

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
 JANUARY 10, 2022
 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION OFFICE

A special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Mountain Home School District No. 193 was convened at 5:00 p.m., January 10, 2022, at the District Administration Office, 470 N 3rd East, Mountain Home, Idaho, in said district, pursuant to authority provided by Title 74, Chapter 2, Section 74-202(4)(c)(6)(b) – Open Meeting (Special Meeting), Idaho Code, and pursuant to affirmation by the Clerk that notice of the special meeting had been given to each trustee and posted public notice as required by law. A copy of the Notice of a Special Meeting of School Trustees so posted follows:

**NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
 MOUNTAIN HOME SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 193
 Mountain Home, Elmore County, Idaho**

Courtesy Livestream Board Meetings: Zoom/Livestreaming/recording board meetings is a courtesy to give the public an alternative means of attending a school board meeting; the board meeting would continue even if there is a failure of technology affecting the zoom meeting (<https://www.mtnhomesd.org/calendar.html>).

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a special meeting – Bond Committee Recommendations, of the Board of Trustees of Mountain Home School District No. 193, will be held on Monday, January 10, 2022, at 5:00 p.m., at the District Administration Office Boardroom, 470 North 3rd East, Mountain Home, Idaho, in said District, during which the following business will be conducted:

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84169337295?pwd=K3BWejB6WUJMdUhTaVFRC0w3eFd1QT09>

Meeting ID: 841 6933 7295

Passcode: 669788

Find your local number: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/kdoFBYctR4>

- I. CALL SPECIAL MEETING TO ORDER**
- II. BOND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (POSSIBLE ACTION)**
- III. ADJOURN (ACTION)**

This Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees of Mountain Home School District No. 193 is called pursuant to Title 74, Chapter 2, Section 74-202(4)(c)(6)(b) – Opening Meeting (Special Meeting), Section 74-204(2) – Open Meeting Law (Special Meetings), Idaho Code.

Dated the 21st day of December 2021.



Sharon M. Whitman

Clerk, School District No. 193

Mountain Home, Elmore, Idaho

- I. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER** – Chairperson/Vice-chairperson. Chairman Abrego convened the special meeting of the Board of Trustees at 5:00 p.m.

Trustees Present: Chairman Abrego, Vice-Chair Binion, Trustee Donahue, and Trustee Monasterio, and Trustee Knox were in attendance at the start of the board meeting; thus, establishing a two-thirds majority of the board IAW Idaho Code, Section 74-202.

- II. **BOND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (POSSIBLE ACTION)** – Superintendent Gilbert informed the Board that the Bond Committee was a group of diverse people representing all aspects of the MHSD to look at the need of a new high school. The committee was tasked to get community input and come up with options that would best fit our community regarding either building a new high school or renovating the current building. Superintendent Gilbert asked the Board to hear and consider what the Bond Committee’s recommendation is and to take action on the recommendation.

Mr. John Bidegenta, spokesperson for the committee, reported the following to the Board. He began by thanking the Board for listening to their recommendation of pursuing a \$79 million bond to replace the aging high school building. Over the past few years, many of us on the committee have been asked to come up with the best route of improving the high school be it renovating the current building or building a new high school. A few years ago, the District did a study to receive feedback on whether to bond or not, the feedback reflected that a bond was unlikely to pass. Now forward to 2021, with the explosive growth of southern Idaho, Superintendent Gilbert asked the committee to again review the situation. Based on the current student population and the influx of new people to Mountain Home, and the approximate 2,300 homes slated to be built, we felt the need is urgent and the bond is much more likely to pass.

Mr. Bidegenta reviewed some statistics of the current high school building, the original building was construct in 1953, with additions being constructed in 1956, 1958, 1961, 1962. In 1980, there was a fire in the gymnasium which resulted in improvements to the gym and a cafeteria added. The annex was remodeled and added to in 1988. In 2009, after the failure of the bond, temporary classrooms were added. Other than some mechanical, electrical, cosmetics, and roofing, nothing much has been done to the building.

