

1 Joint Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

2 Wednesday, October 21st, 2020

3 Meeting Minutes- Approved 11 18 2020

4 Attendees Via Webinar:

5 Administrative Team: Adam Steel- Superintendent and Roger Preston- Director of Facilities.

6 Committee Members: Pim Grondstra- SCSB Member, Ellen Gruzdien- ASB Member, Tom
7 Gauthier- ASB Member, Stephanie Grund- SCSB Member, Amy Facey- SCSB Member/ JFAC
8 Chair, Shannon Gascoyne, JFAC Vice Chair, Amherst NH, Jeanne Ludt, Amherst NH, Brian
9 Coogan, Amherst NH, John Bowkett, Amherst NH, and Lisa Eastland, Amherst NH.

10 Meeting Minutes: Danae A. Marotta

11 Public: Lance Whitehead and Anne Ketterer- Lavallee Brensinger Professional Architects,
12 Manchester NH.

13 I. Call to Order

14 **Chair of the Joint Facilities Advisory Committee, Ms. Amy Facey, called the meeting to**
15 **order at 6:01PM.**

16 II. Minutes Approval- 09 17 2020 and 09 30 2020

17 **Ms. Parisi motioned to approve the Draft Minutes of 09 17 2020. Ms. Grund seconded the**
18 **motion. The vote was unanimous. Motion passed.**

19 Ms. Facey used the “raise hand” feature to view responses. There was no discussion.

20 **Mr. Grondstra motioned to approve the Draft Minutes of 09 30 2020. Ms. Grayson**
21 **seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, motion passed.**

22 Ms. Facey used the “raise hand” feature to view responses. There was no discussion.

23 III. Subcommittee Updates

- 24
- 25 • Souhegan 2.0

26 Chair of the JFAC Souhegan 2.0 subcommittee, Ms. Victoria Parisi, shared her screen and noted
27 that she had posted it but there were no questions.

28 She reviewed the timeline.

- 29 ○ Dec 2017- Warrant Article \$150,000 for A &E fees, SCSB votes 5-1 to put on
- 30 ballot. FAC votes 7-0 in support.
- 31 ○ Mar 2018- Voters support Warrant Article
- 32 ○ Fall 2018- SAU #39 creates Joint Facilities Committee
- 33 ○ Dec 2019- Facilities Summit held to discuss SAU wide facilities
- 34 ○ Jun 2020- Souhegan 2.0 Subcommittee was formed

35 SCSD approved the hiring of Lavallee Brensinger Professional Architects, Manchester NH. To
36 create a Souhegan 2.0 comprehensive plan for updating the Souhegan campus.

37 During that time, Lavallee Brensinger met with students, former SHS Principal Mr. Rob Scully,
38 and Superintendent Steel to create a project. This work has resulted in a \$35.5 million project
39 proposal by Lavallee Brensinger.

40 The SAU #39 JFAC created the Souhegan 2.0 subcommittee to focus on the proposal and
41 provide recommendations to JFAC, who will provide a recommendation to the Souhegan
42 Cooperative School Board.

43 She explained that there are 10 projects within the Souhegan 2.0 which is in listed in a probable
44 cost sheet. There is more information located in their JFAC Slack channel.

45 The Subcommittee Objectives are the following:

- 46 1. Find consensus of priorities
- 47 2. Establish HVAC needs
- 48 3. Keep costs in control to support facility improvements across SAU #39.

49 Their Priorities are the following:

- 50 1. HVAC System
- 51 2. Science Labs in Annex
- 52 3. Secure Main Entrance
- 53 4. Locker Rooms

54 First, the SCSB identified the need for clean air in the Warrant Article that began the Souhegan
55 2.0 work. With Covid-19, the focus was to ensure safer air quality for staff and students.

