

AGENDA



**Addison Central School District
Facilities Committee
Committee Meeting
Thursday, November 14, 2024, 8:30 am - 9:30 am
49 Charles Avenue
Middlebury VT
05753**

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:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81811300575>

- A. Call to Order Upon Reaching A Quorum
 - 1. Introductions - Board Members, Administrators and Staff
- B. Recommendation to Approve Minutes From October 16, 2024
- C. Public Comment
- D. Committee Discussion:
 - 1. Capital Improvement Planning RFP Review
 - 2. Action: Maple Broadband Easment Approval
 - 3. MUMS Renovation Discussion
- E. Other
- F. Adjournment

Matthew Corrente

Matthew Corrente

***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
Wednesday, October 16, 2024, 8:30 am - 9:30 am
49 Charles Avenue
Middlebury VT
05753**

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 called the meeting to order at 8:30 am

B. Introductions - Board Members, Administrators, and Staff

Jason Chance, Barb Wilson, Brian Bauer, Chip Malcolm, Joanna Doria, Bruce MacIntire- Dir of Facilities, Matt Corrente- Dir of Finance and Operations, Wendy Baker- Superintendent

C. Recommendation to Approve Minutes from September 18, 2024

Motion Status: passed. Abstain: Joanna

D. Public Comment

No public comment

E. Committee Discussion:

1. Capital Improvement Planning RFP Review

Bruce starts the conversation off: He has been working on the RFP since last month's meeting.

In order to select a consultant, we need to describe what we want, then we can receive a proposal and price. Chip asks about the necessity of the RFP. Matt answers that if we want to

spend more than \$40,000, we need to go out for a bid. Chip clarifies his question: it is necessary

from the State's perspective? Bruce answers that it is not a requirement the State is asking for;

RFP is a Request for Proposal and it allows us an apples-to-apples comparison. We can put what

we want into it; the more details we add, the more suitable/relevant the final proposal will be.

Also, it is the best way to get accurate and multiple bids. Bruce asks for any feedback the committee has with regard to the presented draft.

Barb is a little confused as to how the draft reflects the committee's conversation from last month's meeting. The focus, she remembers, was on Phase I and the Middlebury Schools. She is

concerned the scope is too large, as it seems the current draft reflects more than Phase I and might be asking for unqualified deliverables. Are there phases she is missing? Bruce responds

by noting the vital information the architect needs to know in order to direct/help us prioritize. That's why this has is a broader scope. Barb wants to spend our money wisely to ensure this RFP helps us make decisions grounded in our Phase I which the board agreed on was the Middlebury Schools.

Matt clarifies our language around Phases and Processes; this is a two-process two-phase model. Process I is MUMS, Mary Hogan, and MUHS. Process II is all the other schools.

Phase I is

developing a conceptual plan for the Middlebury schools which already reflect a logical size/level of consolidation. Simultaneously, Process II is unfolding with a policy examination at

the board level. With regard to the RFP, we should attempt to include the full scope but, to Barb's point, the processes and phases should be clarified.

Barb wonders what the immediate ask is? Bruce says that there is no immediate ask; the RFP

outlines the project so we can solicit bids and identify the most appropriate firm for the District's needs/wants. Once we have a selected preferred vendor, we can then move forward

with a more interactive process. Wendy asks about previous RFP processes and how that might

be reflected in the current draft. Bruce says that there hasn't been a previous RFP for Facilities

Master Planning; TruexCulpeper was selected based on reputation and availability. The firm was

also familiar due to work on MUMS.

Wendy adds to Barb's thoughts: if the immediate work from the Committee focuses first on the

Middlebury schools, we are getting pivotal/important pieces of information which will inform what is analyzed in Phase II which is the policy discussion. She notes there are questions from

the greater community around the educational (teaching) capacity of Mary Hogan and MUMS.

Bruce says that's why the whole district is part of the RFP- we need to be clear with the firm that the ask might ultimately include all of the schools and not just the board's priority of Mary Hogan, MUMS and MUHS.

