

AGENDA

Addison Central School District

Facilities Committee

Committee Meeting

Monday, May 23, 2022, 5:00 pm - 6:15 pm

208 Charles Avenue, Middlebury, VT & Virtual Connection

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82194229032>

- A. Call to Order Upon Reaching a Quorum
- B. Introductions: Board Members, Administrators and Staff
- C. Approve the Agenda
- D. Public Comment
- E. Recommendation to Approve the Minutes of May 9, 2022
- F. Discussion: Results of the MUMS and MUHS Facilities Assessments
- G. Discussion: Facilities Master Plan Engagement
- H. Other Business
 - I. Next Meeting Date/Time
- J. Adjournment

MINUTES

Addison Central School District

Facilities Committee Committee Meeting

Monday, May 9, 2022, , 5:00 pm- 6:15 pm

208 Charles Avenue, Middlebury, VT & Virtual Connection

In Attendance

Victoria Jette, James Malcolm; Jennifer Nuceder, Barbara Wilson, Mary Heather Noble

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82825107775>

A. Call to Order Upon Reaching a Quorum

Meeting called to order at 5:04 p.m.

B. Introductions: Board Members, Administrators and Staff

Administrators: Peter Burrows, ACSD Superintendent; Logan Price, ACSD Business Manager

Staff: Bruce MacIntire, ACSD Director of Facilities

TruexCullins: David Epstein, Cam Featherstonhaugh

C. Select a Committee Chair

Nominations: James Malcolm nominated. There were no other nominations.

Jennifer Nuceder was elected chair

D. Select a Meeting Recorder

Jennifer Nuceder asked for nominations and/or a volunteer to be the meeting recorder.

Barbara Wilson volunteered and was elected as the meeting recorder.

E. Approve the Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda.

Move: James Malcolm Second: Victoria Jette Status: Passed

F. Public Comment

No public comment.

G. Approve the Minutes of March 9, 2022

Motion to approve the minutes

Victoria Jette and James Malcolm were the only committee members present who attended the March 9th meeting.

Move: Victoria Jette Second: James Malcolm Status: Passed

H. Committee Discussion:

1. TruexCullins Secondary School Facilities Report

David Epstein and Cam Featherstonhaugh, from TruexCullins (TXC) provided a summary presentation on the secondary school (MUMS and MUHS) facility evaluations they conducted earlier this year. This was a continuation of the elementary school evaluations that TXC completed in 2019 and 2020. The findings will be compiled with the elementary school report into a final document. The secondary school evaluation team consisted of representatives from TruexCullins (architecture), Engineering Ventures (structural and civil engineering), ENGV (mechanical engineering), Pearson Associates (electrical engineering), and ReArch Company (cost estimating).

A summary slide that included all of the ACSD schools highlighted the ages of each school. The newest schools are Middlebury Union Middle School (1996), Salisbury Elementary School (1996), and Ripton Elementary School (1989). Additions and/or modifications were made to several schools in the 1990s and early 2001 timeframes. Since then, no major upgrades and/or improvements have been made to any of the ACSD schools. David Epstein pointed out that MUMS is 26 years old and that building products are not necessarily meant to last longer than 26 years. If you designed a new school, you might expect to see an average of 175 sq feet (SF) per student at the elementary school level and 250 SF/student at the high school level. Many of our schools are much higher than that. The only schools that are near that size are the elementary schools in Cornwall and Shoreham and MUMS. Salisbury and Waybridge Elementary Schools are 402 and 392 SF/student, respectively and MUHS is 375 SF/student.

Jennifer Nucedder asked if the enrollment numbers shown were for the current year. David Epstein responded that Bruce MacIntire recently gave him the current enrollment numbers.

Cam Featherstonhaugh pointed out an observation that each of the elementary school enrollments were down this year. Several committee members highlighted that this was primarily due to the 6th grade move to MUMS, where the enrollment is now higher.

Next, David Epstein presented a slide showing the renovation costs for each school. The estimates are stated in 2024 dollars and attempt to take into account the current viability in construction costs. In addition to the total renovation costs, an average cost per square foot was provided along with a comparison of what it would cost to replace each school including a FCI (facilities construction index). MUHS FCI was computed to be 86% indicating that the renovation costs are 86% of the replacement cost. The replacement costs assumed that the school would be sized based on the current enrollment space requirements instead of the existing school capacity. It was pointed out that, even with the adjustments made to escalate the elementary school estimates, the costs appear lower than MUMS and MUHS on a cost/SF basis and TXC recommends re-estimating these elementary schools. It is not accurate to take 2019 costs and keep applying escalation factors to identify 2024 costs. The cost/SF values ranged from \$389.52 (MUHS) to \$116.23 (Salisbury Elementary School). The costs for most of the elementary schools were below \$200/SF including Mary Hogan.

Victoria Jette questioned if the elementary schools cost/SF costs would actually be as high as MUHS or even MUMS. David and Cam expressed concern that the elementary school costs may be too low and should be re-validated. David pointed out that since we have all the quantities for the elementary schools, new unit costs could be applied to re-estimate the maintenance costs. They are confident that the high school and middle school costs are valid.

Peter Burrows pointed out that the data needs to be able to support a bond once the scope is clear. And asked,, what additional research needs to be done to true up the estimates to ensure that they accurately reflect the costs? David Epstein pointed out that the estimates are divided into priorities. This enables the Board to determine what it would look like to do all priority 1s, or priority 1s and 2s, or priority 1s, 2s and 3s. It is not possible to go directly to bond with these numbers. A more in depth analysis must be done to true up the numbers.

Next, David Espein walked through summary slides for each school. The summary included the physical characteristics of each school (e.g., square footage, amount of land, number of students), the major issues found, and the repair and the upgrade cost items and assumptions. The common theme for all the schools is that only basic maintenance has been done. No upgrades and/or improvements have been made for decades. Most systems have a lifespan of 20 years, so even with MUMS, major systems need to be replaced and/or upgraded.

At the conclusion of the prepared presentation, committee members asked several additional questions. Victoria asked what makes up the \$61M estimate for the high school. Cam stated that the building is over 50 years old and there is a long list of work that is required. The report is broken down into the different disciplines of the design team (e.g., electrical, structural, etc.). Power systems, lighting, complete replacement of water supply system due to copper piping which contains lead solder, building cooling, structural investigation and work, paving, windows, roofing, and much more. Costs are bundled based on systems. For example, if you are replacing the ceiling, then it makes sense to add insulation. Soft costs are estimated at 20% of hard costs. There is also a 7% contingency included. The costs do not include educational transition costs to align the schools with the Board's vision/goals.

In response to further questioning, David described next steps to be is to decide on the scope of the work that the board will move forward with. This could be done by doing various "what if" scenarios of various approaches that could be taken. This will involve working through the detailed cost lists to identify the priority items that will be addressed on a school by school basis. David Epstein doesn't have confidence that there will be state level funding available for some time. It could take 18 months or more to be ready for a bond vote. By then, there could be more information available at the state level.

I. Other Business

No other business discussed.

J. Set Next Meeting Date/Time

Committee meetings will be held from 5 p.m. to 6:15 p.m. prior to ACSD board meetings. The next meeting will be on May 23, 2022 .

K. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Wilson, Recorder

Motion to adjourn.

Moved: James Malcolm Status: Passed