56 Improvements since March 2020 include the following:

- 57 • Director of Facilities identified current HVAC repairs to extend the life of current system,
58 including improved air filtration
- 59 • Director of Facilities identified current repairs to unit ventilators to extend the life of and
60 improve air circulation (UV exchange the air about 4 times per hour)
- 61 • Director of Facilities has created a maintenance plan to properly maintain units

62 Cost from Souhegan 2.0 Lavallee Brensinger Probable Cost Document: \$22,487,814.

63 The funding of this complete overhaul would need to be evaluated by the SCSB and
64 Administration as the costs include everything above the ceiling tiles as you access the HVAC
65 ductwork (upgraded water pipes, fire suppression system, ceiling, electrical, and lighting).

66 Ms. Facey inquired why the cost is so high.

67 Ms. Parisi replied that when you once they got into the scope of it, it is not just the HVAC but
68 the fire suppression, ceiling, electrical and lighting.

69 Second, the current Science Labs in the Annex are in disrepair and lack adequate space.

70 The SCSB has identified the science labs as a place of needed improvement to deliver
71 curriculum at a higher standard.

72 Superintendent Steel places this as the #1 curricular need at Souhegan.

73 Cost from Souhegan 2.0 Lavallee Brensinger Probable Cost Document: \$1,041,231

74 The subcommittee recommends installing science labs in the annex, while lowering the cost.
75 Cost can be lowered by doing a design & build, not replacing soft costs (furniture and fixtures
76 that can be reused) and analyzing the number of labs needed.

77 Third, the Main Entrance of Souhegan enters directly into directly into student and staff
78 accessible areas. Other buildings in SAU #39 have a secure vestibule for visitors to access the
79 building. Community Council worked on a safety analysis that suggests securing the campus,
80 particularly at the main entrance.

81 Varying levels of design available to make this happen, including a simpler second door, key-in
82 all the way up through redesigning the use of space nearby the entrance.

83 Cost from Souhegan 2.0 Lavallee Brensinger Probable Cost Document: \$716,176.

84 The subcommittee recommends securing the main entrance to the level as is attainable in the
85 fastest manner.

86 Last, the Girls' and Boys' locker rooms are in a state of disrepair. There are varying degrees of
87 improvements from simply fixing the poor conditions to creating additional spaces included in
88 this number. Cost from Souhegan 2.0 Lavallee Brensinger Probable Cost Document: \$1,155,404

89 The subcommittee recommends repairing the locker rooms without creating additional spaces.

90 Ms. Gascoyne inquired what additional spaces would they be creating.

91 Ms. Parisi replied that there would be team rooms and it is addressing both the upstairs and
92 downstairs.

93 Science Lab Improvements \$1,041,231, Secure Main Entrance \$716,176 Locker Room
94 Improvement \$1,155,404

95 Total Cost from Souhegan 2.0 Lavallee Brensinger Probable Cost Document:
96 \$2,912,811. The subcommittee believes these costs can be lowered by focusing on essential parts
97 of each scope to fit within the SCSB's desired spending limit. This would be the charge of the
98 SCSB or their choice to continue this committee's work.

99 Ms. Parisi explained the various ways they can fund the project.

- 100 1. Use the Unassigned Fund Balance at end of FY21. Work can begin in Summer 2021 and
101 requires frugal spending by the SCSD in the current year.
- 102 2. Include a Warrant Article on the ballot to move the unassigned fund balance into a
103 Capital Improvement Fund. This will allow the list of improvements to be worked on
104 over time.

105 3. Include a Warrant Article on the ballot to fund a Capital Improvement Fund to add funds
106 to each year in order to save towards future projects while keeping the tax rate steady.

107 When it comes to future projects, other parts of Souhegan 2.0 are worth looking into after the list
108 of priorities has been completed. The number of science classrooms in the main building needs
109 to be determined. The SAU 39 Strategic Vision should continue to steer future projects.

110 Ms. Facey thanked Ms. Parisi and her subcommittee. The SCSB will be very grateful for all of
111 your help.

112 Mr. Gauthier inquired about the increased costs since they are in 2019 dollars.

113 Mr. Lance Whitehead, Lavallee Brensinger Architect, replied that they are assuming that with
114 FY 21 will be down a few percent but for FY 22 will be up 5%.

