

Draft

Minutes of the special meeting of the Standing Building Committee held on July 21, 2020 via teleconference

Present: David DeMaio, James DeMaio, Peter Rader, Will Thompson, Adam Tulin, Michael Tyre

Also present: Cliff Gurnham, Director of Operations; Ted Sands, Board of Education; John Landock, Sarah Fountain, Sightlines

David DeMaio called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Discuss for possible action update on School Facilities Needs Assessment. Mr. Gurnham introduced John Landock and Sarah Fountain who were present from Sightlines to provide a preliminary presentation on the Guilford Public Schools 2020 Facilities Assessment & Planning report.

Mr. Landock reviewed the space profile used to categorize buildings by age. Buildings built prior to 1951 are considered Pre-War and generally are a more durable construction, and while they are older, they typically last longer and often need programmatic or modernization updates. Buildings in the Post-War Modern era of between 1951 – 1990 were generally quick construction with the use of lower quality building components so they are generally in need of more repairs and renovations. Buildings built in 1991 and newer are considered Complex and are technically complex and more expensive to maintain and repair. Guilford's school buildings fall primarily in the Post-War/Modern and Complex eras. Mr. Landock reviewed a graph that showed the percentage of the GSF of total schools in each age category and the general needs of buildings in that category. A total of 37% of the GSF of Guilford's facilities are over 50 years and buildings in this category generally have components that are past due in their life cycle, failures are possible and core modernization cycles are missed. A total of 26% of the GSF of Guilford's facilities are 25 - 50 years and buildings in this category generally have major envelope and mechanical life cycles that are due and functional obsolescence is prevalent. A total of 2% of the GSF of Guilford's facilities are 10 - 25 years and buildings in this category generally have short life-cycle needs and primarily are in need of space renewal. A total of 34% of the GSF of Guilford's facilities are under 10 years and buildings in this category generally require little work since they are in the honeymoon period.

Mr. Landock reviewed the identified 10 year capital needs for the District which totaled \$32 million. The study identified a total of \$13,022,000 in value for 205 projects for the next 1 – 3 years, a total of \$10,832 in value for 446 projects for the next 4 – 7 years and a total of \$8,162,000 in value for 258 projects for the next 8 – 10 years. Guilford's needs are very close to the percentages of recent Facilities Assessment & Planning experience. Mr. Landock reviewed another charge that identified the total needs in millions by building over the next 10 years. Adams has the highest need at \$9 million and the High School has the lowest need at \$3.1 million. Other charts reviewed by Mr. Landock included one that identified the cost per square foot needs by building and by timeframe, one that identified the needs by system, which included building envelope, building systems, infrastructure, safety/code and space improvement and one that identified the needs by system and by building.

2-Minutes of a special meeting of the Standing Building Committee, July 21, 2020

Mr. Landock reviewed the final charts and graphs of the study as follows:

- Identified needs by building, by timeframe and cost /GSF
- Net Asset Value by building
- Projected Net Asset Value project based on funding levels
- Identified needs by investment criteria which included reliability, which is the highest priority project, safety/code, asset preservation economic opportunity, and program improvement, for the full district
- Identified needs by investment criteria broken down by school

Mr. Landock reviewed a possible metric to utilize that looked at investment criteria, timeframe and a building score to create a project score to use for strategic prioritization of projects. Depending on the investment criteria, a specific project is assigned a score of 5 – 1, with 5 being assigned for a reliability project, 4 to a safety/code project, 3 to an asset preservation project, 2 to an economic opportunity project and 1 to a program improvement project. Projects would then be scored from 3 to 1 based on whether they fall into timeframe A, B or C. Buildings with a \$/GSF need over \$75 are then scored with a 3, a \$/GSF need between \$50 - \$75 are scored with a 2, and a \$/GFS need lower than \$50 are scored with a 1. These three numbers are added together to create a project score of between 3 – 11 points with the higher point value equaling a higher priority. In another chart Mr. Landock showed how the project score is applied to the district as a whole and to each school individually.

Mr. Sands recommended that consideration be given to not utilizing the building score metric because this would always provide the more run-down buildings with a higher priority. In Guilford's case the school with the highest priority would be Adams with is in need of \$9 million in projects. At a certain point the District needs to look at the value of the building and at how much more is it worth investing money in this building. In response to a question by Mr. Sands, Mr. Landock noted that \$9 million is 32% of the replacement value of Adams. Mr. Sands suggested that at some point in the future there might be a need to close one of the elementary schools because of declining enrollment, and the Town could look again at expanding Baldwin to become the only middle school. Mr. Landock noted that they could present this graph both ways with the building score included and with this metric eliminated.

Mr. Landock summarized the core observations and key takeaways from the completed study. He noted that the buildings in the district are all original with no full gut renovations to offset their age. The age of each building drives its capital upkeep needs and the distribution of upcoming projects. The study identifies the 10-year capital needs for the district at \$32 million. Half of these needs fall in the 1 – 3 year timeframe. This 10 year need translates to \$50/GSF and when factoring in the replacement value of each building, the Net Asset Value of the district is 84%. The High School is the lowest need building and is driving down the cost/GSF need while driving up the Net Asset Value.

3-Minutes of a special meeting of the Standing Building Committee, July 21, 2020

Mr. Landock noted that current funding levels are slightly below what is needed to maintain the Net Asset Value over the next 10 years. If funding is not able to be adequate to meet these needs, project prioritization can be used to decide which projects are most important and which can be deferred.

Mr. Gurnham noted that the funding scenario provided calls for an investment of \$3.2 million per year over the next 10 years to maintain the asset value and generally the District has \$2.6 million available. Mr. Gurnham noted that they are currently doing projects including the Jones and Baldwin HVAC projects, which are not represented in this report since these projects were not completed when the survey was done.

Mr. Sands noted that he believes the report and presentation were very well done and helpful. As a member of the Board of Education he noted that the District and Board are very focused on the re-opening of schools at this time so he suggested that a presentation to the Board of Education be put on hold until October or November. Mr. Gurnham agreed that October would be a good time to bring this report forward to provide input on the bonding projects to include for the April, 2021 budget referendum. They will also be working on building a 5 year capital plan for review to include in a presentation for the Board of Selectmen, Board of Finance and Standing Building Committee.

David DeMaio suggested that consideration be given to looking at grouping projects together to create a number of larger projects rather than many small projects. Mr. Gurnham and Mr. Landock will look at options to group projects.

David DeMaio noted that the Parks and Recreation Department has a project at Bittner Park to create additional pickleball courts and he questioned if the Committee members would rather discuss this item at the August 4th regular meeting or hold a special meeting to receive a presentation on this project. The Committee members agreed that the August 4th meeting would be long because of the discussion on the legal item regarding the contracts so they would prefer to hold a special meeting for the Parks and Recreation Department item.

David DeMaio requested that members come to the August 4th meeting prepared with questions on the legal issues related to deliverables and the penalty clauses provisions in the project contracts to discuss with Attorney D'Onofrio. In response to a question by Mr. Rader, Mr. Gurnham agreed to forward a copy of the up-front provisions included in specifications to the Committee members for review.

On motion made by James DeMaio, and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Terry Holland-Buckley
Clerk