



**To:** Attendees  
**From:** Annie Bearss | AB  
**Date:** September 20, 2016  
**Comm. No:** 162116

---

**Subject:** Independent School District #623  
Roseville Area Schools: Long Range Planning Process  
September 14, 2016 Physical Conditions Committee Meeting #1

*This meeting was held at Roseville Area High School at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 to begin discussing the needs of the district from the perspective of the Physical Conditions Committee.*

**Discussion Topics:**

- A. Introductions:
  - 1. Vaughn Dierks from Wold introduced the Committee co-chairs Pam Harris and Tyler Peterson.
  - 2. The Committee members present introduced themselves and briefly explained their connection to the school district.
- B. Overview of Goals/Outcomes:
  - 1. Wold reminded the committee to focus on prioritization and quantifying and defining need (as opposed to creating solutions). This will allow the group to determine how the physical conditions limit learning. The following questions can help define need:
    - a. Where should the focus be?
    - b. What should the priorities be?
    - c. What are minimum expectations?
    - d. What are operational goals?
  - 2. The roles and responsibilities of the committee include:
    - a. Show up.
    - b. Talk to others.
    - c. Review the information.
    - d. Participate in the discussion.
    - e. Be respectful.
  - 3. Different types of data that can be used to quantify and define need include, but are not limited to:
    - a. Facilities Inventory:
      - 1) Life cycle assumptions.
      - 2) Baseline assessment.
      - 3) Requires prioritization to customize.



- b. District Funding:
    - 1) Building and grounds budget.
    - 2) Previous maintenance funding.
    - 3) Utility data.
    - 4) Current roof and paving plans.
    - 5) Technology plan.
  - c. Future data (as needed):
    - 1) System comparison.
    - 2) Cost models.
    - 3) Code/regulatory standards.
  - d. For Consideration:
    - 1) Similar approaches in other districts?
    - 2) Minimum standards and approaches.
- C. Inventory:
- 1. Why were the facilities inventoried?
    - a. Current observation of existing district facilities.
    - b. Updated catalogue of existing materials and equipment.
    - c. Development of comprehensive maintenance strategy.
    - d. Create two year alternative facilities recommendation.
    - e. Forecast ten-year maintenance recommendation.
  - 2. Facility inventory process:
    - a. Define District Categories and Sub-Categories.
    - b. Tour Existing Facilities (Incl. meeting with On-Site Staff).
    - c. Define Analysis Criteria.
    - d. Apply Analysis Criteria to the Inventory.
    - e. Evaluate Inventory Program Recommendations.
    - f. Develop Two and Ten Year Maintenance Plans.
  - 3. District primary categories/sub categories:
    - a. Architectural:
      - 1) Site:
        - a) Parking.
      - 2) Exterior:
        - a) Envelope.
        - b) Doors.
        - c) Roofing.
        - d) Fenestration.
      - 3) Interior:
        - a) Floors.
        - b) Walls.
        - c) Ceilings.
        - d) Doors.
        - e) Equipment.
        - f) Casework.
        - g) Other.



- b. Mechanical:
    - 1) HVAC.
    - 2) Plumbing.
    - 3) Controls.
  - c. Electrical:
    - 1) Power and distribution.
    - 2) Lighting.
    - 3) Systems.
  - 4. Life cycle base timelines:
    - a. The ranges given correlate with the type and quality of equipment but can be used as a tool to create appropriate baseline standards:
      - 1) Wold reminded the group not to think about the life cycle base timelines as consistent with the replacement timeline in a residential setting; wear and tear of hundreds of students per day is very different than wear and tear in a home.
  - 5. District priorities (TBD):
    - a. Priority 1: Items concerning mitigating deterioration of the building and energy efficiency.
    - b. Priority 2: Items that concern exterior site areas.
    - c. Priority 3: Items concerning indoor systems that are deteriorated.
    - d. Priority 4: Items that concern high use student areas.
    - e. Priority 5: Remaining deferred maintenance items.
- D. Findings/Analysis:
- 1. Draft report context:
    - a. Everything is currently included based on life cycle.
    - b. Annual funding set to \$200 million to show backlog.
    - c. Inflation set to fixed 4%.
    - d. No prioritization or sorting has been implemented.
    - e. No upgrades are included – “like for like” replacement.
  - 2. Ten-year overview (with backlog) [preliminary report only]:
    - a. \$186,265,845 in total recommended maintenance:
      - 1) Exterior: \$31,540,674.
      - 2) Mechanical: \$76,509,089.
      - 3) Electrical: \$12,459,630.
      - 4) Interior: \$56,713,503.
      - 5) Site: \$8,829,159.
      - 6) Recommended work at all district facilities.
      - 7) Backlog in Year One: \$147,594,145.
  - 3. Context:
    - a. Roseville is an older infrastructure district with the most recent renovations over 20+ years ago.



