

## CCS FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT TO BOARD

November 4, 2008

The CCS Board of Directors charged a facilities committee to prioritize the repair and renovation needs of the CCS facility, as well as options for the Quonset Hut and community water supply. To that end, the facilities committee met on September 22, September 29, October 7, October 13, October 20, and October 27 to consider the charges. The core committee consisted of CCS Principal Monica Smith, head of CCS Maintenance, Dave LeBlanc, community member Lee Dore, of Dore and Whittier Architects, and school directors Clyde Baldwin and Lynne Jaunich. In addition, input from Chris Wheeler (APPENDIX 1) of CRW Associates, Cathy Hilgendorf from the DOE, data from the December 12, 2007 Feasibility Study of CCS, the June 2008 capital improvement plan for the 1949 building (APPENDIX 2), the Vermont School Construction Planning Guide ([http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/pgm\\_construction/guide\\_08.html](http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/pgm_construction/guide_08.html)) and enrollment projections from Bill Smith was sought and considered.

The committee utilized 5 main criteria for prioritizing the deficits identified in the 2007 Feasibility study:

1. Conditions that are unsafe or threaten the health of students or employees
2. Deterioration of existing buildings or systems beyond the scope of annual maintenance
3. Excessive energy use resulting from design characteristics or aging mechanical systems
4. Code violations
5. The school population is projected to remain stable for the next 20 years

Based on the data collected, discussions, and extent of repairs to date, the committee has prioritized the repair areas to be:

1. The 1949 building
2. The HVAC system of the 1969 building, and it's integration with the central heating system
3. Insulation and ventilation of the boiler room
4. Code violations

In terms of the 1949 building, the extent and number of problems to be addressed are well beyond the scope of normal maintenance and extend throughout the entire building. There are multiple systems, identified and detailed in the 2007 Feasibility Study, which present not only unsafe conditions but also excessive energy use. The square footage of the 1949 building accounts for less than 30% of the total square footage in the entire facility, yet the repairs comprise over 45% of annual maintenance costs. The severity and cost of issues currently present in the 1949 building significantly increases that percentage.

In terms of the 1969 building, the feasibility study highlighted the air quality of this building as one of concern. The unit ventilators in the building do not work consistently and are at the end of their lifespan. The pneumatic control system is outdated and expensive to maintain. However, before any repairs are made to the HVAC system in the 1969 building, the committee recommends that the entire system be rebalanced, at a cost of approximately 10-15K.

In addition to the above buildings, the boiler room in the 1949 building, while adequately sized, is not insulated at the interior walls and ceilings. This allows considerable heat to escape from the boiler room into the floors above it, making climate control extremely difficult. Therefore, the committee recommends insulation and ventilation of the boiler room with any repair option.

Finally, there are many areas of the building that may not meet code. Depending on the extent of repair/renovation work done to an area, there may be code and ADA compliance issues to address. These issues would also become part of the repair priority.

The committee proposes five options to the board for consideration:

1. Patch Approach
2. Gut Approach
3. Raze/rebuild Approach
4. Piecemeal Approach
5. Tear Down and Consolidate Approach

Each option consists of repairs to be addressed, financial implications, timelines, pros/cons and questions for future consideration. The committee does not recommend one option over another, nor does it assume that input from all constituents has been solicited and received. It is the committee's opinion that based on the options that are presented in this report, the full board will consider next steps, either choosing an option to pursue or choosing to elicit further input within a different committee structure.

The Feasibility Study outlined several other areas within the CCS building that also require attention. The committee recommends that Dave Leblanc develop a 10 year capital improvement plan that will address these issues.

Although not nearly as complex as determining priorities and options for repairs, the Quonset Hut provides its own set of challenges. The committee believes that the primary purpose of the Quonset Hut should be to house the workshop (if no other space in the primary building can be found) and the storage of the tractor. To that end, the committee recommends the following:

1. Put the demolition and removal of the Quonset Hut out to bid. Depending on dollar amount, either include in annual budget, or include with any bond vote.
2. Depending on which repair/renovate option the board chooses, replace the Quonset Hut with a building capable of storing the tractor at a minimum, as well as providing shop space at a maximum. Potential cost of a 25x25 building: 20K

With the removal of the Quonset Hut, the issue of the community water supply will need to be addressed. Certainly the water supply could be located at the rear of the cafeteria or in front of the library and usage could be monitored. We have the ability to continuously monitor and disinfect. As the school cannot "charge" the taxpayer for using the school water, the committee recommends the board discuss with the Selectboard the cost of wear and tear on the water system (ie pump) and safeguards to protect the school in case of more serious water issues (ie coliform).

