

Community Facility Survey Questions

July 2016

1. In 2014 the community approved a three year non-recurring district budget referendum in the amount of \$950,000 per year. These referendum dollars have been used, in conjunction with existing budget reallocations, to:
 - Improve and expand advance placement (AP) programs for all students.
 - Install fiber optic cable to eliminate leasing costs and expand technology service between all district buildings.
 - Expand the availability of technology to all students, regardless of economic means, in all district classrooms and grade levels.
 - Expand reading instruction in all grade 6-12 classrooms through the hiring of a Literacy Coach who works with teachers to develop instructional lessons that integrate reading strategies across all curriculum and content areas.
 - Expand technology integration in all grades (4K-12) through the hiring of a technology specialist who works with all teachers to plan the effective use of technology to teach content skills across all curriculum areas.
 - Install safety and security upgrades in all district buildings to help protect staff and students on a daily basis.
 - Purchase and install a new metal roof on the Lodi Middle School, to purchase and install a new chiller at the middle school, to purchase and install a new boiler at the high school, and to complete several general facility and grounds maintenance projects across the district.
 - Maintain class size within approved Board policy limits.
 - Retain and hire high quality staff to deliver instruction to our students.

This three year non-recurring referendum will expire at the end of the 2016-17 school year. An independent agency (R.W. Baird – Public Finance) was contracted to review our future state and local budget projections. R.W. Baird has indicated our district will need to replace the expiring \$950,000 referendum with a new referendum in the amount of \$1.5 to \$1.7 million over the next three to five years just to maintain our existing instructional and co-curricular programs, to address facility/grounds maintenance and needed roof replacement, and to sustain the district technology infrastructure to support a 21st Century classroom learning environment.

Definition of non-recurring vs recurring referendum:

Non-recurring means a defined number of years is specified when asking for additional budget funds. At the end of the specified time period (usually 3 to 5 years) the additional referendum budget dollars are no longer available to the school district. The Board would then have to ask voters to approve another non-recurring referendum.

Recurring means the amount of additional budget funds the Board would ask for, if approved, goes on indefinitely. The Board in this case would not have to come back to ask for that funding amount to be renewed.

Responses:

- Non-recurring (7)
- Recurring (3)

- What's the question? #1 is a rambling set of statements and definitions. If the question is "Do you favor approving a new non-recurring fund for the aforementioned list?" then my answer is NO. We cannot afford more taxation in this continually dwindling economy.
- Is there supposed to be a question here?
- No
- Sooo, is this poor planning or overspending (again)?

Would you support a three to five year non-recurring referendum that would provide between \$1.5 to \$1.7 million dollars to replace the current expiring \$950,000 referendum to maintain existing instructional programs, repair and maintain facilities/grounds/roofs, maintain a modern instructional technology program, and maintain a high quality staff if the referendum did not require the district to raise additional taxes?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	45.19%	174
Probably Yes	31.43%	121
Undecided	6.23%	24
Probably No	7.27%	28
Definitely No	9.87%	38

Comments: 47

- In this economy? Insanity.
- I'm all for maintaining the structures and staying competitive with staff. This district however seems to use this money on whatever it wants whenever it wants. I think the public would be more apt to support these referendums if the school could come up with a clear plan and follow it. Why does the school constantly overspend what it asks for? Also can the school prove that the students are academically better than before with all of this "technology" and special positions? I doubt it, but maybe some statistics to show us and a better business plan would go a long ways in selling the public.
- The amount is too large for the community to financially support.
- You need to find ways to save money. You keep spending more money each year. There has to be some accountability for the spending habits you have. I am sure there are some costs you can give up or push out. It keeps coming down to us tax payers with no accountability.
- A 5% increase YoY would equate to a request of 1.1M for the first year of a 3yr renewal and an ending amount of 1.2M. Extending out for 5 years would still only put year 5 at 1.35M. Asking for a starting figure of 1.5M means that costs have gone up in excess of 10% a year. If that is true, administration needs to put in place better cost controls and cuts as necessary as a 10% increase in costs yearly is not justifiable.
- Something has to be done to reduce/eliminate repair and maintenance costs for the older facilities. This isn't a good long-term plan; it's a band-aid.

- Use fundraisers/private donations
- Not at this time - need much more proof of need. If I would support, the non-recurring would be only possibility. Need to "live within our means".
- You have some staff that every person in the community dislikes yet you keep them - at high salaries. Get rid of the HATED teachers and keep the good ones. There is a lot of wasted money within the school district already.
- Too expensive. Project needs to be reduced
- not needed
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- You have not made any attempt to cut administrative costs. We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. It is time to consider consolidating with one or more adjacent districts. Florida has 68 counties and 68 school districts. We should follow their example.
- The cost increases referenced are extremely high and yet your justification is extremely vague. Spending increases of this magnitude are not in line with what taxpayers see as prudent and/or financially responsible.
- Taxes, taxes, taxes. Are we to become like the Madison School District where every year the tax levy is increased to pay for poor management of taxpayers' "investment" in education? Enough already. You've demonstrated a tremendous ability to spend. Impress us with frugality in an economy that demands it. We slobs who labor every day for years without pay increases have had to sacrifice to make ends meet. Come back with your hand out when the economy is rolling.
- Simply stated, I would prefer that we focus more on paying our teachers a salary that reflects our appreciation for their hard work, rather than buy every kid an iPad or a chrome book. I will want more detailed budget information before I support this.
- I would support the 1st year and would have to look at each additional year based upon a cost and need.
- In today's world why would we spend money on a full time technology specialist? Call Waunakee and share there's for a small fee.
- I only support maintenance of property
- Pay the teachers less, they are overpaid.
- Great idea, but what will the cost be to individual families.....taxes already too high in this town.
- If the referendum did not require the district to raise additional taxes.
- Make do with what you have like the rest of us! We are not your cash cow!
- No, We Don't need it, Period
- Not specific enough
- What is role of renters?
- Too much money.
- I don't believe more money equals better quality. I also don't believe it is our duty to buy every child/student a computer/notebook. It is a parental responsibility although a rent option should exist for actual poor families. Many other similar reasons.
- Even though the state has foolishly lowered aide to schools we will have to live within our means until people come to their senses and oust the current administration
- We do not need a new building to replace 1 old building, 1 fairly old building, and 1 newer building.
- Only if no other referendum were proposed in addition to this one. I would support this as a sole referendum. I have a finite amount of money to budget for this and although I understand I should never expect my taxes to go down (which could happen if the referendum is allowed to expire & no referendum passes), I can support them staying close to the same. School board, what will

happen if none of this passes? I ask you that? Is it better to shoot for the moon or at least get what people can reasonably maintain?

- How would it not increase my taxes?
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- As long as taxes are not raised. Living on fixed income.
- The school districts need to learn to live within their means, like the local families need to do. I had several classes in jr high in modular, double wides when my hometown schools ran out of room, to keep costs down. I learned just as well there as I would have in a granite shrine of a building. I already pay \$6k per year in property taxes, which is outrageous. If anything, taxes should be going down. If costs rise based on inflationary issues, fees should be raised to people who have children in the schools to cover that. Please seek private industry or individual donors to cover any new construction or purchase endeavors.
- Where would the money come from?
- taxes,
- Enrollment is down and it would be better to add on to the present school buildings than to build a new one.
- This is such a wonderful program, it would be very sad to not have it! All would lose what was gained these past 3 yrs. good luck. Classes learn so much.
- As long as taxes remained where they are. If taxes increase I personally will be taxed out of my house!
- I think they can minus the computers for every kid. There is a thing called sharing computers at school and doing homework at home with paper and pen. That's how I learned and it worked just fine. We would save so much money.
- First of all, you would've have to raise the taxes because the taxes will remain up from the last referendum which is something you've failed to mention. Additionally, I believe that the way you are currently spending money in the district is not in the best interest of the students and teaching staff, but rather to reach goals/desires that administration has set forth. When you talk about MAINTAINING staff, can you explain why you've let go 6 staff members for the coming year, many of whom were some of the best with children, just to hire new people from out of the district? You've not demonstrated that you are following through with what your intentions were from the last referendum and as a result, I'm not going to support an upcoming referendum.
- The board and admin needs to start looking at how every dollar is spent before asking for more money. A lot of waste in Lodi District.
- How would this be funded if not through additional taxes?
- We pay enough in taxes, the district needs to learn to live with it's means.