- E. Strategic Planning:
  - 1. Annual funding strategy assumptions:
    - a. Immediately addressing the entire backlog is not practical or feasible.
    - b. Continued investment at current rate will require significant future investment.
    - c. Any plan must address critical asset deterioration immediately.
    - d. Equity between buildings and work categories is expected.
    - e. Life expectancy issues will drive major funding allocations:
      - 1) A roof life expectancy of 25 years requires 40% replacement over ten years.
      - 2) An asphalt systems life expectancy of 20 years requires 50% replacement over ten years.
    - f. Energy efficiency projects with high return costs should be explored.
    - g. Planning will likely be a combination of annual investment, future reinvestment strategy, and efficiency based alternatives.
  - 2. Efficiency/return on investment projects:
    - a. Zero to five-year payback ('no-brainers') versus five to ten-year payback.
    - b. Significant investment strategies (up to 30% reduction in operating costs):
      - 1) Convert from steam to hot water operation.
      - 2) Heat recovery of exhaust air.
      - 3) Replace air handling unit/unit ventilator systems near the end of their useful life with new modern system approaches.
- F. Inventory summary:
  - 1. District has kept up-to-date on roofs and paving.
    - a. Mechanical overwhelming issue:
      - 1) Every building had issues with temperature control.
      - 2) Pneumatic controls out of date.
      - 3) Tunnel based ventilation doesn't meet ventilation standards; may contain asbestos.
      - 4) Dehumidification?
    - b. Finishes are showing life cycle.
    - c. Fairview needs reinvestment decision.
- G. District Facilities: Reports for each building in the district were presented including information about dehumidification, previous toilet renovations, boiler plant type, ventilation type, controls, and roof type:
  - 1. Summary:
    - a. Typically, classrooms that have exterior windows do not have dehumidification. None of the gymnasiums have dehumidification.
    - b. Not all server rooms have dehumidification – it would be ideal to have these spaces dehumidified.
    - c. Toilets in high traffic areas have been remodeled in some schools.
    - d. Almost all school have a built-up roof system which is a high quality system as well as a high cost improvement.



- e. In general, Harambee Elementary School is in very good shape. Everything but the gymnasium is dehumidified.
  - f. There is no fire protection at Fairview Community Center. It is generally agreed upon that this building is in very poor shape.
- H. Previous Maintenance Investment:
- 1. Information about previous maintenance investments, annual building and grounds budget and utility data was provided to give the committee a sense of what have been done based on the annual budget and additional levies. Each year, decisions about maintenance projects have been evaluated based on what the district can afford and what is a priority (mostly roofs and pavement).
- I. Security:
- 1. On overview of the existing security for each building in the district was presented:
    - a. A technology plan is available upon request but not included in the presentation.
- J. Criteria Development and Discussion:
- 1. Wold reminded that group to think about overall needs and prioritizing as opposed to trying to come up with solutions. This approach will make it much easier and more straight forward for the options committee to make decisions if they are provided with a definite baseline.
  - 2. The issue of existing lighting fixtures efficiency was brought up. Currently, the typical features are T8s; T12 type fixtures are more efficient. There are also very few LED lights in district buildings.
  - 3. A question was posed about whether any code upgrades would be required due to the age of buildings if renovations took place. Wold informed the group that most code violations would be grandfathered in if no renovations were taking place in those areas. However, the building code now stipulates that a certain percentage of the renovation budget in existing buildings must be allocated to ADA upgrades.
  - 4. The group is to first focus on bigger, more global issues as well as 'hot-button' issues which will come out of free-form discussions. Wold will use information from those discussions to form preliminary statements which the group will critique and edit until the statements reflect the committee's criteria. These criteria statements will be passed on to the options committee in the next phase of the long range planning process.
  - 5. The committee is tasked to figure out, as representatives of the community, what physical conditions are acceptable. This tolerance level is subjective and unique to this community.
  - 6. The group agreed that their focus should be primarily on education. However, criteria such as square footages of classrooms will be discussed more thoroughly in the Educational Criteria Committee. This committee should focus on how the physical conditions limit learning.
  - 7. It was brought up that the D Wing of RAHS has not been updated since it was built and may no longer meet the needs of the users.



8. A question was posed about how to keep the bigger district-wide picture in mind when particular buildings are in very bad shape physically (the Fairview Community Center skyway for example). Wold suggested that after specifying those individual areas, the committee could translate specific issues into baseline district standards. However, if there are particular places that the committee deems wholly below the baseline, the options committee will use that information to determine an appropriate solution.
  9. If the Group would like to see particular buildings or specific space, please contact Merrie Zakaras
  10. Again, Wold encouraged the committee members to talk to peers and people using the facilities what their perceptions are of the facilities.
- K. Wold will distribute meeting minutes following each meeting and will coordinate with the Communications Committee regarding methods of informing the general public. Independent School District #623 will also post meeting contents to the District website ([www.isd623.org](http://www.isd623.org)).
- L. Next Meetings:
1. Thursday 9/29, 6:00-7:30
  2. Thursday 10/6, 7:30-9:00
  3. Monday 10/18, 6:00-7:30
  4. Thursday 11/3, 7:30-9:00

cc: Vaughn Dierks, Wold

LW/ISD\_623/162116/min/9.14.16 Conditions