

MEETING MINUTES

Project: Schoolcraft Community Schools – Long-Term Facility Plan
Meeting: Long-term Facility Planning Committee
Date: September 12, 2018

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Indicated with *)

Jennifer Gottschalk*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Jill VanDyken Hunt*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Rusty Stitt*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Jason Walther*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
James Weiss*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Marc Fox*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Matt McCullogh	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Ric Seager*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Dave Powers*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Matt Webster*	Schoolcraft Community Schools
Jenny Lint*	Community Member
Rob Lint	Community Member
Tracey Branch	Community Member
Ben Sheen	Community Member
Bobbi Yeater*	Community Member
Jen Jager	Community Member
Chad Howard*	Community Member
Nikki Hulinec*	Community Member
Larry Meyer*	Community Member
Andy Poulsen	Community Member
Sara Howard	Community Member
Katie Redmond*	Community Member
Wade Rutkoskie*	Community Member
Jennifer Sportel*	Community Member

If there are any corrections or additions to the above meeting minutes, please provide written notification, within five days from today (9/21/2018). Please do not hesitate to call if there are any questions or concerns.

John Stodola*	Community Member
Terry Dehart	Community Member
Jason Bouma	Community Member
Kristen Gerfen	Community Member
Kirk Bergland*	Community Member
Kyle Corlett	Community Member
Jen Walther	Community Member
Jeff VanderWiere	Community Member
Jim Henning	Community Member
Gloria Moon*	Community Member
Richard Moon*	Community Member
Jeff Clark*	Community Member
Candy Shearer	Community Member
Sue Reed	Community Member
Linda Burson	Community Member
Rita Broekema	Community Member
Brian Crissman*	Christman Construction
Kaleena Kowalkowski	Christman Construction
Steve Jurczuk*	C2AE
Bob McGraw*	C2AE

ITEMS DISCUSSED

1. Rusty welcomed everyone and thanked them for their continued participation in helping the District identify a long-term plan for addressing facility needs.
2. C2AE reviewed the 8 Long Term Planning Options and the 3 Stadium Options:
 - #1: Add. & Rem. to EL for PK-4 and to MS for Grades 5-8; Remodeling at HS \$32.33M
 - #2: New PK-4; New 5-8 MS; Remodeling at HS \$46.26M
 - #3A: Add. & Rem. at EL for PK-4; New 5-8 MS; Remodeling at HS \$41.58M
 - #3B: New PK-4; Add. & Rem. at MS for Grades 5-8; Remodeling at HS \$39.55M
 - #4A: New PK-8; Remodeling at HS \$37.55M
 - #4B: New HS; Convert HS to PK-8 \$48.17M
 - #5A: Add./Rem. to EL for PK-6; Add./Rem. at HS for 7-12 \$31.00M
 - #5B: New PK-6; Add./Rem. at HS for 7-12 \$33.00M

If there are any corrections or additions to the above meeting minutes, please provide written notification, within five days from today (9/21/2018). Please do not hesitate to call if there are any questions or concerns.

- Renovate Stadium w/6-lane Track \$4.16M
- Renovate Stadium w/8-Lane Track \$5.02M
- New Stadium w/8-Lane Track \$7.37M

Note: Costs for demolition of existing buildings and a possible additional Gym (versus keeping the existing Elementary Gym) have not been included at this point. Once the Options have been narrowed, then these items will be included as appropriate and the costs adjusted.

3. Christman shared the debt millage history and current debt millage projection. Christman also shared that this is a Long-Term Plan and that it's may not be feasible to implement as a single project. The cost for a single project could raise millage rates to the 8+ mill level, similar to when the HS was built. A 2-Phased approach was probably more supportable by the community with a bond being done in 2019 for a 1st Phase Project and then when the current debt millage comes off in 2025/2026 a second bond could be done for a 2nd Phase Project. Christman presented millage rate/tax impact for a first phase of \$20 million - \$25 million.
4. There was discussion and some clarifying questions on the options. A Level of Support Activity was conducted to narrow the options to a maximum of 3 to take to the community for further input. The Level of Support activity had each participant (18) identify on a scale of 1-6 their level of support for each of the 8 options (1 being Absolute Oppose and 6 being Absolute Support). Following are the raw tallies of each level of support for each option and the composite score for each option:

Option 1:	15-1; 1-3; 1-5	Total: 23	Composite: 1.35 (only 17 votes)
Option 2:	3-1; 3-2; 9-3; 3-5	Total: 51	Composite: 2.83
Option 3A:	5-1; 5-2; 2-3; 6-4	Total: 55	Composite: 3.05
Option 3B:	8-1; 8-2; 2-4	Total: 32	Composite: 1.78
Option 4A:	3-4; 10-5; 6-6	Total: 98 (92)	Composite: 5.16 (19 votes; 5.11 w/18 votes)
Option 4B:	14-1; 3-2; 1-3	Total: 23	Composite: 1.28
Option 5A:	9-1; 8-2	Total: 25	Composite: 1.47 (only 17 votes)
Option 5B:	2-3; 2-4; 2-5; 12-6	Total: 96	Composite: 5.33

Options 4A and 5B had substantially more support than any other options, with Option 5B having the highest composite score of 5.33 out of 6. Both of these options will be shared with the community.

It was also decided that Option 1 should be shared with the community as additions and remodeling to the current buildings is always an option for consideration and a "baseline" for comparison.

Next Meetings:

Community Input Sessions	Sep 17 6:00 pm – Village Hall; Others TBD
Long-term Facilities Planning Committee	Oct - TBD