

MEMORANDUM

TO: North Syracuse Swimming Pool Study Advisory Committee

FROM: Bill Silky

RE: Meeting Notes-Meeting of March 13, 2018

DATE: March 16, 2018

Attendance:

Committee Members: Alexandra Knipp, Annette Francescotti, David Sargalski, David Towers, Kevin Eager, Andy Harrington, Jody Rogers, Joseph Blidy, Patrick Kennedy, Kristin Purdy, Marlene Bittner, Michael Kubala, Nichole Polos, Raymond Patraw, Sarah Jobin, Walter Dengos

Consultants: Bill Silky

Observers: Michael Shusda, John Shehadi, Annette Speach, Brad Ranieri, Paul Gill, David Campbell, Maria Francescotti, Matt Francescotti, Doreen Dengos, Kamryn Lenning, Ryleigh Lenning, Bille Lenning, Scott Griffin, Sandi Thorne, Paul Johnston, Eli Ward Ryan Heitmann, Garrett Pitre, Michael Ferguson, Owen Flahuty, Gretchen Walter, Sarah Walter, Rick Walter, Bill Gabrielli, Steve Cooley, Susan Cooley, Nicole Ward, Aidan Menkins, Damon Pientowski, Amanda Hamann, Janna Kulakowski, Mark Kulakowski, Theresa Leonard, Paul Leonard, John Cifaratta, Anthony Cifaratta, Jennifer Ferguson, Nicholas Ferguson, Brenda Lenweaver, Richard Carroll, Jr., Barb Carroll, Jessica Svoboda, Cassidy Svoboda, Gabriella Svoboda, Robert McRobbie, Conor Burke, Melissa Burke, Michelle Tolhurst, Carly Tolhurst, Emma Warner, Jason Warner, Stephen O'Driscoll, Beth Williams, Adam Rein, Christine Dallmann, Nathan Dallmann, Jean Payrot, Bri Smith, Laura Petralla, Jeanne Vinette

Location: District Office

1. Bill Silky opened the meeting by reviewing the meeting protocol and the dates of future meetings. He also asked if everyone had received the notes from the February 27th meeting and if there were any changes or additions. Everyone reported they did receive the notes and no changes/additions were noted so the minutes stand as written. The agenda for this evening's meeting was reviewed and attendance was taken.
2. Using a Powerpoint presentation, Bill once again started by reminding the committee of the charge (critical question) the Board asked the committee to address.
3. Bill then indicated that only one committee member (Joe Blidy) had submitted additional information to be added to the option of renting a pool by the district. His input included two additional advantages related to having a private organization construct a pool versus the district. His additions were added to the pro/con list.
4. Updates to the previous King & King presentation were then shared with the committee. At the committee's request, King & King developed concept drawings of how an 8-lane pool might

be added to either the Junior High or C-NS. He further shared the updated estimated costs for either a 6-lane pool (the state aid local share amount was adjusted) and an 8-lane pool. Bill said that King & King had run these estimates by both the Aquatics Development Group and also USA Swimming. Bill also reported that the district apparently had done a detailed cost analysis 10+ years ago on the maintenance and operating costs of a pool in the district and at that time it was projected to be about \$150,000 per year. He further indicated that this amount would be quite a bit higher today given the time differential.

5. At this point in the meeting, Bill introduced John Shehadi from Fiscal Advisors and Marketing to share their analysis of the borrowing of money and impact to the local taxpayer for pool construction. After introducing himself and offering some background on Fiscal Advisors, John talked through several slides. The first slide indicated that the district would borrow money and repay it over 20 years for construction of a pool in varying amounts (\$6,000,000 to \$10,000,000 in million dollar increments). He shared what the local share annually would be depending on 30 or 60-building aid units. The following two slides John presented illustrated the potential impact to the local taxpayer owning a \$100,000 full-value assessed property, using the range of costs noted above, at either the Junior High or C-NS. The range of annual cost went from \$9.41 to \$17.87 per year to this homeowner. John concluded his presentation by taking questions, some of which revolved around the cost of borrowing, which he indicated is very low at the moment.

6. Bill then introduced Brad Ranieri, a district swim coach, who shared a survey he had conducted of other schools districts that posed the question: “Does the district pay a full-time custodian whose **only** job is to take care of the pool or is the pool just one of many responsibilities that a custodian has to tend to?” The amount of custodial time varied from 10-15 hours per week. Brad indicated that no district surveyed assigned a full-time custodian to this duty.

7. Before narrowing the options the committee would recommend the Board consider, Bill reviewed what “feasible” and “desirable” means as far as selecting options and the decision making process the committee would be using to finalize its recommendations. He then reported from the following meeting he surmised the committee had reduced its options to two: Either the district constructs its own pool (6 or 8 lanes, at the Junior High or at C-NS) or continues renting pool time from a local organization (Twin Rinks, Aspen or the Y). He reported that the North Area Y Operations Director, Cheryl Walker, said their 25-yard pool is used every day from 4-8 p.m. thus limiting its access and her facility could not address all of the district’s needs. Bill also added that in checking with Skaneateles Central Schools that rents pool time from their local YMCA that they have their varsity girls’ swim team use the pool and the Y charges \$15 per lane plus a flat fee of \$780 per meet; the total cost to the school district from August to November this past fall was \$11,320.

Considerable discussion ensued and resulted in the committee voting on the options to present to the Board. The majority of the committee voted to recommend only that the Board consider construction of a pool either at the Junior High or at the High School and either a 6 or 8-lane pool. The option of possibly renting from another local agency was dropped from consideration

8. Bill then reminded the committee of the criteria he shared at an earlier meeting that should govern any recommendations including: (a) will benefit students, (b) will be sensitive to the unique cultural context of the school district, (c) will be independent of special interest groups, (d) will be educationally sound, (e) will be fiscally responsible and realistic, and (f) will present options for access to a swimming pool for district use. The committee agreed that the recommendation of the district constructing its own pool did in fact meet these criteria,

9. Bill then shared what he presented as possible additional recommendations the committee could make for Board consideration including: (a) the Board should study the report and related documents then consider the options (advantages and disadvantages) the committee is recommending, (b) either the full-board or a sub-committee of the Board should conduct a public hearing on the options under consideration, and (c) Last, the Board should select an option that it believes is in the best interest of the community and school district and develop a plan for moving forward to implement the option. Discussion took place regarding (b) above with some committee members feeling this was overkill and just another delay in making a decision. This recommendation came to a vote and the majority of the committee voted to leave (b) in as a recommendation for the Board's consideration.

10. The committee meeting then was concluded and the floor was open for observers to question and/or comment. The first speaker was Brad Ranieri who spoke to the committee and questioned the cost estimates that King & King had presented. Brad shared that he had contacted an organization that is knowledgeable about swimming pool construction and was told that King & King's estimates were too high. Paul Johnston from King & King indicated that their analysis was conservative as a district cannot exceed the amount approved by a community should actual costs come in higher than expected and at this stage in the process these are simply estimates. He went on to say that until the Board decides on a specific direction, more precise cost estimates cannot be determined. Following this exchange, a number of other meeting observers (students, parents, another swim coach) stood and spoke in favor of the district constructing its own swimming pool.

The meeting concluded at approximately 8:55.

I believe this covers the essence of the discussions at our meeting on March 13th. If you have questions with these notes, please feel free to contact me.

C: Annette Speach