

AGENDA



**Addison Central School District
Facilities Committee
Committee Meeting
Monday, November 27, 2023, 8:30 am - 9:30 am
208 Charles Avenue, Middlebury VT & Virtual Connection**

ACSD District Vision and Mission

OUR VISION

Our vision is for all ACSD students to reach their full learning potential, have a sense of belonging in our schools, and enrich our community and the communities where they live in the future.

OUR MISSION

Our mission is to provide high-quality, equitable, and varied learning environments that inspire a passion for learning and growth among our students.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

Link to join Webinar

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89104767570>

- A. Call to Order Upon Reaching a Quorum
 - 1. Introductions: Board Members, Administrators and Staff
- B. Public Comment
- C. Approve Minutes of 9/25/2023
- D. Committee Discussion:
 - 1. Update: MUHS - project expected to be completed without use of contingency funds
 - 2. Update: MH - Additional funding for HVAC project is in the budget currently.
 - 3. Update: Ripton - water controls system replacement.
 - 4. Update: MUMS - discussed forming a building level stakeholder feedback group.
 - 5. Discussion: Enrollment Projections
 - 6. Discussion: Facilities Equity
 - 7. Discussion: Facilities Budget Standards from State
- E. Public Comment - Any Topic
- F. Adjournment

*Public Comment Guidelines:

Public comments are encouraged and welcome at each regular board meeting during the period designated for public comment. Comments are limited to three minutes per person. Citizens will be called to make their statement by the board chair. Public comments regarding personnel, students or legal matters will not be heard by the Board.

MINUTES



Addison Central School District Facilities Committee

Committee Meeting

Monday, September 25, 2023, 8:30 am - 9:30 am

49 Charles Avenue, Middlebury VT

ACSD District Vision and Mission

OUR VISION

Our vision is for all ACSD students to reach their full learning potential, have a sense of belonging in our schools, and enrich our community and the communities where they live in the future.

OUR MISSION

Our mission is to provide high-quality, equitable, and varied learning environments that inspire a passion for learning and growth among our students.

A. Call to Order Upon Reaching a Quorum

Jason Chance called the meeting to order at 8:35 AM

1. Introductions - Board Members, Administrators and Staff

Present: Jason Chance, Ellen Whelan-Wuest, Barbara Wilson, Chip Malcolm, Brian Bauer,

Facilities Director Bruce MacIntire, Interim Superintendent Timothy Williams and Director of Finance and Operations Matt Corrente

B. Public Comment - Agenda Items None

C. Approve the Minutes of June 16, 2023

Approved

Move: Barbara Wilson Second: James Malcolm Status: Passed

D. Committee Discussion:

1. New Website and Facilities Master Plan

Jason asked if committee members had comments or suggestions for the website presence of the Facilities Master Plan

Barb suggests that the website might include information about where do we go from here, so that if someone were to visit the page they would understand where things go from the present day. She noted that the new rules call for the

administration to have a 5 year plan for every building, and possibly that would live on this website.

Would be nice to have access to other facilities-related reports and documents, other archives that are relevant

There were a lot of TruXCollins meeting presentations and reports, aside from or in addition to the final report.

The opening memo is dated and should remove references to having printed copies

available

Should have an introduction that hits on the time period and process that went into developing the plan, the summary of what is in the report, and the plans for what will happen next.

Chip also points out we should have an explanation for the time gap between April 2022 and October 2023.

Matt will work with Emily on that and bring it back to the committee to review.

Jason points out that having an embedded document like this makes it difficult to use or almost impossible on a table or phone, so suggests that it be an icon that links to a new site rather than a page within a page.

Tim suggests pulling the language in the plan about the process and timeline to inform what is used for a new site introduction.

Barb suggests that the timeline could even be pulled out as a separate link as well.

Jason points out that the FAQs need to be updated since they are 18 months old

Ellen agrees with Barb's suggestion that at some point it will be helpful to have a building-by-building break down of what will happen in each facility

Matt agrees that this will make sense especially once we have concrete plans for the buildings.

Determining what the plans will be is going to be complicated by the interconnected nature of all the projects, and also the balance of determining a bond amount based on projects vs. what voters will support.

Jason asks if we should try to update the facilities master plan to include the more updated information from the TruXCollins report which doesn't necessarily appear in this plan. In particular, the data that is updated relates to the secondary education buildings that are a huge amount of the costs.

Barb says that if we pull out the timeline and list the things that have happened since then, that might help.