Barb suggests that we clarify what the deliverables are and incorporate the language from Matt's August presentation; i.e. the phases and processes. We should avoid re-doing previous

work and respect the board's policy decisions and the timing of that.

Matt wonders if that means we wait to engage an architect. All agree that's not the intention.

Joanna asks about the RFP language around the three Educational Leadership Teams and what

they are reflecting. Can they be defined to more follow Process I? Bruce says he can add/change that, if that's what the committee wants. Wendy asks Bruce if the RFP includes too

much of the Board's processes, might it not be attractive to potential firms? Bruce isn't too

concerned with that but notes the shift between Middlebury and district-wide being laborious/not cost-effective.

Jason asks of the RFP is meant to include both processes and all phases and what the goal is.

Bruce says that the goal is to identify a vendor and agrees it needs to incorporate the processes as presented to the board.

Barb suggests we add a background section and note that the goal is to move on from the previous work and clearly define future deliverables along with an effective and efficient Capital

Improvement Plan. The first deliverable is associated with Mary Hogan, MUMS and MUHS that

should give us an apples-to-apples comparison. The second deliverable includes follow-up work. We have to be okay with the potential that there might not be a way for the firm to deliver on the second process, yet, until the board grapples with the policy conversation. Matt echoes the unknowns and that we won't switch firms, but the bidder should know there is more work to come.

Bruce understands that the addition of the phases in the RFP needs to happen.

Wendy notes the need to differentiate Facilities Master Planning and Capital Improvement Planning where the vision is being led by the board and not the architect firm. Joanna questions

the preauthorization process- what do we need from the potential firm to achieve that goal? The beginning stages of bond development.

Jason asks about the scope of the RFP is there any reason to limit that to just Process I? Wendy

thinks it's important to include both Processes (and both Phases). Bruce: the closer we can come to identify the whole project, the better position we will be in. Jason notes that the second Process holds so many unknowns that it could be a barrier to gaining bids. Wendy breaks it down to a spectrum of options: Process II could include an analysis of as many as 6 schools or as few as one analysis of a new site, including a portion of the six. If we provide a range, we will get a nice range back. Which means we need to be extra clear on what we need

as a deliverable.

The committee continues grappling with the scope and order of the RFP.

Bruce notes that it might be helpful to include the firm in some of the process. With regard to the Strategic Plan, Brian is concerned that some of the goals might not be affordable. Barb drills

down on the deliverables and wants to be sure there is clarity on who is responsible for each piece. Chip remembers the time spent on the ideals and doesn't think we should rehash the work. Barb doesn't see that as the deliverable. Jason suggests removing the words "educational

specifications" from the deliverables since it's really an output from the board. Same with "project goals and principles." Barb wonders if the organization of the RFP could include affordability and potential risk assessment. Matt wants to be clear that there is some groundwork to build on as we expedite/track MUHS; MUMS and Mary Hogan. It helps the board move forward from "making a plan to make a plan." We also want to be able to say that our buildings are not a liability.

Matt outlines the framework of the RFP on the whiteboard:

Process I: Capital Improvements @ Mary Hogan, MUMS, MUHS

Phase 1: Need Identification

Strategic Plan Integration

Phase 2: Conceptual Design

Process II: Facilities Plan at Elementary Schools
Phase 1: (pending Board policy) Develop Configuration Options
Policy leads to options
Presentation back to Board
Phase 2: Create Capital Improvement Plan from options
Options lead to plan
Presentation to Board

Matt has reworked some of the RFP organization and all agree that the committee needs to see

a second draft. Question about Mary Hogan and what process it belongs in. We also agree that

building Educational Capacity should be included. Brian adds that flexibility will also be a need.

Jason questions phase 2 (of process I): reconfiguration options. Does that apply to Process I?

