

HARBORFIELDS CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
GREENLAWN, NEW YORK

Kind of Meeting	-	Special Meeting
Date of Meeting	-	July 22, 2015
Place of Meeting	-	OMS Auditorium
Board Members Present	-	Dr. McDonagh, Mr. Mastroianni, Ms. Gaughan, Mr. Giuliano, Mr. Lee, Ms. Lustig and Mr. Steinberg
Board Members Absent	-	None
Others Present	-	Ms. Todaro, Mr. Nimmo, Mr. Cox Ms. Whelan, Mr. Fred Seeba and Mr. Curt Coronoto, BBS Architects and Community Members

Mr. Mastroianni called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion duly made by Ms. Gaughan, seconded by Mr. Steinberg, and carried (5-0) the board and district office administrators moved to Executive Session at 6:45 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the employment history of a particular individual. Mr. Giuliano joined the meeting at 6:48 p.m., and Dr. McDonagh arrived at 6:54 p.m.

The board reconvened the special meeting at 7:35 p.m., and Dr. McDonagh led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

HUMAN RESOURCES

5.1 Professional Appointments

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Giuliano, seconded by Mr. Lee, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the following professional appointments, in accordance with the schedules attached to the official minutes of July 22, 2015, were approved.

Probationary		
Name	School	Assignment
Tara Falasco	OMS/WDPS	K-8 Assistant Principal
Part-time		
Name	School	Assignment
Crystal Carrion	HHS	LOTE Teacher (0.6)

5.2 Recall from Preferred Eligible List

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Lee, seconded by Ms. Gaughan, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the following employee was recalled to service.

Whereas, a part-time vacancy is deemed to exist in the tenure area listed below and the teacher listed below has been identified as the most senior person on the District's Preferred Eligible List in such tenure area it is hereby resolved that the following staff member be recalled to service in accordance with Section 2510.3 of the Education Law.

Name	Assignment	School
Cari Sacks	Elementary Teacher	WDPS

5.3 Extracompensation Appointment Schedule

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Steinberg, seconded by Mr. Giuliano, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the appointee specified on the Extracompensation Appointment Schedule, as attached to the official minutes of July 22, 2015, was approved.

5.4 Substitute List Addendum

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Mastroianni, seconded by Mr. Steinberg, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the substitute list addendum as attached to the official minutes of July 22, 2015 was approved for the maximum period through June 30, 2016 to serve at the pleasure of the Board.

5.5 Civil Service Appointment

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Giuliano, seconded by Mr. Lee, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the following civil service appointment, in accordance with the schedule attached to the official minutes of July 22, 2015, was approved.

Contingent Permanent Probationary		
Name	School	Assignment
Mirgile Fresnel	Business Office	Senior Account Clerk

INSTRUCTION

6.1 Student Internship Placement

Upon motion duly made by Ms. Gaughan, seconded by Mr. Giuliano, and carried unanimously (7-0), and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, the following graduate student, Sara Norouzieh, be provided with the opportunity to complete a non-paid, 21 hour per week internship commencing in the fall of 2015, for the 2015-2016 school year. As specified, Ms. Norouzieh will be assigned to the Thomas J. Lahey Elementary School.

COMMUNITY FORUM – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BOND PROJECT

Ms. Todaro announced that tonight's meeting was added to the schedule in an effort to afford the community with another opportunity to comment on the capital improvement bond, while also providing the board with an opportunity to review and discuss the bond projects in detail. Ms. Todaro offered a brief presentation on the Capital Improvement Bond Project. She reviewed information previously presented with regard to the list of projects, financing period for the bond (15 years), and the anticipated state aid reimbursement the district would receive during that period (51%). She also presented information on the estimated property tax increase the bond would carry based on a home's assessed value. She reminded everyone that the board will identify the final list of projects at the August 26, 2015 board meeting and the referendum will be put before the community on Tuesday, October 27, 2015. All information on the capital bond may be found on the district's website. Ms. Todaro also thanked Messrs. Seeba and Coronoto from BBS Architects and Engineers for their attendance at tonight's meeting.

Dr. McDonagh acknowledged the amount of feedback the board has received from the community with regard to the capital bond, and he explained that the board would review the proposed list of capital projects item by item this evening.