Mr. Bidegenta then discussed the age of the building and why it makes more sense to build a new building rather than renovate it. The building is nearly 70-years old and the last renovation was 34-years ago. It would be very difficult to live under the same conditions we did 40-50-years ago, so why are we forcing our students to function this way. Our committee did consider a complete renovation of the building as one of our options, cost as given by Beniton Construction was about 15% less than cost of new construction. There were many reasons why 87% of the committee chose a new building as an option. Even though it is possible to upgrade the heating, plumbing, and interior finishes, it cannot be done economically. The layout and size are antiquated, the corridors are very small by today's standards, and it is not economically feasible to change any of those things. He added that due to many safety incidents over the past years nationwide, building designs have improved drastically over the years to improve safety of our students. The current high school cannot accommodate the needed safety changes, not to mention that a renovation would take about 7-years to complete with constant educational interruptions to students and staff, new construction would only take about 3-years. Renovation could also end up costing more due to the amount of time the renovations takes and the yearly increases in construction costs and supplies. Mr. Bidegenta explained the even if the current high school was demolished, the current gymnasium and multipurpose room would be saved and renovated and with the new gymnasium would increase the amount of space for sporting events, practices, and community events.

Mr. Bidengenta mentioned that the Bond Committee was also asked to consider building a brand new Stephensen Elementary School on the airbase. The DOD has programs that would fund a majority of Stephensen Elementary, but it would add about \$6 million to the Bond. The committee felt that by adding a new building for Stephensen on the airbase would cause the Bond to fail in the community because the community would not want to pay for a new building on federally owned property.

Mr. Bidengenta explained that he is the youngest of four siblings and could retire in two years. His oldest sibling in 80-years and all four siblings attended the same Mountain Home High School building. He went on to explained that one of his classmates was the first student to get a pocket calculator, which was one of the wonders of the time, school shootings were unheard of, yet our children are still attending the same antiquated building. All four of his children graduated from MHHS and with most families, three generations have graduated from the current building and all of this without any significant improvements over three decades. It is time to give our children and grandchildren the modern facilities to assure a more competitive education going forward.

Chairman Abrego asked Mr. Bidegenta if the Bond Committee was swayed at all by the District or did they just consider the information given to them. Mr. Bidegenta responded that they made a decision using the information give them and that there wasn't any predisposed idea of which way to go, it was all open and honest and the architects and CM team came up with pricing options that we as a committee thought was reasonable for both a renovation and a new building, it was pretty fair and open.

Discussion began regarding a presentation that was created according to community input and to ensure that the cost was under \$80 million, reduced capacity was made to reduce the cost of the project, other

options were eliminated to keep the bond price under the \$80 million; what are the needs of the high school and not all the wants in the high school; whether to support the DOD grant opportunity in which there wasn't much support; the scope of the projects; the comparisons of the two projects; etc.

Discussion continued. Superintendent Gilbert reported that the last bit of data that came in from the committee was that the committee was in favor of a new building, 87% favored a new building, 13% favored renovation, 73% said the original \$89 million estimate was too high, 13% wanted SES added, 6% favored revisiting MHJH, but keep in mind that the 13% and 6% were also in favor of a new building.

For the full discussion of the Bond Committee recommendation, the Bond Project Analysis, and the Tax Impact can be found on the zoom meeting video.

Superintendent Gilbert, Beniton, and Design West reviewed the Bond Project Analysis.

New Facility

• Size: 215,000 SF

- Similar to Middleton or Ridgevue High School
- Performance/Practice Gyms
- Auditorium
- Visual & Performance Art Areas
- Properly Sized Classrooms/Labs
- Kitchen/Cafeteria
- Vo/Ag (CTE) Facility
- Secure Entry
- Site Safety/Circulation & Parking Lots

New Facility

• Size: 215,000 SF

- Do we have room on existing properties to build it?

- Current View



- We are authorized to build fields at East Side Park

- View of the new building



- Plenty of room to build a new high school without purchasing property.
- Add additional parking and hopefully reconfigure bus access lane to include MHJH.
- Need to consider adding tennis courts in the future.
- The old baseball fields would move to Green Acres.
- Maintenance department would move into the current CTE building.
- We would keep the old gyms that could be utilized by Parks & Rec.

<p>Renovation & Addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation Size: 116,900 SF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not include 7 portables that are to be removed • Addition Size: 98,100 SF • Total Size: 215,000 SF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation Scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different Levels (comparable to new) • New Addition Scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auditorium • Cafeteria/Kitchen • Classrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Suites • Performing Arts • Administration/ Controlled Entry • CTE Addition • Code Compliant Traffic/Parking
<p>Renovation & Addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation Size: 116,900 SF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not include 7 portables that are to be removed • Addition Size: 98,100 SF • Total Size: 215,000 SF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have room on existing properties to build it?

