



architects
engineers
www.woldae.com

305 Saint Peter Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102

tel 651 227 7773
fax 651 223 5646
mail@woldae.com

To: All Community Planning Group Members

From: Kaitlin Schalow *KS*

Date: 9999

Comm. No: December 8, 2014

Subject: Independent School District #879
December 4, 2014 Delano Community Planning Group #5 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Darrell Egly	darrell_egly@cargill.com
Adam Steffl	adamsteffl@hotmail.com
Phil Kern	pkern@delano.k12.mn.us
Becky Schaust	bschaust@cbburnet.com
Patricia Osmon	eposmon@gmail.com
Joe Vieau	jvieau@delano.k12.mn.us
Mitchell Rue	mrue@delano.k12.mn.us
Kimberly Harder	kharder@msn.com
Diane Johnson	djohnson@delano.k12.mn.us
Shawn Danielson	shawn@christianbuilders.com
Howard Glas	hdglas@yahoo.com
Ben Moonen	ben@fivetechnology.com
Dale Vander Linden	timberdan1@msn.com
Dan Menk	drmenk@gmail.com
Heather Walberg	hwalberg@delano.k12.mn.us
Carolyn Kivisto	pckivisto@frontiernet.net
Ted May	theoymay@gmail.com
Mike Lindquist	mlindquist@delano.k12.mn.us
Steve Heil	steve.heil@delanoschools.org
Ryan Green	greenrya@live.com
Judd Wadholm	jwadholm@carlson.com
Nick Neaton	nneaton@delano.mn.us
Jason Seurer	jvseurer@frontier.com
Misty Link	mistydelano@yahoo.com
Linda Althoff	lgalthoff@charter.net
Andrea Quandt	andrea.quandt@streamworksmn.com
Maggie Thomas	rymagthomas@charter.net
Jenny Power	jpower@delano.k12.mn.us
Darren Schuler	drschuler@delano.k12.mn.us
Katie Horeis	Katie@alexstenback.com
Mary Reeder	mreeder@delano.k12.mn.us
Joe Schleper	jschleper@delano.k12.mn.us
Mark Schramel	mscramel@delano.k12.mn.us
Marty Kittok	mkittok@delano.k12.mn.us
Ken Chock	ken.chock@genmills.com
Matt Schoen	mschoen@delano.k12.mn.us
Vaughn Dierks	vdierks@woldae.com
Kaitlin Schalow	kschalow@woldae.com

Minnesota
Illinois
Michigan
Colorado
Iowa



Absentees:

Mark Schramel	mschramel@delano.k12.mn.us
Katie Horeis	katie@alexstenback.com
Renee Klinkner	rklinkner@delano.k12.mn.us
Judd Waddholm	jwaddholm@carlson.com
Ken Cholk	ken.chock@genmills.com
Steven Schauburger	sschauburger@delano.k12.mn.us
Lynae Schoen	lschoen@woldae.com

Discussion Topics:

- A. Some members of the Group toured the Community Education building prior to the regular Community Planning Group meeting.
- B. Recap from Meeting #4
 - 1. There were no questions or concerns from the Group over last meeting's discussion.
- C. The Group reviewed the Criteria created and reviewed over the past two meetings.
 - 1. The Group reviewed the criteria of: safety and security, capacity, programming, building and sites, athletics and activities, and physical conditions.
 - 2. Group discussion concerning the Criteria included:
 - a. There was concern from several Group members that a 3-5 grade option should be added back in to an acceptable grade structure.
 - b. Everyone was in agreement that the current grade level structure in place in the District is acceptable. The divisions should be added to the overall acceptable grade level options.
 - c. The Group discussed the Community Education building and whether it should be located in the K-12 setting.
 - 1) There was concern from the Group over the accessibility of the building.
 - 2) The Group reviewed potential Mechanical upgrades to the building.
 - 3) There was concern over the pick-up /drop-off of the Community Education building.
 - a) The Group was in agreement this was not a priority for concern.
 - 4) The Group discussed where early childhood programming would be best located in the District.
 - a) There was consensus from the Group that Community Education building may need some improvements (accessibility, mechanical, and cosmetic changes) but the building currently meets the needs for its programs and is located in a prime location downtown.
 - d. There should be selective use of language and terminology when describing potential additions and renovations. For example, "educational programming" should be used instead of "educational opportunities" for the potential Performing Arts space.
 - 1) The Group was in agreement that the potential Auditorium addition should be adaptable and allow for multi-purpose use. Language should be added to convey educational enhancement abilities district-wide.
 - e. Athletics: There was concern from the Group over the availability of Gym spaces/courts in the District.
 - 1) Discussion was based around the abuse the spaces get from high-impact sports.
 - 2) There was concern from the Group over the availability of the TAC center for family use outside of District sports.
 - 3) The Group discussed that for a District the size of Delano, the current amount of Gym space (courts) is comparable to other districts in the area.
 - f. The Group agreed that the overall needs of the District have been met through the Criteria.
 - D. Options Discussion
 - 1. The Group reviewed the Capacity need for the District.
 - a. Projected capacity need is two grades and Early Childhood (TBD).



