**MEMORANDUM**

TO: North Syracuse Swimming Pool Study Advisory Committee

FROM: Bill Silky

RE: Meeting Notes-Meeting of January 30, 2018

DATE: February 1, 2018

**Attendance**:

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

Consultants: Bill Silky

Observers: Don Keegan, Michael Shusda, Annette Speach, Brad Ranieri, Gina Gabrielli, Billie Jo Lenning, Sandi Thorne

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 first 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.

2. Using a Powerpoint presentation, Bill started by reminding the committee of the charge (critical question) the Board asked the committee to address. He then indicted that in the final analysis, the recommendations to the Board are those of the committee and not simply his a facilitator. Therefore, to arrive at the committee’s recommendations, recommended options should be both “feasible” as well as “desirable”. To get to this point, Bill said ideally the committee should make decisions by consensus (everyone can at least live with what is recommended), however if a member indicates s/he cannot live with a specific recommendation then a vote of the committee will be taken and the majority will dictate whether a specific recommendation will be included or not.

3. Bill then shared the options the committee generated at its initial meeting including:

* Continue current practice
* Build a pool onto one of the district’s schools
* Rent a pool facility (i.e., Mid-State Hockey grant)
* Work with the community to build a pool (one of the towns)
* Collaborate with an adjacent school district to construct a pool
* Collaborate with a local health club for pool access
* Develop a pool for year round aquatics (*it was questioned if this was really an option or simply something that could perhaps be accomplished with several of the above options)*

4. Bill reported that a great deal of information had been collected from a variety of sources such as Brad Ranieri (swim coach) and district employees to help inform the continued discussion of the committee. He then proceeded to walk the committee through the gathered information.

* A 5 lane pool can host 99% of competitions & community events but not host a state meet
* A diving event can be held in a 6 lane 25 yard pool like Red Creek
* Cicero Twin Rinks could be nice location but historically has had no money for a pool
* CNS teams can be successful without a pool but continued reliance on a city pool is an issue
* Pools of the size of Red Creek don’t require an Aquatics Director, however if the community use the facility a director is required
* In 2007 (11 years ago) some parents (not architects) reported a pool cost (pool & building) ranged from $1.29-$1.55 million for one similar to Red Creek
* Both the NSJH and C-NS have site space to add a pool

Using maps of the school sites (C-NS and NSJH)-

* Both school sites have complexity-C-NS on the east side would displace parking lots, thus adding parking and complicate traffic situation; on the south side of the building tennis courts would have to be removed. Both parking and tennis courts would have to be replaced.
* At NSJH, the back of the building, where the basketball courts are now is the most logical location but the courts would have to be replaced
* Both schools would need critical infrastructure upgrades (such as electrical service).
* The district does own two parcels of land that could be used: Land adjacent to C-NS just east and south of he Canteen (4.9 acres) & 30 acres on the corner of Lawton and Crabtree in the Town of Cicero
* According to Alexandra Knipp (Assistant Operations Manager for both Twin Rinks and Cicero Family Fitness and a committee member), they have secured grant funds to be used in connection with loan proceeds to finance the cost of both a third sheet of ice AND an aquatics facility. They would be interested in meeting the needs of both current clients-C-NS and F-M.
* School districts in the immediate area that have swimming pools include B’ville, Liverpool, J-D, and West Genesee. Each is current being surveyed to gather information. The results will be presented at the next meeting.
* According to B S & K (the district’s law firm), NYS Education Law details permissible uses of school property. Buildings and grounds may not be used for the benefit of any private, for-profit entity.
* There is both state aid and grant opportunities to fund school pools. However, state aid is available to fund gym stations based on student population and NSCSD already has the required number of gym stations at the Junior and Senior High Schools. That said, the district may be able to justify to the NYS Education Department Office of Facility Planning one or two more stations depending on modifications/repurposing of existing gym stations. If so, it would make the most sense to add a pool at the high school or junior high to maximize aid. Based on calculations, the district *might* be able to get $1,250,000 for two gym stations. This would take negotiations with SED.
* It currently costs the district about $23,000 annually to rent a pool: $13,200 to Syracuse City and $9,750 to Le Moyne College (plus $350 per meet). This is not the total cost of the swimming program however.
* To determine if there is another area district (such as Central Square) that might have an interest in working on a joint pool, the district would have to formally solicit interest and get a legal opinion regarding the ability to collaborate. More likely, it would be a non-profit agency that would rent to both school districts.
* The district would need to formally solicit interest and obtain a legal opinion regarding its ability to collaborate on a facility with a local municipality (town or village). Again, it is more likely a non-profit agency would rent to both the school district and town/village.

