



A Community of Learners

Educational Master Facility Plan: *Future Ready D36*

To: District 36 School Board

From: Brad Goldstein, *Chief Financial Officer*
Trisha Kocanda, *Superintendent*
Future Ready D36 Core Team

June 6, 2018

Background

A comprehensive log of activities, artifacts, presentations for Future Ready D36 is available via a dedicated website at <https://www.winnetka36.org/master-facility-plan-overview>.

At its May 8, 2018, special meeting, the School Board provided the Future Ready D36 Core Team with the following direction:

- Focus work on concepts that include neighborhood schools. This includes further analysis of K-3, K-4 and K-5 models. Suspend the “Transform” model.
- Include the following baseline components in the Educational Master Facility Plan:
 - Health, Life Safety Items
 - ADA Accessibility
 - Cosmetic Updates
 - Safety & Security Enhancements
 - HVAC with Air Conditioning
 - Domestic Water Pipe Improvements
 - Electrical Capacity Improvements
- Account for higher enrollment in modeling cafeterias and gyms to embed long-term planning benefits. The Board determined that they would like the Core Team to use the 2000-2016 enrollment average (16 years) plus one standard deviation.

- Include modernization in the models and examine a tiered approach with grade-level prioritization.

At the meeting, it was also determined that the concept descriptive titles would be eliminated and the remaining concepts titled by grade configuration.

Since the May 8th meeting, the Core Team has been analyzing the remaining models with this guidance in mind. It has also prioritized modernizing learning environments for older students, primarily due to educational programming and expectations.

Update

The Future Ready D36 Core Team will share its analysis of the three models under consideration for the District’s Educational Master Facility Plan (EMFP). A written analysis for each model is attached to this memo. Highlights of the analysis will be shared via a Core Team panel discussion with the School Board at the June 6, 2018 meeting. The accompanying presentation is attached as well.

Description of Remaining Options



Neighborhood Schools K-3 4-8: Space Highlights

- Three K-3 Neighborhood Schools (Early Childhood focus)
- A 4-8 School organized into developmentally appropriate grade level centers
 - 4-5 Intermediate
 - 6-8 Middle School

K-3 Neighborhood Schools	4-8 School
Available Classroom Space (Flexible Use)	New / Renovated Classrooms @ 950 SF
Cafeterias (CI / HW)	Two Cafeterias
Kitchen (All)	Expanded Kitchen
Expanded Gyms / KW Storage (All)	Expanded Gym / KW Storage
	Renovated Resource Center
	Dedicated Project Rooms (~9,000sf)
	Inquiry Learning Space (~2,000sf)
	Dedicated Study Space (~3,000sf)

Note: The Core Team also added an option of a New 4-8 School for comparison



Neighborhood Schools K-4 5-8: Space Highlights

- Three K-4 Neighborhood Schools
- A 5-8 School organized into developmentally appropriate grade level centers
 - 5-6 Intermediate OR 5 grade center
 - 7-8 Middle School OR 6-8 Middle School

K-4 Neighborhood Schools	5-8 School
Available Classroom Space (GR / HW)	New Classrooms @ 950 SF
Added Classrooms at CI (3)	Renovated Classrooms @ Existing SF
Cafeterias (CI / HW)	Two Cafeterias
Kitchen (All)	Expanded Kitchen
Expanded Gyms / KW Storage (All)	Expanded Gym / KW Storage
	Renovated Resource Center
	Dedicated Project Rooms (~5,000sf)
	Inquiry Learning Space (~2,000sf)
	Dedicated Study Space (~2,500sf)



Neighborhood Schools K-5 6-8: Space Highlights

- Three K-5 Neighborhood Schools
- A 6-8 Middle School

K-5 Neighborhood Schools	6-8 Middle School
Available Classroom Space (GR)	Renovated Classrooms @ Existing SF
Added Classrooms (CI - 6 / HW - 2)	-
Cafeterias (CI / HW)	Expanded Single Cafeteria
Kitchen (All)	Expanded Kitchen
Expanded Gyms / KW Storage (All)	Expanded Gym / KW Storage
	Renovated Resource Center
	Dedicated Project Rooms (~3,500sf)
	Inquiry Learning Space (~1,500sf)
	Dedicated Study Space (~2,500sf)

Definition of Modernized Work Spaces

Project Space:

Individual Work, All Class, Small Group, Teacher-Guided

A space for STEAM, Project-Based Learning, and Experiential Learning

Inquiry Space:

Small Group, Large Group, Self-Guided

A space for creative exploration, sensory work, multimedia and digital work.

Study Space:

Hard Focus, Individual Work, Small Group Work

Flexible workspace with acoustic privacy and multiple small breakout areas.

Context

The following provides context in key areas related to the analysis.

Redistricting

The District consults with Cropper GIS Consulting to examine demographics, enrollment projections, and attendance boundaries. There are multiple attendance boundary options available for the redistricting plan. Considerations include magnitude of student impact, proximity to school, safe walkability, school enrollment balancing, and long-term viability. Grade configuration impacts the redistricting plan. Each concept has an estimated range of students and households that would experience an attendance boundary shift to balance the elementary school enrollments and adhere to school capacities. There has been no determination regarding grandfathering; however, there is special attention on the Crow Island families who have been impacted by the short-term Kindergarten plan.

