MINUTES

1. Public Participation

   If governor lifts stay home order and public is allowed to hold small group meetings would school buildings be available for commission meetings if school is not yet back in buildings? We are unable to answer this today. We will look at this down the road to determine how buildings will be utilized if the stay home order is lifted but school is not back in session. Dates can be sent to Mike and Tiffany Cain. They will look at them on a case by case situation.

   With mail being held at the post office there is concern about mail for PTO. We are picking up US mail from the post office and delivering it to the buildings at least one day a week. A communication was sent to all staff regarding packages to be delivered. We have asked buildings to make sure any orders placed be sent to Central Office with the name/building of the person who is to receive the order in the address portion of the order. Packages will be delivered from CO to the buildings each week. Interschool mail is being delivered to the buildings on Wednesdays and Fridays. Building staff will be sorting/distributing mail.

   Mark Abate asked that principals reach out to their PTO’s to let them know how mail is being handled in case they are expecting something specific.

   Playgrounds – PTO’s revenue streams have taken a hit the past couple of years. Any assistance with funding and equity from the district would be greatly appreciated. This is on the agenda and will be discussed later in the meeting.

2. Summer Projects

   Mike McDonough shared and explained the attached Capital Projects|Summer 2020 list. This is the same list we shared in January with a few adjustments.

   The Darby paving project is a little less than originally planned. In addition to the Darby paving project we have added Darby Athletic paving/handicap improvement. We are planning to reinforce the cell tower access with this project as well. Darby athletics will share some of this cost.

   Given our current situation, from an athletic standpoint, we have the opportunity to address
some of our practice fields and green spaces throughout the district.

Athletic Field Improvements was added to the project list. We are currently seeking bids. Once this project is underway we will schedule the reconditioning/rest periods for these fields in FMX.

We have closed down and are moving forward with work on Memorial’s stadium field.

We are not proceeding with the heavy duty paving at Avery due to the uncertainty of where we are with the Master Facilities Plan.

Nadia Long asked about prioritizing the project list should it need to be revised. Darby paving project is a priority as well as Britton/Norwich Campus project. It includes the pathway between the buildings. Branding, interior upgrades and moving expenses are included in this project.

Nadia Long asked about costs associated with Alton Darby/Darby Creek. Mike McDonough shared that HCSD will take are of any moving for this over the summer. Larger costs associated with Alton Darby/Darby Creek will not be seen until next summer when they become a campus. We will work with transportation and both building principals for any transitioning that is necessary.

Rich Boettner gave a Technology Update. iPads and laptops for teachers have been ordered as well as iPads for our upgrade for students. We are working on a plan for distributing the laptops with minimal interaction. We are also working on video training since the teachers will not be able to meet for training on their new devices.

Network improvements are in process. The network team is working on improvements. We received e-rate funding for half of the cost of the improvements.

Operations is handling the majority of the work to remove the tube TV’s.

3. Ameresco Facilities Database Update

Ameresco is the facilities database company that the district has partnered with to work with our Ops team go through every asset, from a capital perspective, every part, every system, etc. throughout the district and put together a facilities database that shows the life expectancy of every system and the cost to replace those systems. We used a lot of this FCI (Facility Condition Index) information throughout the Master Facilities Plan as well as providing information that was requested by the finance committee about what costs we might incur looking 30 years out at each of our buildings.

We will continue to have an evaluation period every year as something comes due and determine if it can be extended rather than replacing it to stretch our dollars as far as we can.

Cliff Hetzel explained the information in the database and how we get our FCI for each building. Each building is broken down into primary disciplines – the shell, interiors, mechanical, electrical and building site work. By building, everything that is facing a life expectancy or a need for repair or replacement has been identified. It gives us the total cost of replacement by year, by discipline, by building. We take that against replacement cost for the building to determine our FCI.
This information is updated every year based on what is going on in the market. We will review this information with our team to see what has been identified as needing repaired or replaced to determine where we stand. In addition to that we will update our replacement costs each year.

This database provides us information and guidelines by building. It has led us to what we suspected to be challenges as well. In some of our older buildings we will be hitting that point where we need to decide if we want to continue to repair these items or do we want to look at replacing the building along with additional capacity needs along with equity across the district.

It also enables us to generate various reports as needed.

4. Master Facilities Plan

Mike McDonough shared that the MFP is currently on hold given the uncertainty of the financial climate and the future we face with the ongoing challenges we are dealing with right now. He went through the MFP process and explained what was covered/accomplished at each step. Please see the attached summary for the details of this discussion.

