



Frequently Asked Questions - Get The Facts!

September 30, 2015

Does the proposed plan affect the location of the four year old kindergarten program?

No. The 4K program will remain at our community partner sites.

What is irreparable at Tess Corners, Mill Valley and Muskego Elementary?

- Tess Corners, Mill Valley and Muskego Elementary lack ADA compliance with various levels, without major construction this aspect cannot be addressed.
- Tess Corners, Mill Valley and Muskego Elementary lack fire protection and much of the building is wood frame construction
- None of the Elementary schools have tornado shelters that match current standards.
- Mill Valley has water incursion in the oldest part of the facility
- Mill Valley has structural bowing in the oldest part of the facility
- Tess Corners and Muskego Elementary have structural cracks in the walls indicating the buildings are shifting
- Tess Corners, Mill Valley and Muskego Elementary do not have monitored fire alarm systems
- Tess Corners, Muskego Elementary and Lakeview Elementary lack air conditioning and present indoor air quality concerns.
- Tess Corners and Muskego Elementary room sizes are smaller than current recommendations
- Tess Corners steam boiler system is 60 years old, with little access to parts
- Muskego Elementary boiler system is obsolete
- Muskego Elementary and Mill Valley have fuse boxes and small electric services. We were unable to add air conditioning to the Mill Valley gym because the service is too small.
- Lack of air conditioning presents issues with electronic equipment
- Storage at Tess Corners and Muskego Elementary is non-existent. Storing items in kitchen, gym open space and mechanical rooms

Will students be impacted during construction?

Student, staff and visitor safety will be the highest priority during all of the potential construction projects. The potential additions and renovations at Mill Valley and the High School Pool would require special coordination to minimize the impact on the existing buildings while the additions are constructed. The renovation work at Country Meadows/Bay Lane and the High School for STEM and band areas would be completed during the summer to prevent disruption of school.



How do you ensure that people don't take the survey more than once?

The School Perceptions proprietary software ensures that each survey code can be used only once.

What about health concerns connected with synthetic turf fields?

While the National Turf Council states there is no evidence that typical crumb rubber infill on synthetic turf fields is a health risk the District is proposing an alternative infill product called Nike Grind. Nike Grind is unvulcanized virgin rubber and polyolefin and is a byproduct from the shoe manufacturer. It is green in color versus the typical black infill product on most turf fields.

What are the Sustainable goals of these projects? Will solar panels be used?

Sustainable design strategies will be utilized with all projects, as appropriate, to coordinate with systems and approaches that the District has already successfully integrated into existing buildings. While the specifics of what green technologies will be implemented and where they will be used are not yet finalized, a few great examples of the types of sustainable products, systems or approaches that will most likely be used include: LED lighting on the interior and exterior, Energy Star Rated equipment, spray foam insulation in the walls to create the most efficient wall system possible, high performance glass, solar hot water for the swimming pool, and much more.

Will attendance areas be changed if the project is approved?

Given that the recommendations include closing two elementary schools, attendance boundaries for the three remaining schools will need to be considered to include students from Tess Corners and Muskego Elementary. The district's intent is to make only necessary changes to attendance areas in order to maintain the least disruption. As a result, the district will work with necessary groups to determine current and future development so as to gain a better understanding of potential net impact on attendance boundaries and any necessary redistricting that may need to occur.

What is the plan for closed schools?

First, the District will prepare to sell the properties with the buildings intact. If however, a buyer does not come forward, the buildings would be razed, and the land sold. Revenue from the sale would be used toward debt payments.

What will these projects cost the District? What is the tax impact?

We are still in the information-gathering stage until we receive and analyze the results of the community-wide survey. At this point, costs are estimated for this specific solution, and final costs will be determined by the community's recommendation. That said, should the Master Planning Committee's Recommended Plan appear on a referendum with a total project cost of \$55 million, an individual's property tax mill rate would increase by \$.53 per \$1,000 (\$53.00 per \$100,000) of a home's value.

What is the proposed schedule of all of these projects if there were approved in a referendum?

If the community survey indicates the community would support the facility plan the School Board would most likely consider a spring 2016 referendum. If a referendum were proposed and approved in April of 2016 (for example) the preliminary schedule for design and construction is as follows:



- Early 2017: Design and Bid all projects
- Spring 2017: Begin construction on all projects
- Start of 2017 – 2018 school year: Complete Lake View, High School Academic, and some outdoor facilities (football stadium)
- During 2017 – 2018 school year: Complete High School Pool and remaining outdoor facilities
- Start of 2018 – 2019 school year: Complete Mill Valley Additions/Renovations, New Middle School and Country Meadows/Bay Lane Renovations

Why is the District conducting a long-range master plan?

