

**GUILFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2011
GUILFORD HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY, GUILFORD, CT**

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Bill Bloss called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Board members present were Keith Bishop, Bill Bloss, Mary Beeman, Alan Meyers, Chris Moore, Barbara Dudley, Susan Renner, John Ireland and Ted Zuse. Administrators present were Tom Forcella, Anne Keene and Rick Misenti. Also present was Accounting Manager Linda Trudeau.

2. Discuss and Consider Facility Options for Guilford High School

Chairman Bloss stated that the decision that the Board will make regarding the best option to address the facility needs of the high school is its most important decision in recent times and will effect Guilford for many years.

Mike Ayles, Chair of the Board of Education Options Review Committee explained to the Board that the Department of Education has stated that, in the Governor's proposed 2011-12 budget, reimbursement rates for new school construction are expected to be reduced significantly. He stated that this will impact project applications submitted after June 30, 2011.

The Board proceeded to outline the positive and negative attributes of each of the four options recommended by the Options Review Committee and posed questions they had regarding each option. Dr. Keene recorded the Board member's comments on easel pads to make it easy to review the attributes.

The following are the attributes and questions stated by Board members regarding the **Baseline Option** with a projected Gross Cost of \$37,428,900 and a net cost after State reimbursement of \$34,434,588:

Positive Attributes:

- Cheaper to taxpayer in short-term
- Uncommitted decisions
- Program less at-risk (operating budget)
- Ventilation code requirements

Negative Attributes:

- Does not correct major problems: hallways, multiple roofs, layout, lack of collaborative space
- Cost escalation over 20 years
- Cannot be fitted as an emergency shelter
- Duplicated soft costs
- Deteriorating building – continuous repairs
- Long-term expenses
- Five phases – 12 portables
- Does not meet educational specifications
- Energy inefficient

Questions:

- What would be included in the projected costs beyond the initial maintenance?
- Is it reasonable to bond over 20 years? 30 years?

Mike Ayles noted that the Bond Council determines how many years to bond a project.

Mr. Ireland commented that it is important to stress that with the Baseline Option you still have a 60-year old building that will need continuous repairs.

The following are the attributes and questions stated by Board members regarding the **Renovate-Like-New Option** with a projected Gross Cost of \$67,240,300 and a net cost after State reimbursement of \$47,068,210:

Positive Attributes:

- Good for 20 years
- Air conditioning and ventilation
- No disturbance to fields
- Somewhat lower cost
- Improved learning environment
- Could retrofit alternative energy

Negative Attributes:

- Does not meet educational specifications
- Footprint the same – expanding hallways could reduce class space
- Security issues
- Roof area the same – 163,000 SF
- Asbestos abatement
- 12 portables
- Difficult process for students/staff
- Cafeteria in same place
- Undersized auditorium
- Constrained ventilation/air quality

Questions:

- How does interior floor plan change?

Architect Ryszard Szczepk noted that the footprint (SF) of the building will remain the same with this option and that all windows and electrical systems would be replaced. He explained that the building would be ventilated with air conditioning throughout.

The following are the attributes and questions stated by Board members regarding the **Renovate-Like-New + Replacement Option** with a projected Gross Cost of \$76,658,340 and a net cost after State reimbursement of \$55,013,696:

Positive Attributes:

- Might have broad voter support
- Continue with larger gym
- Fields untouched
- Meets educational specifications
- Saves science wing
- Accessible to the community
- Larger auditorium and cafeteria
- Classroom wing with collaborative space
- Least expensive to meet educational specifications
- Ventilation and air conditioning
- Location site appealing
- 1% additional contingency

Negative Attributes:

- Asbestos abatement
- Still 30% old building
- Roof area greater than new construction – 166,175 SF
- Three-year project – construction interference – could impact enrollment

- Wasted circulation space

Questions:

- Is there a way to lower the cost?
- What might the compromises be?
- How do we add for an emergency shelter?

Mr. Zuse asked about the contingency estimates included in the options and if this money usually gets spent. Mr. Szczypek responded that it usually does.

The following are the attributes and questions stated by Board members regarding the **New Construction Option** with a projected Gross Cost of \$87,970,800 and a net cost after State reimbursement of \$62,409,919:

Positive Attributes:

- Shorter time and less disruption
- Meets educational specifications – optimal space
- Could be on other location on same site
- Less building risk
- Easier and lower cost to maintain
- Gain an athletic field
- Efficient technology backbone; space use
- Opens up options; less disruption to building process
- Reimbursement rate 31% - will not last
- 95,400 SF roof – smallest of all options
- \$25 million less than earlier plans
- Parking and traffic pattern

Negative Attributes:

- Highest cost option for short term
- Temporary disruption to athletic field
- 280 feet (possibly) from Long Hill property line
- History of referenda

Questions:

- Is there a way to lower the cost?
- What might the compromises be?

The Board continued with a discussion about alternative energy and how and when costs for these items should be included in a project cost. Mr. Szczypek suggested that a decision about which alternative energy options are to be incorporated should be made when the option is chosen by the Board.

Sid Gale provided an explanation to the Board of co-generation, an alternative energy source for electricity and heat during times of energy stress.

Mr. Gale suggested that a placeholder be made for alternative energy since the Board would not be choosing a specific energy source at this time. He noted that geothermal has a more immediate payback but co-generation has grant opportunities.

The Board also discussed including an emergency shelter in the project estimated at \$300,000 - \$500,000.

The Board discussed whether the alternative energy options and emergency shelter should be a separate referendum question.

Mr. Bishop distributed a handout on the impact that the four options would have on students attending the high school during the years that construction and/or renovation would be taking place.

Discussion continued regarding removing the Baseline Option from consideration. Mr. Bishop suggested eliminating the Baseline Option and deferring the discussion and decision on the remaining three options to another meeting based on the time.

Upon a motion made by Dr. Moore and seconded by Dr. Meyers, the Board voted seven in favor of removing the Baseline Option from consideration. Mr. Ireland and Mr. Zuse abstained from the vote.

Mr. Zuse expressed concern that the Board may have to consider this option in the future.

Chairman Bloss stated that he would like to hear answers to the questions raised tonight prior to making a decision.

Dr. Forcella noted that the Option Review Committee would like to continue its work as a communications committee to educate and communicate the Board's decision to the public. He also stated that others would like to get involved with the process.

Chairman Bloss stated that the Board will meet on Tuesday, April 19, 2011, at 7 p.m. to continue reviewing the facility options and make a decision on which option to recommend.

Mike Ayles addressed the request made at a previous Board meeting by a Board member to survey parents and possibly the community to get opinions on which option they would support. He explained that it would be too difficult to communicate the amount of information the public would need in a survey format for them to be able to make an informed decision.

Dr. Meyers noted that there would not be an effective way to reach community members with a survey as the school system only has wide access to the email addresses of parents.

Upon a motion made by Dr. Meyers and seconded by Mrs. Dudley, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Lorri Hahn
Clerk to the Board of Education