As the board members proceeded with their review of the proposed capital project list, various questions and/or points of clarification were posed to district administration and the architects, some of which included:

HHS Auditorium Projects

Question: Why is the cost of the proposed sound system presented as a range rather than a set price?

Answer: A price range is presented since the exact type of sound system has yet to be selected; it would depend on how sophisticated a system the district wishes to purchase.

Question: How is the auditorium typically used?

Answer: The auditorium is used by all students in the theater program, for district concerts and assemblies. On occasion, outside presenters will also use it.

HHS Gymnasium Projects

Question: Given the heat elevation in the gym, would a portable cooling system be cost effective?

Answer: The rental fee for a portable cooling system would run approximately \$30,000 and the cost to purchase such equipment would be significantly more.

Question: Are the bleachers ADA compliant?

Answer: Yes, NYSED requires ADA compliance on all new projects.

HHS Instructional Area Projects

Question: What is the plan to reconfigure the choral room?

Answer: The room needs upgrading to accommodate the number of students who utilize it, therefore, the practice rooms will be removed to create a larger space.

HHS Athletic Projects

Question: Why the need for a new wellness center?

Answer: The existing wellness center doesn't really meet the needs of all our students. Moving the wellness center would allow for more students to use it for dance, cardio, etc., and would involve expanding the equipment and providing adaptive PE opportunities for our students. The existing wellness center area would be used to create a multi-media computer lab and expand the journalism program.

Question: Does the cost of the wellness center include equipment?

Answer: Yes, there is an allocation of \$125,000 for equipment.

Question: What is the useful life expectancy of the equipment?

Answer: Assuming the district purchases commercial grade equipment, life expectancy may be anywhere from 15 to 20 years.

Question: Can the equipment purchase be bonded?

Answer: Yes, if it's part of the overall project.

Question: Will the tennis courts be redone or refurbished?

Answer: The courts will be replaced, not refurbished.

Question: Are there some tennis courts not being replaced?

Answer: Yes, four courts are being replaced; two were previously replaced.

HHS Facility Renovation Projects

Question: The ladies room renovation includes expansion of the area?

Answer: Yes

Question: Does the abatement of the floor tiles throughout the high school complete the district's asbestos abatement?

Answer: It will bring it very close to completion.

Question: How many new spaces will the parking lot renovation create?

Answer: Thirty new spaces and navigation for the buses will improve.

Question: How will the proposed storage building be used?

Answer: Storage building will be a central location for all sports equipment.

Question: Is the architect's suggested cost of the building a firm cost?

Answer: We remain in contact with various manufacturers to get competitive quotes and are hopeful that the cost may be reduced.

Question: How large a facility will the new storage building be?

Answer: Approximately 35' x 35'.

Question: Will the proposed ADA path provide access to all athletic fields?

Answer: The path will provide access to the football field stadium with outlets to several of the other fields along the way.

Question: Is it possible to look into having accessibility to all fields?

Answer: Expansion of the path by Pulaski Road was explored.

Question: Is the cost included?

Answer: Per the architect, it is included.

OMS Gymnasium Projects

Question: Why the need for the boys and girls locker room renovation?

Answer: The lockers are 50 years old and physically don't accommodate the equipment.

Question: With ADA compliant bleachers, would the number of seats change?

Answer: The ADA compliant bleachers should provide approximately the same number of seats.

OMS Athletic Projects

Question: Does the lacrosse field presently have irrigation?

Answer: No, it does not. A new irrigation system would improve the condition of the field.

Question: What's involved in the renovation of the fields?

Answer: The renovation includes removal of the clay fields and improving drainage. It includes new infields, new grass and improved irrigation.

Question: Is there fencing included?

Answer: No

Question: Perhaps we can look into something for ball retention?

OMS Facility Renovation Projects

Question: Will the masonry pointing take care of all re-pointing costs?

Answer: It will take care of all existing areas. New areas may crop up years from now, but everything that currently needs to be done is included.

Question: Should we include more money, as a contingency measure for future needs?

Answer: Probably not since we have no way of knowing when the mortar would fail.

Question: Can we slow the deterioration?

Answer: Unfortunately, no. Old construction did not include what today's construction standards include. The district could ask the community to use funds from the capital reserve should a problem crop up in the next several years.

TJL Gymnasium Projects

Question: What will the multi-sensory learning lab entail?

