

LNSU/LNMUUSD BOARD MEETING MINUTES
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
MONDAY, JULY 29, 2019

Board members present: Belvidere – Stephanie Sweet; Cambridge – Bill Sander, Jan Sander, Laura Miller, Bernard Barnes, Mark Stebbins; Eden – Jeff Hunsberger; Hyde Park – Lisa Barry, Tina Lowe, Patti Hayford, Chasity Fagnant; Johnson – Mark Nielsen, Katie Orost, Bobbie Moulton; Waterville – Bart Bezio. Others present: Deborah Clark, Dylan Laflam, Brian Pena, Brian Schaffer, Dan Noyes

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment

M. Nielsen called the meeting to order at 6:01. No changes to the agenda were suggested.

B. Sander said Rebecca Holcombe, who is running for governor, will be in Hyde Park on August 5.

Bond Discussion and Possible Action

D. Clark said the finance and capital committee has been working with D. Laflam over the last few months on the bond. The scope of work has been narrowed down to include work on the gym, the auditorium, the cafeteria and strategic roof repair/replacement. She showed a summary of the proposed work.

D. Laflam said 60% of the bond is for the gym. He noted that the insulation over the gym is poor now. The R-value will be increased greatly. The gym will be completely refurbished, including banners. The stage floor is nearing the end of its life and will be replaced. The cafeteria ceiling, which is the original ceiling from 1966, will be replaced. In the cafeteria, lighting will be replaced, the drop ceiling will be removed, acoustical panels will be installed, and the serving line will be remodeled. The cafeteria will be painted. The roof over the auditorium and gym will be replaced, as will the roof over the upper A wing, which was last replaced in 1991 and is at the end of its life.

D. Clark reviewed the project budget. The subtotal for the scope of work is \$1,885,259. She added 11% for design and contingency, 4% for permit and legal costs, and an allowance of \$64,953 for short term borrowing if needed. The total bond request amount is \$2,233,000.

D. Clark showed a table illustrating the district wide debt strategy through FY24. The first year of payments for this bond will be only interest. In FY22, because of retiring debt, we will see a one-year decrease in debt service. We may talk in the future about using the surplus from that drop.

D. Clark reviewed the impact on taxes. If everything else stays the same (equalized pupils, yield, etc.) the bond would add \$8.60 per \$100K of property value, except in Cambridge where the amount would be \$8.30 per \$100K.

D. Clark reviewed the proposed timeline of key events, culminating in a vote on September 3 or 4. If the vote is positive there is a 30-day certification period. If we want to get work started in June we have to be able to go to bid in January. In order to meet deadlines for an early winter bond, we have to get our application in by early December.

Open houses are planned for August 22 and 24. B. Schaffer suggested having an open house on the night of 9th grade family orientation, August 21. L. Barry suggested adding August 21 but also having the August 22 open house for community members who don't have kids.

An informational meeting is planned for August 26. An additional informational meeting could be held on September 2, depending on feedback and interest.

D. Clark said we have heard over the past few years that town clerks prefer to have votes on Tuesday. People are used to that and it leads to better turnout. But one town clerk requested that we consider scheduling the bond vote for September 4 because September 3 is the day after Labor Day, which could make setting up harder as people may be on vacation in the days before the vote. But they said they would do what was needed to make it work if it is on September 3.

D. Laflam said if a revote were called it would throw off our schedule. A petition for it could be submitted on October 1 and then we would have to rewarn the vote and go through another 60-day process.

L. Miller asked what the building will look like after demolition but before building is started. D. Laflam said the idea is that starting June 1 the construction company will bring in equipment and find staging points. The day after school is out they will cut a giant hole in the wall, bring in an excavator and a small dump truck, cut the floor and take out the pieces. The roofing contractor will probably start working on roof demolition at the same time.

L. Miller asked, if school ends before June 22, will they start earlier? D. Laflam said yes. He said some work can be started while school is in session.

K. Orost asked, what if graduation has to be inside that year? D. Laflam said it is possible to rent huge tents.

D. Laflam said demolition will happen when kids are not here but construction is scheduled to go until October 30. The gym will be under construction during September and October.

L. Miller asked if we will still have summer school during construction. B. Schaffer said yes. D. Laflam said summer school this year was 4 classrooms, all right outside the high school office. Power and HVAC will still be up. We will have to close the middle school but the rest of the building can be used.

M. Stebbins asked if the gym will be the only part of the building still under construction at the start of the school year. D. Laflam said yes.

C. Fagnant asked if the cafeteria is used in summer. D. Laflam said yes, but not a lot. We have told the group that runs basketball camp that there will be no basketball camp next summer. We will be closing the facility down except for summer school.

B. Sander asked if we are entitled to get background checks on all construction personnel. D. Laflam said we decide whether we want background checks. There is a cost. For construction he was involved with in Craftsbury they did not require background checks during phase one, but there was no way for construction workers and students to mingle. For phase two, they did require background checks. His guess is that we will probably want to. It will be up to administration. D. Clark said we are always entitled to do background checks. The cost is \$25 per person.

C. Fagnant said there is no way we will know if the person fingerprinted will be the one working. If someone gets sick they may send someone else. D. Laflam said we can require that all who come on the job site get pre-approved and we can say we need a certain amount of notice if they want to bring in someone else. In September and October the people working will be from specialty trades and there will be an average of just 5 or 6 people working here at one time.

D. Clark showed the board the proposed resolution that a proposal for issuance of a bond be submitted to the voters. **M. Stebbins moved to accept the proposed resolution regarding the bond vote and the motion was seconded and passed.** The resolution as passed showed the date of the vote as September 3.

The board reviewed the proposed warning for the vote. B. Sander noted that Hyde Park was misspelled. D. Clark corrected the spelling. He said he feels the paragraph about how state funds may not be available and the district is responsible for all costs incurred in connection with borrowing in anticipation of construction aid is a little confusing. It implies we won't be reimbursed. He wonders if that could be cleaned up to avoid confusion.

D. Clark said the wording was vetted by a lawyer. The documents say we will use all outside funds available but they may not be available, so we will be on the hook for \$2.3 million.

B. Sander said it implies we wouldn't reimburse ourselves from the loan. B. Sander also noted that the proper names were not used for the high school and the tech center. D. Clark changed them.

D. Clark said she wouldn't want to change the wording too much in the section B. Sander thought was confusing without having it vetted, which would mean delaying until another board meeting.

B. Sander said it implies it excludes us from reimbursing ourselves for the costs of preparing for construction as the separate declaration says we can do. D. Clark said she doesn't think it does. She doesn't think this is in conflict with the declaration. M. Stebbins said he thinks it is clear enough.

M. Stebbins moved to approve the warning for the bond vote with the changes agreed upon and the motion was seconded and passed.

D. Clark said the Declaration of Official Intent of Town of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District to Reimburse Certain Expenditures from Proceeds of Indebtedness allows the board to reimburse itself for soft costs leading up to when we actually get the debt. Those costs could include short-term borrowing if we think we need it, legal support in writing and applying for the bond, design and RFP work. If we can avoid short-term borrowing we will. If we need it, this declaration says we will be able to reimburse ourselves from the debt. Without this declaration we can only use the bond for expenses incurred after we take out the debt.

M. Stebbins moved to approve the Declaration of Official Intent of Town of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District to Reimburse Certain Expenditures from Proceeds of Indebtedness and the motion was seconded and passed.

Adjourn

It was moved and seconded to adjourn at 6:39, and the motion was passed.

Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths

UNAPPROVED