Regarding the two bulleted item above, Bill suggested a formal letter be sent to Central Square, the Village of North Syracuse, and the other townships that are within the North Syracuse Central School District to see if any interest exists with these other entities. A draft letter was presented and approved by the committee to send.

* At this time, it is uncertain what the position of a local health club such as Aspen is regarding working on a pool project with NSCSD. It was approved that a formal inquiry be made to test this possible interest.
* The estimated cost of building a swimming pool depends on the size of the pool and amount of site work. However, the range of cost from King & King architects over the past few years has been $4 million for a 10,000 sq. ft. pool facility to $15 million for a 40,000 sq. ft. facility.
* Clyde-Savannah just had a pool approved last May (6 lane, 25 yards) similar to 97% of school pools in NYS. Victor CSD, in 2013, developed a pool that is the   
  “Cadillac”—8 lanes with separate diving pool/lap pool—in 1% of pools in NYS school districts.
* The district’s architect firm (King & King) indicated the only recent pool project they know about was the Naples Central School District.
* A representative from Clyde-Savannah said “funding the construction of a new pool is very challenging and unless the stars align the right way, available aid (if any) is usually the biggest factor in making the decision to move forward with including a pool in a referendum. Because we are doing a ‘gut renovation’ of our existing pool space as opposed to building a standalone new construction, our aid was higher. In the overall project, we were actually able to pick up additional aid on other spaces which helped in the large scope of things. A healthy capital project reserve fund and aid schedule from previous capital projects certainly helped things as well.”

5. The committee discussed the above findings a generated a number of questions that need to be pursued including:

* Since the high school and junior high school are at their maximum number of gym stations given building enrollment, how can the district make a case for a new pool?
* What is actually considered a gym station (tennis courts? Outdoor basketball courts?) and is a pool considered just one station?
* Does the district have any money in a capital fund? (*the district answered this saying it has all been used for the current capital projects)*
* Can we add a Syracuse City high school to the survey the committee is conducting of area districts with a pool?
* Can the district architects provide information on the best way to attach a pool facility to the NSJH and C-NS?
* Is there an elementary school site that could possibly be used for a pool facility?
* Could some cost projections be presented and show the impact to the local taxpayer?
* If the tennis courts at the high school are torn up, could it be possible to just remove two or relocate the tennis teams to the new courts at the Junior High?
* Would funding (state aid) be less if the district built a pool facility on district owned land not attached to a building?
* Is building aid still available to the district if a pool facility is built on the NSJH or C-NS site but not physically attached to the building?
* Does a new pool facility require DOT approval?
* Would state aid be available if the district built a joint pool facility with another school district such as Central Square?
* Would it be possible to get bullet aid perhaps with Al Stirpe’s assistance to help fund the pool facility?
* What grants might be available to help fund a pool facility?
* Can a school district rent a pool facility from a for-profit organization?

6. The committee then worked in sub-groups to take the information presented and update the pro/con lists for each possible option. Following this, the sub-groups reported out and summary sheets were given to Bill to update. He said he would return the updated summary at the next meeting.

7. The meeting was opened to observers to ask questions and/or make comments. Just a couple of comments were expressed.

I believe this covers the essence of the discussions at our meeting on January 30th. If you have questions with these notes, please feel free to contact me.

C: Annette Speach