Jason asks if we should just update the plan?

Matt says that David Epstein at TruXCollins has recommended that instead we go through what appears in their updated report and rank each building on a scale that evaluates needs and potential for covering through a bond, and then focusing on the buildings and needs that qualify as high need for the bond effort.

Barb points out this is the deferred maintenance issue while the facilities master plan is more about what our vision is.

Chip says we have to understand that a lot of voters will not want to invest in a smaller school without many students.

Ellen notes that we can't have isolated conversations about investing in school buildings if we're not also engaging with the long term planning about which buildings we will have in the long term.

Barb points out that there is a statutory requirement for a five year plan for each school. Matt asks Bruce to offer what he's hearing from the state level as part of the school construction task force that Bruce is part of.

Just started meeting to talk about school construction aid, which ended in 2008. Looking at MA and RI which came up with their own processes for making sure that no one defers maintenance until it's dangerous.

Need to come to the state with a recommendation in January 2024 so the legislature has something to work on in February.

As part of Act 72 there were building assessments to be done, and 80% of those are done by now. By the end of October they are to have visited every public school in the state. There is a state dashboard that accounts for all of their assessments. It's now getting populated with the information that the engineers and architects have collected, and ACSD's schools are on there now too.

This will give the state a statewide comparison and they will use a formula to determine how they'll distribute funds.

Right now the task force is grappling with how huge the problem is.

There isn't enough money in the Education fund so where it comes from will be the big conversation.

Chip recounts how there are times in the past when individual districts argued over all number of things, like smoking on campus, but then the state made a single mandate. Need to be definitive in the short term about what our essential needs and priorities are that we'd focus a bond around, as opposed to what we might be able to repair and hold on for a little while to avoid the potential for a double tax if we raise a bond for repairs that the state might also increase property taxes to fund years down the line as they determine how to fund statewide facilities repairs.

Barb believes that if we follow the same process we used for prioritizing what was necessary for the high school that will give us a select few Priority 2 projects that we can use a bond to fund.

Matt points out that a lot of Priority 1 projects are required by code but might not be essential to keep the buildings open.

We need a long term- 20, 30 year vision for the district that is part of how we lay that out for people.

Barb explains that a challenge in consolidation is that our rural schools weren't built for consolidation. Every building has challenges and coming changes in demographics. We need a vision that we can build a plan around.

Brian doesn't see how we can have a vision for the next 10 or 20 years when we can't even come up with a plan for 5 years.

Tim believes that there are two visions and they are competing, and there needs to be a way long term to

If we floated a bond today to keep the current footprint and possibly that could be voted down. There are a lot of possibilities for how different footprints might meet the long term needs of the district.

We need a vision for what the district looks like for the next many many years, and then we develop a plan for getting there that feels manageable for families and communities.

Can we establish a plan that is long enough out that people can prepare for it?

Brian is concerned that this won't provide people with the information they need to make decisions today.

We should be talking about what is best for the education of kids for a certain amount of money and funding. Can't continue putting such a heavy load on people without a shorter term plan for how things will get better.

Decisions should be as much about the performance of schools and academics for students. Brian is concerned about the increases in hiring, spending and the lack of outcomes. We've hired 20 paraprofessionals using ESSR funds but do we know that these hires have impacted anything?

Jason asks if it would be possible to request TruXCollins do a similar level of spreadsheet analyses as they've done for MUHS for the elementary schools?

Bruce said it should be possible to request, and Tim points out that the amounts might need to be adjusted for inflation. Project that have been done from this MUHS list that was developed in 2022 have come in at almost double the '22 estimates.

Ideal would be to identify a handful of things and updated the figures.

Jason thinks it would be great to get an updated list along these lines. Bruce says this is what our 5 year capital plan will look like and include.

Barb recounts the Honeywell presentation the board received in the past that seemed to provide an opportunity for how to support a bond initiative.

2. MUHS Kitchen Project Update

Bruce talked through the renovation. There remains an extensive punch list to completing the project, and completing those remaining pieces will take some weeks/months, but we have a certificate of occupancy that we are using (Health Dept. signed off), all the major equipment is in place.

The staff say it functions well and it is a smaller foot print than it was, but it works more efficiently.

Everyone likes the look and design.

