second floor) that is bubbling -- could require abatement of asbestos tile and mastic below</li> <li>▫ Replacement of non-compliant ceiling in select toilet rooms</li> <li>▫ Replace door hardware at gymnasium exit doors</li> <li>▫ Replace glass in rated doors</li> <li>▫ Provide either locking front covers or panel fillers on existing electrical panels</li> </ul>	<p><u>ADA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Provide proper ADA clearances at corridor doors</li> <li>▫ Fire alarm system</li> <li>▫ Provide area of rescue assistance in stairs</li> <li>▫ Provide ramp to stage</li> <li>▫ Continue replacement of non-compliant door hardware</li> <li>▫ Upgrade present plumbing fixtures to comply ADA ordinances</li> </ul> <p><u>Building Code</u>  <small>(only if major renovation projects are pursued)</small></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Open stairway (Richards)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Reconfigure office and/or vestibules to provide secure entrance</li> <li>▫ Abatement of asbestos floor tile and mastic at select locations</li> <li>▫ Additional electrical outlets in classrooms</li> <li>▫ Replace chalkboards with markerboards</li> <li>▫ Upgrade finishes and correct code issues in existing toilet rooms</li> <li>▫ Replace lockers -- they appear dated and possibly difficult to maintain</li> <li>▫ Provide code compliant storage for gas powered equipment</li> <li>▫ Replace fire alarm system</li> <li>▫ Provide ADA compliant ramp and power assist doors at main entrance and possibly provide ramp to playground</li> <li>▫ Improvement of toilet room finishes including correction of code issues</li> <li>▫ Upgrade plumbing fixtures to comply with current water conservation standards</li> <li>▫ Upgrade domestic hot water system to provide increased capacity and greater efficiency</li> <li>▫ If major upgrades are undertaken, replace existing pneumatic HVAC controls with digital</li> <li>▫ Cumberland -- remove medium voltage transformer for the vault area and replace on exterior</li> <li>▫ Replace pendant fixtures in classrooms with dual level switched 2'x4' fixtures</li> <li>▫ Replace exterior wall pak lighting with cut-off metal halide for reduced glare and improved efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Provide health/nurses room that is within the office area</li> <li>▫ Provide additional small group instruction and/or conference spaces</li> <li>▫ Does not have a receiving room</li> <li>▫ Special education classrooms</li> <li>▫ Library/IMC support spaces</li> <li>▫ Provide additional space for cafeteria</li> <li>▫ Increase accessibility of technology within classrooms</li> </ul>

WHITEFISH BAY MIDDLE SCHOOL  
 WHITEFISH BAY SCHOOLS  
 Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin  
 (Bray Project No. 2856)

April 30, 2007

WHITEFISH BAY MIDDLE SCHOOL

Possible Maintenance Upgrades	Code	Building Upgrades	Educational
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Remove and cap floor drain under recessed mat at northeast vestibule</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> </ul>	<p><b>ADA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Provide proper ADA clearances at some doors</li> <li>◦ Continue fire alarm system upgrade to provide additional horns and strobes</li> <li>◦ Provide area of rescue assistance in stairs</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦ Continue replacement of non-compliant door hardware</li> <li>◦ Upgrade present plumbing fixtures to ADA (where necessary)</li> </ul> <p><b>Building Code</b>  <small>(only if major renovation projects are pursued)</small></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Open stairways</li> <li>◦ Raise televisions to achieve 6'-8" minimum head height</li> <li>◦ Replace and re-size grease trap to include dishwasher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Reconfigure office and/or vestibules to provide secure entrance</li> <li>◦ Abatement of asbestos floor tile and mastic at select locations</li> <li>◦ Additional electrical outlets in classrooms</li> <li>◦ Replace chalkboards with markerboards</li> <li>◦ Correct code issues in existing toilet rooms. In general finishes are in good condition</li> <li>◦ Add acoustical wall panels to all practice rooms</li> <li>◦ Add sound seals and drop bottoms to band, chorus and orchestra doors to increase acoustical separation</li> <li>◦ Playground is in need of resurfacing or replacement</li> <li>◦ Building lacks outdoor storage</li> <li>◦ Replace art room sinks with new sinks and solids traps</li> <li>◦ Upgrade plumbing fixtures to comply with current water conservation standards (on a room-by-room basis)</li> <li>◦ Upgrade domestic hot water system to provide increased capacity and greater efficiency</li> <li>◦ Install fully recessed drinking fountains in the gym</li> <li>◦ Continue to expand the existing energy management system. All future projections should include DDC control for the eventual elimination of the pneumatic systems</li> <li>◦ Replace the 1966 two pipe HVAC system with newer systems that allow heating and cooling at the same time</li> <li>◦ Replace both gymnasium light fixtures with fluorescents</li> <li>◦ Replace exit lights to provide proper illuminated faces</li> <li>◦ If lighting upgrades are considered, add motion sensors and dual-level switching in classrooms</li> <li>◦ Add magnetic hold opens to stair doors</li> <li>◦ Continue fire alarm system upgrade to provide additional horns and strobes</li> <li>◦ Provide new GPS type clock system as existing system fails</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Provide health/nurses room that is within the office area</li> <li>◦ Provide additional small group instruction and/or conference spaces</li> <li>◦ Does not have a receiving room</li> <li>◦ Relocated CD and OT/PF to first floor</li> <li>◦ Provide additional space for kitchen and cafeteria</li> <li>◦ Additional sinks and storage for art classrooms</li> <li>◦ Take better advantage of old gym for physical fitness, additional classroom space, etc.</li> <li>◦ Lacks large group gathering space</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> <li>◦</li> </ul>

