

RHINEBECK CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT/FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting of October 5, 2016

Present: Mark Fleischhauer, Deirdre d'Albertis, Lisa Rosenthal, Joe Phelan, Tom Burnell, Sheldon Tieder. Invited guests: Garrett Hamlin & Kristen Bouffard (on phone) - Tetra Tech Architects & Engineers; Luis (Lou) Rodriguez - Palumbo Group, Construction Managers.

The Committee continued its discussion of the anticipated capital project. Garrett reported out on the results of the Community Task Force ("CFT") meetings, with input from Joe, Tom, Mark and Deirdre, who also attended those meetings. Generally, the members of the CFT were supportive of the District's conducting a capital project and the general scope of the project presented to the CFT. Members of the CFT observed that they did not perceive a need for a back-up generator at CLS, though they thought that having a back-up generator at BMS/RHS was appropriate, to provide a place for the community to gather and the Red Cross to provide services in case of an emergency accompanied by loss of power for an extended period.

One member of the CFT also stated that, while he did support the idea of adding a new lighting board for the auditorium stage lighting system, he felt that the cost of such an improvement was not as important as most of the items already included in the potential scope of work that the CFT was reviewing and discussing. Some discussion took place at the Facilities Committee meeting about whether the addition of a new lighting board might be able to be considered in the event that unused funds from a successful capital project referendum might be available at the end of the project.

The same member of the CFT also recommended that the Board try to keep the overall cost of the capital project below \$10 million. Garrett and the other participants reported that after some discussion at the meetings, the CFT recommended that the cost be held to less than \$100 of annual additional tax payment for a home at the median county value. Tom is in the process of developing a schedule showing what amount of cost would drive such a limitation, but he thought that the value would be close to \$11 million, which would encompass all of the Priority 1 items and most of the Priority 2 and 3 items on the draft scope of work.

The Committee spent some time discussing whether there were any big-ticket items in the scope that the CFT did not support, or that administration did not think should be part of the project. Joe stated that proposed corridor connector between the 100 wing and the 140 wing of RHS, budgeted in the scope at \$200,000, did not seem as necessary as it might have first appeared when the scope was being developed. Even with the reduction of passing time, it appeared that students were reaching their classes timely without the connector. (The connector had first been surfaced as a potential item because of concerns about passing time.) Sheldon also expressed that he did not support it, because of the issues related to maintaining the grounds inside what would become a small and largely unusable courtyard. In addition to the corridor connector, Mark identified the item for

the addition of a roof at the loading dock at BMS/RHS (budgeted at \$50,000) as being unnecessary. If it turned out that at the end of the project there was money left over sufficient to roof the loading dock, the district could consider doing so.

The Committee also discussed whether any of the costs budgeted in the scope still appeared to be realistic. Lou Rodriguez stated that in his experience, when curtain walls such as the ones at CLS are opened up for replacement, there are sometimes asbestos materials identified that require unanticipated abatement, such as tiles on the floor above the area being worked on. Lou said that he and Sheldon would inspect the curtain walls to see whether they could identify such materials and, if they did, he would confer with Garrett and Kristen about revising the budget for that work. Otherwise, Lou said that he thought the budgets for the individual items of work seemed appropriate.

The Committee also discussed the suggestion of one member of the CFT that the asbestos floor tiles in the district be abated fully as part of the project, rather than just in BMS/RHS as the scope currently provides for. Garrett and Kristen ran some numbers and concluded that the cost of this work would rise from approximately \$284,000 to about \$1 million. Sheldon and Joe pointed out that the asbestos floor tile in CLS was newer than the same tile in BMS/RHS, and was expected to last longer, so the need to replace it was not immediate as it is in some areas of BMS/RHS. On the other hand, those tiles will have to be removed and replaced at some point, and it will be more expensive to do that piecemeal (as Sheldon and Tom have already found) or at a later timer than if it were done all at once.

Garrett suggested that, rather than planning for a large-scale capital project once every 20+ years, the District consider moving toward smaller projects every 5-8 years, and to stage the abatement of the asbestos tile in the District over 15-20 years, with a portion being done each time a small project was conducted. Tom observed that this would have the added benefit of better managing the District's debt load, so that when debt taken on from a project was retired, the District could take on new debt and keep the debt load level. The Committee suggested that this should be a topic to be taken up in connection with the commencement of the long-range planning project getting underway this year.

The Committee briefly discussed the replacement of the swipe-card and telephone systems, and the enhancement to safety that those changes would bring to the District. The amount budgeted for the swipe-card system (\$50,000) will have to be revisited and likely increased if, as Sheldon proposed, the District were to add swipe-card readers to doors not now outfitted for them, and to centralize the programming of the system (presently, each door is stand-alone and programmed separately). The Committee also briefly discussed the concept, surfaced by a member of the CFT, of adding a small solar demonstration project at CLS or BMS.

The Committee determined that it is not ready to make a formal recommendation to the Board. However, in light of the Board's expressed preference, shared by the Committee, to keep to a schedule that would allow for a referendum to be voted on in December 2016, the Committee requested that Garrett and Kristen revise the presentation made to

the CFT for presentation to the full Board, and that they present this to the Board at its October 11, 2016 meeting. Garrett stated that he believed it was feasible to do so, with the assistance of Sheldon, Tom and Lou. Joe will place this item on the meeting agenda for discussion, with the expectation that it would be voted on for adoption of a referendum by the Board at a special meeting to be held on October 18, 2016.

Next Meeting: October 18, 2016 at 1 P.M.

Dated: October 7, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Rosenthal