Would you support a recurring referendum that would provide \$1.5 to \$1.7 million dollars in place of the current expiring \$950,000 referendum that would be adjusted on an annual basis by the Board, depending on State funding support, to maintain existing instructional programs, repair and maintain facilities/grounds/roofs, maintain a modern instructional technology program and maintain a high quality staff if the referendum did not require the district to raise additional taxes?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	34.72%	134

Probably Yes	23.83%	92
Undecided	8.81%	34
Probably No	15.28%	59
Definitely No	17.36%	67

Comments 60

- have kids so yes, but worry the community will not approve a recurring referendum and worry about how funds are spent/accountability
- In this economy? Insanity.
- I would never write anyone a blank check, especially someone with a history of being fiscally irresponsible.
- I want to be able to stop the referendum if I do not approve of what the money is being spent on
- I do NOT trust any board to adjust the funding as they see fit.
- The amount is too large for the community to financially support
- I do not want the board to have control. The facilities are in disarray under the current board and leave us with nothing but a mess of debt. How can you let go of the buildings that now are a huge debt?
- See prior comment.
- Recurring referendums are not ideal, as it's easy for the Board & district to lose accountability for its expenditures.
- Use fundraisers/private donations
- Dangerous, this becomes part of regular budget. And then when more may be needed another, additional referendum? Accountability for proof of need. Additional monies more difficult. Part of Boards responsibility.
- Not a recurring referendum.
- I do not believe in reoccurring referendums.
- Recurring might let the state avoid its share of school support.
- should of been maintained over the years
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. You should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- I will not support free use of extra funds because three years down the road we will be asked for more money again. Recurring referendum the public loses its control in this at the mercy of the board.
- Obviously based on my statement above I wouldn't trust the board to "adjust" the amount at all, in fact they would probably be asking for more after a brief period of time.
- See above. Come on, it's the same question to ask a squeezed community: "Will you pony up more tax dollars to cover up poor resource management?" The answer should be a unanimous "No!"
- Reduced accountability with recurring referendum.
- I prefer nonrecurring option.
- I cannot support just giving additional income blindly each year, without some sort of justification in what is needed.
- I don't feel you make good choices of good and bad staff

- Pay the teachers less, they are definitely overpaid.
- How would you get more money, without raising taxes....?
- No, needs to be addressed by voters.
- No recurring referendum
- No, We Don't need it, Period
- The need for the funding may no longer be needed!
- I want to have a vote to determine if referendum should continue.
- Because it established a new norm which reduces state funding for public education.
- Because it established a new norm which reduces state funding for public education.
- I don't like the idea that this could go on indefinitely without input from the tax payers.
- Too much money. If I or we didn't approve of a non-recurring referendum why would we approve of a recurring referendum?
- I would support either one that is proposed.
- It can't go on indefinitely.
- If a referendum passes, I feel the board should be required to review after a period of time and, if more is needed, go to the public for opinion. As it being done this time.
- It is equivalent of a permanent tax increase without accountability or modification for changing conditions.
- It is like giving the school district a blank check
- Adjustments means it could be less \$, or IT COULD BE MORE \$\$\$.
- I would never support an undefined timeline.
- I feel it gives the district more unrestricted and unaccountably for spending.
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- I believe the Board should have to reapply every few years so the taxpayers can decide what is really needed at that time. I don't like the idea of an indefinite pool of money without having to explain actual current needs.
- My husband and I are not made of money nor are we any school system's personal bank. Living on a fixed income.
- should be non-recurring
- The school districts need to learn to live within their means, like the local families need to do. I had several classes in jr high in modular, double wides when my hometown schools ran out of room, to keep costs down. I learned just as well there as I would have in a granite shrine of a building. I already pay \$6k per year in property taxes, which is outrageous. If anything, taxes should be going down. If costs rise based on inflationary issues, fees should be raised to people who have children in the schools to cover that. Please seek private industry or individual donors to cover any new construction or purchase endeavors.
- Once again where would the money come from?
- taxes
- Prefer Non recurring referendum.
- Enrollment is down and it would be better to add on to the present school buildings than to build a new one.
- The school is spending this money very stupidly.
- The same reason as above, but also, I don't trust the district enough to allow them to be adjusting the amount each year even if it is board approved.

- Again, need to look at how we are currently recklessly spending the money we are spending before asking for more.
 - Need more information on the funding.
 - I support continues in education but feel it would be foolish to have a recurring number without having a committee take a look at the numbers and needs first.
 - I feel budgeting should be looked at often, it's like giving money and for years and years it is never assessed again. I support non reoccurring
2. The Board has looked at a variety of different options to address the facility needs of the district. All of the options that the Board and the Community Advisory Committee reviewed, their estimated costs, and their estimated tax impact can be accessed from the School District of Lodi website www.lodi.k12.wi.us under either the "District" or "Community" tab at the top of the home page. The Board is reviewing with city and town officials how to address potential increased traffic flow in regard to any facility plan they pursue.

The two options that the Board is currently considering are Option H-A and Option H-B. Both of these options involve building a new elementary school. The Board explored using existing sites and has done soil borings on the current elementary site, (located by the Highway 60 athletic fields) and on the Lodi Middle School physical education and soccer fields. The elementary site was determined to not be a cost effective solution and deemed impractical as a building site due to the large amount of water and unstable materials that make up the subgrades of that site. The Middle School site is a buildable option, but it would result in reducing available outside physical education and soccer program space and create more traffic congestion on this site. The Board has been exploring the purchase of other possible building sites. The two sites currently being considered are directly west of the current Lodi High School.

Responses: (16)

- Not clear what question I am answering here?
- No
- Would this new school replace both the elementary and primary schools? Are we being held for ransom again on the land purchase?
- I understand but why have we not prepared for this years ago. Why is it now our responsibility? Why is there no oversight of the facilities?
- please don't decrease current space, too congested already
- I would vote for a referendum if I thought the plan for our district would be effective long-term. There should only be one elementary school.
- I like option I.
- Again, where is the question? Does the fact that a simple Survey Monkey survey cannot be created unless it is bloated and cannot be understood serve as the ultimate example of why people should not empty their wallets any further for this school district in this lousy economy? Waste, waste, waste.
- Boo Hiss!
- How do you propose to fix the already high traffic issue we have now? By building yet another school in the same area, there is not a good flow for traffic as it is. I would agree to it if they could come up with a traffic solution that works for everyone. Otherwise, this site just does not make sense.

- I do not agree with putting the school up with the other schools. I do not think any thought has been given to road capacity issues. Have nobody in the school board tried to pick up a student up at the Middle School or High School at the end of the day? The back-up that occurs at Strangeway and Sauk Street is already unacceptable. These streets up at the West end of town are not Boulevards meant to take this amount of traffic, these are residential streets. There are not enough exit points to disperse these traffic. Not to mention that now we are dividing the City into two sides. The east half with no schools which will have to be burdened with always transporting their kids, and the west side which will not have these burdens.
- west of the current Lodi High School
- I would love to see a new primary/elementary school combo- so that OSC kids and all the grades 4k-5 can see one another and also make less buildings. HOWEVER and I know this concerns many, but what will happen to the other two buildings- are we going to another town that just lets them sit and go to waste? Lodi is beautiful and to see a wasting building first thing when you come into Lodi (current Elementary) would not be good... I hope this is something being looked in to.... tearing it down? Turning it into something else, more fields?
- No question here?
- H-B
- Neither option is good

Would you support a resolution and referendum to purchase a new site, make necessary improvements to the site for the purpose of building a new school if the referendum did not require the district to raise additional taxes?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	44.36%	173
Probably Yes	27.18%	106
Undecided	6.41%	25
Probably No	10.77%	42
Definitely No	11.28%	44

Comments 52

- In this economy? Insanity.
- The district has land, use it. Just because you don't like the fact it will take away some space for outdoor PE and soccer fields doesn't mean you should spend more money on land when we already are in a deficit. And I am a parent of a soccer player!
- Only if the school would replace both schools, and the land wasn't being purchased from a friend of the board for 100 times what it is worth.
- However will not approve any building plan that reduces gym space. We need more not less!!!!
- This is nice in theory but typically the cost overruns come up after the fact and then as taxpayers we will be forced to deal with it. There will be lots of animosity at that point so being sure of the numbers better be core to the decision making.