WHITEFISH BAY HIGH SCHOOL  
 WHITEFISH BAY SCHOOLS  
 Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin  
 (Bray Project No. 2856)

May 14, 2007

WHITEFISH BAY HIGH SCHOOL

Possible Maintenance Upgrades	Code	Building Upgrades	Educational
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◻</li> <li>◻</li> <li>◻</li> <li>◻</li> <li>◻</li> </ul>	<p><b>ADA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◻ Provide proper ADA clearances at some doors</li> <li>◻ Provide area of rescue assistance in stairs</li> <li>◻ Continue replacement of non-compliant door hardware</li> <li>◻ Upgrade present plumbing fixtures to ADA (where necessary)</li> <li>◻ Provide compliant access to currently inaccessible areas of the building (e.g. 3rd floor study hall)</li> </ul> <p><b>Building Code</b>                      (only if major renovation projects are pursued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◻ Open stairways</li> <li>◻ Some dead end corridors</li> <li>◻ Upgrade entire fire alarm system to an addressable system with dialer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◻ Reconfigure office and/or vestibules to provide secure entrance</li> <li>◻ Abatement of asbestos floor tile and mastic at select locations</li> <li>◻ Upgrade/replace current corridor lighting with more efficient fixtures that provide higher footcandles (corridors feel a bit dark)</li> <li>◻ Replace chalkboards with markerboards</li> <li>◻ Modify pool to allow swimmers to use competitive start</li> <li>◻ Replace existing plumbing fixtures to comply with current water conservation standards</li> <li>◻ Replace domestic hot water systems with new energy efficient system</li> <li>◻ As upgrades are undertaken, replace existing galvanized water distribution piping with new copper piping</li> <li>◻ As major building upgrades are undertaken, replace existing steam heating system with a more efficient hot water system</li> <li>◻ Replace 50+ year old auditorium chiller</li> <li>◻ Continue to expand the existing energy management system</li> <li>◻ Existing electrical services have reached their expected useful life and are experiencing corrosion – replace with new system(s) when upgrades occur</li> <li>◻ Upgrade classroom lighting to 2x4, 3-lamp, dual level switched fixtures with motion sensors</li> <li>◻ Upgrade exterior wall pak lights to be cut-off type to eliminate glare and gain energy savings with pulse start lamps</li> <li>◻ Replace existing fieldhouse and/or pool HID lighting with 2x4 fluorescents similar to other buildings in the district</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◻ Music wing in need of acoustical improvements</li> <li>◻ Science department is 1-2 labs short based on currently enrollments and class sizes</li> <li>◻ Eliminate articulating wall fans in classrooms if air conditioning is added</li> </ul>

LYDELL SCHOOL  
 WHITEFISH BAY SCHOOLS  
 Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin  
 (Bray Project No. 2856)

April 30, 2007

LYDELL SCHOOL

Possible Maintenance Upgrades	Code	Building Upgrades	Educational
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Abatement of limited asbestos floor tile</li> <li>▫ Some carpeting in need of replacement</li> <li>▫ Continue ceiling and lighting upgrades when possible</li> </ul>	<p><b>ADA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Fire alarm system</li> <li>▫ Continue replacement of non-compliant door hardware</li> <li>▫ Upgrade present plumbing fixtures to comply ADA ordinances</li> </ul> <p><b>Building Code</b>            (only if major renovation projects are pursued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Abatement of asbestos floor tile and mastic at select locations</li> <li>▫ Upgrade finishes and correct code issues in existing toilet rooms</li> <li>▫ Replace original 12"x12" ceiling tile with 2'x2'. Lighting upgrade depending on proposed used of space</li> <li>▫ Replace all original exterior doors and frames</li> <li>▫ Replace all non-insulated windows</li> <li>▫ Exterior building envelope upgrades to include tuck pointing and replacement of brick at select locations</li> <li>▫ Replace fire alarm system</li> <li>▫ Upgrade plumbing fixtures to comply with current water conservation standards</li> <li>▫ Replace existing galvanized water distribution piping</li> <li>▫ Insulated all water distribution piping</li> <li>▫ Upgrade hot water system to achieve energy efficiency and increased capacity if expansion is considered.</li> <li>▫ If major upgrades are undertaken, replace existing pneumatic HVAC controls with digital</li> <li>▫ Replace existing unit ventilators with new units that contain heating and cooling coils</li> <li>▫ Remove existing through wall air conditioning units and install a central water chiller</li> <li>▫ Upgrade electrical service if major project is considered</li> <li>▫ Electrical panel boards should be replaced with new NQOD panels with circuit breakers</li> <li>▫ Upgrade exterior wall pack lighting to eliminate glare and provide better visibility</li> <li>▫ Add emergency egress lighting on the exterior of the building</li> <li>▫ Replace clock system with GPS type clocks</li> <li>▫ Provide adequate space and HVAC for data closet(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫</li> <li>▫</li> <li>▫</li> </ul>