

River Valley School District
Monday, January 25, 2016
Special Meeting
High School New Gym
7:00 p.m.

Present: Nelson, Jennings, Cates, Young, Bettinger, Strozinsky, Cummings, Iausly
Absent: McCauley
Admin: Wermuth, Novak, Krey, Blakley, Kjos, Hegland, Radtke
Others: Approximately 70 audience members, Jeannie McCarville (Home News), Paula Wedige (Administrative Assistant)

President Cates opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. He noted that the meeting had been properly posted and notice had been provided to the appropriate media and each School Board Member. Iausly moved to proceed with the legal meeting. Strozinsky seconded. Motion carried.

Consideration & Action on Approval of Agenda

Young moved to approve the agenda. Iausly seconded. Motion carried.

Facilities Feasibility Study – Presentation by SDS Architects

Tom Twohig of SDS Architects provided an overview of 9 facilities concepts (list of A through I below) developed for River Valley School District based on the results of a Facilities Feasibility Study done for River Valley in the fall of 2015.

A=addition to Spring Green Elementary to create Pre K-8 facility; address 1-10 year facility needs at the high school. (\$39-\$41 million)

B=new PreK-8 facility in Spring Green; address 1-10 year facility needs at the high school. (\$51-\$54 million)

C=additions to Spring Green Elementary and high school; address 1-10 year facility needs at the remaining portion of the high school. (\$50-\$55 million)

D=new middle school and high school facility; addition to Spring Green Elementary. (\$69-\$72 million)

E=new PreK-12 facility in Spring Green. (\$78-\$80 million)

F=vacate Lone Rock Elementary and Arena Elementary and redistribute grades PreK-5 throughout Plain Elementary and Spring Green Elementary; address remaining 1-10 year facility needs. (\$16-\$18 million)

G=address 1-10 year facility needs at all district buildings. (\$16-\$18 million)

H=demolish Lone Rock Elementary and Arena Elementary and build new facilities at current sites; address remaining 1-10 year facility needs. (\$22-\$24 million)

I=vacate Lone Rock Elementary and redistribute grade levels; address remaining 1-10 year facility needs. (\$14-\$1.6 million)

It was noted that the district has seen a 13.4% decrease in PreK – 12 student enrollment since 2006-07. It is projected that the district will lose 112 to 227 more students in the next 5 years.

Board members asked clarification questions about the 9 facilities concepts presented.

Twohig noted that 75% of cost is infrastructure and 25% is finishes. The concepts do not factor future growth but are designed for current enrollment. When asked about vacating buildings, Twohig noted it is a challenge to repurpose those buildings. When asked what he would pick and why, Twohig said to try to get the most value out of buildings and recognize some are beyond useful life, and to consider the 50 year mark and if it is worth the investment or putting resources elsewhere.

Audience members then asked questions.

It was clarified that while closing a school can balance the budget for 2016-17, the following year will bring a new deficit amount which will need to be balanced. The funding formula was discussed and it was noted that revenue cannot be raised without a referendum.

Several in attendance thanked the administrative team for ensuing these difficult conversations and thanked the Board for its questions.

Iausly moved to adjourn at 9:00 pm. Cummings seconded. Motion carried.

Submitted by Paula Wedige for:

_____ Deborah Nelson, School District Clerk