- I am frustrated with the facilities manager. What do we pay him as a district? Why have we not prepared for this years ago? This is a disgrace.
- This is the best long-term solution for the district.
- Use fundraisers/private donations
- If some soccer fields are sacrificed, so be it. We all have had to or will have to make sacrifices in life. No new sit use land/site already have.
- I don't know how you can buy land and not raise taxes.
- I'd rather not shift focus away from downtown. I like the activity and opportunity the schools being in that area bring.
- use what you have
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- The theory of "if you build it they will come" is NOT accurate. We have declining numbers in enrollment in Lodi, unlike in the 90's when this community was growing.
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been reduced. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- There's no way you can do this without raising taxes.
- You should explain how you would accomplish this. As far as I know and have always been taught, "there is no free lunch" so if you are not raising taxes, how is it being paid for? If you have an anonymous donor willing to foot the bill for all of this say so, otherwise explain yourself. If not, I have to assume some kind of creative accounting is being used with the end result being higher taxes anyway.
- See above.
- Need to see enrollment numbers as justification for a new building.
- What about reusing the Primary school location? I despise the edge of town locations that discourage pedestrian and bike traffic, encourage sprawl and car dependency! Maybe if sidewalk and bike lanes were installed I'd be less opposed. I find it deplorable that kids have to zig-zag their way across the same street (4X?) to the edge of town to go to school.
- Learn to make do with what we have.
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.
- It would depend on what the plan is.
- We own plenty of fine property and we are a small small town. We don't need to purchase anything new.
- No higher taxes...great!
- I feel that the current condition allows several more years out of the current elementary and grade schools
- Enrollment is down
- No, We Don't need it, Period
- With the decreasing number of students attending the school district as a whole likely to continue, building new structures seems unreasonable.
- You have enough land! Why buy more land?
- We don't need a new school.
- The cost of sites being considered is exorbitant. The expected revenue from sale is extremely low. What some may want is not the issue. What is needed is the issue.
- The existing site supported the current buildings for how many years. I actually kept grade for the excavator when the former high school was excavated and there was no soil problems where the current buildings are sited
- With declining enrollment and lack of community growth, I would rather see resources go to improving or consolidating to existing buildings. Also, that area is so congested already, I cannot

see how adding another building is safe or an effective use of resources without significant restructuring and road improvements which will also fall on the tax payers.

- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- I think the Lodi Middle School site is a good option and we should utilize what we (the TAXPAYERS) have already paid for.
- Do not believe could be done without raising taxes
- As long as taxes are not raised.
- There needs to be a gym/field house included in any of the plans.
- Not needed- declining enrollment and existing middle & high school can fit more classrooms.
- The school districts need to learn to live within their means, like the local families need to do. I had several classed in jr high in modular, double wides when my hometown schools ran out of room, to keep costs down. I learned just as well there as I would have in a granite shrine of a building. I already pay \$6k per year in property taxes, which is outrageous. If anything, taxes should be going down. If costs rise based on inflationary issues, fees should be raised to people who have children in the schools to cover that. Please seek private industry or individual donors to cover any new construction or purchase endeavors.
- higher taxes
- Utilize all existing space, than consider addition's onto present school buildings.
- it wouldn't lower taxes
- They should not put the elementary school by the high school because the high school kids don't drive respectively. They will end up hitting a child. I've seen how they drive on Church Street and Sauk street. They don't care! Apparently neither does the school district.
- A new school is not necessary! Enrollment is down and spending the money is not necessary.
- I still strongly believe that building a new school is unnecessary and just another way that the administration is trying to achieve their own goals/desires. With decreasing enrollment, why are we going to build a new school? Yes I've been to some meetings and read the materials you've put out for community members, however, I still feel like there is an agenda here more then what is being presented.
- Decreasing enrollment, so spend more when you already need more money.... That doesn't make sense.
- Why has there not been POSITIVE publicity regarding this issue. The paper printed an article that in my opinion left a negative image of future plans for a referendum. The Facebook comments I have seen have also been negative. When is the committee, school board or administration going to step up and share a positive Image of the support that this referendum needs? The community (~75% without school aged children) need to see someone step up and paint a positive image to represent what is needed at the elementary level!!
- It's unfortunate that both options include building a new school. Some members of the community might feel they're being forced into this option.
- I believe there is value in the Elementary School. Losing the two gyms will just make scheduling athletic practices/games more difficult. This is significant as practices for youth sports continue to get later in the evening. The \$ spent on the HVAC system was not that long ago.

Would you support a resolution and referendum to purchase a new site, make necessary site improvements if the purchase and improvement costs were paid for by increasing the amount of a recurring or non-recurring referendum with the additional funds, once the site costs are paid off, being reallocated to maintain existing instructional programs, repair and maintain

facilities/grounds/roofs, maintain a modern technology instructional program and maintain a high quality staff if the referendum did not require the district to raise additional taxes?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	33.42%	129
Probably Yes	27.72%	107
Undecided	9.07%	35
Probably No	15.54%	60
Definitely No	14.25%	55

Comments 50

- In this economy? Insanity.
- The district has land, use it. Just because you don't like the fact it will take away some space for outdoor PE and soccer fields doesn't mean you should spend more money on land when we already are in a deficit. And I am the parent of a soccer player.
- You are not keeping good teachers
- That is a capitol expense we are discussing, the referendum to me is to keep the current facilities operational
- Need to keep any building referendum and operational referendum separate
- Again unless overall plan reduces gym space.
- Too wordy to make an accurate assessment of what is being asked.
- You need to prove to the people of the community that you are able to curb some of your spending in order to help with the tax implications.
- See prior comment.
- Would prefer a non-recurring referendum.
- Use fundraisers/private donations
- Bottomline - if new site and/or recurring are in any referendum I will not support. And, too much emphasis on sports. Phys Ed important - kids need to move around, get off phones and away from computers.
- Separate distinct non-recurring referendum should be used. See above
- Only yes if not a recurring expense.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- The theory of "if you build it they will come" is NOT accurate. We have declining numbers in enrollment in Lodi, unlike in the 90's when this community was growing.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- I would only support non recruiting referendum.
- I am a definite no without a feasibility study of some type to assess what is best for the community. I think that it would cost more to build new and still have to maintain existing sites instead of using what is already there. I don't want to see taxes increase instead of increasing our tax base.
- See reply to #5

- Would the \$\$cost be the same? Obviously it will not take as much \$\$ to maintain a new structure.
 - I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.
 - Lodi should be able to live within it's means, we don't need new facilities.
 - Would agree to most things if not going to raise the taxes.
 - Not needed enrollment is down
 - No
 - if a recurring referendum
 - if a recurring referendum
 - We don't need a new school.
 - Again, voting in a permanent new set of fixes. Cost of taxing is not appropriate. It becomes an entitlement.
 - This question is VERY difficult to understand!
 - Again - wrong sites and this doesn't address the cost of a building project. If you buy the land, eventually you need to build the building and that isn't going to get any less expensive by delaying the project.
 - Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
 - Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. It taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
 - See above.
 - See comment question #3.
 - see #2
 - no more taxes
 - See above for comments.
 - it wouldn't lower taxes
 - You have a space you own..use it!
 - I have a very modest home. If my taxes raise I will not be able to remain in it.
 - Uncomfortable with the additional funds being used after the site costs were paid off!!
 - They can build on the site where the primary school is.
 - I am skeptical that the district could do that without raising taxes. It is important to have the funds to address issues that arise with current buildings. It is a great idea to sell the primary school. With enrollment down, I have a very hard time with the idea of building a brand new school, especially with the prospect that it will raise taxes.
 - If you are going to have to relocate funds when the site costs are paid off, why can't you just lower the referendum amount so that you break even with what you need to accomplish? This seems like a way to get more money from your tax payers over a longer period of time.
 - Again, decreasing enrollment.
 - Too many "ifs" in this proposal, need more details.
 - I would not support something that was not fully outlined in an initial proposal. I don't feel the school needs to acquire more property at this time. I feel that is something that can be handled after we take care of more pressing issues
3. The Community Facility Advisory Committee of 93 community members, parents, staff, local officials and business owners, formed back in February 2016, recommended that the Board consider pursuing facility Option H-A. This option would include the following:
- The Board would sell the Primary/OSC building and land as the costs associated with renovating this building have been deemed to be a poor financial investment, sell the

