

SPECIAL

**Futures Task Force Functional Capacity Sub-Group and
School Board Operations Subcommittee Joint Meeting Minutes**

July 6, 2023

6:00 - 7:30 PM

Elm Street School Conference Room

Members Present: Steve Holbrook, Patrick Irish, Melanie Harvey, Jessica Smith, Angela Swenson

Members Absent:

Other Board Members Present: Mary Martin,

Administrators Present: Todd Sanders, Amy Hediger, John Hawley, Kaitlynn Brown, Jess Madsen

Staff Members Present:

Others: Bob Klar (Task Force rep)

Item 1: Discussion with a sub-group from the Futures Task Force regarding Operations

Goal: Update the School Board Operations Subcommittee on Futures Task Force work related to operations and facilities.
Recognize operations and facilities is one piece of the puzzle, not the entire puzzle.

1. Introductions (Amy) (5 minutes)
 - a. Members Present: Bob Klar, John Hawley, Kaitlynn Brown, Steve Holbrook, Patrick Irish, Melanie Harvey, Jessica Smith, Angela Swenson, Mary Martin, Jess Madsen, Todd Sanders, Amy Hediger
2. Review of Task Force task and responsibilities (Amy) (10 minutes)
 - a. Relevant work in progress or completed - Pros and Cons, Field Trip
 - i. Amy outlined the Future Task Force Timeline and the outcomes of the meetings held from April 2023-July 2023. This timeline included the staff and community forums, the failed heating bond, the formation of the task force and the development of the sub-groups to evaluate functional capacity, public relations, staff/community collaboration, educational opportunities for students within RSU 16. In July, the community survey was completed, the operations committee/functional capacity meeting was held, and there will be an upcoming community forum.
 - ii. Amy highlighted key topics explored by the Future's Task Force including the operation cost of MCS, the transportation routes, a review of the RSU 16 budget through the years, the potential cost of moving Adult Education to the Medical Office Building in Mechanic Falls, and a review of the RSU 16 Capital Improvement Plan created by John Hawley prior to his departure in 2018.
3. Relevant data: CIP plan and Budget Over the Years (10 minutes) (Amy and John)
 - a. John shared information regarding the RSU 16 Capital Improvement Plan that was developed based upon an outside evaluation completed in 2011. The RSU 16 Capital Improvement Plan has been shared by Amy with the task force and the operations committee. This plan included a projection of projects that needed to be completed based on the life expectancy of boilers, heating systems, water systems, etc and included items to be done as part of a comprehensive preventative maintenance plan. The lack of funding for our Capital Improvements Line (CIP) has created an inability to complete these projects in the recommended timeframe as outlined by the CIP plan created by John. John has worked with Gary

Purington, Dave Haskell, and Tony Bennett to review what items from his CIP were completed and what projects are remaining. Any of the items that are highlighted have not been completed.

- b. The team identified an action step of looking at the CIP plan that was developed by John and breaking it down by each building separately to determine total costs for each building to be completely updated. To get a true estimate, we would also need to go back through the 2016-2017 project timelines to cover the projects that were not completed that would need to be completed. We would need to evaluate priority items from all of these lists and the total cost to complete the priority items.
 - c. A potential additional action step would be for the district to consider having a third party assessment of the elementary buildings to be completed to help identify the total cost to restore the three buildings. John will work to get quotes from companies to have these evaluations completed, however, it will likely have to be paid for in the next budget year.
 - d. A third action item would be to add the EMS quotes that were provided to the RSU as part of their evaluation to the CIP plan since we have the quotes/anticipated costs for that work to be completed.
4. Functional Capacity Sub-Group - role and work in progress or completed (40 minutes) (John and Bob)
- a. The functional capacity sub-group consists of Mary Martin, John Hawley, Bob Klar, Jess Madsen, Terri Arsenault, and Kaitlynn Brown.
 - b. We have completed a square footage assessment of our buildings to determine the functional capacity of the buildings.
 - c. Kaitlynn and Jess worked together to design the potential layout for the school if we were to combine ESS/MCS into the Elm Street School. Once the square footage for PCS has been completed, the team can then evaluate how grade levels could be divided as part of the reconfiguration option.
 - d. Bob Klar shared that the current square footage is 150 per child in Minot, 233 per child at ESS, if we put all of the students from ESS/MCS it is 123 per child at Elm Street School.
 - e. Kaitlynn and Jess shared the floor plan evaluation that they completed regarding the physical layout of the Elm Street School space to maintain current classes (Pre-k-6) and they evaluated the layout if 6th grade were to move to the middle school.
 - f. Jess Smith suggested clearly stating the reason why keeping MCS open was not evaluated by the task force. Bob shared that it comes down to square footage and MCS does not have the current footprint to house any additional students.
 - g. The other option that has not been fully explored yet by the task force is getting on the list to be considered for new construction for one large 1000 student elementary school. Amy suggested ways the task force and the school board could work together to gather more information regarding this. Amy suggested articulating that this consideration should be part of the long-term planning for RSU 16. The team discussed that we would need to evaluate the additional cost to the taxpayers to build a new school even if the State were to help fund the building project.
 - h. The team discussed the Title Funding Comparability given that MCS did not qualify for Title funding for the 23-24 school year.
 - i. There was discussion about the pros and cons of abandoning MCS and how that could benefit the RSU or the town. Bob shared the current estimated appraisal of the school and what it could potentially be sold for. The team evaluated ways the district could use a portion of the Minot Building as a potential transportation space, or for additional storage.
5. Feedback and Questions from School Board Operations Committee (15 minutes)
- a. Mary Martin reminded the group it will ultimately be the responsibility of the school board to take the recommendations from the task force in order to make a final decision. Mary wants to ensure that all of the members of the school board have the necessary foundation to truly understand the reasons behind the recommendations given by the task force and why other options were considered and why they were not put forward to the board.

- b. Angela Swenson suggested having a potential school board workshop session to present the work of the task force prior to a voting session. Todd Sanders suggested they add an agenda item to the school board meeting to ensure this is discussed fully and that foundation of key understanding is built with the board.
6. Action Items: what, who, when (10 minutes)
- a. **The team identified an action step of looking at the CIP plan that was developed by John and breaking it down by each building separately to determine total costs for each building to be completely updated. To get a true estimate, we would also need to go back through the 2016-2017 project timelines to cover the projects that were not completed that would need to be completed. We would need to evaluate priority items from all of these lists and the total cost to complete the priority items.**
 - b. **A potential additional action step would be for the district to consider having a third party assessment of the elementary buildings to be completed to help identify the total cost to restore the three buildings. John will work to get quotes from companies to have these evaluations completed, however, it will likely have to be paid for in the next budget year.**
 - c. **A third action item would be to add the EMC quotes that were provided to the RSU as part of their evaluation to the CIP plan since we have the quotes/anticipated costs for that work to be completed.**
 - d. **Angela Swenson suggested having a potential school board workshop session to present the work of the task force prior to a voting session. Todd Sanders suggested they add an agenda item to the school board meeting to ensure this is discussed fully and that foundation of key understanding is built with the board.**

Adjournment: 7:30 p.m.