



JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

**Board Facilities Committee**

JCPS VanHoose Center – 3332 Newburg Rd, Louisville, KY 40218  
September 21, 2022

**Board Facilities Members Present**

Susan Biasioli, James Craig, Cassie Lyles, Brent McKim, Sienna Newman, Chris Perkins, Brandy Corbin, Kym Rice, Brent West, Adeline Thaler, Marty Pollio, Jeff O'Brien, Marland Cole, Rider Rodriguez, Amanda Averette-Bush

**Minutes**

Call to Order
James Craig called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.
Approval of Minutes
Dr. Pollio made the motion to pass the Board Facility Minutes from the August 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Susan Biasioli
Overview of Agenda
Chris Perkins reviewed the agenda stating that the Committee would be revisiting the comparison of Student Needs with the Facility Needs and relevant considerations to take into account; he further explained that the Committee would be taking a look at what the next 10-12 years could look like for facility planning purposes when taking into account the new bonding capacity and factoring-in the facility and student needs; he also stated that the Committee would be taking a look at specific schools and campuses to illustrate the complexities of the decisions as capital construction projects are mapped-out for the next decade.
Athletics overview, Combined Facility Index, Long Range Planning,
<p>Susan Biasioli explained that historically, HVAC has always been the driving factor for Facilities Planning to determine the next group of buildings to be renovated as a tentative plan for the next eight years is drafted; she also explained that her team has to take into consideration how many renovations JCPS Operations (Facilities and Maintenance) can fund (based on costs) and manage (within the short 2 ½ month summer break timeframe).</p> <p>Dr. Pollio mentioned that when it comes to decisions on Facilities, there are essentially three options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Renovate the existing building</li><li>• Rebuild a building on the current property</li><li>• Locate a new property to (re)build on</li></ul> <p>Dr. Pollio also state that everything being discussed at this Committee meeting is NOT a final plan, it is strictly intended to demonstrate what a potential proposal might look like and to solicit feedback or recommendations from the Committee.</p> <p>Brent West presented multiple graphs to model student needs based on different data sets. These data sets included multiple student data points like Free/Reduced Lunch, Mobility, Special Needs, English Language Learners, Students of Color, Sense of Belonging, etc. After comparing the three models, he demonstrated how each school's Free/Reduced Lunch participation percentages were a consistent reflection of the holistic student needs for each school and served as an accurate representation in the context of weighing facility-related decisions. Questions were entertained for clarification of the data and its meaning. Chris Perkins explained that prioritization based on student needs at each school would not be significantly impacted based on any individual data set and that Free/Reduced Lunch participation was a fairly consistent number from year to year, it was one</p>

singular data point compared to multiple weighted averages, it is a readily accessible data point that warrants no interpretation, and that it is a commensurate reflection of student needs when compared to all of the various factors shared with the committee. The Committee had no further questions and all in attendance agreed that it was an appropriate representation of a school's holistic student needs.

Brent West went on to explain that Facility Condition Index is a number (1-100) that represents the ratio of the replacement value of a building compared to the renovation costs of a building. Based on Industry Standards, a Facility Condition Index above 35 indicates that the cost of renovations exceeds the value of replacement costs. West also explained other factors that must be considered when making decisions about facility investments, such as useable acreage, shared campuses, and the architectural significance of a building that represents a historically appreciated design (examples were the Academy@Shawnee, DuPont Manual, Portland Elementary, Johnson Traditional Middle School, and a few others. The Architecturally important buildings will always be renovated because they are historically significant and cannot be replicated. Perkins added that some of the schools that would be strong candidates for rebuilding, would be a major challenge due to the physical location of the building on the property, the available (or lack of) space on the campus to rebuild, surrounding flood plains, and the continuity of educational services while a school is being rebuilt.

Chris Perkins explained that Susan Biasiolli would be walking the Committee through what the next 10+ years could potentially look like in terms of renovating several schools and rebuilding several others. Perkins went on to clarify that capital projects "technically" begin once approved by the board and the project goes out to bid for Architectural design. Perkins added that the tentative plans that Susan Biasiolli was about to present, would be organized by the year that JCPS anticipates construction would likely begin (either construction of a new building or renovation-related construction).

Perkins reminded the Committee that large-scale summer renovations (usually middle and high schools) often span breadth of two complete summers with prep-work and follow-up work completed during the school year as scheduling permits.

