

# Project Advisory Team (PAT)

April 7, 2011

4:15 - 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, Douglas Bennett, Michaela Ryan (absent), Bill Beach, Scott Schindler, Bob Vansice (absent), Bernadette Canfield, Michelle O'Connor (absent), Kathy Hutteman, Alan Shaffer (absent), Peter Crooker (absent), Brian Domke

1. At the March 10<sup>th</sup> committee meeting members were requested to complete an evaluation survey of the four options originally presented to the Board of Education:
  - a. Barker Road Middle School – turf field only
  - b. Sutherland High School – turf field and lights
  - c. Mendon High School stadium – turf field only
  - d. Mendon High School back fields – turf field and lights
2. Results were slow to come in so a second (simplified) version was distributed via email. Between the two requests 75% of the members returned opinions/comments.
3. The results of both evaluations, while independent of each other, confirmed consistent results. The committee discussed the findings and points of clarification. Based on the results, the committee members present attained consensus for two of the options and the consensus was the two options should be linked, not exclusive. The final recommendation will be summarized in a report currently in progress.
4. Committee's charge from the BOE was reviewed to confirm all items have been completed. One item remained; *determine potential alternate funding sources*, and remains an area needing further development.
5. Discussion ensued about funding possibilities in light of the State's current financial situation. Mention was made of possible funding sources being donations, booster groups, fund-raising, approaching representatives in Albany for consideration when/if any federal or state funds are available, grants from any governmental agencies, private citizen donations (Webster was example cited), support from local politicians.
6. Brian Domke (Tetra Tech) said almost all districts he has worked with have raised funds independently of state aid and district funds. Inquiry was made as to how much was raised. Brian did not have figures but noted that several districts raised a "substantial" amount to fund the turf option, independent of state/district funds.
7. Comment was made that perhaps local politicians/legislatures could be approached for support in procuring these funds. Project may have more community support if funds were not totally seen as a result of a tax increase.
8. Scott Barker inquired of the community youth groups if they have had success in fund raising or ability to contribute. They stated they have not had need to fund raise in quite a while.

9. Brian Domke spoke about state aid. For the time being no change to the formula has been made. At this time Pittsford projects generate approximately 50% aid, but turf is subject to lower thresholds. However, there has now been a more formal proposal to revamp state aid procedures. With the current economy, changes are likely for next fiscal year. He spoke about the complexities of state aid in relation to the “ceiling cap.” In simplified terms, according to the formula each building generates its own maximum (ceiling cap) aid that can be used within a 5 year time span. Aid will be generated for the specific building up to the ceiling cap at the current formula rate. Once a project exceeds the cap the district is responsible for 100% of the cost over the ceiling cap. Turf would fall under incidental (site) work and as a result would be subject to a much lower cap than the building cap. Maximum cost allowance calculations have been requested from SED.
10. The State has been slower to approve turf field projects and assigns a higher priority to actual building needs. Caution was advised however, since changes have been proposed in a more formal manner, and there have been instances where changes were made retroactively. It was also noted that a balance needs to be arrived at so that should an emergency arise, the amount of the project would not put the District over the ceiling cap. The Building Condition Survey has generated enough needed work to tie a field project to any of the district schools.
11. Inquiry was made to the possible use of corporate sponsorships and SED regulations regarding same. Discussion centered on the legality of such.
12. Possibility of booster clubs donating funds to cover certain aspects of project (i.e. concession stand, storage facility, landscaping) was mentioned. Also mentioned Lions Club and Rotary as possible contributors in other districts.
13. A tentative format for the report to the Superintendent was distributed. The committee inquired on various timelines and “what if” scenarios. Darrin advised he could not speak for the BOE; the roll of the committee was to complete the charge. There was discussion by several members about the economic and political climate and other external factors that could influence the project. Some frustration was expressed that these factors existed last year also.
14. Darrin volunteered to compile a rough draft of the committee’s work into a report. The draft could be emailed to members for review and comment and/or another meeting to fine tune it for submittal to the Superintendent.
15. The committee agreed with this process and the meeting was adjourned.