2. The Group discussed several proposed Options which include:
 - a. Option 1: New 4-6 building
 - 1) 4th grade out of ES
 - 2) 5-6th grades out of MS
 - 3) No Land Acquisition Needed
 - 4) Renovate MS/HS
 - 5) Expand Amenities
 - 6) Early childhood to ES?
 - b. Option 2: New High School
 - 1) 4th grade out of ES to MS?
 - 2) Early childhood to ES?
 - 3) 4-5/6-8 structure
 - 4) Overbuilt by (1-2 grades)
 - 5) High school programming needs to be duplicated
 - 6) Requires land acquisition
 - c. Additional Options:
 - 1) Additions on all of the buildings?
 - 2) All of Community Ed in Existing?
 3. Discussion from the Group concerning the proposed options:
 - a. High School discussion included fire lane access concern around the Auditorium addition.
 - 1) A continuous fire lane around the building can be maintained.
 - b. There was concern from the Group over vehicle traffic at one point for the Middle School/High School vs. the two that are currently in place.
 - 1) It was explained that congestion would be reduced by having two lanes: one drop off and one bypass lane.
 - c. The Group reviewed the two options for the new Elementary School site.
 - 1) There was concern from the Group over the limited amount of parking.
 - 2) Congestion at the Elementary sites was a concern for many. It was explained that the amount of students will be similar to how it is now, but traffic will be reshuffled on site.
 - d. There was interest from several Group members to integrate 5th grade in the MS/HS configuration.
 - e. There was a suggestion from the Group to build a new High School with multiple stories in order to reduce the building's footprint on site.
 - f. There was interest from the Group to structure the proposed new 4-6 building so that an additional story could be built at later date.
 4. Members of the Group liked the message to the community of a new elementary school being built on land that is already acquisitioned.
- E. The Group reviewed the budget costs of all the options.
1. *Note: All options to include program improvements, athletics and activities improvements, physical conditions, security/safety, traffic/parking, and accessibility.
 2. Rough budget numbers for the options include:
 - a. Option 1 (New 4-6 Building): \$60-65 million
 - b. Option 2 (New High School): \$85-100 million
 3. The Group discussed what the Community threshold for the overall budget number would be.
 - a. The Group expressed the concern that most hesitation from the community will be from tax impact on property owners.
 4. One member from the Group shared that he has talked with members of the community and many are willing to spend more.



5. The Group discussed options to reduce the \$60-65 million price tag, if need be.
 - a. Some to cuts could potentially include:
 - 1) Diving Well
 - 2) No additions to the current Elementary School (Elementary "Pinch Point" Relief)
 - 3) Auditorium
 - 4) Stadium
 - 5) Fields
 - b. Non-negotiable/must-haves:
 - 1) Capacity
 - 2) Security
 - 3) Programming
6. The Group was in agreement that the \$60-65 million price tag was acceptable and believed that the community will be accepting of this option.
7. The Group agreed that a lot of the hurdle for support with the referendum will be education about what is included.
- F. The Group came to the understanding that different variations of Option 1 may be discussed at the next meeting, but the Group will move forward with developing Option 1.

Next Meeting: Thursday, December 11, 2014 at 6:30 at the High School Media Center

cc: Lynae Schoen, Wold

KN/promo/ISD_879/min/12.4.14