

Governor's Commission on School Construction  
Meeting Agenda  
**May 23, 2025**  
**10 a.m. – noon**  
[Join the Zoom meeting here.](#)  
Meeting ID: 826 0968 9381  
Passcode: 93161210

---

**Advance Materials for Review/Reference:**

- [Title 30-A Section 6006-F](#)
- [Chapter 64 Rule](#)
- [Presentation to Commission re: SRRF \(on January 22, 2025\)](#)

**Key Topics**

1. School Revolving Renovation Fund (SRRF)
2. Decoupling Major Capital Construction Funds and EPS

**Desired Outcome**

Commission determines next steps on above topics. Options include identifying additional information or analysis needed for decision-making/recommendations and/or endorsing a recommendation in concept to be further developed with language for the Commission's review and decision.

---

**Agenda**

*(Times are approximate.)*

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| 10:00 | Welcome and Introductions<br><i>Valerie Landry, Chair</i>                    |
| 10:05 | Commissioner's Update  |
| 10:15 | Other announcements<br><i>All</i>  |
| 10:20 | Work Plan Review <i>(brief)</i>  |
| 10:30 | School Revolving Renovation Fund (SRRF)<br><i>(See key questions below.)</i> |

11:15	Decoupling Debt Service and EPS (See key questions below.)
11:50	Wrap-Up and Next Steps
Noon	Adjourn

### Key Questions

There are two sets of questions below for each major topic on today's agenda. The first set is intended to facilitate today's Commission discussion. The second set supports closer examination and analysis of the topic by staff, subject experts, and/or Commission members between Commission meetings. Commission members are encouraged to add or refine questions or desired analysis.

#### 1. School Revolving Renovation Fund (SRRF)

**Premise:** Increasing the cap on the SRRF (for example, from \$2 million to \$8 million) would enable larger renovation projects, thereby reducing the pressure on more costly new construction.

##### Examples of Questions for Commission Discussion

Is the Commission interested in pursuing this strategy? If so, what information is needed to move toward a recommendation, e.g.:

- What supporting evidence exists that increasing renovation funding would reduce the demand for new construction (e.g., life cycle analyses and life cycle cost analyses); and are there other studies regarding the consequences of deferred maintenance in the public or private sector?
- What other benefits would this achieve? For example, as previously stated, districts that maintain buildings should not be at a disadvantage in the funding selection process.
- What disadvantages or unintended consequences could result?
- Are there other ways to achieve the desired outcome?
- What funding sources could support an increase?

##### Examples of Questions for Subsequent Examination

###### a. Desired Outcome

- Specifically, what are the benefits of this approach? What problem does it address?
- If the intent is cost reduction, what is the estimate over the next five, 10, 20 years?
- What other benefits would be expected?

###### b. Stakeholders

- What entities have authority in this area and/or would need to be directly affected by this change? How will they be involved in design and/or decision-making of this approach?
- c. Funding
  - What would be the funding source?
  - How could it be sustained?
- d. Cost Savings
  - How would savings be measured over time?
  - What type of tracking system could be used?
- e. Prioritization
  - Should SRRF priorities continue as now written, or should they be modified?
  - What prioritization factors should be considered (e.g., quick return on investment, essential health/safety, energy efficiency, sustainability, preventative maintenance, and/or cost efficiency)?
  - Should prioritization be supported by a statewide master plan that maps hazards?
  - Would MEPRI needs assessment data be the basis for determining high-impact projects? If yes, how often would this need to be performed?
- f. Management and Governance
  - What entity would provide oversight and manage the application process?
  - What changes in statute, rule, or policy law would be needed?

## 2. Decoupling Debt Service and EPS

**Premise:** Decoupling EPS and Debt Service would enable improved fiscal planning and transparency for both districts and the state. It would reduce the likelihood of year-over-year changes in school budget requests and erratic changes in local tax rates.

### Examples of Questions for Commission Discussion

Is the Commission interested in pursuing this strategy? If so, what information is needed to move toward a recommendation, e.g.:

- What problem does this approach address?
- What would be the benefits of this approach?
- What, if any, negative or unintended consequences could result?
- Would any cost savings be derived? If yes, how might these be captured and allocated?

### Examples of Questions for Subsequent Examination

- a. Desired Outcome
  - Specifically, what benefits would result from this change, and what problem does it address?
- b. Stakeholders

- Who would be affected by this change? How should they be engaged in discussion/decision-making?
  - What are the consequences for districts?
  - What are the consequences for the state?
  - Is the relationship between capital borrowing, taxes, and impact on spending for education well-understood by stakeholders? If not, when and how should this communication occur and by whom?
- c. Budgeting
- Is there a line item in the annual district budgets for Debt Service (principal + interest) and EPS (instruction, student support, operations, etc.)? If not, should there be for added transparency?
- d. Management and Governance
- What changes would be needed in statute, rule, or policy either at the state or municipal levels?
  - What entity would monitor the benefits, or lack thereof, of this approach over time?