Lodi Elementary building and land and sell the district office building and land.
(Estimated Income - \$450,000)

- The Board would build a new school on a separate or existing site that would house all elementary grades early childhood through 4th grade and the OSC Charter School Program. **(Cost estimate excluding site - \$27,070,000)**
- Remodel the current Lodi Middle School to add 5th grade classes (not part of the OSC Program) and make entrance safety improvements. **(Cost estimate - \$2,230,000)**
- Lodi High School would receive some minor internal renovation to accommodate modern learning needs and the district office would be moved to northeast wing of the high school which would be renovated to accommodate district office needs. **(Cost estimate - \$1,250,000)**
- The Board would need to construct or lease a separate building to house the district maintenance shop and vehicle storage. **(Cost estimate - \$1,760,000)**
- The total estimated cost of Option H-A is \$31,860,000 (excluding site and site development costs) and would result in an **estimated tax increase of \$137.00 on a property valued at \$100,000 or \$411.00 on a property valued at \$300,000.**
- The district would pay off the debt for Option H-A over a 15-20 year period by issuing public (debt) bonds.
- The Board has also discussed that selling the current district office and maintenance shop building, moving the district office to the high school, and building or leasing a separate maintenance building seems to be an unnecessary district cost expenditure.
- If the Board chooses to keep the current district office/maintenance shop at its current location and make necessary roof and heating/ventilating repairs to the existing building, the total cost of Option H-A would be reduced to \$30,871,000 and result in a corresponding tax reduction as well.

Responses: (9)

- not clear what question I am answering here
- No
- What cost does the OSC incur?
- Keep the current office/maintenance shop.
- 31 MILLION DOLLARS! Are you out of your minds? That's my Survey Monkey question for you.
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic
- I support no tax increase
- Don't agree
- Sell primary school, take funds to help build a second gym in the high school (which should have been done at the beginning), the middle school should be able to hold 5-8, as it has in the past. DO staff could utilize room 2000 in the high school. While 4K & OSC could use the current DO. K-4 at the primary!!!

Would you support a referendum (Option H-A) to build a new elementary school on a separate site to house all elementary grades early childhood through 4th grade, remodel of the existing Lodi Middle School to add 5th grade classes (not part of OSC program) and make entrance safety improvements, make minor internal renovations at Lodi High School, move the district office to the high school, and build or lease a new maintenance shop building at an estimated tax increase of \$137.00 for a property valued at \$100,000 or \$411.00 for a property valued at \$300,000?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	22.92%	88
Probably Yes	24.74%	95
Undecided	11.98%	46
Probably No	20.31%	78
Definitely No	20.05%	77

Comments 77

- In this economy? Insanity.
- What are the land and building going to be listed for? Believe land and building worth more.
- I might, but I would want to see the school get multiple bids, and I'd want to see the school desegregated and evenly funded by eliminating the OSC program.
- Wrong Plan That tax burden is too high for a town the size of Lodi
- This would take away already needed gym space.
- Too expensive
- too many students in one building
- The taxes in Lodi are out of control. I think you need to look into cutting some spending. You should have prepared for this long ago. We are paying the price because the board did not do their diligence on the facilities.
- There is no value add to relocating the district maintenance shop anywhere other than on school grounds.
- \$1.7M for a district maintenance shop and vehicle storage is exorbitant. Extremely so.
- 1st is the student population consistently and constantly rising? 2nd This is why fundraising & private donors exist. Please utilize other resources & stop asking to increase OUR taxes.
- Again existing site. removed from question. And middle school was 5-8 previously - why remodeling necessary? If our enrollments is not increasing, I guess I cannot connect the need for either/all of these building referenda. Much more information is needed.
- Don't need to move office or maintenance
- If the proposal was to deal w/the primary school only, I would support the proposal. Why sell the elementary school & district offices?
- Tax impact to high. No sense wasting a usable district office, shop and elementary building.
- Too much investment for this school district, with declining enrollment.
- are you nuts
- Unable to afford increase in property tax.
- not needed
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- Make better use of current schools. We have the room. Declining enrollment.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- We need more gym space plus our taxes would go up by \$300. This is a small town and does not justify a large tax increase. Our numbers over all are dropping and will continue if the costs increase.

- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- At this time we don't have enough money to properly maintain the buildings we have, I can't understand why we would be building more schools that we can't maintain with the declining enrollment.
- If moving the DO to the HS eliminates current classrooms then I'd vote no. I feel remodeling the HS and removing current classroom may in the future hurt us in terms of growth down the road.
- As I understand it, the average class size is shrinking. Maybe we should look at combining sites and making better use of the space we already have.
- 31 million dollars for a city of 3000. What this town needs is a reality check. Hello? 31 million dollars of money we do not have to support a dwindling school population in a town that has two Cadillac secondary school buildings with vacant space. This survey would be laughable if you weren't actually serious about it. 31 million dollar facilities in a city where there are less than 90 5th graders. Insane.
- Keep district office or move it to current Primary school site.
- I can NOT afford the tax increase. We would our home.
- Only if you could fix the traffic flow that we currently have and will be made worse by adding another school to the same side of town.
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.
- I would support parts of this but not other.
- Do not put the district office in any school.
- District offices are very nice. The Charter school gets their own funding let them find their own building. The maintenance Dept. should get what they need.
- I think the Elementary School still has several years of life left in it. Would rather see the Primary close and reshuffling of the grades with adding to the Middle and High Schools if needed.
- taxes already too HIGH in Lodi....supporting our over abundance of police, dogs and new police cars
- I will not support any tax increases.
- No. too costly (taxes) & don't need these are wants not needs.
- Would move. Can't afford taxes
- I can barely afford the present taxes.
- No
- See comment above.
- Are you kidding? Not at the price tag. We do not have to get rid of the Elementary school, many years of life left in it.
- If the elementary site is not a building site - who would buy the property? The elementary school is still a usable building. Too much money at \$31.8 million not including land.
- We would like to know these 93 people who voted for this please print their names and businesses. Option H-A - Way too much money.
- Keep 5th grade in the elementary school.
- We don't need a new school.
- I don't think this option is viable for many of our elderly and am more supportive of a lesser amount. This amount would be a burden to my family. The salability of the current primary school is questionable as well. Really \$450,000 income is a drop in the bucket when you are looking at a \$30 million dollar project and not a good "selling" point to the public. Does this referendum address any maintenance costs at the current middle & high school? Or will there need to be a non-recurrent referendum for that next year?
- Please consider keeping 5th grade at the new elementary school.

- I think the current Elementary school still has years left to it, plus has 2 gyms and I believe \$ has already been invested in it. (maybe this is the building to house OSC and primary and build a new elementary school to house 3-5 instead)
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- This additional tax burden is unaffordable.
- See comment question #3.
- The original options were between \$18-24 million. After everyone's input, there was no compromise, they just included everything anyone wanted.
- see #2
- I think Lodi needs new school board members
- We do have a declining enrollment in the district. I think the Board of education is going over the top on these plans. Were any of the 93 people at the Feb. meeting retired and on a fixed income?
- taxes
- You never build just a school, it always becomes an overpriced monument!
- With declining enrollments I do not see the need for a new school at this time. There are many districts in the state that are functioning fine in much older buildings and tighter spaces.
- No new taxes
- The only one that I see would work is option H-A. Building, but again I can't afford 411.00 additional for taxes. That would make my taxes over 7000. A yr. that's crazy. I wouldn't even be able to sell because of that.
- Does not include the OSC? Also moving the district offices is too expensive.
- Build on the primary school site
- A major additional concern I have about this is that you'd be separating the 5th graders to the middle school and leaving the OSC 5th graders in the elementary school. This makes it even more difficult to collaborate across OSC and non-OSC students/teachers and I do wonder about what the OSC staff truly thinks of this option.
- Figure out where each penny is currently wasted before asking for more.
- There's no need for a \$2,000,000 garage.
- Yes! Why are we even thinking of putting more money into a deteriorating building? Take pictures and show the community. Unsafe stairs that young children are walking up and down. Classrooms that are so hot classes cannot even take place. Bug infestations. Faucets that are constantly leaking and costing taxpayers' money. Do people who have not been in these buildings for years really know what is inside of them? Open the doors, invite them in! Show them what we have and then show them neighboring schools that are pulling students away from the Lodi district with open enrollment. Also, operating costs would certainly change. Why are these numbers not figured in?!
- Who would possibly be by BOTH Buildings? They would sit vacant for years! Not to mention, we need the sport fields as well.
- Why build a new district office and a new shop. Keep what we have and update.
- I feel if you are building a new school why not keep 5th grade there and keep Middle School 6-8. If that were the case my vote would be 'Definitely Yes'
- I cannot vote for anything that does not address the gymnasium issue within the district. It's impossible to find time now. And eliminating gyms without replacing them is not an option for me. I understand they can make PE classes work out. But this is a VERY active community and further choking that with this plan for that much money is ridiculous to me.

