

**WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOPERATIVE
FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday June 12, 2023 6:00 p.m.**

Videoconferencing: meet.google.com/oid-ghda-mgy

Audio: [+1 443-671-4775](tel:+14436714775) PIN: 226 727 056#

All videoconferencing options may be subject to modifications. Please check www.sau63.org for the latest information.

I. CALL TO ORDER at 6:05 pm. Board members in attendance: Geoffrey Allen (Chair) and Tiffany Cloutier-Cabral. Administrators in attendance: Kristie LaPlante, and Buddy Erb. Budget Committee members in attendance: Jonathan Vanderhoof and Leslie Browne. Community members in attendance: Fran Bujak.

II. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES: Jonathan Vanderhoof suggested we no longer list public in attendance. Mr. Vanderhoof suggested wording be changed to more accurately reflect his statement about spending funds in the year they were raised. Edits added and minutes approved. Motion to approve by Ms. Cloutier-Cabral. Mr. Allen Second. Passed unanimously. Conversation had to add a third board member to facilities committee.

III. Business Administrator presentation of CIP: Ms. LaPlante doesn't want to substantially change CIP. She requested to move locker room to next year to allow for planning, stated windows are \$71,000, and questioned paving quote

accuracy.

She strongly recommends school board consider \$50,000 supplemental warrant article to move unspent funds to next year's capital reserve fund. This allows for better planning and saving for long-term projects as it allows the district to build the base for future projects (roofing, etc)

Ms Cloutier-Cabral asked when we received paving quotes and if they still honor their quote for a year. Mr. Erb said they were from a local company and were no longer current. The project was not in the CIP due to cost, according to Ms LaPlante.

Ms. Cloutier-Cabral said there should be an alternative plan. She and Ms. LaPlante discussed the scope of projects changes and we should check the minutes to get a better idea of what happened.

Mr. Bujak said it shouldn't come off the CIP. We should leave things on the CIP for planning and budgeting purposes.

Discussion ensued surrounding how to get quotes, how to track projects, and how to fund them. There was confusion about what a "pass-through" is and whether the district is trying to build a bank account. Moving to a reporting model similar to what the Town of Lyndeborough uses was discussed as more transparent and easier to understand, track projects, and budget.

Mr. Allen discussed breaking a roofing project into 8 sections duplicate staging costs and stated projects should be completed at once to avoid duplicating costs. Discussion about how to best represent this on a spreadsheet was had. We all agreed that better planning and budgeting is needed and the spreadsheet needs to reflect that.

Mr. Bujak said we should include due date, estimated cost, account balance,

and years of funding left. Mr. Allen said those elements should absolutely be part of the CIP. Mr. Allen said the projects like the roof that are broken up to flatten the budget should be grouped together over time and budgeted for. It wouldn't be prudent to combine them all at once.

Ms LaPlante doesn't want to make a spreadsheet until the items on it are decided. Mr. Allen stated that the items were decided at district meeting and can only be changed by the school board. What we are discussing here is how to represent them on the spreadsheet and what we want to present to be added for approval at the next district meeting.

Ms LaPlante pointed out that there have been several iterations of the CIP and the school board needs to decide which we are using. Mr. Allen replied that she is correct, which is why he has asked this board to focus only on the CIP presentation format using the information that was already approved at district meeting. The facilities committee will take that format to the school board for approval. Once approved, we can make recommendations to the school board for changes we would like to make. The first step is a finalized working document approved by the school board. We can't change anything yet because for transparency we should only consider items approved at the district meeting.

Further discussion was had, and it was agreed that any changes we propose, outside of funding issues identified on the CIP for the 23-24 school year, are for the 24-25 school year. We are at this point only discussing the format method in which we display and report the CIP.

Ms. LaPlante said she would take the current information and build out the CIP as we discussed for 5 years using the same format as Lyndeborough, then look at the larger projects to bring back for discussion.

Mr. Bujak said we need to first agree on the policy, then fill out the form. We

just need to first create the form for approval. As far as the policy, we need to come up with a draft policy and turn it over to the policy committee.

It was agreed that we need to build the draft policy to present to the policy committee as soon as possible.

Discussion ensued about what the policy should say and the importance of having a policy.

Ms. Browne was concerned that the items on the CIP don't include all the items that should be included. Mr. Allen pointed out that moving to a new policy and transparent tracking form will always include all items, not just those that are in a current funding cycle.

Ms. Browne asked about items like the locker room that are many years out. Mr. Allen said things like the locker room would stay on the CIP as part of a renovation plan. Maybe a separate document that is a renovation plan, just like the art room was renovated this year. Should a document exist that has a schedule for updating areas?

Under "Requirements for CIP Projects" add a 4th line that states: Any new project identified over \$20,000 would be added to the CIP.

Mr. Vanderhoof asked what should the tax impact be for a warrant article that doesn't pass? Discussion was had around this part of the proposed policy. It was decided to remove the language.

There was discussion about how to add a project to the CIP and it was decided that the policy should state application to be made to the facilities committee. It will then be vetted, discussed, and presented to the board. Ms LaPlante stated should would send out a sample application before the next meeting.

Ms. LaPlante said it would be good to have one more meeting to review the changes before presentation to policy committee. The committee agreed and Mr. Allen stated he would send the draft for review.

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN & CRF: Skipped, as the discussion was merged with the CIP presentation

V. ADJOURNMENT: Ms Cloutier-Cabral motioned to adjourn at 7:44pm. Mr. Allen Second the motion. Motion passed.