Crow Island School opened in 1940 with an addition in 1954 on a 7.1-acre site. The school’s gross square footage is 66,725 square feet, with an optimal capacity of 306 students.

**Percentage of Time Spent at a Location**

- **Classroom**: 59%
- **Outside**: 12%
- **Foyer / Lunchroom**: 8%
- **GYM**: 7%
- **Art**: 4%
- **Library**: 3%
- **Spanish**: 3%
- **Music**: 3%

**Forecast**

- **Current**: 850 (K-4)*
- **2018-19**: 847 (K-4)*
- **2019-20**: 816 (K-4)*

**C.I. Capacity**: 368*

**C.I. Capacity**: 368*

**Area Comparison**

- **D36 Post-2020**: enrollment drops slightly

**Did you know . . .**

86% of occupants dissatisfied with thermal environment in summer. Crow Island has the highest recorded temperatures in the district classrooms are over-lit by artificial light.

**How is this information collected?**

The DLR Group team collected data through the use of environmental sensors, District energy bills, and logging equipment. The sensors were placed in several rooms where they logged data from one to seven days. Spot measurements and multiple devices were then used to validate the results.

**Physiological Condition**

- **All restrooms lack ADA clear floor area**
- **Classroom entries lack pull clearance**
- **Classroom sliding doors do not work**
- **Guardrail required at stairs**
- **Recommend new boiler burner**

**Thermal Comfort**

- **Importance**: The September week that was logged was unusually temperate (cooler) than in recent years or even as observed this past week with temperatures in the 90s. Wide fluctuation in interior temperatures and humidity was personally observed by our engineers. Thermal comfort issues were widely reported by faculty and staff as well. This is a significant issue and will need to be addressed.

**Top 5 Take-Aways**

- Awesome access to outdoor/natural light
- Thoughtful, child-centered design is great
- Need dedicated lunchroom space
- Noisy hallways, not great for collaboration
- Need a bigger or additional gym

**Listening Tour**

An all-staff meeting (Listening Tour) was held at each school where faculty gave input about the strengths and weaknesses of the building. Architects and Engineers assessed each building noting deficiencies in material finish and code compliance.