- View of what the renovations would look like.



- Would need to add a two-story academic wing.
- The Bond Committee was unanimous about increasing the size of the CTE program and space.
- Would need to add a cafeteria/visual & performing Arts
- Add additional parking.

Renovation & Addition

- Renovation Size: 116,900 SF
 - Does not include 7 portables that are to be removed
- Addition Size: 98,100 SF
- Total Size: 215,000 SF

• Phasing of Renovation?

- Renovations take many more years than a new building.

• Phase 1 – (complete 2025)

- Build New Additions

- Time frame is tremendous and there are some things that cannot be fixed such as the size of the entry way, the loss of instruction, costs could increase over the seven years, cannot increase size of hallways or classrooms.

- Phase 2 – (complete 2026)
 - Move one grade level into new addition
 - Renovate the vacated wing



- Phase 3 – (complete 2027)
 - Move one grade level into new renovated wing
 - Renovate the next vacated wing



- Phase 4 – (complete 2028)
 - Move one grade level into new renovated wing
 - Renovate the next vacated wing



- Phase 5 (complete 2029)
 - Demolish/Remove Portables
 - Convert to Parking or Green Area
 - Renovate the common areas of school during summer break(s)

New High School

Item	Cost
New Facility (215,000 SF)	75,250,000
Demolition of Existing Portion of Building	200,000
Redevelopment of Existing Site	1,000,000
Misc. Renovation to Gymnasiums to Remain	2,000,000
Misc. Renovation to CTE – Converting to new Facilities & Operations	500,000
TOTAL	78,950,000

- We kept making adjustments to help keep the cost below \$80 million to \$75 million.

High School Addition & Renovation

Item	Cost
New Additions (98,100 SF)	34,335,000
Renovation of Existing Facility (116,900 SF)	29,225,000
Remove/Demolish Portables – Redevelopment of Site	300,000
Phasing Premium/Inflation (4 additional years + 5% inflation/year)	4,582,000
TOTAL	68,442,000

- Renovations would have to include the costs of asbestos abatement, new windows, new carpet, etc.

- Old site maps



	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U
1	Scope of Work																				Total Cost
2		Cost/SF UNC	Reconfigure Space (ADA, Function)	Replace Windows	Replace Millwork	Replace Flooring	Replace Ceilings	Replace Lockers	Replace Plumbing Fixtures	Mechanical Upgrade	Repair/Paint Walls	Update Lighting	Upgrade Alarm	Fire Sprinklers	New Roofing	Asbestos Abatement					
		\$50	\$12	Lump sum	\$12	\$6	\$195 /locker	\$42	\$22	\$5	\$4	\$6	\$4	\$20	\$5						
81	Gross SF	9,177													\$44,730	\$35,784	\$53,876	\$35,784	\$178,920	\$44,730	\$393,624
82	1961 Addition																				
83	Language 101	745		\$6,940		\$8,940	\$4,470						\$16,390								\$38,740
84	M Restroom 102	256	\$12,800			\$3,072			\$10,752				\$5,432								\$32,256
85	F Restroom 103	256	\$12,800			\$3,072			\$10,752				\$5,432								\$32,256
86	Janitor 105	116				\$1,392			\$4,872				\$2,552								\$8,816
87	Biology 107	1,123		\$13,478	\$34,000	\$13,478	\$6,738		\$47,168				\$24,708								\$129,562
88	Research 108	156		\$8,000	\$1,872	\$936			\$6,552				\$3,432								\$18,792
89	Research 109	106		\$8,000	\$1,272	\$636			\$4,452				\$2,332								\$14,692
90	Animal Rm. 110	95		\$8,000	\$1,140	\$570			\$3,990				\$2,090								\$13,790
91	Biology 111	1,148		\$13,778	\$34,000	\$13,778	\$6,888		\$48,216				\$25,256								\$131,912
92	Math 112	758		\$9,072	\$6,000	\$9,072	\$4,536		\$11,752				\$18,632								\$77,064
93	Math 113	753		\$9,036	\$6,000	\$9,036	\$4,518		\$11,626				\$18,566								\$76,712
94	Math 114	765		\$9,180	\$6,000	\$9,180	\$4,590		\$12,130				\$18,830								\$77,910
95	Classroom 116A	763		\$9,156	\$6,000	\$9,156	\$4,578		\$12,096				\$18,796								\$79,676
96	Classroom 116B	652		\$7,824		\$7,824	\$3,912		\$14,344				\$16,796								\$33,904
97	Office 117	99			\$750	\$1,188	\$594						\$2,178								\$4,710
98	Storage 118	66			\$1,500	\$792	\$396						\$1,452								\$5,140
99	Office 119	96			\$750	\$1,152	\$576						\$1,412								\$4,590
100	Chemistry Lab 28	1,754		\$21,048	\$34,000	\$21,048	\$10,524		\$71,668				\$38,588								\$188,876
101	Prep. 28A	201		\$6,000	\$2,412	\$1,206			\$8,442				\$4,422								\$23,482
102	Security 28B	60			\$1,500	\$720	\$360						\$1,320								\$3,900
103	Science Classroom 30	949		\$11,388	\$34,000	\$11,388	\$5,694		\$39,858				\$20,878								\$113,206
104	General Science 124	751		\$9,012	\$34,000	\$9,012	\$4,506		\$11,542				\$18,522								\$95,594
105	General Science 125	758		\$9,096	\$34,000	\$9,096	\$4,548		\$11,636				\$18,676								\$95,252
106	Math 126	759		\$9,108	\$6,000	\$9,108	\$4,554		\$11,678				\$18,698								\$77,346
107	Subtotal	33,283																			\$224,590
108	Hallways	4,552					\$54,624	\$27,312	\$42,510	218		\$100,144									\$224,590
109	Walls	655																			