Bruce answers: Only if it applies to the elementary schools. Matt adds that, possibly, every building (capacity) should be considered. Ultimately, Jason asks for final committee thoughts: Joanna would like to see Strategic Plan integration; Barb would like to see more concrete deliverables and avoid lofty statements. Matt adds affordability, remembering Brian's earlier comment. Board could help set guidelines as it relates to the bond initiative/tax rate. Timing of

the second draft? End of the week and Matt will email it out to the committee. Should the Facilities Committee, ideally, approve the draft before the full board sees it? RFP can be submitted without full board approval. Jason, as Chair, should update the board as to the submission of the RFP.

2. Action: Maple Broadband Easement Approval

The Ripton proposal has been revised since the last schematic. There was an attempt to carve

out the smallest sliver of grass on the south side of the school. Also, there is the addition of the

cabinet of 69" and three walls is 2" taller than the cabinet to shield the component from tree fall. The other site would be where the soccer benches are in the middle of the soccer field. Bruce indicated that is not desirable. There is committee uneasiness about the concrete bunker. Barb questions why the initial location isn't an option anymore. Since this doesn't seem

ideal, Joanna would like other options to present to the Selectboard and RES. Agree we need to

bounce it back to Maple Broadband.

The Middlebury proposal at the Mary Hogan Dr. site seems to be the best option of the two. It was the ideal location from Maple Broadband's perspective due to the proximity to rt7 and the

poles. They will provide a stipend for landscaping or build a chain link fence. The other option is

at the Rec Center which might cause the need to move the backup generator, which is on a trailer, so not a deal-breaker, but potentially not ideal as compared to the Mary Hogan site.

Matt asks about looping in Ripton Selectboard, or others, for future conversation of the easement location. Joanna says to go ahead and include the whole Selectboard.

Joanna asks that the Maple Broadband designs get forwarded to the committee.

3. MUMS Renovation Discussion

Matt highlights the capacity need at MUMS; if any relief will be offered next year (FY'26)

planning needs to happen next month (Nov 2024). We need to finish building the school, as it was designed. Barb wonders about capacity at MUHS and if that could be a potential conversation, if we're talking about major construction. Chip notes that he disagrees with that path.

Matt brings up that our projected Capital reserves fall within range of making that addition at MUMS something we could do with our existing funds. Knowing that the future of reserves is

uncertain (ultimately, it belongs to the State's Ed Fund) might that contribute to wanting to alleviate this acute issue. Also don't want to make decisions based on speculation. Current reserve fund is ~\$4.8 million and the project would be ~\$4 million. For context, the MUHS kitchen was \$2.5 million which was intensive on plumbing and specialized equipment. Matt says that we kind of have a head start (some engineering has been done). Matt wants to look to

the committee for approval to include the renovations as an expedited track in the Capital Improvement Plan. Brian asks about including the public in the decision-making process here.

That money can only be used for Capital Improvements. Conversation with the principal is that

this acute need rises to the top. The price is \$3,000 for a professional cost estimator. It was done on the MUHS kitchen and it was worthwhile. Barb would like to go ahead and approve the

expenditure. But to get the schematic design would be more. What has been produced in the past can be used to help the process. It will not be included in the scope of the new RFP, if it's

already been done.

We decide include this as a conversation in the next committee meeting agenda.

F. Other

G. Adjournment

10:09am meeting adjourned

***Public Comment Guidelines:**

Public comments are encouraged and welcomed 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.

Addison Central School District

Request for Proposal for Capital Improvement Planning Services

DRAFT 11/11/2024 Middlebury, Vermont

INTRODUCTION

The Addison Central School District (ACSD) seeks to engage a qualified architect-led design team to assist them in creating a Capital Improvement Plan. The Owner will be using a Quality Based Selection (QBS) process. As part of that approach, the applicant will submit a Technical Proposal (qualifications) and a Financial Proposal (costs). ACSD intends to make their initial selection based on the applicant's qualifications (Technical Proposal) and then open the Financial Proposals. They will then make a determination if the costs for the winning bidder are reasonable and make their final selection accordingly.

