

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SCHOOL ACADEMIC FACILITIES
MEETING
#1 Capitol Mall, Suite 4D-200
August 29, 2017, 9:30 a.m.**

Committee Members – Present

Jim Alessi, Chairman
Charles Stein, Vice Chairman
Brad Montgomery, Secretary
Brent Massey
Cody Beene
Jeff Steiling
Jim Tucker
Joe Wishard

John Hoy
Jon Collins
LaKenya Riley
Nathan Smith

Craig Boone, *Ex Officio*
Scott Copas, *Ex Officio*
Doug Harris, *Ex Officio*

Committee Members – Absent

Jim Yeager
Rusty Mullen
Scott Archer

Division Staff – Present

Brad Montgomery, Director
Terry Granderson, Assistant Director

Kenneth Johnson, Senior Project Administrator
Carol Bowman, Administrative Analyst

Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 25, 2017

Meeting Minutes from July 25, 2017, meeting were submitted and approved.

Review of Proposed Changes to Wealth Index

Representative Mark Lowery not in attendance, will reschedule next meeting.

2004 Assessment & MAAPS

Mark Mehlberger, Senior Consultant with Jacobs Engineering Group, contributed via teleconference. Mr. Mehlberger stated he supports Arkansas DPSAFT and helped create the comprehensive software for the assessment with extremely detailed data. In 2007, he developed the system for school districts to access some data. Life cycles were included as part of system.

The Committee had a discussion and Dr. Stein indicated the 2004 room data provided a list of rooms and buildings and that a room's use may have changed but the size would be the same. Discussion included:

- School districts may have ability to self-assess their facilities and if properly using SchoolDude, the updates should be current
- School districts are not qualified to self-evaluate building and system conditions, nor does the Division have qualified staff to maintain the assessment because in 2004 the State did not provide the Division enough staff or any code-official staff for system reviews
- Superintendents and teachers don't have knowledge of the "big picture", only ability to report a roof leak so would not be a good source of findings
- Committee should not re-evaluate new facilities
- Construction approval forms would support new facilities
- Only do random assessment of some school districts because cheaper. (Multiple members of the Committee disagreed)
- Utilizing volunteer professionals to perform the assessments. (The 2004 assessment took 100 plus assessors 6-12 months to do the task so that would not be viable.)
- Partial random assessment was not a good idea and opposition voiced

Mr. Massey asked about the school districts' level of achievement to resolve the 2004 findings. Dr. Stein stated he would address a State Master Plan later during the meeting and that until the State has a State Plan, the question would be hard to answer how far the State has come, and that school districts must use SchoolDude properly. Discussion included:

- Superintendents are in good position to provide subjective data even if not qualified in various specialties
- Assessment findings would be skewed if random inspections were performed
- Teachers, for example, would not be qualified to assess the buildings and systems
- State needs universal consistency input into and use of SchoolDude and the assessment itself
- Random assessment may be misunderstood but can be useful if we get expert judgements
- Random assessment suggested, but multiple Committee members remained opposed to suggestion
- Declining and stagnant school districts are falling further behind while growing school districts have received a lot from the program

Mr. Alessi stated he and Mr. Montgomery have a scheduled meeting with Commissioner Johnny Key on August 30, 2017, to discuss the project.

Compliance – Computerized Maintenance Management System (*SchoolDude*) & State Mandated Inspections

Kenneth Johnson reviewed State Mandated Inspections, SchoolDude, and discussed the Division's maintenance inspection report form.

Terry Granderson was recognized by the Chairman as a key contributor. Mr. Granderson stated Arkansas has 8,179 school buildings, 2,089 were inspected last year, and it takes approximately four years to inspect all buildings with a staff of five or six.