115 Mr. Grondstra also thanked Mr. Preston and the subcommittee. He added that there are costs that
116 will be required. He questioned what the estimate was to keep the current HVAC system in good
117 condition for the next few years. He further inquired how much the costs were with the
118 reductions included.

119 Ms. Parisi added that they do not have the amount right now and it is a matter of what they want
120 to be included.

121 SAU #39 Director of Facilities, Mr. Roger Preston, noted that it is anticipated costs. They will
122 have breakdown on these units. He has put in the SHS Operating Budget HVAC repairs as they
123 were in the past. They are working on a preventative maintenance program with an outside
124 company to come in and work on these units throughout the years.

125 Ms. Facey suggested that they put this on the Souhegan agenda. She added that they have a
126 meeting on Monday and wondered if they have time for discussion.

127 Mr. Grondstra replied that he will discuss it with Superintendent Steel.

128 Ms. Ludt thanked the subcommittee. She noted that there was a question in the chat about how
129 much is in the maintenance fund.

130 Ms. Facey replied that the last she knew was \$250k. They will have to check with Ms. Croteau.
131 The next steps are to coordinate with the Souhegan Board. She thanked the subcommittee.

132 • Scope Subcommittee

133 Mr. Preston added that they met a few times and went through Mr. Whitehead's and Harvey
134 Construction documents for CW and AMS. They went through line by line for both CW and
135 AMS. They had made reductions but did not discuss project management. They still have a
136 second pass and gave options to look at deeper with an OPM. They are trying to make some
137 reductions but then that would be adds. For those two meetings, they did invite the Principals.

138 Mr. Whitehead noted that they did have a productive meeting. They continue to carry a 5%
139 Escalation on the soft cost side. They will need to reassess if it is later than 21-22. They assumed

140 that 50% of the furniture and equipment will be carried over and he has made adjustments for
141 that.

142 Mr. Preston mentioned that for them they have a lot of leg work about what they can bring over.

143 Ms. Facey thanked Mr. Preston, Mr. Whitehead and the whole committee.

144 Ms. Gascoyne gave her support for the approach for going line by line.

145 Ms. Facey asked for questions for Mr. Preston or Mr. Whitehead. She added that they have a
146 draft presentation for the Board.

147 Mr. Whitehead noted that when they went back to the middle school, they redesigned it and
148 much of the cost savings was scaled back.

149 Ms. Gascoyne mentioned that they are not trying to take anything away but utilize the original
150 footprint.

151 Ms. Facey suggested that they move to a different subcommittee.

152 • Finance Subcommittee

153 Mr. Coogan commented that they are at a historic low in the marketplace. The rates are lower
154 than personal mortgages (0.57%). At some point in time, these facilities are going to need
155 renovation or new construction they will probably not be in a position to capitalize on. They
156 need to take that into consideration. There are significant cash changes just by waiting. There is
157 also home valuation to think about as well.

158 Mr. Steel showed a typical bond with the first year being the highest and the payments going
159 steadily down. He gave an example showing three projects with not keeping the tax rate level,
160 you can see the huge spikes and drops. They then researched historical rates and the table shows
161 figures going back to FY' 10. There is no science in predicting rates for the future.

162 He has built a model with project approval times, cost, inflation impact, CRF withdrawal,
163 amount borrowed, average rate, term, total debt service, total interest, interest rate of project and
164 total investment. If they were to do the Clark Wilkins project (est. \$66m) in FY' 32 as opposed
165 to FY' 22 the cost would be \$98m.

166 He discussed providing a consistent tax impact using arbitrary numbers. He picked a
167 conservative valuation number. When sorting it out and looking at it, if they did CW and waited
168 5 years to do AMS the amount of money that they have spent was an additional \$7m. They can
169 use the model and add in different variables.

170 Ms. Facey commended Superintendent Steel for putting this together.

171 She proposed doing AMS and CW projects at the same time with one bond.

172 Ms. Parisi mentioned that it is a great idea. She wants to make sure that when they do the
173 Souhegan 2.0 project in 10+ years that the priorities are taken care of.