The following firms have been invited to participate:

- Black River Design
- Freeman French & Freeman
- TruexCullins
- Dore & Whitter

[Addison Central School District](#)

[INTRODUCTION](#)

[BACKGROUND](#)

[Request for Capital Improvement Services – Technical Proposal](#)

[GOALS](#)

[PROJECT ORGANIZATION](#)

[SCOPE OF WORK](#)

[Process A - Visioning/Programming of Middlebury Buildings](#)

[Phase 1 Scope - Need Identification at Middlebury Schools](#)

[Phase 2 Scope - Concept Design for Middlebury Schools](#)

[Process B - Reconfiguration Options for Elementary Schools](#)

[Phase 1 Scope - Pending Outcome of Board Policy Initiative](#)

[Phase 2 Scope - Capital Improvement Plan for Smaller Schools](#)

[PROPOSED SCHEDULE](#)

[PROVIDED BY OWNER](#)

[SUBMISSION FORMAT](#)

[IMPORTANT DATES](#)

[APPENDICES](#)

BACKGROUND

Addison Central Supervisory Union became ACSD in 2017. as part of Act 46. The district is located in Addison County and includes the towns of Middlebury, Cornwall, Bridport, Ripton, Salisbury, Shoreham, and Weybridge.

In 2016, they adopted the International Baccalaureate program for all grade levels. This includes the Primary Years Programme (grades K-5), Middle Years Programme (6-10), and Diploma Programme (grades 11-12).

There are nine schools in the District with the following size and enrollment:

School	Grades	Enrollment	Size (sf)	Age
Middlebury Union High School	9-12	513	144,063	1955, 1997
Middlebury Union Middle School	6-9	387	64,570	1996
Bingham Memorial School (Cornwall)	K-5	85	13,500	1959, 1984
Bridport Central School	K-5	54	17,620	1955, 1987
Mary Hogan School	K-5	360	72,000	1955, 2000
Ripton Elementary School	K-5	32	14,864	1989
Salisbury Community School	K-5	48	24,550	1996
Shoreham Elementary School	K-5	68	14,864	1954, 1972, 2001
Weybridge Elementary School	K-5	40	15,300	1961, 1996

In 2019, TruexCullins completed facility evaluations of all seven elementary schools. In 2022, facility evaluations of the high school and middle school were completed. From 2019 to 2021, they worked with ACSD on a Master Plan that focused on possible reconfigurations of the elementary schools. This effort was tabled due to a combination of factors, including COVID, an interim superintendent, and the need for a comprehensive Strategic Plan. As a result, no definitive recommendation was made at the conclusion of the planning process. The existing Addison Central School District work is extensively documented in “Report to the Community: Educational and Facilities Planning,” April 2022. (See Appendix A.)

The District now stands ready to resume this work. Building off of the guiding principles

outlined in the newly developed Strategic Plan, the School Board and Administration hope to develop a comprehensive approach to address the capital needs of our school buildings. In order to optimize progress, the District has divided the work into two separate processes. Each process is further split into two phases, as outlined below.

Process A - Middlebury Schools		Process B - Elementary Schools
Phase 1	Need Identification - What do our three largest buildings require in capital improvements over the next five years? - What longer-range needs exist? - What capital improvements could support our Strategic Plan goals?	Configuration Options - The School Board will determine what policy changes support Strategic Plan goals. - Based on policy, what building configurations are possible?
Phase 2	Conceptual Design - What would addressing the needs identified in Phase 1 look like? - What would it cost to do this work?	Capital Improvement Plan - Based on Configuration Options, how does ACSD plan to address Elementary School capital improvements?

The following table summarizes the deliverables that would accompany each phase. More detailed deliverables are listed below in the Technical Proposal section.

