

Project Advisory Team (PAT)

February 7, 2011

4:00 - 5:30 P.M.

Notes

Ad Hoc Committee to review athletic field improvements

Committee Members:

Darrin Kenney, Scott Barker, Jeff Beardsley, Karl Thielking, Liz Konar (absent), Douglas Bennett (absent), Michaela Ryan, Bill Beach, Scott Schindler (absent), Bob Vansice (absent), Bernadette Canfield (arrived late), Michelle O'Connor, Kathy Hutteman, Alan Shaffer, Peter Crooker, Brian Domke (absent)

The committee continued its work on the criteria needed to evaluate various options. A preliminary evaluation sheet was distributed and the committee was asked to consider whether additional items were needed, did any items need to be deleted, was there sufficient information available to appraise the items, and consider what priority that item would receive.

Discussions and comments ensued:

Use of town fields – district is limited to upgrades

Hosting sections/tournaments – District is not forced to host sectionals, districts bid for hosting rights. Downside to hosting is “out of district” users in building and grounds. Revenue can be collected from rental of facilities; booster clubs can raise additional funds through concession sales.

Number of booster clubs was questioned. Most sports have booster clubs. Clubs submit by-laws to district. Fund raising must be approved by Superintendent’s office, financial statements are required. Director of Athletics tries to attend meetings of various clubs throughout the year.

Private clubs – CYO basketball, Mustang Soccer, etc. must submit Facility Use request forms, supply proof of insurance and pay for custodial services per policy and regulation 3280

Question was raised how turf would extend/aid PE classes. Unit/activity planning was explained. Weather/field conditions often cause a quick reorganization of plans. PE classes can have as many as 90 students in one class. Old gym facilities had folding doors to help partition into two groups and buffer noise. New gyms use curtains so noise is a factor for teacher.

If lights were part of project, what sort of limitations would be placed on coaches so lights were not on extensively? There could be a schedule established for games and practices. Flexibility may be necessary during spring and fall seasons. Architects will provide displays, presentations to demonstrate the light shed. This would be reviewable should the project progress to Sage II.

With lights brings the question of security at night – is our present arrangement adequate for evening events and possibly larger attendance? It was noted that often teachers are willing to act as chaperones at various events for additional compensation. This is desirable since they often know the students and just their presence can deter problematic behavior. Should it be necessary the district could also contract for security personnel.

Sound Systems – current systems have caused occasional complaints from neighbors. Will this be addressed? It was noted that technicians can help with this current situation by making sure the sound equipment is pointing in the right direction. It was noted that if MHS stadium was redone it would provide an opportunity for the sound system to be upgraded. This would be looked at further in Stage II of committee work pending the Board’s decision of the committee recommendation for Stage I

Involvement of Town and Village – how can we leverage “grants” or funds to help fund or replace fields when necessary? Does Town or Village support this endeavor? Both have indicated support of the concept but neither has offered any financial support at this time.

The State aid climate was discussed. It was noted that the State has been slow in approving projects.

The issue of “branding” was brought up. The district cannot promote for profit companies.

Next meeting March 10th at 4:00 P.M. in meeting room #2 BRMS