Perkins also pointed out that historically, new construction for elementary schools can take up to two complete years from the time construction actually begins; and for middle and high schools, it is likely to span across three calendar years depending on the availability of materials, supplies, and labor force.

Biasiolli began presenting what tentative plans for the next several years might look like, outlining preliminary suggestions as to which schools we begin being built and which school would begin being renovated:

Year 1 (2023) Schools already in the design process:

- **W.E.B. Dubois** – Design for a new 6-12 building is already underway; we are awaiting a response from KDE regarding the waiver submitted, requesting permission to build on a property that is smaller than indicated recommendations
- **Fairdale High School** – Major Systems Renovation project design is already in progress; limited to renovation because the school building is surrounded by a floodplain
- **Johnson Traditional Middle** – Major Systems Renovation project design is already in progress; Renovation determined based on the architectural significance of the building and the property being too small to rebuild on.
- **DuPont Manual High School (YPAS) Sam Meyers Hall** – Major Systems Renovation project design is already in progress; Historical Building and limited space on campus justify a renovation.

Year 2 (2024) Schools under consideration:

- **Atherton** – Renovate based on the physical layout of the land and potential drainage issues.
- **Okolona** – Rebuild due to poor physical design and high student needs. The challenge would be the limited space and the way it is distributed around the existing building. James Craig asked if we could purchase the property in the rear of the school building from Metro Parks? Biasiolli responded that a call had already been placed in efforts to connect with Metro Parks
- **Dixie** – Renovate because of the surrounding flood plain and limited availability of land without impeding upon Valley High School's Athletic Facilities
- **Grace James\*** (Note: see comments from Perkins in Year 3 below)
- **West End Middle School\*** (Note: see comments from Perkins in Year 3 below)

Year 3 (2025) Schools under consideration:

- **Seneca**- Rebuild based on condition of the building and the availability of land on campus; Perkins stated "I'd like to make a strong argument to rebuild Seneca for the very reasons Brent & Susan have already discussed; there is ample land, the building has an extremely low Facility Condition index, and the student needs are significantly high. This is a great example of how we can use student-needs data to inform our decisions, because historically this would have



JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

simply been another renovation to get us through the next 30 years; now we have an opportunity to change the trajectory of a school community with high student needs.” Biasiolli explained that there will be some challenges because Seneca and Goldsmith share a central plant that will require some creative problem solving to keep it functioning in support of Goldsmith once the old Seneca building is demolished. Biasiolli went on to explain that the availability of usable acreage not affected by the surround flood plain, will necessitate a unique design to optimize the unique space in the rear of the property. Biasiolli went on to state that Seneca would be the priority and once completed, we would address Goldsmith by rebuilding it. Brent McKim added that he believed it might be more feasible to relocate students from Binet during construction than some of the other special needs programs like Churchill Park. Dr. Pollio included that several programs like Binet, Mary Ryan, and perhaps others, the long-term plan would be to house them together for more consistent support and oversight. \*James Craig asked where were Grace James Academy & the new West End Middle School on the list? Perkins responded that they are already on the long-range plan as Year 2 candidates, as well as the tentative “road map” shared at the August Board Facilities Committee Meeting, and also that they are already reflected in JCPS’ state-approved District Facility Plan. Perkins went on to explain that because there is not a definitive answer regarding their exact location at the time of the presentation, there was no available site plan (LOJIC Map) to display in the presentation. He clarified that Grace James and a New West End Middle School *are* in the plan and are already factored-into current bonding capacity for each respective year. Perkins went on to state that he was hopeful more information would be available to share with the Committee within the coming months.

- **Byck** – Renovate based on the small property and limited space.

Year 4 (2026) Schools under consideration:

- **Kerrick** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs are significantly high. Biasiolli explained that because there is plenty of land to rebuild on without disrupting the instructional process in the current building, construction could begin without disruption, similar to the new Indian Trail and Wilkerson Elementary Schools.
- **Frayser** – Renovation determined based on the architectural significance of the building and the property being too small to rebuild on.
- **Olmsted South** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs are significantly high. Biasiolli explained that because Iroquois and Olmsted South share the campus and because the campus was oddly shaped, both schools could not be rebuilt at the same time. Perkins added that Iroquois was just renovated in 2010 and we still have a few years before significant renovations would be needed, so rebuilding Olmsted South would be the first priority. Biasiolli explained that Olmsted could be rebuilt on the rear of the shared property, on the Eastern portion of the property near Brookline Ave. Perkins explained rebuilding in that area would impeded upon the athletic facilities of Iroquois, so we would need to make arrangements for their athletic events for the next 2-3 years. Perkins explained that Iroquois would be rebuilt later and would be discussed in the next few minutes.