Dr. Smith suggested the Division might seek an I.T. solution to transfer the inspection reports into a data system to facilitate review of the data maintenance and facilities regarding the condition of the buildings. Mr. Granderson continued that each individual building form has two pages, the Division has been performing maintenance inspections since 2008, the form is regularly revised, the staff members are not code officials, and the Division only does maintenance inspections which does not help with the requested assessment. Mr. Montgomery stated the Division is in the process of designing an all-inclusive data platform, preparing to develop a RFP to begin the bidding process, and suggested waiting on compiling the maintenance inspection data until the new database is launched. Discussion included:

- Multiple members agreed to wait until the new database is finalized before entering maintenance inspections as they are unrelated to the assessment
- Assessment should include details such as HVAC serial numbers which will provide information on life of the system which is more to the point.
- Statement if nothing was done with the compiled data, then data was useless

Mr. Alessi indicated the answer to Mr. Beene's comment might be tied to Dr. Stein's suggested State Master Plan and that he liked the idea, and to wait on compiling the inspection reports until new data system is secured by the Division.

Dr. Stein explained the application process from 2005 forward, and that in 2006-2007 included projects to replace things such as door knobs.

Review of Partnership Program 0607 forward & 9% Foundation Maintenance Funding

Dr. Charles Stein reviewed handouts regarding the history of the Partnership Program from 2006-2007 to present.

Mr. Wishard stated that repairing buildings was only putting a band aid on the problem. Committee members stated superintendents may not repair HVAC since State will pay to replace it, that school districts let the State pay for a new system instead of using the 9% to repair it, and school districts want to let the State pay for it.

Dr. Smith suggested changing the prioritization of the 2019-2021 projects now. Mr. Montgomery and multiple Committee members stated that would be a disaster (train wreck) and could not happen. Dr. Smith indicated the Governor and Legislature create the prioritization. Mr. Montgomery responded no. The Division approves the project, the Legislature provides a funding amount, and the Commission approves the project funding. Mr. Alessi stated that altering the 2019-2021 prioritization will not happen at this point.

Dr. Stein discussed the 9% Foundation Funds maintenance funding, that utilities are included, and the remaining funds must be saved for facilities maintenance. Discussion included:

- A system to allow school districts to receive permission regarding the remaining funds for future projects
- Some school districts' maintenance staff lack skills managing buildings
- Licensed trades personnel on staff at the cooperatives used by all their school districts which should help extend the life of the structures and systems
- Logistic issues with cooperative personnel and would be hard to implement and fund
- State Master Plan needed

Mr. Collins asked if some school districts were not maintaining buildings and multiple responses were yes.

Dr. Smith asked why the 9% could not be removed from law and untie the school districts' hands because they were capable of maintaining their facilities. Mr. Granderson, recognized by the Chairman, stated the reason the Committee and Division exist is because the school districts did not maintain the facilities which caused the Lakeview case and resulted in rules. Multiple Committee members agreed. Mr. Montgomery and Dr. Stein explained the 25 mills for maintenance and operations plus the 9% foundation funding matrix. The Committee disagreed with Dr. Smith. Mr. Alessi stated school districts don't maintain the buildings without rules. Dr. Smith again disagreed.

Sub-Committee Updates

Jim Alessi stated the Assessment Sub-Committee report was discussed during the meeting.

Jeff Steiling stated the Manual Sub-Committee had divided the manual into eight sections and will provide the Committee minor recommendations soon which will include providing the Division some flexibility with variances. He said the manual should include items over-and-above what is mandated by code.

John Hoy stated the State Plan Sub-Committee cannot proceed until the State defines adequacy. He suggested checking with other states such as Ohio and New Mexico. Mr. Montgomery stated that ADE Legal will review the Lakeview case in the next meeting, and that he plans to call Ohio and Colorado.

Dr. Stein indicated the Wealth Index, Ranking, & Rules Sub-Committee performed a funding study, are reviewing the data, and will provide the report to the Committee once completed. Mr. Montgomery confirmed with Dr. Stein that the Sub-Committee will also address the prioritization process.

Other Business

None discussed.

Next Meeting Date

The Committee selected the next meeting date of September 26, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

Adjourn