

Facilities Committee Meeting - Jun 9, 2022
Minutes

Find supporting documents on [our new website](#).

Present: Jerry Papania, David Roche, Michael Slaughter, Brian Mayer, Richard Zopf, Judith Hempfling, Jack Hatert, Dorothee Bouquet, Mike Ruetschle, Terri Holden, Megan Winston
Absent: Kineta Stanford, Chris Hamilton
Late: Scott Fife (7.30 pm)

Judith is giving an update on the interview of the MPA candidates

Jay gives a presentation on whether to hire an MPA: we saw the information of what they would be able to provide. He's using projected costs provided in 2020 by Energy Optimizers, who provided a free study to the district. He underlines that his estimates are conservative. He organized them by system and priorities (electric update, hvac, roofing, parking resurfacing, etc) but acknowledged that they would need to happen simultaneously so that it makes sense pragmatically. His estimates don't include adding more bathrooms. His estimates include a "track resurface" which was not submitted by EOU, but which is based on a recent estimate he got from a vendor. He converted costs into mills to see what it would cost to taxpayers. Over a 10-year period, he's looking at 4.4 mills per year at a minimum to cover those urgent projects. He's underlining the list of projects (safety & security, basic comfort/function, sustainable operating costs, 21st-century teaching, community capacity, general ambiance) which would not be included through the 10 projects he first outlined. He's running several taxpayers scenarios comparing the cost to an hypothetical retired owner of a home worth \$100k between the 2021's levy and the list of 9 projects he listed above. The difference is \$70 per year. Neither are expensive. He argues for saving the MPA cost and addressing all of the needs in a new building that meets all of our needs.

Judith gives a summary of the interview of the MPA companies on Monday. They had great experience in their portfolio. Judith Hempfling announces that we will be negotiating with one company. Judith acknowledges that the MPA would only do renovations and not meet all of the needs of the school.

Dorothee Bouquet gave her takeaways: it was an enlightening process which underlines what an MPA would cover and exclude. The list of existing issues and needs that would be excluded is extensive and Dorothee underlined the gap in the process of this committee between what it would investigate and what is actually needed. A MPA would only work on a limited scope of work, to bring back the existing buildings to their prime, without acknowledging the changes in use of the buildings since they were built in the 1950s and 1960s. She stated that it is not a wise use of our money to move forward with an MPA when it leaves so much to address on the table. She gave quotes from the 3 MPA firms' presentations which underlined that they think a renovation would only extend the lifetime of the building temporarily and/or would not address our needs.

Judith responds that she didn't hear those statements from the 3 companies. Michael Slaughter wants to see this process play out.

Moving onto the Facilities needs reports updates: Judith specifies that they are not going to be complete assessments.

- Michael looked at the electrical and IT at MLS: see report.
- David Roche assessed the HS roofs where he has found leaks and issues, he is surprised that he couldn't find more leaks/ water stains inside. See report.
- Jerry looked at HVAC and plumbing at MLS, and underlined its inefficiency and inadequacy in terms of thermal quality and air exchange. See report.
- Richard Zopf spent a whole day looking at the exterior walls of MLS: the masonry was solid all around. The newer windows are in better condition, but the newer part of the building has caulking issues too. A railing is about to fall off on the back and on the eastern part of the building. "What has been done is incredibly sloppy." Some of the window units could be removed easily.
- Judith is giving information about the lifecycle of the modular classrooms. See report. Brian Mayer adds details to the state of the trailers at MLS, since the members of this committee didn't get a tour of them. He talks about a known but unfound leak in the roof, which would require for the whole roof to be torn away; the doors don't fit the frame and the floor plan issues with the lack of bathroom. Judith responds that she doesn't know whether the shoebox and the trailer should be kept. Terri specifies that the shoebox includes 2 offices, 4 bathrooms, 4 classrooms and the IT office. Brian asked whether the information compiled by Judith was compared to residential framing, and not commercial building. Jay confirms that few schools are built with 2x4, and adds that the state of modular depends on whether they were installed properly and properly maintained. There is a consensus about seeing the trailer as a throwaway.
- Megan Winston asks for the members of this committee to be informed of the urgent, dangerous issues they are noticing, such as the railings that have been reported about to fall.

Judith moves onto a list of prioritized items put together by the building experts:

- Security improvements
- Roof
- HVAC
- IT improvements
- Electrical and plumbing items
- Volunteer programs for helping with getting the facilities ready in the summer.

Jay asks specificity about the phrase "relatively inexpensive", which has been used to qualify the improvements listed above.

Next, Mike Ruetschle presents a draft list of identified deep renovation projects and enhancements needs. See report.

- Storm shelter. There was a requirement for providing a storm shelter for educational facilities with more than 50 students. A moratorium expires in the Fall. There is a square footage requirement.
- Added for MLS in a discussion: private office spaces for counseling, furniture, finishings, classroom casework, decouple gym/theater, missed opportunity with preschool program, classroom technology
- Added for HS in a discussion: AC in the gym, proper performance stage, accessibility in the tower

Jack is asking whether we should consider moving 6th-graders to 420 Enon Road.

His next comment is about the difficulty of recruiting educators and facilities are a big factor in appealing to candidates. This is more of a reality in 2022 than it was for past levies.

Terri Holden wants to respond to the idea of moving 6th-graders. Educationally it makes sense, but it is only an idea for now.

Discussion about how this list would fit with the work of an MPA. This list would be in addition but in concurrence with the MPA.

Next discussion focuses on visiting other school facilities: some that have been renovated and also new facilities. Discussion about whether to delay this to September so that we see them in action.

Next meeting will be on Monday July 11, 2022 at 7pm in the MLS Conference room