

April 8, 2009
Southern Cayuga Central School District
King & King Project #09-44-3916
Facilities Planning Committee – Meeting #6
Page 1

Attending:	Leonard Jordan	BOE
	Ted Rejman	BOE
	Dean Winspear	BOE
	Mary Kay Worth	Administration
	Martha Stevermer	Administration
	Luke Carnicelli	Administration
	Pat Reilley	Administration
	Mary Lou Cronin	Administration
	Anita Furness	Faculty
	Kathy Mahaney	Faculty
	Cathy Murray	Faculty
	Becky Davis	Faculty
	Chris Clapper	Faculty
	Maureen Holmes	Faculty
	June Janssen	Support Staff
	John Nedza	Support Staff
	Mary Burns	Support Staff
	Cheryl Jackson	Support Staff
	Pam Hamel	Community
	Peggy Bradley	Community (withdrew 12/9/08)
	Robb Jetty	Community (withdrew 3/10/09)
	Phil Donovan	Community
	Charles Pearson	Community
	Jack Rejman	Community
	John Schmitt	Community
	Jason Benedict	King & King, Architects LLP (K&K)
	Jim King	King & King, Architects LLP

The purpose of this meeting was to continue the Facilities Planning Committee discussions. The following meeting minutes reflect comments and tasks associated with the agenda items discussed at the 4/8/09 meeting.

A. DESIGN OPTIONS:

1. Administration/K&K reviewed the four (4) design options that were recommended by the Facilities Committee for further investigation. Prior to reviewing the summary sheets for each option, committee members were asked to add any additional “pros/cons” to each scheme (see below for additional comments). The following reflect comments & decisions of the committee:

- a. **Design Option A** (PreK – 12 @ Poplar Ridge w/ additions):

- (i) Additional Pro’s:

1. “Allows for growth”
 2. “Addition could allow or meet the needs of young children (drinking fountains/bathrooms”

- (ii) Additional Con’s:

April 8, 2009
Southern Cayuga Central School District
King & King Project #09-44-3916
Facilities Planning Committee – Meeting #6
Page 2

1. “Most expensive”
2. “Loss of aud-performance space”
3. “Loss of gym & cafeteria space for classes”
4. “Loss of gym & cafeteria space for community”
5. “Scheduling questionable for PE & Specials”
6. “Parking space?”
7. “Loss of field space for construction/parking needed for primary students – need to keep separate from MS/HS”
8. “Loss of historical facts”

(iii) Decision: Committee requested further time/information to decide.

b. Design Option B (PreK – 12 @ Poplar Ridge w/o additions):

(i) Additional Pro's:

1. None

(ii) Additional Con's:

1. “Limits growth”
2. “Limited storage space for EH equipment”
3. “Total lack of program – population flexibility”

(iii) Decision: Committee reached a consensus to delete this option. Not feasible.

c. Design Option C (PreK – 4 @ EH plus 5 – 12 @ PR):

(i) Additional Pro's:

1. “Least expensive”
2. “Supports developmentally appropriate education”
3. “Fits in with 2 bus runs”
4. “Physical facilities appropriate for population”
5. “Daily PE classes now”
6. “Use of facilities for community”
7. “Achieves small group teaching spaces to support district curriculum goals”

(ii) Additional Con's:

1. None

(iii) Decision: Committee requested further time/information to decide.

d. Design Option D (PreK – 5 @ EH plus 6 – 12 @ PR):

(i) Additional Pro's:

1. “Achieves ‘Ideal’ elem-ms alignment”

(ii) Additional Con's:

April 8, 2009
Southern Cayuga Central School District
King & King Project #09-44-3916
Facilities Planning Committee – Meeting #6
Page 3

1. None

(iii) Decision: Committee reached a decision to delete this option. Not feasible.

B. COST ANALYSIS:

1. K&K reviewed the “Cost Impacts” for design options A & C. The three (3) cost scenarios prepared by (FA Fiscal Advisor & Marketing, Inc) were very preliminary. Cost assumptions included: Timeline for SED approval early 2011; Building Aid Ratio of 81.2%; Bond Percentage of 95%; State Aid paid over 15 years (Based on assumed interest rate of 3.625%); Bond Rate of 4.5% which represents a difference of 0.875% (conservative). *(Note: Once a specific scope of work was determined by the BOE, a more detailed cost analysis will be required.) Based on this preliminary information, the local share of Option A could potentially be lower than the cost of Option B, even though the first cost is greater for Option A.*
2. Administration (Mary Kay) updated the committee on the Federal Stimulus Package. Based on a recent webinar, the Federal government is to issue “Tax Relief Bonds” (reasonable rates) for eligible school districts proposing Capital Projects. The time frame is unknown but the preliminary qualifications require: construction to be for educational purposes – not for general maintenance projects. Further information is required to determine if this proposed project would qualify.
3. Administration updated the committee on the “Transportation Study.” Results of the study concluded the current # of bus runs are required. At this time, this has no impact on either design option.

C. NEXT STEPS:

1. Committee is to meet again to finalize the most ‘ideal’ design option to recommend to the BOE. Once this recommendation is determined, the BOE will have to decide next steps. Assuming the BOE proceeds with either option, a “Public Relations” campaign will be required to inform the community of the proposed work. *(Note: Depending on the design option that is chosen, additional meeting may be required to define a specific scope of work, cost impact, etc.)*

D. QUESTIONS:

1. What other information is required to assist with a decision for either option A or C? *Committee response:*
 - *A more detailed cost breakdown*
 - *Cost to local taxpayer*
 - *Confirm ‘educational strategies are incorporated into design.*
 - *Cost to demolish E.H.*
 - *Cost of a gym/wellness room*

(Note: Effort(s) to gather as much of this information as possible and send to committee members prior to the next meeting will help the committee in a

April 8, 2009
Southern Cayuga Central School District
King & King Project #09-44-3916
Facilities Planning Committee – Meeting #6
Page 4

final option recommendation. It will also help the committee to anticipate the wider community questions. The more prepared the committee is, the better the chances for success the community meeting will be. We also agree that facilitating for the community meeting would NOT be by administration or King & King. Community committee members are good possibilities. John Schmitt is capable and, with support of people and planning time, is willing.

2. Can the Emily Howland facility be demolished & materials salvaged? *K&K response: Based on a conversation with a local demolition contractor, the type of building precludes it from having a lot of valuable materials to be salvaged. Hence not a viable option.*
3. What will happen with Emily Howland if closed? *K&K response: BOE has to determine next steps.*
4. Can a gym/fitness room be added to offset the loss of E.H. gym? *K&K response: Community can build any type of addition, it may not be aided by the State. If it is a priority, it can be included in the scope of work.*
5. What other scope of work should be considered as part of a renovation project @ P.R.? *Committee response: Science wing renovation, asbestos remediation, ADA upgrades, parking renovations, storage, gymnasium/wellness room,*

E. NEXT MEETING:

1. Next meeting: **Wednesday, May 6, 2009** from 6:30 - 8:30 pm at Poplar Ridge (Jr./Sr. HS).

Please review the above notes and advise of any corrections or additions within five days of receipt.

KING & KING, Architects LLP

Jason Benedict

cc: All Committee Members