### **OPTION 1: PATCH APPROACH: TOTAL COST APPROXIMATELY 2 MILLION**

The scope of work assumes all prioritized repairs will be addressed concurrently.

#### **Repairs**

1. 1949 building repairs per the Capital Improvement Plan, 1949 building (approx 1.5 million)
  - a. Addresses roof, exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS), windows, frames, screens, mechanical and electrical system improvements, removal of vinyl asbestos tiles, some ADA non-compliant issues (chair lifts, door handles)

2. HVAC system in 1969 building per Chris Wheeler’s report (approx 212K)
  - a. Replaces unit ventilators (140K)
  - b. Replaces pneumatic control system with digital (68K)
3. Insulation of boiler room (21K)
4. Code items
  - a. Unreinforced masonry walls in 1949 building (11K)
  - b. Upgrade bathrooms in 1949 building and make ADA compliant (85K)

**Financial Implications:**

1. Currently no state aid available. Could pursue funding through mortgage, bond bank or do private placement. Current interest rates 5.25-5.5%, but potential to drop in 2009. Cost for borrowing and the annual principal and interest payment are eligible education expenses to be reported each year on the budget. Would trigger 2 votes under Act 82.

**Timeline:**

Most work could be completed during summer recess

PROS	CONS
1. Minimal impact on education programs	1. Space use not efficient
2. Students would not have to be misplaced	2. What other repairs are triggered during process
3. No need for portables	3. No additional shop space gained

**Questions:**

1. Could this approach address alternative fuel options in the future?
2. Does option 1 start to approach option 2 once we begin opening walls?

**OPTION 2: GUT APPROACH : TOTAL COST BTWN 3.5-4.25 MILLION (PLUS PORTABLES 6-750K)**

This approach would gut the entirety of the 1949 building, leaving just the foundations and structural elements.

**Repairs:**

1. The entire 1949 building would be completely renovated within it’s existing footprint. The boiler room and code/ADA issues would be included in the cost of the renovation. Some reallocation of space could occur, especially in the basement. This would allow for a potential alternative fuel option at an additional cost of 900K-1.5 million. (3.5-4 million)
2. HVAC system in 1969 building per Chris Wheeler’s report (approx 212K)
  - c. Replaces unit ventilators (140K)
  - d. Replaces pneumatic control system with digital (68K)

**Financial Implications:**

1. Currently no state aid available. Could pursue funding through mortgage, bond bank or do private placement. Current interest rates 5.25-5.5%, but potential to drop in 2009. Cost for borrowing and the annual principal and

interest payment are eligible education expenses to be reported each year on the budget. Would trigger 2 votes under Act 82.

**Timeline:**

Approximately 18 months

PROS	CONS
1. Minimal impact on education programs	1. Expensive
2. Allows for alternative fuel option	2. Unknowns can increase cost
3. Addresses all needs of 1949 building	3. Renovation can be more expensive
4. Could provide shop space from Quonset	4. ?efficient use of space
	5. Students displaced during construction

**Questions:**

1. Where will the children be moved (to the church, portables?)

**OPTION 3: RAZE/REBUILD APPROACH: TOTAL COST 3.5-4.25 MILLION (PLUS PORTABLES 6-750k)**

This option would demolish the existing 1949 building, with the exception of the boiler room, and replace it with a smaller 13,000 sq foot building, on the same floor elevations as the rest of the school building.