Financials

Continued refinement of first-time and 30-year costs have taken place since the May 8, 2018, School Board meeting. Levers impacting total costs include:

- Enrollment updates
- Classroom ownership (each teacher having their own classroom)
- Enrollment “buffer” model for anticipated enrollment rebound resulting in: Additional gym space and Additional cafeteria space
- Domestic piping upgrades
- Electrical capacity upgrades

Skokie Deferred Costs

If Skokie is decommissioned and reopened at a later date these costs would be deferred, and result in an increased cost at the time of recommissioning. The initial costs currently are \$15.3M for all of the updates. If the District were to defer these items we would use the 10-year construction cost inflation index of 3.5%, and the estimated costs would be approximately:

- 10-years \$20.9M

- 20-years \$29.5M
- 30-years \$41.7M

Baseline Costs

Phase I of the EMFP entailed determining a baseline for the district to address items such as; accessibility, cosmetic needs, health and life safety, and HVAC. Over the course of the EMFP items were added that the Board wanted to see addressed including; safety and security, electrical capacity upgrades and domestic water piping. Below is a breakdown of these costs by school. All costs were established by Ameresco, a third-party cost estimator.

Total all schools \$61,316,011

Lower cost air condition would decrease costs by \$6.0M

Table below has costs detailed by school.

Baseline Items & Costs	Crow Island	Greeley	Hubbard Woods	Skokie	Washburne
Accessibility	\$1,637,973	\$390,819	\$756,172	\$1,160,105	\$503,926
Cosmetic	\$59,112	\$564,106	\$102,941	\$218,921	\$369,195
HLS	\$2,530,599	\$2,300,315	\$1,880,903	\$3,022,912	\$3,823,633
HVAC	\$387,824	\$122,601	\$388,457	\$1,009,597	\$1,190,658
Water Piping	\$646,000	\$387,600	\$494,000	\$273,600	\$478,800
Electrical*	\$2,028,440	\$2,075,621	\$1,626,126	\$3,247,845	\$4,721,181
A/C	\$2,778,990	\$2,251,819	\$2,398,892	\$5,487,970	\$5,414,374
Safety & Security	\$739,127	\$675,873	\$543,543	\$950,000	\$1,675,441
Total	\$10,808,066	\$8,768,754	\$8,191,034	\$15,370,950	\$18,177,208

**Electrical capacity costs shown are for replacement of wiring and installing additional outlets for each of the schools. This was priced on a per square foot basis assuming no utility or transformer upgrades were needed. If the schools do not need wiring replacement these numbers would decrease.*

Debt Assumptions

If the District moves forward with a bond referendum the amount borrowed does not include the interest cost affiliated with the borrowing. This cost would be paid over the 20 year life of the bonds.

Overview of EMFP Architect Selection Process

At the March 7, 2017, Special Board meeting, there was agreement that project scope should be expanded to address enrollment imbalance and facility needs. It was determined a master facility plan would be conducted by architects to inform the planning. The Requests for Qualified (RFQ) Architects was released on March 17, 2017. The District received twelve responses from area architectural firms.

The purpose of the Educational Master Facility Plan was to determine the most efficient use and

allocation of resources given forecasted demographics, enrollment, capacity of existing schools and other relevant variables; and propose to the School Board a range of possible alternatives and make recommendations relative to the current use of facilities, configuration, infrastructure, practices, and procedures, taking into consideration their relevant implications, including, but not limited to, budget, facilitation of academic programs, impact on children and families, and legislative requirements and mandates.

The Facility Subcommittee of the Board met on April 26, 2017 to review the responses to the RFQ and interviewed four firms. The firms conducted tours of District 36 buildings and then were asked to prepare for a panel presentation where the following guidelines were addressed:

1. Using a similar project to District 36, including composition of the buildings (those with historic sensitivities), describe the process before you became involved with developing a Facility Master Plan for the District and the results once the plan was implemented. Also describe how the changes were accomplished.
2. Provide a preliminary view of what the needs of the District are to improve the educational environment and operational efficiencies, and any other suggestions you might have.
3. Provide an explanation of the process you would use to prepare a Facilities Master Plan to address these needs, building off of the District's Enrollment Balancing Phase I work.

Based on qualifications, ability of professional personnel, past record and experience, performance data, willingness to meet time requirements, location, workload of the firm, etc., and subsequent performance of reference checks by Administration, the final three preferred firms emerged for further negotiation of service and fees. The District entered negotiations with the top choice, DLR Group who was awarded the contract to work with the District on the Educational Master Facility Plan.

The Board and administration remain committed to community engagement, clear and transparent communication, a focus on teaching and learning, and fiscal responsibility. The Board will remain attuned to these key commitments when discussing *Future Ready D36* to ensure the standards of expectation are being met.

Next Steps

June 6, 2018, School Board Meeting

- Board narrows grade configuration and modernization concepts

Summer 2018

- Refine timeline, costs, and models based on June 6th direction
- Engage community with information related to remaining concepts

August 2018

- Update School Board/Community with refined details

- Launch community survey/poll to inform Board decision on final concept
September 2018
- Review community survey/poll results to inform School Board decision
Late September/Early October 2018
- Approve District 36 Educational Master Facility Plan (EMFP)
October - December 2018
- Engage the community to prioritize the EMFP timeline and refine costs
- Determine financials related to timeline, priorities, and plan
- Consider an April 2019 referendum resolution
January 2019
- Deadline for April 2019 referendum resolutions

Attachments

- [K-3 & 4-8 Core Team Analysis](#)
- [K-4 & 5-8 Core Team Analysis](#)
- [K-5 & 6-8 Core Team Analysis](#)
- [Facilities and Student Performance Research](#)
- [Enrollment Assumptions by Concept](#)
- [Tiered Modernization Framework](#)
- [June 6, 2018 Presentation](#)