

**Facilities Steering Forum  
Meeting Minutes, October 3, 2007**

Attendees:

Carole Pickering  
Wayne Kurlander  
Ron Suits  
Thom Martin  
Gail Perogine  
Joe Tola  
Bill Wisbauer  
Christine Jones

Barbara Marrine  
Steve Hughes  
John Vanderlee  
Duane Pearson  
Robert Homko  
Barbara Sweet  
Karin Armstrong  
Maria Hoskins

1. Carole Pickering opened the meeting with a brief reference to the status of the Phase 1C work. This work continues, although there have been some delays in getting all the contractors to complete their portion.

Carole next reviewed the materials presented to the Board of Education at its September 27 meeting. These items included a review of the sitework decisions by the board, following receipt of the principals' input, as well as updating the group on the reasons behind the increase in the cost of the replacement windows for the three historic schools.

Following a review and discussion of the principals' feedback, the board determined that the previous decisions on what to delete from the proposed sitework and what to include in that portion of the scope would stand.

With respect to the windows, the three factors contributing to the substantial increase in cost were identified: as testing and abatement of lead paint and asbestos-containing caulk; a specific model and manufacturer of replacement windows that should be acceptable to SHPO; and the labor to install these specific manufacturer's windows.

2. The document that the board had reviewed was updated following the September 27 meeting. Updates included a summary portion, identifying the project costs for each subset of the proposed referendum, as well as the detailed side-by-side comparison of the original Phase 2A proposal and the status following the board's discussions and decisions.

This was reviewed in detail by the group, in addition to specific tax impact information that was provided to the board at that meeting.

Mr. Homko asked where the district displayed the state aid revenue on building projects. Wayne Kurlander responded that this information is contained in the district's budget document. Mr. Homko indicated that it was difficult to identify this part of the district's revenue; this made it difficult for people to know that it was actually being received by the district. He suggested finding a more clear way to note this in the budget document.

Mr. Homko also indicated that, on the slide that would present the average cost to the taxpayer, the notation that this was the result of the “16-year maturity schedule for \$14,924,611 capital project” was misleading. The average taxpayer’s cost includes the interest, as well as the principal on the bond. The committee agreed, and the wording will be changed to include a footnote on this piece for clarity.

3. Wayne Kurlander reviewed the amortization on the purchase of the district office (Phase 2B). The proposed purchase price does not include other costs, such as fees and closing costs. The total will still be approximately \$2 million and will not exceed that amount. He reviewed the detail supporting document and pointed out that the document: overstated the current interest rate for the sale of bonds, understated the future lease payments that the district would incur, and therefore understated the savings to the district.

In response to a comment that the union (owners) appeared to be lagging on completing contract for the sale, Christine Jones said that they were concerned of the results of the testing. She inquired on the outcome of the testing of the underground tanks; Ron Suits indicated that there were no leaks found. Christine indicated that this result should help move the contract process forward.

Duane Pearson indicated that the district should be prepared to identify the operating costs of owning the building. Ron said that the district is already responsible for repairs and maintenance under the lease agreement. Presently, the roof is proposed for replacement under Phase 2A, and there is a need to have the parking lot repaved to deal with drainage problems in certain areas.

Barbara Sweet said that the district should be clear that the purchase included the land parcel as well as the building. Christine suggested using the term “real property” which is inclusive of the land.

4. The committee returned to a detailed discussion of the scope of Phase 2A.

Mr. Homko asked why the district was replacing the roof at FDR if future proposals included substantial modifications to that building. Carole and Ron said that the current roof’s condition required replacement or repair of some areas prior to the future additions, and the proposed additions would not require demolition of the improvements. Mr. Homko indicated that the district should make this clear to the voters. He also asked about warranties on the district’s existing roofs, and was told that these were no longer in force or that the company hold the warranty had gone out of business; this means no recovery for these costs. Finally, he asked about the replacement of the transportation garage roof. Ron said that there is no proposal to demolish the building and that it would be put to future use when/if a new facility was approved. Carole also indicated that there are portions of the existing roof through which you can literally see the sky and that the condition of the building was affected. On each of these points, Mr. Homko said that the district needed to be completely clear in its communications to the community.

Mr. Homko asked about the use of the district's website to provide information to the community. Steve Hughes said that a meeting was planned for Friday, October 5, with Forrest Addor to address methods to keep the website as up-to-date as possible. The committee may be able to use this as a mechanism to provide the Question-and-Answer documents, as well as other pertinent information.

Carole began questions on the replacement windows portion of Phase 2A with a question on the status of SHPO approval. Bill Wisbauer indicated that the physical inspection of the three buildings' windows had just been completed and that the conditions report requested by SHPO will be transmitted on Tuesday, October 9. Bill said that SHPO indicated as little as a 2-3 day turnaround for a response on their approval. This timeline would not necessarily provide this information to the board in time for its meeting on October 11, when it will be discussing its final decisions on the scope. Bill Wisbauer said that the report was being completed as quickly as possible and that the physical inspection had only just been completed; SHPO has agreed to review it as quickly as possible.

Barbara Sweet inquired about providing the old windows to the Little Red Schoolhouse. Joe Tola said that the estimate does not include the costs of selective demolition.

Steve Hughes asked about the failure to include the cost of lead paint abatement in the original project cost estimates. The community is well aware of the presence of lead paint in these windows, and this contributing to the increase in cost may be seen as a reflection on the credibility of the entire proposal. He also wanted to be able to identify the difference between the costs of the windows previously proposed by Ameresco and those in the current proposal, and why the newer replacement windows were so much more expensive. He also wanted to be able to state that the reason for the substitution was solely to get SHPO approval for the proposed replacements. (SHPO had previously denied the district the use of the previous replacement windows.)

On the subject of the late addition of the costs for lead and asbestos abatement to the estimates, Bill Wisbauer said that these costs had not been carried over from the entire scope of Phase 2. Gail Perogine indicated that there had been a line item for abatement in the overall scope of the entire Phase 2; when the replacement of the historic windows was pulled out of this scope as a stand-alone project, these costs appear not to have been transferred. Bill said that the costs for the specific replacement window (that SHPO appears prepared to approve) and the higher labor costs to install these particular windows contribute to approximately 55% of the increase in this portion of the project costs.

5. Carole indicated that the committee should be prepared to focus solely on the presentation of the referenda at the next FSF meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, November 7. In the interim, the district and consultants will be revising the side-by-side to reflect greater detail on each piece of the Phase 2A scope. Additionally, a detailed Phase 2A scope document will be developed. The district

and consultants are already meeting on the development of the publicity campaign.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann S. Fadgen