Process A - Phase 1 MUMS, MUHS, Mary Hogan	● Project Goals ● Project Diagrams ● Space Needs Assessment (School Capacity Assessment)
Process B - Phase 1 Elementary Schools, pending Board Policy changes.	● Policy-based options. ● Presentation to School Board
Process A - Phase 2	● Building and Site Plans ● Cost Estimates ● Presentation to School Board
Process B - Phase 2 Elementary Schools, pending Board action on Options	● Formation of Capital Improvements Plan ● Presentation to School Board

Request for Capital Improvement Services – Technical Proposal

GOALS

From the 2022 report, the forces driving facilities master planning process were:

Informed Management of ACSD's Collective Resources

- Addressing deferred maintenance
- Resolving inefficiencies of underutilized buildings
- Proactive long-term planning

Provide Excellent, Equitable Student Learning Environments

- Making sure all ACSD facilities are appropriate, well-equipped, and adequately staffed
- Addressing inequities between student opportunities and classroom experiences
- Enabling allocation of resources where need exists

Financial Sustainability and Fiscal Responsibility

- Responding to increasing expenses
- Addressing declining enrollment

In addition, Guiding Principles for the elementary school experience were developed (see page 23 of the report).

PROJECT ORGANIZATION

The owner shall organize themselves in the following fashion:

• Executive Planning Committee (EC)

- o Roles and Responsibilities: process planning, agenda for Facility Committee, a final recommendation to the Board

o Members:

- Superintendent
- School board chair
- Director of Finance and Operations
- Facilities Director
- Chair of Facility Committee (see below)
- Consultant Team Representatives

• Facility Committee (FC)

- o Roles and Responsibilities: To review materials developed by the consultant team and provide feedback, develop communication and outreach plan, and recommendations to the board (the executive committee)

o Members

Stakeholder representatives, including admin, board, staff, community

• Educational Leadership Teams (3)

- o Roles and responsibilities: to provide information on space and program needs for each division: Elementary, Middle, and High School
- o Members: 3 Teams, each consisting of select admin and staff to represent Elementary Schools, Middle School and High School.

SCOPE OF WORK

The following Processes and Phases will be included in the master planning work:

Process A - Visioning/Programming of Middlebury Buildings

Phase 1 Scope - Need Identification at Middlebury Schools

- Project Goals and Guiding Principles—Reconfirm the goals and principles in the 2022 report with the facility committee/School Board.
- *Educational Specifications* – ACSD will provide a written description of their existing educational program and any proposed changes.
- Organization – Create adjacency diagrams depicting the ideal arrangement of spaces in a typical elementary, middle, and high school
- Space Needs Program - Work with a high school, middle school, and elementary school leadership team to understand and document both existing and proposed space **needs** in a spreadsheet (space needs program). Provide additional detail on each school's educational **capacity**.

Meetings (virtual unless otherwise noted)

- Kick-off meeting – 1x in person
- Executive committee mtg – 1x month
- Facilities committee mtg – 1x month
- Educational Leadership mtgs – 2 per team (total 6)
- Board Presentation – 1

Deliverables

- Project Goals
- *Educational Specifications* - ACSD
- Adjacency Diagrams for each division
- Space Needs Program

Phase 2 Scope - Concept Design for Middlebury Schools

- Design Development—Develop the selected configuration option from Phase 1 in greater detail, including basic site plans, floor plans, and building massing for both existing and proposed spaces.
- Pricing Package - Assemble a set of drawings and outline specifications suitable for pricing by a professional cost estimator. Include outline specifications for civil, structural, mechanical, and electrical disciplines. Provide an option for net-zero energy design solutions.
- Cost Estimate – work with a professional cost estimator to develop costs for each option.