Haven't seen all the invoices yet, waiting on August invoice for the architect to sign off, and then we'll know more about how the final costs come in. But so far we are on budget. We are also now putting together an RFP for Mary Hogan air handling project which is ESSR funded and has to be done this summer (2024) to use those funds. This will address the air handling in A wing at Mary Hogan. Originally wanted to cover A and C wing air handling, but when the prices came back the combined costs far exceeded the ESSR funds.

3. RAMP Review

Matt explained that starting the school year there wasn't a good protocol in place to structure the decision making and record keeping for the kinds of maintenance projects we are doing. Wanted a model for how to govern our decision-making process on these types of projects. As we consider bonds and other future projects we need a structure plan for meeting building needs as we potentially spend large amounts of money relative to what we have in the general fund before we access bond dollars.

The idea was to create levels of authorization around these decisions while not tying Bruce's hands at every decision-point.

Split projects into 4 levels: Micro, Small, Medium and Large (see RAMP document for thresholds and breakdowns)

Matt walked through a presented on the proposed process and structure.

Jason asks at what point in the process of requesting a project over \$40,000 would someone issue an RFP?

Matt says he thinks someone would need authorization to issue an RFP first. But also acknowledges that an RFP could change the number significantly.

Barb asks if, like in the past, issuing an RFP would be something the administration would notify the board about? Yes.

Accountability processes would allow us to better track where and how repair maintenance dollars were spent by location, so that the facilities committee and the full board has access to that information.

Jason asks where the \$250,000 amount came from- why that amount?

This is the threshold between a small and a medium purchase in bid law, Matt believes. It wasn't an arbitrary number. In bid law \$40-250k is considered a "small" purchase and over \$250k is considered a large purchase.

Tim points out that nothing precludes us from taking anything in the \$40-250k range to the board from approval.

This will help us put in guidelines to have an efficient system that also allows for more engagement and proactive planning at a certain threshold of spending and projects.

4. MUMS adjacent land owner development project

Matt provided an overview of the issue: The town of Middlebury has changed their zoning designation that would allow for several homes to be built in an area behind MUMS. Currently, the only way to access this area is to use Deerfield Lane which is on school property.

The primary question is whether ACSD could be required to let traffic that was headed into

and out of the proposed development use school property to do so, since the current owner has an agreement to allow this for his home.

The person who owns this property currently has his home residence on a portion of this property and has an easement that allows him to use Deerfield Lane to gain access to his property. His correspondence to Matt offered to enter into dialog with the district to possibly purchase this property.

The committee talked about whether or not ACSD would need to allow Deerfield Lane to be used to provide access to the possible housing development.

Everyone agreed it is best to check with an attorney to see what we'd be legally required to allow (if anything).

E. Public Comment - Any Topic None

F. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:21 AM

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Whelan-Wuest

Move: James Malcolm Second: Brian Bauer Status: Passed

***Public Comment Guidelines:**

Public comments are encouraged and welcome at each regular board meeting during the period designated for public comment. Comments are limited to three minutes per person. Citizens will be called to make their statement by the board chair. Public comments regarding personnel, students or legal matters will not be heard by the Board.

DRAFT

ACSD Scenario 1 (current)

	ACSD Sq. Ft.	390,000 (244 sqft. per pupil)
multiplied by	Cost per Sq.Ft to Build	\$450
equals	Replacement Value	\$175,500,000
Operations Budget plus		\$1,755,000
<u>Maintenance Budget</u>		<u>\$3,510,000</u>
Total Recommended Standard		\$5,265,000
Current Facilities Budget FY24		\$4,252,272
Difference		\$1,010,728 (+24%)

ACSD Scenario 2 (half sqft)

	ACSD Sq. Ft.	195,000 (122 sqft. per pupil)
multiplied by	Cost per Sq.Ft to Build	\$450
equals	Replacement Value	\$87,750,000
Operations Budget plus		\$877,500
<u>Maintenance Budget</u>		<u>\$1,755,000</u>
Total Recommended Standard		\$2,632,500
Current Facilities Budget FY24		\$4,252,272
Difference		-\$1,619,772 (-38%)

ACSD Scenario 3 (high construction cost)

	ACSD Sq. Ft.	390,000 (244 sqft. per pupil)
multiplied by	Cost per Sq.Ft to Build	\$600
equals	Replacement Value	\$234,000,000
Operations Budget plus		\$2,340,000
<u>Maintenance Budget</u>		<u>\$4,680,000</u>
Total Recommended Standard		\$7,020,000
Current Facilities Budget FY24		\$4,252,272
Difference		\$2,767,728 (+65%)