The last master plan began in 2008, and it was time to complete a comprehensive review of all buildings and land owned by the District. With the help of the School Board, administration, staff and the Master Planning Committee, the District carefully evaluated all facility resources, including the indoor and outdoor athletic facilities. A thorough review was conducted on the capacity and condition of the five elementary schools, two middle schools and the high school.

What is the condition of our school buildings?

Muskego-Norway School District works hard to maintain their buildings however, several buildings have more than exceeded their useful life. The average life expectancy for a school is 40 years.

- Tess Corners was built in 1924; improvements were made in 1952, 1955, 1959 and 1961.
- Muskego Elementary was first constructed in 1924; with renovations in 1949, 1952, and 1957.
- Mill Valley Elementary was built in 1925; improvements were made in 1950, 1960, and 1992.
- Lakeview Elementary was built in 1956; enhancements were added in 1967, and 1989.
- Country Meadows Elementary was created as an addition to Bay Lane Middle School in 1968; improvements were made in 1992 and 1993.
- Lake Denoon Middle School was built in 1999.
- Bay Lane Middle School was built in 1968; enhancements were made in 1992 and 1993.
- Muskego High School was constructed in 1957; with several additions and renovations taking place from 1957 through 2004.

What are the average class sizes for each grade in the District for 2015-16?

The components of the recommended facility plan does not create larger class sizes. Average class sizes per grade for 2015-16 are:

- Kindergarten - 21 students/class
- 1st Grade -20 students/class
- 2nd Grade - 23 students/class
- 3rd Grade - 21 students/class



- 4th Grade - 22 students/class
- 5th Grade - 26 students/class
- 6th Grade - 28 students/class
- 7th Grade - 27 students/class
- 8th Grade - 27 students/class
- High School - 26 students/class

How many students are currently involved in co-curricular programs at the high school level?

Over 1,200 students, or 75%, out of the total student population of 1,600 participate in co-curricular programs. Participants achieve higher GPAs, have fewer absences, less behavior issues, higher ACT scores and graduation rates, and attend college at a higher rate.

Does the condition of our facilities match the District's Vision and Mission?

The District values: 1) a high-achieving learning environment; 2) attracting and retaining high-impact staff; 3) maintaining community support; 4) a system-wide continuous improvement process; and 4) long-term financial sustainability. Currently, our facilities do not support a high achieving learning environment, the needs of community recreation or long-term financial sustainability. Our facilities do not match the District's mission to be the *District of Choice*.

What are the goals of the master planning process?

The Master Planning Committee was charged by the Board to focus on the following: evaluate the facility needs at both Tess Corners and Muskego Elementary schools; study possible enhancements to the athletic facilities at the high school; review any other district facility/department maintenance or capital needs; and present recommended solutions to the Board in April or May of 2015.

What is the Master Planning Committee?

The Master Planning Committee is made up of 36 community members that are parents, graduates, and friends of the District in addition to several business leaders and senior citizens. They are supported by 12 representatives of the District, which includes staff, coaches and administration. This team was formulated to provide structure and guidance to the master planning process.

Who served on the Master Planning Committee?

Citizen Members

Kevin Anundson; Jeremy Bartlett; Ryan Beeck; Tracy Blair; Trace Burger; Rene Calvetti; Mark Ciepluch; Scott Cieslak; Christopher Coggins; Randy Girard; Gregg Golden; Kevin Greenthal; Tom Grotophorst; Julie Grotophorst; Phil Gural; Teddy Hahlen; Keith Hammitt; Amy Harrington; Chris Hastings; James Jegers; Karla Klein; Chris Kuchler; Cathy Makinen; Ben McMullen; Elmer Megna; Jennifer Mlachnik; Elizabeth Newbold; Angela Peardon; Brandon Pearson; Mei Robertson; Gary Schuster; Melissa Spadanuda; Kirk Spano; Heidi Szczupakiewicz; Lisa Voisin; Bill Wisialowski

Administration & Staff Members



Jamie Beckman; Tim Gorecki; Alan Groth; Jeremiah Johnson; Julie Kelly; Kristin Kuenstler; Scott Kugi; John LaFleur; Jeff Petersen; Rich Raney; Robin Schrot; Kelly Thompson

Consultant Team Members

Bray Architects, CG Schmidt Construction and School Perceptions

Who are the consultants and how were they chosen?

