

Joint Assembly School Board Facility Planning Committee
DRAFT MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING
Zoom Webinar
April 7, 2022

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:03 PM.

Members Present: Chair Greg Smith, Brian Holst, Elizabeth Siddon, Emil Mackey, Wade Bryson joined the meeting at 12:20 pm, Ms. Triem, Mayor Weldon joined the meeting at 12:10 pm.

City & Borough of Juneau Staff Members Present: Katie Koester, Rorie Watt, Janet Sanbei, Bridget Weiss, Jeanne Rynne, Beth McEwen, Sherry Layne, Robert Barr, Jeff Rogers, and Robert Palmer.

School District Staff Present: Cassee Olin, Mark Sabbatini, and Will Muldoon.

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No objection, Agenda approved.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. January 13, 2022 – Regular Meeting

No objection. Minutes approved.

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Demographic Trending of Facility Planning

Mr. Watt talked about the forecast of the future student population and its steady decline. He asked the Committee to consider this information as they go forward talking about facilities and their use in the future. It is a gradual decrease that will happen over time. This topic is important and should be considered well before significant loss in student population occurs.

Discussion comments included being sure building maintenance continues whether or not the School Board/Assembly feel the building will be used in the future. Other comments included making determinations as to whether a building will continue to be used as a school. The consideration of consolidating students to fewer schools may have financial impact based on special funding that could be affected by moving students. The demographic study is leaning toward decrease in population. It is important to be sure the Committee uses due diligence and makes the hard decisions regarding closing some buildings. There is substantial deferred maintenance on several buildings which will have students in them for the immediate future and must be maintained. It is important to keep buildings maintained. It is expensive and the State is no longer providing funding to assist in these efforts. To place a large project on the

ballot for voter input, requires a lot of explanation as to why these buildings need to be improved and maintained. It will require voter confidence that money is being spent appropriately.

Chair Smith stated this will remain a topic on future agendas for deeper discussion.

B. CBJ and JSD Facilities Spending: Maintenance and Bond Debt

Ms. Koester gave a brief explanation regarding the industry standard vs the City standard for maintaining facility maintenance. It is evident there is a greater need for facility maintenance than there are funds. The City currently spends \$12M a year on combined school and CBJ facility maintenance each year. It is difficult to get the needs met without the assistance from the State which is not happening at this time. The conversation at this time is determining which facilities are the most important and working on maintenance in that order.

Discussion included an explanation by School District staff of the spreadsheet on page 21 of the packet. The spending on the chart shows the costs of employees, supplies, minor maintenance, insurance, etc. Deferred maintenance is the main issue for affecting the budget. Deferred maintenance has not always been funded where it needed to be. The question as to whether there is another way to look at funding maintenance on buildings, especially the back log. Industry standard for maintaining buildings is 2%-6% of the replacement value of the facility. Expenses on preventative building maintenance has not kept up with the industry standard. Deferred maintenance is just preventative maintenance that has been put off and become a bigger problem. Keeping up with the preventative maintenance is important. It is difficult to convince the Assembly to approve large dollar amounts for facilities that are not used fully. Maintenance projects that are currently have broad estimates listed. It would require further investigation in order to get more accurate numbers. Portions of buildings which need improving are not always seen or known about. The fact that these repairs have not been completed is largely due to the State's neglect in providing the constitutional funding requirement.

C. Next Steps

Discussion included making decisions on what is most important and bring back to the Committee. Break up the large projects into smaller projects, which may be easier to get funding.

VI. FUTURE MEETING DATES

The chair will work with the Committee and the Clerk's Office to come up with a future date for the next meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:01 PM.