- This is a hard time for families, I think there are more pressing things that need to be tended to first. \$411 annually adds up to about \$35 month, which is substantial for some
- Nothing wrong with current elementary school. Would be waste of taxpayer dollars to vacant the property.
- do not believe 5th grade should be included w/ middle school population

Would you support a referendum if the district office and maintenance shop was maintained and renovated thereby reducing both the total cost and tax impact of Option H-A?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	24.74%	95
Probably Yes	29.17%	112
Undecided	16.41%	63
Probably No	14.84%	57
Definitely No	14.84%	57

Comments 47

- In this economy? Insanity.
- I'm not sure the district office needs much more than a couple smartphones, however I understand the importance of the maintenance shop.
- see above
- Gym space
- You show me some fiscal responsibility and I will be more willing to listen to options of spending.
- Again - \$1.7M for a district maintenance shop and vehicle storage is exorbitant. Shop around or explore alternate solutions on existing sites. You could build a shed with an office on an existing site for less than that.
- Reallocate where budget \$ is being invested. No need for a referendum. Again please adjust \$ budget, fund raise & ask for private
- Would like to see the current DO site be reutilized for other municipal needs, specifically as a location for a new public safety building housing Fire, EMS, and Police.
- If all the schools are concentrated, though, it would be good to have the office up there, too.
- If you do something do it right. Don't keep the old District Office.
- What is wrong w/the elementary school? The district office now has more space with the daycare closed - use that for the district or maintenance dept.
- see above
- no H-A period
- Same as above.
- use what you have
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.

- H A building project to simply too expensive.
- We definitely support a single building for the elementary school. There should be economy of scale savings by not having two separate buildings for elementary age. Not clear to me why 5th grade goes to jr high however. Why not in grade school?
- No, I support the status quo and doing your level best to make do with less in a time when we all have to do this at home to survive. Again, shelve this for another time when people are getting raises and their COL increases aren't near double digits each year.
- There does not seem to any reason to renovate
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.
- They need to be taken care of first so they can maintain the buildings so they don't need to be replaced.
- ok, would reduce...but still go up? probably not
- No. too costly (taxes) & don't need these are wants not needs.
- Nothing wrong with district office
- I cannot afford additional taxes.
- No
- Not the right plan, even at a lower cost.
- I just don't like option H-A no matter what was done to reduce costs. \$31.8 million is just too much.
- Land is part of the Elementary.
- Not a big enough difference to change my opinion.
- have buildings in a school campus
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. It taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- This option would still be too costly.
- See comment question #3.
- see #2
- I wouldn't trust the Lodi school board to wipe my hind end
- taxes, wouldn't be lowered
- Again it comes down to taxes.
- Why is it okay for the DO to stay in it's place, but that same land was deemed not cost effective/impractical because of the contents of the land for the elementary school building?
- Again, too much money currently being wasted to give you more to waste.
- It would be foolish to have the entire school district campus at one site and the district offices elsewhere
- As above
- Again no added field house at the high school and in new building.

4. The Board of Education is also considering facility Option H-B. This option would include:
- The Board would sell the current Primary/OSC building and land. **(Estimated income - \$180,000)**
 - The Board would build a new school on a separate or existing site. The building would be planned for future expansion as an elementary school building. This new building would

be built to initially house only Early Childhood, 4 year old Kindergarten, Kindergarten and the OSC Charter School program. **(Cost estimate - \$12,830,000)**

- Remodel the existing Lodi Elementary building to house grades 1 to 4. **(Cost estimate - \$3,450,000)**
- Remodel the existing Lodi Middle School to add 5th grade classes (not part of OSC Program) and make entrance safety improvements. **(Cost estimate - \$2,230,000)**
- Lodi High School would receive some minor internal renovation to accommodate modern learning needs. **(Cost estimate - \$230,000)**
- The existing district office/maintenance shop building would receive roof, heating, and ventilating repairs. **(Cost estimate - \$250,000)**
- The total estimated cost of Option H-B is \$18,810,000 (excluding site and site development costs) and would result in an **estimated tax increase of \$31.00 on a property valued at \$100,000 or \$93.00 on a property valued at \$300,000.**
- The district would pay off the debt for Option H-B over a 15-20 year period by issuing public (debt) bonds.

Responses: (13)

- 12.8 Million for a school with limited number of occupants is outrageous!
- This Amount would be acceptable, but no more.
- The elementary students need to be kept together. There are already bad vibes between the two separate elementary programs. If there would be Gregory in the future this would also create a new numbers and school alignment problems.
- Why do you need reno to the LES in this option? It is unclear to me why that is needed when the building already houses grades 1-5
- not clear what question I am answering here
- No
- No
- okay
- Why don't you tell us how much our taxes will go down after the referendum have expired so we know the true cost of the tax increase.
- No charter schools
- This would be less of a burden for the tax payers.
- No
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.

Would you support a referendum (Option H-B) to build a new elementary school on a separate site to house early childhood, 4-year old kindergarten, kindergarten and the OSC Charter School Program, remodel the existing Lodi Elementary School to house grades 1 to 4, remodel the existing Lodi Middle School to add 5th grade classes (not part of OSC Program) and make entrance safety improvements, make minor internal renovations at Lodi High School and make roof, heating and ventilation repairs on the existing district office building at an estimated tax increase of \$31.00 on a house valued at \$100,000 or \$93.00 on a house valued at \$300,000?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	25.71%	100
Probably Yes	26.22%	102
Undecided	15.68%	61
Probably No	18.77%	73
Definitely No	13.62%	53

Comments 70

- In this economy? Insanity.
- I feel option H-A is much better in long term
- cost is more in line no net increase in taxes with High School now paid off
- I am not convinced that a school district with declining enrollment needs to build a new school. Really disappointed, obviously from previous comments, that the lack of gym space in the school district is not being addressed. Is there really a need to build a new school to house just 1-4 with OSC? Would definitely need more info. Unfortunately meetings are always scheduled during my work times.
- 5th graders don't need to be part of the middle school drama and situations.
- Show me the tax savings after the current referendums expire so we know the true cost of these options.
- Costs to move the 1-4 graders at a future date would most likely exceed the cost to just build the new facility all at once.
- Option H-A is a better long-term solution, but this is a good, albeit more short-sighted, alternative. We will just end up having this exact same conversation again in a few years, because the Elementary school site is old as well and will require increasing investments to maintain.
- Use fundraisers/private donations
- This seems like a cost-effective plan that does not preclude implementing the benefits of plan H-A later.
- This is a better option but cut out the 5th grade going to middle school. Why not keep elem. School w/2 - 5th grade, new school replace primary w/E.C., 4K, 5K & 1st? Let the 5th graders be kids - middle school starts with 6th grade.
- The OSC should not overly influence the bldg. design. The number of children enrolled should be counted, however the OSC charter should not be considered in perpetuity.
- there are class rooms at the primary that are not being used move elementary students there
- not needed
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- There is no reason to have OSC
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- just defers costs, which will be higher at a later date and waste money on old buildings
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- 4K and K should be in the same school as 1st-4th. Then there will be less transitioning for students.
- I disagree with building a new school for just EC, 4K, K and OSC.