Year 5 (2027) Schools under consideration:

- **Westport** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs being significantly high. Based on significant acreage, construction could begin without disrupting the instructional process in the current building. James Craig asked if these plans were in order of student needs? Perkins responded that these proposals for each year were based on critically urgent mechanical system needs, approaching or exceeding end-of-life systems) and absolutely based on the student needs in each building, coupled with factors like the availability of land to build upon, the historical significance of the building, while factoring-in the available bonding capacity and the scope of the project. Perkins went on to explain that is why some of the projects are spread over multiple years and to account for the community’s infrastructure to support the work.
- **McFerran** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs being significantly high. Because of the available acreage, construction could begin without disrupting the instructional process in the current building. Dr. Pollio added that there may be an opportunity to rebuild McFerran or Grace James on the property.

- **Jacob** – Renovate School because the school was built in the 1990's and it is mainly the HVAC system that will need to be replaced
- **Goldsmith** – Rebuild because Goldsmith is in the same condition as Seneca, but because of the limited available acreage to build upon and the surrounding floodplain, Seneca will need to be completed before rebuilding Goldsmith can start.

Year 6 (2028) Schools under consideration:

- **Western HS** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs being significantly high. Because of the available acreage, construction could begin without disrupting the instructional process in the current building. Amanda Averette-Bush pointed-out that beginning with the 2024-2025 school year, Western will become a new STEM Magnet and renovations or building modifications may be necessary to support that STEM program, prior to the rebuild. Dr. Pollio responded that we would do whatever needed to ensure they have what they need to support the new STEM program. Pollio added that equipment and technology can be relocated and reinstalled in a new building. Biasioli pointed-out that one of potential challenges will be the Waller-Williams building, and that locating an alternate site for Waller-Williams, would provide a larger space to rebuild Western, giving the Design Architects more liberty to innovate the new building design. She stated that it wasn't a deal-breaker, but that relocating Waller would be extremely helpful. Perkins added that Waller-Williams draws students from all over the county and that its current location isn't ideal because of limited accessibility and that it puts a strain on Transportation; he added that a more centrally located Waller-Williams might be beneficial to all stakeholder groups.
- **Male** – Renovate based on the current layout and usage of the campus, space to build upon would be limited to the Football field/stadium, which would be an enormous expense to rebuild, couple with the recent renovations of the Gheens Building and Durrett Auditorium, and the lower student needs index.
- **Atkinson** – Renovate because the school was built in the 1990's and the HVAC system should only need to be replaced. Additionally the property is too small for rebuilding.

Year 7 (2029) Schools under consideration:

- **Cochrane** – Rebuild due to extremely poor building design, high facility needs score, availability of land, and significant student needs. While the land is adequate in size, usable space will be a challenge because the build is situated directly in the middle of the property. The building's design is not supportive of 21<sup>st</sup> century teaching and learning because it's a round building, with no windows, and would be a poor investment to renovate such a poorly designed building. Biasioli added that this project is several years out, so we have time to get creative and plan accordingly.
- **JCTMS** – Renovation determined based on the architectural significance of the building and the property being too small to rebuild on.
- **Wellington** – Rebuild based on the poor condition of the building, the availability of land on the campus, and the student needs being significantly high. Because of the available acreage, construction could begin without disrupting the instructional process in the current building. Dr. Pollio added that rebuilding Wellington was the obvious decision.