5. Elementary Playgrounds

This summer we will be working with our Operations Team and Aramark to address some of the playgrounds. Aramark donates money each year to some initiatives within the district. This year we will use these funds as well as some internal funds for elementary playgrounds. Moving forward we plan to have money earmarked for elementary playgrounds. We will work in collaboration with the buildings to maintain and upgrade playgrounds. We have committed to support Avery and the preschool for their playgrounds this summer. The district would like to work towards having a more formalized approach to the playgrounds and not completely rely on the individual building PTO’s.

Nadia Long suggested exploring outside support from business partnerships in the community. Cliff Hetzel explained that if corporations supported HCSD they would also need to support other districts and did not know how much we could rely on it but definitely something to consider.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 1 which is still under the stay home order. We will decide closer to that date if we will meet via Zoom or cancel.
## Capital Projects | Summer 2020

### Facilities Committee Meeting 4/3/2020 Update

**OPERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>BUSINESS DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Darby Paving</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$385,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Darby Athletic paving/Handicap</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Britton Norwich Campus</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elementary Lighting</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avery Paving</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Weaver Tennis Courts</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District Sealing/Striping</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Athletic Field improvements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Remove Obsolete Tube TVs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,445,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,320,264)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance: +/-</strong></td>
<td><strong>($115,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,736</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/27/2020</th>
<th>4/1/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>004 BOND Funds Available</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 PI Funds Available</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Available</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of projects are dependent on competitive bid performance that meets scheduling milestones.
Purpose

From October 2019 to March 2020, the Hilliard City Schools conducted a master facilities planning process to create a roadmap of capital improvements that will address aging facilities, balance of enrollment, and create appropriate capacity for future enrollment. The master facilities planning process was intentionally conducted to balance data with the expectations of the community.

Steering Committee

The steering committee was assembled to provide a diverse citizen representation of schools, neighborhoods, school organizations, professional organizations, and civic organizations across the District. This group of approximately 45 members met a total of five meetings during the process to review data, community feedback, develop options/scenarios, and provide guidance for the final recommendations.

Community Engagement

There were a total of three broad based community meeting events conducted. The community meetings allowed the broader Hilliard community to examine data findings, review options/scenarios and provide feedback that provided guidance on the direction of the master facilities plan. These community meetings allowed the planning team and the task force to have insight on the expectations of the community thus shaping the ultimate recommendations for the master facilities plan. The following is an overview of each of the meetings:

1. **Facilities for Tomorrow Conference, Process, & Community Expectations:** Approximately 50 community members attended the first community meeting. This meeting outlined the current state of school facilities and provided an overview of the data being used to develop the master facilities plan. Participants were separated into groups and asked to answer 3 questions: What school looks like within the Hilliard City Schools? What was your most memorable school experience as a student or teacher? What should all students in the Hilliard City Schools have access to? The groups then reported out their responses to the entire room.

2. **Educational Framework:** 437 community members participated in this community meeting by completing the online survey. This presentation focused on planning framework that would help shape options/scenario development moving forward in the process. Community members provided feedback on when should buildings be replaced instead of renovating, when should boundary changes be considered, grade configurations, and program impacts of planning. The results from this meeting helped shape the planning framework for decisions moving forward.

3. **Options/Scenarios:** 852 community members participated in the third round of community engagements by completing the online survey. This meeting focused on the facility planning options developed based on data and previous community feedback. The options provided an opportunity for the community to review scenarios that explored different grade configuration options, actions to facilities, and to balance elementary school enrollment in the future.
Themes

Throughout each phase of the master facility planning process there were five key themes that came out of both our steering committee discussions as well as our community engagements. Those themes were as follows:

1. All day kindergarten at all elementary buildings
2. Expansion of the special needs preschool
3. Addition of a third 6th grade building to align feeder patterns
4. All facilities should be equitable
5. Safety and security of school facilities and students

Preliminary Recommendations

The preliminary recommendations are a result of a six-month process that involved collaboration with members of the community and the Hilliard City Schools. The initial known challenges were aging infrastructure, expected growth, and aligning sixth grade feeder pathways. Through the process undertaken, those challenges and the proposed solutions were presented to the public for feedback. There are three key issues that need to be addressed through the short, mid, and long term phases of the master facility plan:

1. Aging facilities/infrastructure
2. Elementary capacity as it relates to expansion of all-day kindergarten and/or potential closing of older facilities
3. 6th grade feeder pattern