174 Ms. Ludt remarked that they need to inform the public that there is significant cost savings in
175 doing the projects now. She inquired about the materials and if that is a factor.

176 Mr. Whitehead replied that this is a unique situation as they have never been in a pandemic
177 before. They are seeing select materials spike, such as wood for decking. Masonry and Steel
178 have not changed. Looking at the overall construction market there are a lot of reports out there
179 and a lot are saying that it will rebound. The sooner that you do a project, the less it will cost.

180 Mr. Gauthier inquired about the tax impact.

181 Mr. Steel replied that he has set up the spreadsheet on establishing the cap on two ways, a tax
182 rate impact or on a total dollars expended. The other way is to change it to Tax Rate Impact.

183 Ms. Facey asked how the CRF plays into the Souhegan 2.0 project.

184 Mr. Steel replied that the CRF would enable them to save money on interest rate payments by
185 applying that level tax impact every year. They do not have to do that, and the voters would have
186 to decide.

187 Ms. Facey asked Mr. Steel to explain how it can work with CW and AMS.

188 Mr. Steel mentioned that in this model, that the CW and AMS project being completed together
189 in FY 22 has its advantages. First, the projects can be evened out if one is over or under. Second,
190 the CRF is only for Souhegan. Those warrant articles to save that money would on the Souhegan
191 side of the ledger.

192 Ms. Gascoyne questioned if she were to vote in March, would there would be a warrant article
193 for the CW and AMS project and then an additional warrant article for \$5m for the Souhegan
194 CRF.

195 Mr. Steel replied, yes, it is possible that it can be in one warrant article but likely in two all on
196 the Amherst ballot.

197 Ms. Gascoyne added that they will have to explain to the public.

198 Mr. Steel replied that it does not have to be done for that first year.

199 Mr. Gauthier asked which projects are they suggesting now.

200 Mr. Steel mentioned that CW and AMS. He referenced the Salem School District in the way that
201 they presented it to the community.

202 Mr. Preston replied that by doing the two projects he looks as that as buying bulk. The OPM
203 should be able to run those two projects together with his help.

204 Mr. Whitehead explained that that larger projects tend to drive that square footage down.

205 Ms. Grund thanked them for going in and reviewing line by line. She is in support of the CRF
206 and suggested that speak to MV residents as well.

- 207 Ms. Gruzdien gave an analogy she suggested that they simplify it to explain it to the taxpayers.
208 She asked where will the students be if they do both projects at the same time.
- 209 Mr. Whitehead replied that they would merge the phasing plans and potentially save money
210 there. They would make sure that they have a great educational experience.
- 211 Ms. Gruzdien added that she understands the efficiencies with doing both projects at once.
- 212 Ms. Gascoyne gave her support for the projects.
- 213 Ms. Facey asked for other questions. She suggested that they go over their draft presentation.
- 214 Ms. Gascoyne mentioned that it is a rough draft mode.
- 215 Ms. Facey replied that this is for the upcoming SAU board meeting next Thursday. They can
216 then plan to attend the individual boards for November and December so that they can make
217 their decisions.
- 218 Ms. Gascoyne noted that the first slide shows the logos and the all of the work done as
219 community members. There is a timeline, a process, school building conditions, photos, existing
220 conditions, significant issues-CW, existing conditions-Wilkins, significant issues- AMS,
221 significant needs- ams, class size targets, enrollment projections, staff survey results, community
222 survey results, free response highlights, and the options.
- 223 Mr. Whitehead added that the Kick the Can number is over the next 20 years.
- 224 Ms. Facey mentioned that the Renovate/Refurbish amount of \$64,500,000 is close to the amount
225 of Build a New Elementary School \$66,038,000.
- 226 Ms. Gascoyne added that they have shown why they need to build a new elementary school.
227 She asked Mr. Whitehead if he could explain the costs at AMS.
- 228 Mr. Whitehead mentioned that this is assuming that they are building a middle school for three
229 grades (\$59m). Currently, they are housing 4 grades and the elementary school is housing K-5th
230 grade. They are different size buildings.
- 231 Ms. Gascoyne reviewed the slide why they would renovate and refurbish AMS.
- 232 She noted the costs at SHS. Complete Renovate/ refurbish SHS \$35,000,000 and Partial
233 renovate/ refurbish \$2,500,000 (further refinement of scope may reduce costs).
- 234 They will cover the financial information as well.
- 235 She asked for extra questions.
- 236 Ms. Gruzdien thanked Ms. Gascoyne for all of her work.
- 237 Ms. Ludt commented that they really are overcrowded.
- 238 Mr. Gauthier mentioned that they can show the enrollment projections with the red. That is a
239 good place holder. It may be helpful to review what Kick the Can means.