- The CM and architects went through the classrooms, offices, hallways, labs, custodial area, storage closets, windows, walls, restrooms, etc., to determine the estimated cost.
- The transparency with the process and the cost estimates is what the committee felt comfortable with during the meetings.

High School Options

<p>Option #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost: \$78,950,000 • Completion Date: Fall 2025 • Pros/Cons 	<p>Option #2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation & Addition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost: \$68,442,000 • Completion Date: Fall 2029 • Pros/Cons
---	--

- The committee viewed both options and determined that the most economical option was to have a new building.

Chairman Abrego asked what kinds of people were part of the committee. Superintendent Gilbert said there were a variety of committee members such as farmer, ranchers, business owners, educators, some

other diverse groups who provided input but were not able to attend the meetings. Many of the committee members seeked out input from their peers and others and would bring that input back to inform the committee. Mr. Bidegenta mentioned that some of the members were large property owners so the tax increase to them would be substantial.

Discussion ensued including the ability to add additional rooms 20-30-years down the road, the projected growth of Mountain Home, additional explanations from Beniton and Design West, the pros of having an auditorium, the importance to the committee of having a large CTE program and space, etc.

Superintendent Gilbert handed out the information from Piper Sandler who is the company who will do the bond analysis and sell the bonds. He had Piper Sandler break it out a \$79 million bond for 20-years, 25-years, and 30-years. We have a AA1 credit rating that is just under the highest of a AAA1, so we should get a good interest rate. He then reviewed the Bond Analysis.

