

**Finance and Capital Committee**  
**Reorganization and Project Timeline**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**April 19, 2023**

**Attendees:** Mark Nielsen, Bart Bezio, Lisa Barry, Mark Stebbins, Sue Prescott, Katie Orost, Deb Clark, Brian Pena, Dylan Laflam, Rene Thibault

**Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment:** Nielsen called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Stebbins made a motion, seconded by Barry, to approve the agenda. The motion passed unanimously. There was no public comment.

**Minutes of January 9, 2023 FCC Meeting:** Barry made a motion, seconded by Stebbins, to approve the minutes of the January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

**Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment:**

**Elect Committee Chair:** Barry nominated Mark Stebbins, seconded by Bezio. There were no other nominations. The motion passed unanimously, with Stebbins abstaining.

Clark reported that the roles and responsibilities of the Committee hadn't changed.

**Cricket Hill Project Timeline:** Clark informed the Committee that the administration would like to have a bond vote on September 19<sup>th</sup>. The vote needed to be warned no more than 40 days and no less than 30 days before the vote. Ideally, the bond vote would be warned on August 14<sup>th</sup>, which was the date of the regular Board meeting. Clark stated she saw July as the time they would request community input, promotions, and possible fundraising efforts. She anticipated having engineering estimates to the Board at their regular meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>, with a special meeting on May 15<sup>th</sup> to review and provide final approval of the final scope of design, which would include safety investments. Clark offered May 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> as a date that the FCC would meet to get a preview of the design and the safety investments. Clark then offered August 21, August 28, September 11 and September 18<sup>th</sup> as possible dates for the informational meetings.

Stebbins stated the dates sounded reasonable. Laflam said it was ambitious but reasonable and he was comfortable with the dates. Members of the Committee stated it would be good to meet prior to the presentation to the Board. May 10<sup>th</sup> was the preferred date for the FCC members to meet. The members also decided not to have the architects present at the FCC meeting.

Laflam stated the interior layout was modular for the most part. There were two options that shared the same center structure of the building. Option A was bookending the main structure with the athletic facility on one side and the preschool facility on the other side. The preschool would be able to accommodate 25-30 students and there would be a dedicated office and meeting space. Finance, HR, and additional conference space would be in the front facing part of the building. The second floor would be the administrative office space. This option was 2,000 square feet larger than Option B. The 2500 square foot would allow for storage in the basement and would allow for expansion.

Option B would eliminate the athletic bookend space. It would expand the preschool to allow more students, up to 40. Clark explained that the full day full week 4-year-old pre-K option was going to happen. More square footage in the Pre-K provided more flexibility and by not adding a separate athletic wing it provided more square footage and saved money for other projects. Plan B put the locker section into the basement.

Option B at a glance was about \$600,000 cheaper than Option A. The walkout option was still available. Following a question, Laflam stated that because of the pitched metal roof, the stairwells would be better for the athletes to use rather than the walkout.

Laflam then provided the FCC with the exterior overhead view of the track and parking. Soccer fields were in the drawing but only for future consideration if needed. Pre-K would have its own drop off and pick up and be sufficient enough in size to accommodate busing. It would be separate from the drop off/pick up for athletic events.

Laflam then discussed the concept of all-inclusive bathrooms. The plans called for a remodel of a minimum of two bathrooms with 8 stalls and one handicapped stall. The stalls would be private and this concept would mean there would no longer be room for students to congregate in the bathrooms. Montpelier High School already had this bathroom concept in place.

Laflam then provided a design for the performing arts center, located in between the auditorium and the middle school. It would be 3,000 square feet. Auditorium bleachers would be available to use and would then able to move back into the wall. A dressing room, storage space, and an office space would be included.

Thibault stated he had met with the athletic coaches and the performing arts teachers and it met with unanimous approval. Coaches and athletic directors throughout the area were very supportive and excited about the project and willing to help in getting the bond passed. Clark noted there were a lot of fundraising opportunities and other events, such as farmers markets, could take place there. Laflam stated they could also look at the possibility of incorporating PT and OT for Sterling View residents.

Laflam informed the Board that an auxiliary sports storage building would need to be built. There was a lot of equipment that came with a full track facility. The building would be inexpensive.

Prescott asked about liability associated with this. Clark stated it was the same liability as the common use of buildings by other groups.

Laflam asked for opinions of the members on which option they preferred. Bezio stated he was leaning toward Option B. Stebbins said he preferred Option B, stating that he didn't think it was necessary to have a wing dedicated to changing facilities for athletes. Laflam added that these lockers rooms would also support the Nordic ski team so it would include warming areas. Clark stated Option B allowed for an additional 500 square feet to the Pre-K program. She believed that parents would take advantage of the full day program. Laflam noted that the design of the building would allow an addition to the building if it were needed in the future. Nielsen stated he was fine was Option B.

In speaking about the timelines noted previously, Laflam reminded the Committee that Board members should be present at the community meetings. Therefore, Committee members should pay attention to the dates being scheduled for those meetings. The Committee members agreed to move ahead with the community dates.

Clark then reported on the safety investments being considered:

- Change the layout of the high school lobby and add secondary access control which would entail enclosing the stairwell, adding security doors after the check in/reception location with key code remote access.
- Change the high school lobby glass and add two-sided security film
- Change the layout of the middle school lobby and add secondary access control which would entail enclosing the stairwell, adding security doors after check in/reception location with key code remote access.
- Change the middle school lobby glass and add two-sided security film.
- Add auto-drop blinds on the ground floor.
- Add magnetic lock release buttons.
- Add panic buttons.
- Add ballards so people couldn't drive a car into the building.
- Add more exterior lighting.
- Add a backup generator to help keep communications available.
- Add a generator at Waterville
- Add access controls at Waterville and Belvidere
- Add video to Johnson.
- Upgrade the Waterville and Belvidere video and boost the Hyde Park video program.

Because the list of investments had come in after the initial bond consideration, the dollar amount wouldn't be available until the August Board meeting. Clark stated these costs would be funded through the bond funding.

In response to a member expressing thanks for developing this safety list, Laflam noted that this was an issue that was reviewed quite often. Each school met monthly to discuss safety issues, with Hyde Park being the flagship by meeting weekly.

**Other Business:** Clark stated the \$1.2 million loan associated with the GMTCC was paid off in October. It was an interest-free loan that came in, went into an investment account, and money was moved yearly to a checking account to pay the loan. Because it was in an investment account, there was now \$868,000 available. This was a 2005-2006 construction project and Clark had gone back to determine where that money actually belonged. She believed it belonged to the Union campus. It was facilities/construction related. There was currently a bond associated with the Vermont Bond Bank that would mature in December of 2026. The \$868,000 could go toward paying the Bond Bank bond or the funds could go toward paying for this new project.

Additionally, there was a deadline of spending of any pre-merger funds. There was \$100,000 remaining at Johnson and \$60,000 at Hyde Park and both had a list of projects to encumber and obligate those funds by June 30, 2023.

Johnson had the following list of projects, listed in order of preference:

- Replace swings: \$20,000
- Replace the walk-ins at the kitchen: \$40,000
- Shed: \$5,000
- Generator to support the IT room: \$35,000

Hyde Park had the following list of projects, listed in order of preference:

- Connect the pump house to the main building in a more efficient manner: \$20,000
- Epoxy carpets: \$2,500
- Replace damaged JACE: \$12,000
- Shed: \$5,500
- Grounds work, fencing, and playground: \$20,000

**Adjourn:** Nielsen made a motion, seconded by Bezio, to adjourn at 7:10 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.