- I may support this referendum with the exception of OSC program being deleted.
- Would probably support if that were the option chosen, but still think one elementary building makes the most sense.
- BS. We all know the game by now. Cost overruns and underestimates are the reality of government grift. This will end up costing each resident far more than your estimate and you know this. But lie all you want about the estimated costs and debt bonds because the stark reality is beyond your ability to shine: you're asking for millions of dollars that you don't have to pay for poorly managed budgets over the past two decades and this is the grand scheme to make up for the waste. No, no, no! Live in reality with the rest of us.
- Prefer ES and OSC programs to be housed in different locations.
- I am not in favor of the purchasing new land on the West side of town for a new Elementary School. The roads in that area cannot handle the additional traffic.
- Totally stupid who are you selling the primary building to for \$180,00? Take away OSC funding if we have to support them, what's the point? Make do with what we have, support the maintenance Dept and the good staff. Buildings don't teach people do.
- Possibly, this is not huge money...but still an increase...when here 1 in 4 kids is hungry....? how do families afford this....even \$100 is a couple loaves of bread or gallons of milk a week
- I prefer the other option. Not a fan of putting money into a dead horse (ES) but would support if it was the only option given.
- I do not want to see 5th grade classes combined with the middle school. I feel that the younger kids need time to have recess and be a little kids.
- What's wrong with the Elementary School - can you move primary to it and elementary to MS and MS to HS since enrollment is down?
- This makes the most sense
- No
- I would not support any new construction unless we see an increase (large) in the number of students.
- No gym for high school in this plan.
- Option H-A & option H-B your wish list is ridiculous. Your last referendum was supposed to solve some of these problems - Wrong, it wasn't enough money.
- The Lodi Schools do not need anymore new buildings. They have three sites already in opposite sides of town. Retired families cannot afford more taxes. They are very high in Lodi already. And there is very little commercial business & work here to support more schools. You're chasing retired people right out of town. Also the district administrator that wants all this stuff, doesn't live in the district.
- Elementary needs work.
- We don't need a new school.
- Total cost would have to be outlined including any site purchase & Improvement cost before determining what the vote would be.
- See if you can actually sell the existing properties for this amount of money instead of assuming you can get this much money
- If you do choose this option, PLEASE make sure that the new school allows for expansion when the current elementary school becomes outdated!
- I am not a supporter of OSC Charter. This option is not giving the new resources to the majority.
- I would need more information on site costs or would it be considered to use the existing primary school site to demo & rebuild on, resulting in no site cost, but only demolition costs? - Although this option is more reasonable and I could be swayed, I feel the information above is incomplete and an untrue representation of actual costs that would be imposed on the tax payer. If sites proposed earlier are those being considered, I would vote no as congestion is still a concern and would suggest something closer to the existing elementary school if any exists in that area or keep the land the primary school resides on and demo & rebuild there. What is that cost? Can you

purchase a new site for less than \$180,000 plus cost of demolition? (the income generated if that property is sold plus demolition) Very doubtful, but I don't have the demo. Number to know for sure.

- Still would like to see the new building as an elementary school rather than house 4-k, K and OSC. Have 4-k, K and OSC in the current elementary.
- elementary school site and office should be sold
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- How long before we have to have another increase just to build (or add on to) the school we are forgoing now?
- See comment question #3.
- No school needed. OSC costs district too much for the few kids who get into it. Early childhood, 4 yr. old K and K can easily fit in Elem school site when 5th grade moved. Use district office building for these grades if needed and move district office to HS.
- see #2
- taxes
- I won't support building on a new site.
- taxes
- That amount I could afford for taxes. Plus it's getting rid of the Present PS.
- I feel this is a much better option compared to H-A, however, I am still having trouble grasping why in one plan you say the Elementary site is not deemed worthy to be used again, and here you are saying that it's okay and we'll just update the building. You've got a beautiful spot of land where the OSC/Primary building is and could build a beautiful school on that hill that would catch the attention of anyone driving through our wonderful town. It'd be its own advertisement to try and bring more people in. Building a school somewhere else where we'd have to buy land and it wouldn't be where everyone driving through Lodi would see it seems like a poor idea and not good use of what we already have. I'd actually be more apt to approve a referendum that supported the use of the land we already owned and taking down and rebuilding on the current Primary/OSC site
- So let me get this straight, you had all these community meetings to discuss and come up with viable options and now you're telling me you didn't like the community's idea so you just came up with your own? This is why there is an issue in our district, you don't listen to the community. Nice job Board, keep ignoring what the people want, you probably won't even look at these results.
- Please take teacher input into account during the planning process. They know better than any architect what is needed in the space they work in.
- The elementary students need to be kept together. There are already bad vibes between the two separate elementary programs. If there would be Gregory in the future this would also create a new numbers and school alignment problems.
- I do not understand why you would put money into the elementary school if the eventual goal is to move them?
- In my opinion, both the Primary & Elementary schools need to be addressed due to their ages relative to when the bond would be paid off.
- It's passing the problem down the road! Spend the money and let's do it right!
- Again.... I cannot vote for anything that does not address the gymnasium issue within the district. It's impossible to find time now. And eliminating gyms without replacing them is not an option

for me. I understand they can make PE classes work out. But this is a VERY active community and further choking that with this plan for that much money is ridiculous to me.

- It doesn't make sense to build a new building for that small of a population. Also, the ES will be costing more and more every year to keep open and that will be a money drain.
- There were recent years that the Elementary school received funds for improvements (HVAC). I'd prefer to keep this building if possible.
- I don't agree with building a new school. Move OSC to district office. District office to add on to High School. Build a Field House and alterations to weight room and wrestling room
- You would still have 4 building with 4 operating costs. Doesn't make sense if you are building a new building. You also then segregate OSC from the rest of the elementary school kids.
- If and only if, the safety plan was outlined and would actually mean it would be safer for our kids.
- do not believe 5th grade should be included w/ Middle school population, should be included at elementary level

5. Since receiving the Community Facility Advisory Committee recommendation the Board has been approached by community members and parents who have expressed that there is strong community sentiment that the Board should consider adding another gym to the high school. The architects have estimated adding an additional gym to the high school and improving locker rooms to cost approximately \$7,400,000.

Responses: (12)

- I do not support this
- Why didn't they do this in the beginning? Not thinking?
- Yes please
- YES!
- Who are these community members and parents? Transparency before taxation.
- Why is this so expensive, where would the addition take place?
- Not now. Get your learning centers right before you even touch this subject.
- Make those fools pay for it themselves then. I call BS in this. Publish the expansive list of community members and parents who have asked for this. If it isn't larger than 770 residents (half of our total enrollment), then it's a special interest request and it should be funded privately. Ask those concerned community members and parents if they happen to have 7.4 million bucks in their spare change cups at home.
- I am sure another bid would bring these costs down significantly!
- Additional Space for healthy and active student events is something I can support.
- s
- No

Would you support a referendum to add an additional gym, expand the current wrestling room and add a new weight/physical education room to the existing high school at a cost not to exceed \$9,000,000 with an additional estimated tax impact of \$38.00 on a home valued at \$100,000 or \$116.00 on a home valued at \$300,000?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	22.25%	87

Probably Yes	18.67%	73
Undecided	15.86%	62
Probably No	23.79%	93
Definitely No	19.44%	76

Comments 84

- In this economy? Insanity.
- A new gym will benefit the entire community. The current high school should never have been built with only one gym space. easier to pass November referendum as it will be seen to benefit more of the community and students at all grade levels
- Would definitely approve this, but would want to know what the building plan was to go along with this.
- Let's get real about the schools before we worry about the gym.
- Not needed.
- Clarification - this gym would need to be available to fulfill the needs of all ages (e.g. elementary & middle school sports). We have a definite shortage of gyms in the community, which would be strained if option H-A passes and we lose two gyms at LES. As it is, we already constantly use LSRC for additional gym space.
- In a time of strained budgets, money for athletics and sports facilities seems superfluous.
- Use fundraisers/private donations
- Again too much emphasis on sports, sports scholarships, etc.
- There is already too much emphasis on sports in school. How about a new bio lab?
- Get another bid, 7.4 mil is crazy for what you would be getting
- We need to use facilities we have and work out schedules. Taxes an issue.
- We need to ensure we do not reduce the overall number of gyms if we build a new school.
- this would be a waste of my tax dollars
- It is far more important to take care of our academic and building needs first. Adding a gym is a luxury we cannot afford and does not benefit every student.
- use what you have
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- We don't need two gyms at the high school.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- this is a want NOT a need
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- I don't see that as an educational priority
- The high school should be the last school that we put money into. Could the new elementary school be built have two gyms? It sounds like there will be three schools (HS, MS and EL all in the same place in the city of Lodi. These gyms could be utilized.
- Another gym is needed.
- I assume the tax impact on a \$300,000 home would be \$116 not \$116,000.
- To \$\$\$
- I question all of these cost estimates. How many bids were obtained?