- Project Budget – Create a project budget for each option, including hard and soft costs.
- Presentation – prepare a slide deck for presentation to the public and board

Meetings (virtual unless otherwise noted)

- Executive committee mtg – 1x month
- Facilities committee mtg – 1x month
- Public Presentation – 1
- Board Presentation – 1

Deliverables

- Building and site plans for selected configuration options
- Cost estimate and project budget for selected configuration options
- PDF of board presentation

Process B - Reconfiguration Options for Elementary Schools

Phase 1 Scope - Pending Outcome of Board Policy Initiative

- Options - Revisit and update district reconfiguration options in 2022 report, adding new options as specified by the Board.
- Site Planning – develop site plans showing existing and proposed space and site features for up to 3 options.
- Presentation – prepare a slide deck for presentation to the public and board

Meetings (virtual unless otherwise noted)

- Executive committee mtg – 1x month
- Facilities committee mtg – 1x month
- Public Presentation – 1
- Board Presentation – 1 - in person

Deliverables

- Site Plans for up to 3 district-wide configuration options
- Cost estimate and project budget for each configuration option
- PDF of board presentation

Phase 2 Scope - Capital Improvement Plan for Smaller Schools

- Facility Evaluations - Facility evaluations were completed in 2019 and 2022. All costs are currently 2024 dollars. See Appendix B. The consultant will, as needed, update these costs based on the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) implementation schedule.
- Capital Improvement Plan—Work with the Facilities Director to develop a detailed 10-year plan indicating when each project identified in the facility evaluations could be completed. Provide a cost escalation factor appropriate to each item based on the year it is to be completed.
- Presentation – prepare a slide deck for presentation to the board

Meetings (virtual unless otherwise noted)

- Executive committee mtg – 1x month
- Facilities committee mtg – 1x month
- Board Presentation – 1 - in person

Deliverables

- Capital Improvement Plan
- PDF of board presentation
- Final Masterplan report – to include all deliverables plus Executive Summary

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

The following is a proposed schedule for the project. The consultant is invited to confirm this approach or propose an alternate schedule in their proposal.

Project	Weeks	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct
Consultant Selection	8 ▾	24	24										
Process A, Phase 1	10 ▾			25	25	25							
Process B, Phase 1	10 ▾					25	25	25					
Cost Estimating	4 ▾								25				
Process A, Phase 2	12 ▾									25	25	25	
Cost Estimating	4 ▾												25
Process B, Phase 2	10 ▾	25	25	26									
Final Report	4 ▾				26								

PROVIDED BY OWNER**School Board Updates**

Pending Board decisions, ACSD will provide updated policies and configuration decisions.

Education Specifications

Detailed information on current programming and future goals.

Enrollment Projections

ACSD will provide enrollment projections, which will serve as the basis for the capacity of all master planning options.

As-Built Drawings

ACSD will provide basic Revit floor plans of each building, drawn from archival hard copy drawings and spot-checked in the field. They will show doors, windows, and walls with a standard wall height and no roofs.

The consultant will assemble site plans from Google Maps and the Agency of Natural Resources wetland and lidar topography information. Should it become necessary, ACSD will contract for surveyed site plans.

Cost Modeling

ACSD will provide modeling of the operational cost impacts of each configuration option.

Transportation Consulting

If necessary, ACSD will contract with a transportation consultant to compute travel times and transportation costs associated with each configuration option.

SUBMISSION FORMAT

1. The applicant shall submit two proposals in separate sealed envelopes: Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal
 2. Technical Proposal shall contain the following (in this order):
 - a. Cover letter
 - b. Project Approach
 - i. Describe the process by which your team will undertake this project.
 - c. Project Schedule
 - i. The project schedule shall be in a Gantt-style bar format.
 - d. Project Team
 - i. Resumes
 1. Key team members only – 1 page only
 - e. Relevant Experience
 - i. Provide examples of similar scale and scope projects
 - f. References
 - i. Provide a minimum of 3 references of school projects of similar characteristics.
 3. Financial Proposal
 - a. Provide a lump sum proposal for all work.
 - i. Itemize by phase.
 - b. Provide an estimate of reimbursables.
 - c. Provide standard hourly rates for all consultants.
 - d. Provide proposed terms and conditions, if any.
 - e. Deliverables
 - i. Provide three hard copies each for the Technical and Financial proposals in separate sealed envelopes.
1. In addition, provide a thumb drive with a PDF of each proposal in their corresponding sealed envelope.
 - ii. Send or deliver separate sealed Technical and Financial Proposal packages to Bruce MacIntire, Facilities Director at Middlebury Union High School, 49 Charles Ave, Middlebury, VT 05673. Packages must be received by 3 pm on December 30, 2024