Answer: It involves a realignment of curriculum, similar to a wellness activity center, and would provide multi-sensory ADA compliant equipment. The space is presently a storage facility, so it will be reconfigured and new equipment will be purchased. The cost for the equipment is included in the bond.

TJL Facility Renovation Projects

Question: Does the parking renovations include additional spaces?

Answer: No, there's no additional parking, only repaving of the existing area and drainage improvements.

WDPS Facility Renovation Projects

Question: What does the expansion of the parking area provide?

Answer: The expansion of the parking area will provide 20 additional parking stalls.

District-Wide Facility Renovation Project

Question: Why is the cost not reflected for the proposed ADA playground?

Answer: Since the exact size of the structure is unknown at this point, a precise cost could not be provided.

Question: If the ADA playground is located at the library park, would it be eligible for state aid?

Answer: No, the library park location would not be considered aid eligible; installation at TJL would be eligible for the district's anticipated 51% state aid.

HHS Athletic Field Projects (Turf and Grass Fields)

Question: A significant amount of money has been allocated in the bond to improve some grass fields. What would that give us?

Answer: The fields would be improved through the removal of the topsoil, regrading of the sub-grade, drainage installation and new natural grass.

Question: Which fields are the ones earmarked for improvement?

Answer: Included are the practice field and three nearby fields. It does not include the football and softball fields.

Question: If a turf field wasn't installed, would the cost be the same for a new grass field for football and softball?

Answer: Roughly the same, perhaps a little more since it's a larger field.

Question: What is the cost of maintaining the natural grass fields?

Answer: Approximately \$25,000 per year to keep them in excellent condition.

Question: What different types of infill are available for a synthetic turf field and what would be the applicable increase in cost?

Answer: There are six different types of infill available. The primary type of infill is crumb rubber, which represents the least expensive choice. In addition to crumb rubber, other fills include cool fill, which contains crumb rubber encased in two layers of colorant sealer, which provides for reduced heat and complete encapsulation of the crumb rubber. It would cost approximately \$85,000 extra. The architect has installed five fields with cool fill. Another alternative is Nike grind, which is made from recycled Nike sneakers. While the architect has not installed fields using this type of fill, it is becoming a popular choice although availability is a concern. It would cost approximately \$185,000 additional. Rounded silica sand is another infill that is used. This product is non-toxic, chemically stable and fracture resistant and requires installation of a shock pad. The approximate additional cost is around \$316,000. EPDM (Ethylene Propylene Diene Monomer) is a polymer elastomer with high resistance to abrasion and wear; commonly used in roofing membranes. The cost of such a fill would run approximately \$362,000 additional. Lastly, there is organic infill, which is a combination of natural cork and coconut. This, too, would require the installation of a shock pad and would cost approximately \$385,000 additional.

Question: What would be the architect's recommendation?

Answer: Cool fill; you don't hear the same issues with this type of fill; it's cooler material because it's colored and has the least increased cost.

- Question: The cost estimate provided is for a crumb rubber infill?
Answer: Yes
- Question: Four grass fields would become five if a turf field were not included in the bond. What's the comparison of maintenance costs between natural grass and turf?
Answer: Annual maintenance of grass fields would run \$25,000 to keep them in excellent condition; a turf field would cost approximately \$7,500 in maintenance annually.
- Question: What's the cost difference for drainage between grass and turf?
Answer: The cost is about the same. The grass drainage system is not being recreated but instead taking what the district has now and making it better.
- Statement: Neither the softball or baseball fields have a score board; would like to see enhancements done to those fields. Perhaps use the money that we'd spend on the practice fields and use it for those fields.
- Question: Is the field hockey field being addressed?
Answer: Yes
- Question: If the district were to make a commitment to a turf field, can we decrease the projects on the grass fields; would it be necessary to spend money for the grass field renovations?
Answer: That would be up to the district. The grass fields do need work; they'd be completely renovated. The scope of the project could be reduced, depending on what the district wants to do.
- Question: What is the cost to replenish the turf field?
Answer: Approximately \$600,000 to replace the infill in today's dollars. Each type of infill would cost more, depending on the condition and how much of the field could be reused.