Bray Architects and CG Schmidt Construction have been working with the Board, administration, and Master Planning Committee to consider all possible options for addressing the needs and improving the facilities in the Muskego-Norway School District. They were vetted and chosen among other candidates through a Request for Proposal process, followed by interviews of shortlisted firms.

How did the Master Planning Committee identify the needs of the District?

The Master Planning Committee and their consultants, Bray Architects and CG Schmidt Construction, toured each school and met with the staff to learn about the strengths and limitations of the buildings. Additionally, the consultants completed an existing facility condition assessment and an educational space analysis for each building. The committee also provided input on their needs and wants for the District. The District furnished the committee with a variety of supporting documents such as enrollment projections and facility maintenance lists. For a complete listing of the building needs, please go to the website (muskegonorway.org) and click on Master Planning Committee, select Master Planning Background and then Past Meeting Documents.

What was the process for narrowing the facility options?

The consultants led the committee to explore each and every potential solution to address the district's facility needs. After touring the buildings and attending numerous meetings, committee members narrowed the possibilities to seven options at the March 4, 2015, meeting. After a thorough review and discussion around these seven options, the committee decided to move forward with pursuing three final options. The end goal is to find cost-effective solutions that will place the District in the best position for the future.

Why is the community more concerned with the elementary school buildings?

Despite routine care and maintenance, several of the District's elementary buildings have exceeded their useful life. Furthermore, they have not seen major renovations or upgrades in 50 to 60 years.

What work has been done to monitor the District's energy savings?

The District has participated in an energy saving program since 2005. We also completed a facility study with McKinstry to identify equipment life-cycle concerns and saving opportunities. Since that time we have upgraded lighting at our newest facilities, replaced boilers at Bay Lane/Country Meadows, sealed building envelopes, replaced windows and doors at Bay Lane/Country Meadows, as well as upgraded heating controls district wide. Through our efforts we have been able to reduce utility bills by about 30% a year/\$400,000 annually.



The district continues its commitment to improve sustainability and efficiency. In the last 12 months we have changed boilers at Lakeview as well as replaced all Lakeview lighting to LED

Is there an economic development benefit of investing in our schools?

Quality schools contribute positively to the economic development of the community. The District's reputation attracts families and businesses to relocate to take advantage of the superior education. It also plays an important role in both finding and attracting qualified workers to the area. As more residents move to District neighborhoods, the demand for housing will increase and real estate property values escalate. The resulting economic development could be considered a return on the initial investment of improving school facilities.

How much does the community currently use the district facilities?

District facilities are utilized after school hours for more than 36,000 hours annually.

How do the swimming pools in neighboring Districts compare?

Several of the surrounding districts have recently made efforts to improve their swimming facilities. Waukesha South has a 10 lane, 25 yard pool and Greenfield has a new 8 lane, 25 yard pool. Their facilities are large enough to host competitions for both WIAA swimming and USA swimming.

The last two referendums failed, what did they include?

In 2010, a \$39.06 million question was proposed to consolidate five elementary buildings to three, construct a new elementary, renovate Mill Valley Elementary, and increase safety and security. It failed with 6,299 Yes votes and 7,386 No votes. In 2011, a \$35.17 million question was voted on. This question included consolidating 5 elementary buildings to 4, constructing a new elementary, renovating Mill Valley and Lakeview schools, and increasing safety and security. It failed to pass with 1,849 Yes votes and 3,424 No votes. The needs of the elementary schools in the District have yet to be addressed.

How does school funding work?

Revenue limits set how much a district can earn in revenue through state aid and taxes. Capital projects, maintenance and operations must be included in the budget within the revenue limit. As a result, the District must go to referendum to exceed the revenue cap for capital projects, operations or both.

Are other districts in the state improving their facilities through referendum?

Yes, you can find a list of all the districts referendums for the November 2015 election at <https://apps4.dpi.wi.gov/Referendum/CustomReporting.aspx>.

How does the quality of our buildings attract new teachers, prospective parents and students?

Quality teachers are perhaps the most fundamental resource for improving student learning. There is a commitment by the School Board and administration to figure out how to recruit and retain strong teachers, especially in older, less desirable buildings. Families want to relocate to communities that have modernized schools and offer flexible learning environments. The condition and design of school buildings and grounds affect the quality of education and the vitality of the District and the community. If the District does nothing to attract new families, it is at risk of declining in quality and status.