Year 8 (2030) Schools under consideration:

- **Iroquois** – Rebuild after Olmsted South is completed. Perkins explained that the school was originally Gottschalk Junior High School for three grade levels (7-9), and for middle-school-sized students; the hallways are extremely narrow and the main hallway stretched a quarter of a mile long which makes effective supervision and access extremely challenging. The building receive additions 30+ years ago that were added on to accommodate additional students, with no thought about how the extended layout would negatively impact the school by spreading them out, promoting the industrial/factory model of education. Perkins added that Iroquois Facility Needs were still significantly higher than they should be, despite the major renovation from 2010 and that with the exception of the upcoming CTE renovations, the rest of the building should be "leveled." Perkins asserted that once Olmsted South's new building is completed in the eastern section of the campus, Iroquois could be rebuilt with a Southern Parkway-facing school front that would symbolically show our commitment to a school with some of the most significant challenges. A committee member asked where the athletic fields would be rebuilt? Perkins explained that the Athletic entrance and access would be from the Taylor Blvd side of the campus.
- **Meyzeek** – Renovate based on the small property and limited space
- **Cochran** – Renovate because the school was just built in the 1990's and the HVAC will be the main system in need of replacement.

Chris Perkins interrupted and explained that JCPS has never projected renovation projects further than year 4 years at a time and that discussing plans for eight years was an unprecedented vision in terms of facility planning.



JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

Dr. Pollio added that with the new Student Assignment plan, we would need to reevaluate the plan by year five to ensure that it still aligns with overarching district needs. Pollio also stated that this plan needs to be replicated every decade because JCPS will have several schools changing to Magnet Programs and students should be better filtered to area schools that currently don't have high enrollment.

Biasioli continued...

Year 9 (2031) Schools under consideration:

- **Wilt** – Rebuild based on the high facility needs, the poor architectural design (no windows), the availability of land, and the student needs being moderately high. Because of the available acreage, construction could begin without disrupting the current building.
- **Carrithers** – Rebuild based on the high facility needs, the obsolete design of the building, coupled with the availability of land. Biasioli stated that rebuilding would be tight, but doable. Perkins added, that by year nine, we will have had time to evaluate the lot, and reevaluate our programmatic needs. Dr. Pollio added that the new Student Assignment Plan will have had time to take effect, clarifying that this school has historically been under enrolled, but we will need to revisit around year five.
- **Maupin** – Renovate because the school was just built in 1990's and HVAC will need to be replaced.

James Craig requested that the presentation be amended to show the use of available "Bonding Capacity dollars" to make sure we don't leave anything on the table. Perkins responded that it would definitely be a part of the presentation once there is consensus on the direction, capacity, sequential planning, and estimated cost; that this was just to share how the data had been analyzed and was influencing the planning.

Biasioli continued...

Years 10-13 (2032-2035) Schools under consideration: Farnsley, Rutherford, Brandeis, Audubon, St. Matthews, Greathouse Shryock, Alex Kennedy, Newburg, Waller-Williams, Zachary Taylor

- Perkins explained that these schools were on the radar because the end-of-life systems and approaching that "desperately urgent need for renovation" status. More information would be forthcoming regarding these schools.

Chris Perkins brought back up the ten-year "long range planning" outlook from the August 31<sup>st</sup> meeting and explained that Operations and the Budget/Finance Divisions have been collaborating to forecast anticipated Bonding Capacity and the corresponding available Capital Construction Dollars year by year to accurately budget for each year without compromising long-range bonding capacity. He encouraged that Facilities Planning may be able to go above and beyond the Committee's initial forecasting to achieve additional facility renovations and construction more aggressively than initially shared. Perkins stated that was excited to bring forth a revised "road-map" for the next ten to fifteen years at the next Board Facility Meeting. The Committee shared their excitement for the forthcoming proposal.

Chris Perkins opened the floor for clarifying questions or comments.

Mr. Craig asked about Waggener? Dr. Pollio responded that it had just been renovated recently.

Craig asked about Waller- Williams? Dr. Pollio responded that it may be possible to consolidate with other special programs at another location and that we could revisit that.

Dr. Pollio asked how long do we wait to renovate a school? Biasioli responded that renovations should be on 30 year cycles.

Perkins asked if there were any other questions or comments?

Next Steps

Chris Perkins asked that everyone email their questions or comments to either Susan Biasioli or himself.

Dr. Pollio said that we are getting close to bringing this proposal to a formal recommendation, and that this is our roadmap and we would like to get everyone's approval soon.

#### Adjournment

James Craig entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Susan Biasiolli made the motion. It was seconded by Sienna Newman & Amanda Averette-Bush. James Craig adjourned the meeting at 5:56pm

#### Visitors in attendance:

- John Niehoff
- Ryan Kidd
- Kevin Brown
- Drew Gardner ( WLKY)