1. No faxes or emailed versions allowed in lieu of requirements listed.
 2. The district retains the right to reject any proposal that is late or does not meet the requirements of this RFP.
- f. All questions must be in writing and emailed to Bruce MacIntire, Facilities Director, at bmacintire@acsdvt.org

IMPORTANT DATES

The following dates have been set for the RFP process:

- Request for Proposal Issued – December 2, 2024
- Walk-thru of facilities – by appointment only.
- Last day for Requests for Information (RFIs) – December 16, 2024
- RFIs response by Owner - December 23, 2024
- Proposal due date and time – December 30, 2024, at 3 pm.
- Notification date of short-listed firms - January 10, 2025
- Tentative Interview date of short-listed firms – January 16, 2025
- Notification of award – February 4, 2025
- Consultants start date - February 2025

SELECTION PROCESS

Selection Committee

- Wendy Baker, Superintendent
- Mathew Corrente, Director of Finance and Operations
- Bruce MacIntire, ACSD Facilities Director
- ACSD Board Chair or appointee

Selection Criteria

- Understanding of project needs and goals
- Project Experience
- Project Approach
- References
- Meeting Schedules and Budgets
- Flexibility in working approach.
- Knowledge of 21st century design
- Knowledge of Sustainability
- Presentation skill
- Quality of presentation materials
- Fee Approach

Proposal Review Process

- The selection committee shall open and review the Technical Proposal first and rank the applicants. They may decide to interview some or all of the participants.
- At some point after the interviews, a committee representative will call references of some or all of the participants.
- A tentative selection will be made. Following this, the Financial Proposals will be opened.
- The intent is for the District to select a qualified firm that is the best fit for them. Should the fee proposal be excessively high or low or for any other reason, the

District reserves the right to reject any or all proposals.

APPENDICES

- A. Report to the Community: Educational and Facilities Planning, April 2022.
<https://www.acsdvt.org/school-board/facilities-master-plan>
- B. ACSD Facilities Overview, May 24, 2022,
TruexCullins [Facilities Overview](#)
- C. Facility Data Table

School	Grades	Enrollment	Size (sf)	Age
Middlebury Union High School	9-12	513	144,063	1955, 1997
Middlebury Union Middle School	6-9	387	64,570	1996
Bingham Memorial School (Cornwall)	K-5	85	13,500	1959, 1984
Bridport Central School	K-5	54	17,620	1955, 1987
Mary Hogan School	K-5	360	72,000	1955, 2000
Ripton Elementary School	K-5	32	14,864	1989
Salisbury Community School	K-5	48	24,550	1996
Shoreham Elementary School	K-5	68	14,864	1954, 1972, 2001
Weybridge Elementary School	K-5	40	15,300	1961, 1996

END OF RFP

To: ACSD Superintendent, Dr. Baker

Cc: ACSD Board of Directors

From: Leonard Barrett

Date: November 12, 2024

RE: Flag Pole at MUHS

As some of you know, I am a lifelong resident of Addison County, a 1973 graduate of MUHS and a past member and Chair of this district's Board of Directors. I support the High School 110% and help out whenever I am able. Previously, I spoke to the Board of Directors about several concerns I had including the use of the flag pole in the circle at MUHS.

I am writing today to ask for permission to erect a new pole in the circle, at no cost to the school. This new pole would be taller than the current one, would include a light and a larger flag.

I also request that the District policy be revised so that this new pole would be used exclusively for displaying the American Flag.

I am available if you have questions or need any other information. I hope you will seriously consider my requests.



Leonard Barrett

Weybridge, VT

802-349-4179