**Repairs:**

1. The entire 1949 building will be new construction (with the exception of the boiler room). The basement would be allocated to shop space currently in the Quonset Hut. The upper floors would be in line with the existing 1969 building, eliminating the steps between the two buildings. All code/ADA compliance issues would be addressed, as well as boiler room insulation. An alternative fuel option could be added for 900K-1.5million. (3.5-4million)
2. HVAC system in 1969 building per Chris Wheeler’s report (approx 212K)
  - a. Replaces unit ventilators (140K)
  - b. Replaces pneumatic control system with digital (68K)

**Financial Implications:**

1. Currently no state aid available. Could pursue funding through mortgage, bond bank or do private placement. Current interest rates 5.25-5.5%, but potential to drop in 2009. Cost for borrowing and the annual principal and interest payment are eligible education expenses to be reported each year on the budget. Would trigger 2 votes under Act 82.

**Timeline:**

Approximately 18 months

PROS	CONS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Potential to improve education programs</li> <li>2. Allows for alternative fuel option</li> <li>3. Addresses all needs of 1949 building</li> <li>4. More efficient use of space</li> <li>5. Solves accessibility issues</li> <li>6. Fixed bid with more knowns</li> <li>7. Could provide shop space from Quonset</li> <li>8. Reduces overall size of building</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expensive</li> <li>2. Students displaced during construction</li> </ol>

**Questions:**

1. Where will the students go during construction?

**OPTION 4: PIECEMEAL APPROACH: TOTAL COST UNKNOWN**

This approach addresses one repair per year, as budget constraints allow.

**Repairs (in order of priority):**

1. 1949 building
  - a. Roof (100K)
  - b. Windows/siding (350K)
  - c. HVAC System (45K)
2. HVAC system in 1969 building per Chris Wheeler’s report (approx 212K)
  - a. Replaces unit ventilators (140K)
  - b. Replaces pneumatic control system with digital (68K)
3. Insulation of boiler room (21K)
4. Code Items (150K)
  - a. Stair lifts (130K)
  - b. Bathrooms ADA Compliant (85K)

**Financial Implications:**

No state aid available. By addressing only one problem, not realistic to pursue bond on an annual basis. Cost of repair would be added to O&M budget, triggering 2 votes on an annual basis.

PROS	CONS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Does not indebt community with P&amp;I payments over 20 years.</li> <li>2.May not displace students/staff</li> <li>3. Unknown impact on educational programs</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Other repairs will likely be bumped to address the major issues. Ultimately, those delayed repairs could end up being emergency repairs (IE HRU’s)</li> <li>2. Does not provide alternative storage from Quonset Hut</li> <li>3. Does not immediately address energy efficiency</li> <li>4. In a difficult budget year, repairs may be delayed</li> </ol>

**Questions:**

1. By putting on new roof, do we limit future options on maintenance? That is, when it comes time to address siding/windows, if new problems are uncovered and the best solution is to raze the building, would we be willing to pursue having just put on a new roof?

**OPTION 5: TEAR DOWN AND CONSOLIDATE APPROACH: TOTAL COST 900K**

This approach would tear down the top two floors of the 1949 building, rebuilding with a single pitch roof over just the basement and boiler area. The 5 classrooms and EEE would be moved to the 1969 building.

**Repairs:**

1. The only remaining part to the 1949 building would be the basement and boiler room, which could be insulated. There would need to be some renovation work done in the 1969 building to convert workspace (ie tech ed room) into classroom space. Code/ADA compliance issues would be addressed in the 1949 building. An alternative fuel option could be added for 900K-1.5million.
2. HVAC system in 1969 building per Chris Wheeler’s report (approx 212K)
  - a. Replaces unit ventilators (140K)
  - b. Replaces pneumatic control system with digital (68K)

**Financial Implications:**

1. Currently no state aid available. Could pursue funding through mortgage, bond bank or do private placement. Current interest rates 5.25-5.5%, but potential to drop in 2009. Cost for borrowing and the annual principal and interest payment are eligible education expenses to be reported each year on the budget. Would trigger 2 votes under Act 82.

**Timeline:**

Approximately 4-5 months

---

<b>PROS</b>	<b>CONS</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Provides storage/shop space from Quonset Hut</li><li>2. All classroom space aligned in one building</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Greatest impact on educational programs as the following programs would not have physical space: music, art, guidance, enrichment, reading room, special education, mentoring, SAP</li><li>2. Potential revenue source with school choice would be limited as classroom space would be maximized.</li></ol>

---

**Questions:**

1. With all students in one building, are there new Code issues to address in 1969 building (ie bathrooms)?