

## **BCOC Meeting Minutes**

**Date: July 16, 2020, 5:30om**

**Location: Video Conference**

### **Present:**

**Committee Members:** Tom Peterson, David Boehm, Nathan Lavery, Marty Spaulding, Clare Wool, Doug Nedde, Kate Stein, Peter Bahrenburg

**Members of the Public:** Cosmo Duncan, Laura Jacoby, Ishmael Ahmed, Jenna Antonino DiMare, Jennifer Green, Eric Morrow, Inf(?), Peggy O'Neil (phone), bethany Whitaker, Chris Damiani, Colin from RETN, Natty Jamison, Tom Flanagan (BSD Superintendent)

### **Meeting Commenced at 5:30pm**

#### **Introductions:**

- **Tom Peterson (TP)** introduced the agenda, explained the role of the committee to new attendees, and the format of the BCOC meetings. He stated that we would be held to the time limitation in respect to those attending the Burlington School District Town Hall meeting later this evening.

#### **District 2030 Presentation:**

- **Jenna Antonino DiMare (JAD):** Director of Burlington 2030 District. District 2030 was organized to support building energy consumption, water and transport emission reductions - all by 2030. It is a public - private partnership. In the Burlington District, there are 32 property owner partner members, including BSD.
- Shared Vision: The City and State have made great progress on energy conservation / efficiency, but there is a lot more work to be done. Buildings account for 40% of US energy consumption. Transportation is 30%. Burlington is no exception. But this is an opportunity - we can play a major role in mitigating climate change. There are 22 2030 districts in the US and CA, which is a voluntary initiative of like minded community members.
- The Burlington 2030 District produces Property Energy Plan (PEP) documents for buildings to give a picture of current usage and a roadmap to improved energy efficiency.
- 2030 District shared goals for new construction = targeting 80% reduction from baseline in 2020. Burlington 2030 District highly suggests BHS pursue these EUI (energy usage intensity) targets. BSD has the opportunity to lead the state and nation. Business as usual will no longer suffice.
- **TP:** thank you very much for your presentation. I'd like to open this up to questions from the board.
- **TP:** I have one question. Renewables can include wood chips, correct? **JAD:** yes - I'd have to double check with 2030 district. Is that something that BHS is exploring? **TP:** yes, BHS currently uses wood chips, and it has been operating well for several years and we'd like to keep it as it was a significant capital investment.

- **MS:** Have you taken a look at our energy modeling? JAD: I have not yet - might there be an opportunity to make a PEP based on your energy model? MS: yes, it is available on our website. TP: Karen walkerman and LN consulting did our energy modeling. JAD: we would love to create a complimentary PEP for you.
- **Doug Nedde (DN):** I had a question about funding. Both for the project, and how 2030 District is funded. JAD: 2030 District is funded by the Vermont Green Building Network, which I also direct. We get grants to fund our programs. DN: how involved do you get in helping to source funds? JAD: we don't do that, but we would love to think about ways we could help steer the project to a lower EUI.
- **Eric Morrow:** (question submitted via text) What was the EUI of the BHS energy model that was shared last month? TP: we will look into that, and drill down to get that EUI. UPDATE: The EUI was not calculated as part of the energy modeling but BSD can have our consultants perform those calculations.

### **BHS Mobility Group Presentation:**

- **Bethany Whitaker (BW):** Local member agencies include BED, Old Spokes home, the UVM transportation research program, and more. Goals: 1. Consistent with the city plans and goals. 2 reflects multimodal equitable approach, 3. Safety 4. Accessibility 5. future proof. Students who ride their bike to school face many challenges. We want to make sure these priorities are taken into consideration.
- The City has a walk-bike master plan, that we believe the new High School facility should be planning to integrate with.
- **TP:** Thank you Bethany - Questions from the Committee?
- **BW:** To clarify, there is no formal transportation plan, correct?
- **TP / MS:** We have circulation plans and a traffic study.
- **BW:** We think creating a formal transportation plan should be a priority. JG: is the committee going to make one?
- **TP:** we certainly have considered accessibility and the traffic impact. To break it into two categories: there are physical plans and there is policy. A lot of these things might be able to be addressed through policies partnerships.
- **CW:** We (the BCOC) really welcome both of these presentations. We appreciate BCL, our student organization that did a survey on bike traffic and more. A mobility/transportation plan is absolutely something that we will work with all of you on developing. We look to your leadership and want to get started now.
- **Tovin Godesky-Hooper:** (submitted via text) "As a high school student at BHS, I can back up the fact that it is very hard to get to BHS by bike. the bike paths are. very narrow and in very bad shape. How many bikes and wheelchairs have you factored into the circulation plan?"
- **MS:** the traffic study did take bikes and pedestrians into consideration, not just vehicular traffic.
- **BW:** is that available to the public. MS: yes it is on the website and we can send it to you. We just presented it to TRC as well.