Mr. Nimmo offered a brief overview on how the financing of the bond would work and how the state aid reimbursement would be received by the district.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A resident thanked the board and administration for all their hard work and transparency with this process; however, she expressed concern that she's not really hearing "apples to apples" when it comes to the numbers. She suggested that all of the variables be put together in one format and placed on the district's website.

A resident questioned if the multi-sensory learning lab at TJL could be paid for through a grant, similar to what was done at Washington Drive School. Ms. Todaro responded that grant funding would be explored. The resident also inquired about the life expectancy on the different infill materials for the turf field. The architect responded that organic typically requires more maintenance and replenishment, but the life expectancy is similar for all types of infill, 8 to 12 years on average. The resident also suggested that the district look into making the tennis court gate ADA compliant.

A resident (retired athletic director) stated that you could argue the pros and cons of turf fields forever. She advised that field hockey is the one sport that would benefit the most

from a turf field. Since students will want to practice on the same type of field they play on, usage will be considerable. She mentioned that Cold Spring Harbor CSD had the good fortune to have their turf field donated to them and money was placed in escrow for its upkeep. How is our district going to pay for replacement? She urged the board to keep that cost in mind when making their decision.

A resident stated that he would feel selfish not supporting the bond in its entirety. He doesn't understand why the turf field is such a lightning rod since the bond offers something for everyone. He supports a bond inclusive of a turf field.

A resident questioned the necessity to install a turf field. Ms. Todaro responded that when evaluating our facilities, the vision was to provide our students with opportunities similar to those available in other districts. Our athletic students frequently play against teams that have a turf field, so the installation of one in our district would provide a competitive opportunity for our students. Additionally, the versatility of a turf field provides for increased playing time that is not available on grass fields.

A resident and member of the Greenlawn Civic Association suggested splitting the bond into two propositions. He also encouraged the board to move forward with the Town of Huntington regarding the library park property. Ms. Todaro responded that the district is continuing its discussions with the town regarding a long-term use and maintenance agreement, one that may include the installation of an ADA playground.

A resident inquired about how long the coating used in the cool fill infill would last? The architect responded that it should last approximately 10 to 12 years. She suggested it might be worth paying a little extra for the Nike grind, and she hopes the board gives serious consideration to all the alternatives.

A resident expressed disappointment that some projects were removed from the list, specifically the boilers at TJL, as that project offers payback for the district. Mr. Nimmo explained that this project could also be done through the district's capital reserve fund or as part of a future energy performance contract, both of which would provide state aid to the district. The resident further commented that he's happy to hear the research on alternative fills for the turf field, but he's troubled to hear that some people will vote no if the turf field is not included. We need to do all the fields.

A resident inquired if the field hockey field was regraded three years ago? Mr. Cacciola responded that it was renovated, but not to the extent that is being proposed in the capital bond. The resident further inquired as to the number of teams that would use the turf field. Ms. Todaro responded that the field would be available to most of our teams who would alternate use, based on scheduling, during the course of the school year. What's the overall advantage for turf? The architect responded that there's less downtime and longer playtime. A grass field sustains 700 hours of use per year, whereas, a turf field can sustain 2,200 hours per year.

A resident stated that she's pleased with the bond and hopes it passes. She urged the board to select an alternative fill for the turf field. She asked who would make the decision

on what type of sound system to purchase for the auditorium? Ms. Todaro responded that we would rely on our staff, our architects, and the expertise of the contractors in the field. The resident commented that the bond is very heavy in athletic areas and hopes the advantage for the arts is not compromised.

A resident stated that there's much discussion and debate out in the community over the inclusion of the turf field, and she strongly recommended that the board split the bond into two propositions. She recalled the time several years back when the district's budget vote was defeated and the district put up virtually the identical budget for a revote. The sentiment in the community was that the district didn't listen the first time and the budget was again defeated, placing the district on contingency. She cautioned that something quite similar could happen with the capital bond vote since many in the community feel they've already cast their vote on turf fields. She also sought clarification on how the district would fund the refurbishing of the turf field. Ms. Todaro stated that it could possibly be a budgeted item, but alternative funding is being investigated.

A resident stated that it would be helpful to have a breakdown of field usage and hours of play.

A resident expressed frustration with some of the things that are being said, and he urged the board not to split the bond.