- What is the anticipated ROI on something like this? Yes, it would be nice to have all of these amenities but what do we receive for our investment? We already have a pool that is free to everyone that lives outside the city limits.
- Good Lord, this is becoming a Christmas list. When we have extra funds in the Christmas season at our house, our kids get big shiny things. But look around. Nobody has been flush with extra funds at home for the past 8 years and our home values are only now recovering from the '08 crash. Nobody has anything extra right now. I'd live to give our kids the moon but if we cannot afford it right now we don't even talk about it. Keep this great wish list in your back pocket for a time better suited for it and in the ranting make do with what we have.
- Too much is already spent on athletics. I support encouraging students to be athletically active outside: hiking trails, running trails, cross country ski trails. Less investment; more bang for the buck.
- We already overspend on extra-curricular sports. We need high quality, modern, environmentally conscious, places for academic enrichment, not more athlete worship!
- This should have been thought of when the HS was built to begin with.
- Additional Space for healthy and active student events is something I can support
- It's been fine for the last few years and the enrolment numbers just don't show the need.
- Gym classes are just fine. A new gym is obscene. A community the size of Lodi has no business adding another gym for extracurricular activities. Make do.
- Would the new primary school still have a gym? After school programs can make sure of that gym given its location near the other schools.
- If grade shuffling took place and you moved additional grades there.
- our gym is fine.....no reason for this...ridiculous.....no would not support this in any way...this kind of money should be spent on more drug and alcohol and well being classes as well as life courses...how to get job, keep job...etc....Education and life skills would be better
- Especially if the ES is closed. We will need the gym space. Should probably have been done when the HS was built but "hindsight" and all...
- Not necessary
- Absolutely No!
- Enrollment is down, don't need it.
- No
- The high school needs a second gym space. It was an error to build the high school with only one gym space. I will not support a referendum without a new gym for high school
- Too much money
- Why wasn't this considered when you built the high school? We don't need another gym.
- Money better spent elsewhere. Why the need for a sports palace?
- We don't need a gold plated gym.
- It isn't a need!
- Definitely no if only expanding gym without new school. Also Elementary school is more important than improving already new HS facility.
- Enrollment is declining and you are complaining about state aide declining so academics will have to be cut, but yet you want to spend money for extracurricular activities.
- This description does not make it clear if the \$38/\$116 is in addition to the amounts listed in #11 or in addition to what we are currently paying.
- I am guessing the \$116.00 is incorrect in this question.
- The Primary school gym is not used now, why add another?
- We have DECLINING enrollment. We don't need MORE gym space. We have DECLINING enrollment, we don't need to spend MORE money when we have fewer students who will play sports. Our focus and money should be spent on ACADEMIC needs; NOT ATHLETIC needs.
- If the elementary school was utilized, I would support a slight increase to remodel the existing "auxiliary" gym - however, to add another one neglects other areas that are more influential to

education and not extracurricular activities. Again, declining enrollment numbers do not dictate a need for more gym space.

- I think there needs to be alternative considerations which are less of a tax impact (maybe leasing the rec, center for additional gym space)
- gym space is of utmost importance
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- You have to be kidding! I understand and support the need for making improvements to keep the quality of our student education at a top level, but I believe we already have totally adequate gym and pool facilities. Things that are obviously unnecessary luxuries (WANTS NOT NEEDS) should not be put on the backs of already burdened taxpayers! If these community members and parents want a new gym, let them fund raise the money themselves. Leave my taxes out of it.
- See comment question #3.
- I do not see the educational value.
- The high school offers no computer programming courses, very limited courses outside of basic requirements (excluding some ag courses). Money should be spent on education, not sports.
- see #2
- Not with a declining student population do I see a need for an additional gym.
- taxes
- Use the Lodi Rec Center
- No more taxes
- We need to concentrate on education right now.
- With the high school being paid off and taxes decreasing, this tax increase would be well spent!
- You do not have enough students in this district to warrant the building, etc. of another gym. Also, I've spoken to people who were on your 93 people committee and they have expressed how they did not pass that option. Why is it that you are asking again for a gym when the committee that you created voted down this option?
- When you say community sentiment, you really mean Chuck what's a gym and will sell it as a community idea even though it was voted against in the Facility Advisory Committee. Again, this group you put together said no, so move on with their suggestions and stop asking for something until you get the answer you want. This is starting to sound like a whining child asking for candy, the answer is NO, you already asked 93 involved community members and the group obviously voted No, so accept it and move on.
- When will the district pay its teachers better? Shouldn't that be the top priority? I would rather see all teachers across the board get a raise than add another stupid gym... come on! What are our priorities as a community? Haven't we already seen enough great teachers leave our district? Is a new gym or even a new school really the problem? Or do the men at the DO just love building things and then leaving us with 20 years' worth of debt... and poorly paid teachers? I am unconvinced.
- Also consider another gym in the middle school.
- Why not put the gym in the new elementary school if planning to build west of the HS?
- This is a current need for the community.
- I don't see how this additional gym would bring extra revenue to our facilities. Especially, if Children count is expected to go down.
- another reason Elementary school should stay- the two gyms are very valuable
- Are there options to keep the PS gym and re-purpose for these other needs at a lesser cost than this option?

- There is already too much time, effort and funding directed towards sports in this community. The funds need to be allocated to academic improvements for students.
- Fully support this idea. Make it more of a field house and we can hold more tournaments, which will build more revenue for the district.
- I would support this if the new school is built. I would absolutely not support this option over building a new school.
- Again, not crucial. Something like this “nicety” can wait.

Would you support a referendum to add a competition (larger) gym to either Option H-A or Option H-B at a cost not to exceed \$7,400,000 with an additional estimated tax impact of \$30.00 on a home valued at \$100,000 or \$95.00 on a home valued at \$300,000?

	Percentage	# of responses
Definitely Yes	17.78%	69
Probably Yes	21.13%	82
Undecided	16.49%	64
Probably No	25.52%	99
Definitely No	19.07%	74

Comments 74

- In this economy? Insanity.
- Where would these additions be?
- H-A never H-B definitely
- Just would want clarification for need of new school with current enrollment numbers.
- Too much for a gym.
- In a time of strained budgets, money for athletics and sports facilities seems superfluous.
- Use fundraisers/private donations. I've been hearing for over 10 years how the taxes for our small community are Way too high & People leave/move after their children have graduated. Please utilize other options for raising \$. Thank you. When people have the option to donate towards a cause or goal~ they feel better about giving their \$ vs being taxed for it.
- Lodi has a good school system in general. Have some of the discussions from Tech Ed Advisory Cmte. Been included in this? Preparing our children for life is our first priority. State mandated, unfortunately, play a large role. Frankly I tire of everyone wanting more & more - all taxpayers in district cannot afford this type of increase in addition to the other increases.
- The current gym is big enough for competition and the gym is for instructional use and smaller events.
- Again, that benefits fewer students. Sports are an extra. Education comes first.
- No to everything at this time. This is too confusing to read - break it down in simple terms and words. We do need to consolidate but PLEASE be judicious in cost and this time smart in what is done. Consolidation should have been done on the last big go around - don't try to pull the wool over our eyes this time - most of us are living economically - you should too.
- If you are already building a new school I would support a larger gym but not for anything near 7.4 million.
- We have ample gym space. Scheduling is important. Taxes are high.