- **TP:** the last slide you presented (Mobility Group Goals) will be a great resource and touchstone for our committee going forward.
- **Jennifer Green (JG):** It sounds like RSGs study was small (2k) and only really looked at traffic in or out. How can we find additional funds for RSG to expand that study?
- **MS:** I would not say that their study was limited to vehicles. They made recommendations around crosswalks, bike lanes, etc. Maybe they were talking about the hard data analysis. The overall evaluation was looking at all modes of transportation.
- **BW:** the mobility group is more concerned with “can we rethink how we access this facility”. We’ve been frustrated that we haven’t been able to access the group and present our goals.
- **Nathan Lavery (NL):** a big factor here is where the school is located. It’s great if you can access the bike path, but otherwise it is challenging. Have you spoken with the city who owns all of the right of way, about access? We obviously can’t control that.
- **PO** (phone): there’s the wiggle. This very circuitous bike route. We have this bike walk masterplan - if we are going to point fingers we won’t get anywhere. If we can encourage RSG to count bikers, you’ll see that they are not accessing it ideally.
- **CW:** We hear you. We did do some surveying of bikers. And recognize the bike parking locations are not ideal. We recognize those challenges and will try to address it. We have full busses. People turn to cars because of the dangerous bike lanes, and the limited bus routes and times, weather etc. We definitely did not hire RSG to just do cars. I’m sorry you’ve felt frustrated in being heard, we’ve had these public meetings this whole time.
- **KS:** If we were to try to expand the study and look at all modes of transportation in the near future - it will look very different than the more distant future due to covid. We can’t predict the future. It’s a very tricky time.
- **BW:** we should envision what we want instead of being reactive.
- **CW:** We hear you and will be turning to all of you for your expertise.
- **KS:** I ride my bike to school - it’s very hard to cross the road to access the bike lanes.
- **TP:** Bethany, you mentioned you had had difficulty being heard... We've tried to make these meetings as public as possible. What happened?
- **BW:** We’ve just been having trouble getting connected.
- **TP:** These meetings are every third Thursday and we will do our best to try to make it more accessible.
- **Laura Jacoby (LJ):** Will we have an opportunity to give ideas? For me it’s about facilitating bike riding for younger people, and physical solutions. When can we give you ideas for that?
- **TP:** Perhaps we could arrange a site visit, or other opportunity for community partners to share their ideas. For now, I’d like to close this agenda item. We have one more item, and then we will have comments from the committee and the public. Thank you all for your presentations and we look forward to working with you further.

### **Future Cost Estimates Discussion**

- **TP:** Our initial project budget included two estimates by the CM. Since the first came back so high, we had to already do a second round at SD. We also reconciled that with Vermuelens, an independent third party, which hadn't been budgeted for. Now, we have budgeted for two more estimates from WT, but the question is: do we want to get both of those estimates and if so, at what stages? If we do, do we want to reconcile them again? That would be \$36,700 to reconcile that is not in the budget. The estimating process takes approximately 4 weeks. Doug Nedde is a new BCOC member and developer and may have insight!
- **MS:** to clarify: the RFP for CMs included 2 estimates, one at SD and one at DD. Because we have already done two, that proposal is fulfilled. We recognized the need for additional estimating, so we did build the budget around that, but it would still be an additional fee to WT.
- **DN:** for our (DN's company) projects we do the DD estimate at 80% - mostly done but gives us some room to make last minute changes. Seems that WT is charging roughly 55K per estimate... that is a big number - what kind of leverage do we have to change that? They already have a baseline estimate, seems like it shouldn't be quite so high.
- **David Boehm (DB):** this is an important item, and a big number. It seems like the 2 additional estimates are probably needed. If things change during DD, those changes need to be identified and estimated / budgeted for as they come. Why wait for 50% or 100% DD to identify the cost of those changes?
- **DB:** when will DD be done? **MS:** October. **DB** so we are almost at 50% **TP:** BRD would probably say we aren't at 50% yet.
- **MS:** I'm not advocating against the additional estimates, but it does take time and energy from many groups involved to do that (BRD, WT, engineers etc) that would otherwise be spent on moving the project forward.
- **TP:** I'd like to table this for now, in light of time constraints. I'd like to make a decision before the August meeting, or that meeting at the latest. Now I'd like to open the meeting to public comment.

### **Public Comment:**

- **CW:** I will follow up with the mobility group personally. And I will follow up on the specific number of bikes and wheelchairs with Tovin (student from above).

**Meeting adjourned at 6:52.**