

Feasibility Study Committee

May 11, 2017 5:30 p.m. Administration Center

Members in attendance: Jay Burkhart, Betsy Holley, Greg Milbrand, Anne Alger, Rob Copeland, Dylan Haigh, Dawn Kepler, Kristen Danner, Jeffery Lynch, Clint Heckman, Charley Gelb, Debbie Lupold, Harold Hinton, Glenn Gurchik, Scott D’Orazio, Sharon Sybrandt, Sarah Miller, Jason Oyler, Steve DavidHeiser, Leesa Demartyn, Dennis Helm, Mike Jones, Adam Oldham, Franklin Marshall and Kathy Kramer.

Dr. Burkhart called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and began the meeting with an introduction of the members present. Dr. Burkhart reviewed the facilities Master Plan as well as a few items that may require district attention, to include a recent roof leak and paving of the entire campus.

Charge of the Committee

The committee discussed what should be the charge of this committee. Specific questions as to the charge were addressed. Some of those questions will be taken in small “bites of the apple”.

1. Can we borrow monies in smaller chunks rather than one large \$40 million borrowing for a 30 year term?
 - a. Although PlanCon is currently on a moratorium, the process has been followed by the architects. Following this process, once a building is renovated another PlanCon reimbursable project could not be started for 20 years. It is smart to follow the process of PlanCon but not assume any PDE reimbursement. The current projected project numbers do not include any reimbursement. Additionally, the district is currently in a financial position to replace debt that is almost paid off with this new debt. The new debt payment will be almost equal to the districts existing debt payment. The effect to the budget will be minimal. It is similar to when a household replaces an older car with a newer car and maintains the same car payment. The effect to the household budget is neutral. The district is utilizing the same logic.
2. How did Crabtree get the different options with different budget totals?
 - a. Based on the district budget, some options were identified that only covered MEP upgrades and other options were developed to include different items all while trying to stay within what the district could afford.
3. Is the committee only to look at options shown?
 - a. The charge of the committee is not to create another option. However, if you have a different idea, it should be brought forward.
4. What is the best borrowing term, 20 or 30 years?

- a. With changes in curriculum occurring more often than 20 to 30 years, you will want to be careful to invest in structural changes. We should be cautious when building specific areas for certain programs. Shorter terms of borrowing make sense. A 20 year term is a good average based upon the expected life cycle of systems.
5. Do we repair what we have or get what we don't have yet?
 - a. Feedback from the HS staff is to just fix what we have in this staff. The walls need painted and the MEP systems updated. We need to fix the "foundation" of our buildings instead of just painting over items that need attention.
6. Will we use the same architects for the design phase of the project?
 - a. Crabtree has a contract for the study phase of this project. A new contract will have to be awarded for the design phase.

Expert guidance will be needed as we progress. The charge of the committee is to keep and maintain the programs for our students. The committee is here because the board is charged to keep the district operating for 100 years. The charge is to have the best ideas brought forward for the best interest of the district in the next 20 to 30 years. Architects do not set the "must haves," the district will.

The committee reviewed each building and the listed deficiencies. The capacities of each building were reviewed and when a school is at 80% capacity, it is considered high. Currently, we do not have extra space at either West Creek Hills (WCH) or East Pennsboro Elementary (EPE). The MEP's at each building are a must do.

ALL BUILDINGS -- What is the ADA compliance regulations once we start to renovate? What revenue/savings would we see in terms of a more efficient and effective energy system? Is there a breakdown showing the deficiencies noted at each building and a line-by-line cost to remedy them?

WCH: The modulars at WCH are a must do. The modulars were never intended to remain as part of the building during the 2000 renovation. It was noted that this committee needs to communicate what is being done and the thought process behind the recommendations. The modulars at WCH could be replaced over the summer to not disrupt education. The parking/parent drop off is only a concern at arrival and dismissal. The study noted the conflicting bus and parent exits. Is this a safety concern? Is there a way to rethink the current design? Could this be accomplished through additional line painting? The committee discussed that this is not a safety issue as indicated in the study. Another crossing guard may fix the issue. Right now, it is as safe as it can be. Adequate storage should be added to the deficiency list. Where might we gain more storage space at WCH? Possibly under an addition? The study noted damaged and stained masonry. Could we simply power wash the stains? What is the cost on the damage? Is this a large ticket item? WCH notates aged playground equipment. Is this the swing

set? The equipment was updated fairly recently. Does it need to be fixed for safety reasons? Additionally, the committee wanted it corrected that there is AC in the trailers at WCH. At the last community meeting it was stated there was not AC out there. Although the modular does have an AC unit, it currently only operates at 50% capacity.

EPE: The committee has requested clarification on the secure vestibule deficiency. EPE notates that the entrance vestibule is not secure. It appears as if this system works the same as WCH. Why is this notated? The storm water deficiency is being addressed this summer. It noted damaged and stained masonry. Could we simply power wash the stains? What is the cost on the damage? Is this a large ticket item? The study noted the conflicting bus and parent exits. Is this a safety concern? Is there a way to rethink the current design? Could this be accomplished through additional line painting?

MS: How would the classrooms without natural daylight be corrected, what is the recommendation? The MS notates an undersized art room. There is only one art teacher and the room is rather large. Was this meant to be plural and discuss the arts? In other words, the chorus room is very small for the amount of kids in the program.

HS: The chorus can no longer rehearse/practice in the chorus room, it has essentially become storage. They use the auditorium. Could we get clarification on the outdated finishes in the HS auditorium? Is this a large ticket item?

Operational efficiencies should be examined at each building. Are there other ways to raise funds other than borrowing? Could naming rights be used? The committee discussed the prior efforts with this type to include the Team up for Turf campaign.

The committee would like to see more specifics on the deficiencies and a more thorough breakdown of the costs. At the next meeting, the committee will start to examine the renovation costs and will tour WCH.

What are our next steps?

3 decisions were made this evening:

1. Create a meeting schedule:
 - a. May 25 5:30 pm WCH
 - b. June 6 5:30 pm EPE
 - c. June 13 5:30 pm HS
 - d. June 20 5:30 pm MS
 - e. June 27 5:30 pm Admin

2. Should the architects attend all the committee meetings?
 - a. The committee felt the architects will be helpful to answer some questions. The committee would like to invite the architects to the June 27 meeting, after the committee has toured each building.

3. Should the committee meetings be open to the public?
 - a. The committee discussed the pros and cons to have the committee meetings open to the public and took a vote. With the meetings open to the public, there would be transparency and an understanding from the public on the final recommendation. The members were concerned about the size of the current committee and adding to that size. The idea of streaming the meetings or utilizing Facebook live was discussed. The committee is the public voice and should serve as a conduit of information.

The vote was counted as 6 yes and 15 no. The feasibility study meetings will not be open to the public.

A group email will be established for the public to contact committee members with feedback and questions. Minutes of the meeting will be reviewed at regular board meetings and placed on the website. Mr. Oldham volunteered to record the questions from the feasibility committee public email and report to the committee. Mr. Oyler volunteered to co-facilitate the meetings with Dr. Burkhart.

The meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.