PIPER | SANDLER

**Mountain Home School District No. 193
Summary of Bond Analysis
January 4, 2021**

Assumptions for Analysis			
Rating	"Aa1" ISBG/ "A1" Under		
Interest Rates	Current as of 1/4/2021 PLUS 0.75%		
2021 September Net Taxable Value (FY 2022)	\$1,941,934,614	(Value includes URA)	
Market Value Growth Projections	2020-2050: 0.00%		
Dated Date	9/15/2022		
Structure	Level debt service		
Levy Equalization	11% of Principal & Interest Cost		
Summary of Scenarios	\$79.0M (20YR) Bond	\$79.0M (25YR) Bond	\$79.0M (30YR) Bond
Term	20 years	25 years	30 years
True Interest Cost (TIC) ⁽¹⁾	2.02%	2.35%	3.03%
Par Amount	\$79,000,000	\$79,000,000	\$79,000,000
Interest Cost	\$17,892,200	\$26,431,600	\$42,468,400
Total Cost	\$96,892,200	\$105,431,600	\$121,468,400
Less L.E. (@ 11% of Prin & Int Cost)	(\$10,658,142)	(\$11,597,476)	(\$13,361,524)
Net Total Cost Paid	\$86,234,058	\$93,834,124	\$108,106,876
Average Payment of Proposed New Bonds	\$4,311,703	\$3,753,365	\$3,603,563
Proj. Total 2023 Bond Rate (Per \$1,000)	\$2.22	\$1.93	\$1.86
Taxpayer Impact on Median Home Value ⁽²⁾			
Median Home Value ⁽²⁾	276,329	276,329	276,329
Less: H.O. Exemption	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)
Equals: Taxable Value	151,329	151,329	151,329
Total Bond Levy Tax on Median Home	336.00	292.49	280.61
Annual Increase in Tax on Median Home	\$336.00	\$292.49	\$280.61
Monthly Increase in Tax on Median Home	\$28.00	\$24.37	\$23.40

Footnotes:
 (1) Interest include a 0.75% cushion over current market interest rates.
 (2) Zillow's Median Home Value for Mountain Home, Idaho as of November 2021.

MSRB Rule G-23 Disclosure:
 Piper Sandler is providing the information contained herein for discussion purposes only in anticipation of being engaged to serve as underwriter or placement agent on a future transaction and not as a financial advisor or municipal advisor. In providing the information contained herein, Piper Sandler is not recommending an action to you and the information provided herein is not intended to be and should not be construed as a "recommendation" or "advice" within the meaning of Section 15B of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Piper Sandler is not acting as an advisor to you and does not owe a fiduciary duty pursuant to Section 15B of the Exchange Act or under any state law to you with respect to the information and material contained in this communication. As an underwriter or placement agent, Piper Sandler's primary role is to purchase or arrange for the placement of securities with a view to distribution in an arm's-length commercial transaction, is acting for its own interests and has financial and other interests that differ from your interests. You should discuss any information and material contained in this communication with any and all internal or external advisors and experts that you deem appropriate before acting on this information or material.

The School Board of Trustees and Superintendent Gilbert with the attending members of the Bond Committee discussed the amount of years to have the Bond, the potential for a property tax base increase with all of the new homes being built. Chairman Abrego asked if the people living on the airbase pay property taxes and the reply was no, they do not. Superintendent Gilbert mentioned that this is a good time for the community to discuss how to replace ageing buildings in the future. He added that McKenna being a Charter School didn't have to follow the same rules and restrictions that public schools have to regarding building, so in McKenna's case, they could build a new building from their fund balance for all of their online education and had a substantial amount of money coming in every year that they could put into their building savings account, not to mention that they also receive transportation money from the state even though they don't transport students; the claim is that they are being transported via the internet. After a thorough discussion of the Bond options, the Bond equalization, etc. Chairman Abrego asked for a motion. Trustee Binion motioned to accept the Bond Committee's recommendation of Bonding for a new high school building, at the 20-year rate. Trustee Monasterio seconded the motion. Discussion of nostalgia began. Chairman Abrego mentioned that he supports the motion but keeps thinking about the grant to build a new Stephensen building and whether another chance would ever happen, and he didn't want to risk this current Bond recommendation to fail because the DOD grant. Trustee Donahue also questioned about leaving money on the table, but the focus was on the high school

and she was willing to risk the failure of the Bond. Discussion continued regarding the airbase, its importance, the community is made of many retired military personnel, etc. Mr. Bidegenta reminded the Board that the committee did consider the DOD grant, but that would put the Bond amount at over \$80 million and that amount would not pass. Chairman Abrego stated that there was a motion and a second. Motion approved. Chairman Abrego asked the clerk to add the Bond Resolution to the January 18 regular board meeting. Superintendent Gilbert informed the board that they needed to determine the term rate so that it could be included in the resolution. Trustee Monasterio motioned to build a new high school building with a 20-year bond, received a second from Trustee Binion. Motion passed.

- III. **ADJOURNMENT (ACTION)** – All business of the Board having been completed, Chairman Abrego called for a motion to adjourn. A motion from Trustee Binion to adjourn was seconded by Trustee Knox. Motion granted. Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Chairman Abrego

Clerk Whitman