240 Ms. Facey asked Mr. Whitehead if he can help with that.

241 Ms. Gascoyne asked Mr. Gauthier if he can send that slide or document to her. She added that
242 what they have shared with the Board is what they share with the community.

243 Ms. Grund inquired if they need to address anything with Mont Vernon.

244 Mr. Steel replied that he believes that they ought to.

245 Mr. Coogan recommended getting a small focus group of residents and figure out their concerns.

246 Ms. Gascoyne added that they had discussed holding those focus groups over the summer.

247 Mr. Grondstra added that when they speak to the public, they need to explain the tax impact, as a
248 resident of Mont Vernon he would want to know that. He suggested having consistent reporting
249 formatting.

250 Ms. Gascoyne and Ms. Parisi agreed.

251 Ms. Facey mentioned that they want to make sure that they are all in agreement. They can
252 formally decide to bring this to the SAU Board and then the individual boards. She would like
253 this to be as official as possible. They are not making the decision to put it on the ballot, but this
254 is the recommendation that they are bringing to the SAU Board.

255 Ms. Gascoyne added that they need to have consensus.

256 Ms. Ludt asked if they had agreed on how far out the Souhegan would be completed. She is
257 concerned with the life span of the current HVAC systems.

258 Mr. Preston replied that the short-term repairs they are confident that the unit ventilators will
259 last 5 years, and they will still add maintenance costs in the budget. The units will definitely run
260 but there will be maintenance costs. Even new buildings have maintenance costs as soon as they
261 open.

262 Mr. Steel noted that they say 5-10 years because it depends on how quickly valuation grows. It is
263 reasonable to assume that if they build a new elementary and middle school that their property
264 values will increase more quickly than they anticipate. That will result in more quickly being
265 able to afford a third project. They can say a range with 10 and as possibly as early as 5 years.

266 Ms. Grund inquired if they can bring up their items at the SAU meeting.

267 Ms. Facey replied that is up to Chairman Grondstra.

268 Discussion ensued about the timeline.

269 Ms. Facey replied that she believes that it is fine because the Board meeting is late in November.
270 She asked if they are ready to take a vote. She inquired if there was a committee member that
271 wanted to take a motion.

272 **Ms. Gascoyne motioned to finalize the recommendations from the Joint Facilities Advisory**
273 **Committee to be presented to the SAU #39 Board in support of a new Elementary School**
274 **project and a Renovation/Refurbish Project at Amherst Middle School and the priorities as**
275 **determined by the Souhegan Subcommittee for Souhegan High School. Ms. Gruzdien**
276 **seconded the motion.**

277 Ms. Facey asked for discussion.

278 Mr. Grondstra asked if Ms. Parisi was available for questions and discussion at the Souhegan
279 meeting.

280 Ms. Parisi replied, yes, she is available.

281 Mr. Steel replied that he can add items in his Superintendent's Report.

282 Mr. Grondstra mentioned that there can be budget impacts. He asked Ms. Grund and Ms. Facey
283 if they were in support.

284 Ms. Grund replied that it will be on their radar.

285 Ms. Facey asked for other discussion before they vote.

286 There was no further discussion.

287 **Ms. Facey reported that it passed unanimously.**

288 It is a very exciting step forward.

289 Ms. Ludt questioned if they can have a reminder with the link.

290 Ms. Facey replied yes.

291 IV. Meeting Adjourned

292 Ms. Facey adjourned the meeting at 8:54PM

293