- New elementary would have a gym and high school needs 2nd gym!
- Competition gym should be on the HS grounds
- no no no no
- See above.
- not needed
- Property taxes are too high, jobs are too scarce and if property taxes rise there will be a sucking sound of families leaving the Lodi area.
- Property taxes are too high, jobs too scarce and if taxes rise anymore people will leave this area.
- Need 2nd gym at or near the high school. If available, could draw more tournaments, would have more space for practices rather than rent space from Lodi Sports and Rec Center
- H-B plus gym yes.
- This is the kind of stuff that turns off tax payers. We must educate and protect our young people but we don't need to create shrines
- We will not support any tax or spending increase until administrative costs have been cut. We should consolidate with one or more adjacent districts.
- See above
- Option H-A but not on Option H-B
- Too much \$\$\$
- Maybe if we as taxpayers didn't have to pay the crazy amounts we pay for MATC we would have more tolerance for additional funds being put toward our own hometown schools, but I am amazed at the amount I have to pay every year for a tech school which neither I nor anyone in my family will ever utilize. Perhaps this should be addressed with the politicians in Madison to try to put the cost of attending and maintaining MATC on those that actually use it, not people who have no vested interest. If you can arrange to remove MATC from my tax bill I would gladly transfer that amount directly to our school system through tax increases. Just something to consider!
- No, no new gym. Publish the list of names of 771 people who want this and maybe I'll change my mind. Otherwise, tell Mr. Hatch to pay for it himself.
- See above
- Overall, I support all of these initiatives; however, I believe that improving safety (Install safety and security upgrades in all district buildings to help protect staff and students on a daily basis) at all locations should be the primary focus over improving technology, building a larger gymnasium, etc.
- I am not in favor of either H-A or H-B because of the traffic impacts on the West Side of the City and how it will divide the City into the school side and non-school side.
- If the school children number is decreasing why would we have to have more Gym space?
- Not fiscally responsible. Pipe dream.
- This should have been built in. You cannot close a school with two gyms and not replace it with a gym that has two full courts in it. It does not need as much seeking as the high school if that is what is meant to be by competition but it does need to allow for two games/practices to occur at the same time.
- again, nothing wrong with our gym
- see above
- Not necessary
- No. High school isn't very old and enrollment is down. They don't need another gym.
- Enrollment is down, don't need it.
- Do you think we all make the \$ teachers and admins make? You need to get a grip on reality!! Just teach there!
- No
- Tax Burden, 2 million pool @ Park, ROL Project, 50 Mil. for new County Bldg

- I will not support H-A plus a gym as the cost would exceed \$40 million. Not realistic. The only referendum I will support is H-B plus a gym. Cost much more reasonable. It is my opinion that the Board should put forward to referendum Plan H-B plus gym.
- Not necessary. Thank you for having paper copy of the survey in the newsletter for us old people who don't have a computer.
- I cannot back any proposals for two reasons. #1 it's my understanding that enrollment numbers have been dropping for several years so we should not require more space. #2 we are retired and on a fixed income. We just can't keep getting hit for more school taxes. It seems as if you won't be satisfied until we are forced to sell our home. If you need extra funding I would strongly urge you to make a determined effort to convince the state that it is time for them to get more funding for the school districts. Our money pot is just about run dry!
- Here is something interesting - If you answer yes - undecided - probably no- you don't have to have a reason. But answer no - you have to have a reason here's one - too much money.
- Money better spent elsewhere. Why the need for a sports palace?
- We don't need a gold plated gym.
- It isn't a need!
- Definitely yes if added to HB option.
- Please stop basing decisions on athletics. People are not moving here due to our facilities or our athletic programs. It's not what Lodi is about. We need to redirect our priorities to staff. You can have the best facilities out there, but without quality staff, it will do not good.
- I would rather the money be spent for IT technology, tradesman, and tech. ed. classes at the high school level - our district is lacking in this area.
- Yes to Option H-B - No to Option H-A
- If it could be done for a lot less I would consider it.
- Taxes are already too high. The City of Lodi decided in 1984 to not develop an industrial park. Now all property taxes fall on to residential property owners. Families are starting to leave now. Many more will follow if property taxes increase any more.
- Property taxes in the City of Lodi and Township are already too high. We do not have a business infrastructure like De Forest, Waunakee or Sauk-Prairie to help absorb the tax load. This area simply cannot afford it. If taxes go up, you will see an exodus of families leaving the area.
- See above. Please, read my comment again.
- See comment question #3.
- If we have money spend it should go towards retaining good teachers and increasing educational opportunities for students, not for a new gym.
- see #2
- See above comment.
- taxes
- No new taxes
- Our taxes do not need to go up for a gym, at that rate, I'd rather approve the building of a new school which I completely do not agree with. At least then I'd feel that students/staff are getting more value from what my money is going toward.
- Let's keep asking this gym question until we word it in a way that people accidentally say yes, great idea. NO!
- Please
- same as answer 13
- not with option H-A
- There is already too much time, effort and funding directed towards sports in this community. The funds need to be allocated to academic improvements for students.
- I would support this if the new school is built. I would absolutely not support this option over building a new school.
- Again, we have a functional gym the way it is

- I will fully support and vote yes for any and all referendums the board decides to pursue.
- With more courts centrally located, the school could host large tournaments which would bring revenue to sports programs via entry fees, plus downtown Lodi via gas, food, etc.

The Board of Education, staff, students, and administration appreciate that you are taking time to provide your input on this very important future community and school district decision.

- Ridiculous timing for this. Truly. When our family income remains stagnant for the past 8 years while our basic living expenses have risen by double digits (sometimes by double digits YEARLY), exactly WHERE is this treasure chest located? Surely not at our house, or our neighbor's houses. Have you insipid leeches forgotten the housing market crash of '08? How many of us have recovered from that? Yet you want close to 32 million for new structures for a school population that is decreasing year to year? Insane.
- Makes the most sense to build a new school. We are just pushing this issue down the road, if possible it makes the most sense to put it near/at the HS/MS area to have a more streamlined bussing process, sharing of teaching staff and all around makes it easier for families. I like the idea of a Lodi school campus with all of the schools close together if possible
- Thank you. Lodi is a great community and affordable. Please continue to keep it that way.
- Is OSC cost effective or are they self-sustaining if not I think it should be eliminated. I don't understand why your construction bids are so high this seems outrageous to me. We currently pay a total of \$6400 in property taxes and I still have to pay for a private tutor for my daughter with Dyslexia because the school is unable to accommodate her learning style. I think the school should look into raising registration fees so property owners are not the only ones bearing this expense.
- I believe that one school should be built for 4K-4th grade. 5th grade moves to the middle school and 8th grade moves to the high school. OSC could purchase one of the other schools or be in the plan for the elementary school.
- This survey design is terrible. I have a PhD and found it hard to read.
- Again, you've proven in this survey and in all the money you've wasted thus far in soil and site studies that you are incapable of wisely using our tax dollars. Learn conservation skills in this time of less and cut your residents a break for once. This mentality is breaking us all and what good are shiny new facilities with no students? Because I can guarantee that people like me will begin to move to places where our personal finances are truly considered. This is stuff of fantasy when people are living month-to-month.
- Some of the questions are very poorly worded and make assumptions with no underlying factual basis (particularly the questions asking us to assume no tax increases in combination with substantial expenditures).
- No, just no! Lodi's planning is just so bad. Use the existing buildings. There is nothing wrong with the old HS (Elementary). Use the gyms there. Spoiled people. If it is not good enough MOVE!
- We are bled enough in taxes. Love our school and our town...but is too much. I would support building of new primary/elementary only....all the upgrades etc. etc. no....and has to be done without adding money to our taxes
- Thank goodness for Act 10! The only thing SW has gotten right!
- Thank you
- You are welcome, thanks for asking.
- It seems like there is a lot of emphasis placed on the Charter School - OSC. This is still a relatively new school. We don't even have test results to see how these kids compare to other kids who went the more traditional route in education to see how they compare.
- Anything to improve our schools

- I think building a new school right now with enrollment down to be financially irresponsible. I believe we can create a comfortable learning environment for our children without the presence of a new school.
- I wish we could focus on more safety issues for these kids. I would 100% fully support on site, protected school police!!