A resident asked if the district intends to open the wellness center for public use? Ms. Todaro responded that there has been some discussion on making it accessible to the community though nothing has been decided yet. The resident cautioned the board against doing so, stating that there's a lot involved, particularly with regard to liability insurance costs.

A resident commented that he hopes the board will keep the bond intact.

BOARD DISCUSSION - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BOND PROJECT

Each of the board members provided an overview of their opinion on the capital bond.

Mr. Hansen will support the bond either as one resolution or split. He expressed disappointment with community members who would not support the bond based on the inclusion or exclusion of the turf field, and stated that the rhetoric is not helpful. He stressed that we need to pull together as a community to pass the bond. He understands the history regarding the turf field; however, this capital bond is much different than the voter-proposed referendum in 2013.

Mr. Giuliano stated that despite all the great things that are included in the bond, the turf field has overshadowed everything. He recalled serving on the Board of Education during the time the district went on contingency. Back then, the board's decision to put the same budget up for a revote backfired, and the district spent a tough year on contingency. There's something to be learned from that experience, and we also should not easily dismiss the recent past. The 2013 voter-proposed referendum on turf fields received a

crushing defeat, and many in the community feel they've already spoken on the issue. He will vote for it no matter what, but he believes the turf field should stand as a separate proposition and include a safe, alternative infill.

Dr. McDonagh thanked everyone who worked so hard this past year on putting together the project list. The intent was to present a compilation of things we need over the next 15 years and the resulting list runs the gamut from core curriculum to extracurricular items. He acknowledged that the turf field has drawn a considerable amount of attention and is keenly aware that the community voted against two turf fields in 2013, but he believes there are significant differences between the voter-proposed referendum back then and the capital bond that is being proposed today. The capital bond includes only one turf field, and from a cost analysis standpoint, may be a valuable addition. He is comfortable with using cool fill as the field's infill, and he would not support breaking it out of the bond for a separate vote. He is hopeful the community can come together to fairly and objectively evaluate the bond. It's meant to be inclusive, not divisive.

Mr. Mastroianni commented that he appreciates all the feedback the board has received on the capital bond; it's been important for the board to listen. When developing the project list, the capital improvement committee looked at a vision for the next 10 to 15 years. He feels strongly that the bond should be presented as one referendum and the turf field should not be removed. He trusts the advice and recommendation provided by the architects with regard to the health and safety concerns. Our student athletes and marching band members frequently play and perform on turf fields elsewhere, so he believes it would be hypocritical to say that we don't want them to play or perform on one here at home. While he understands the position taken by some community members who've stated that they've already voted on turf fields, and question why it's being included again, he believes there are real material differences between that referendum and this one. The last referendum had many people saying that they'd support a more inclusive bond that offered something for a variety of areas. Many of the outdoor enhancements that are being proposed would benefit the community as a whole. He disagrees with those that think we're overspending on athletics, noting that the last bond did not include any athletic improvements. He supports the bond in its entirety.

Ms. Gaughan commented that she is proud and thankful of everyone who worked on putting the bond together. She stressed that we must continue to invest in our district and our community, don't focus on price alone, but consider value as well. The bond represents an investment not only in our students but also in our home values. Our district has received many accolades through the years, and we all want a district and facilities that we're proud of. This bond creates opportunities for all students regardless of what their interests are. She favors an alternative fill for the turf field, noting that it's a worthwhile investment, and she supports the bond in its entirety.

Mr. Steinberg admitted that he's torn on the issue. He commented that the district's mission is to ensure the best educational programs, experiences and opportunities for our students, and while he believes the capital bond serves that mission, he acknowledged that there's history that cannot be ignored. Personally, he was not in favor of the 2013 referendum; however, he believes the proposed capital bond is very different. He would

support the bond inclusive of the turf field with a safe infill. As a board member, he is concerned about the perception within the voting community and is cautious about putting up a bond that includes the turf field, as it might poison the bond. We must not ignore the history and should not avoid the question of why we are including an item that the community previously voted against.

Ms. Lustig commented that she has a unique perspective since she's been on both sides, having served on the capital improvement committee and now serving as a board member. It's disturbing to see how divisive the issue is within the community; both sides have good and bad points. She believes a lot of people are not listening; sentiment in the community is that we've been down this road before. She believes that consideration should be given to an alternative fill for the turf field. Even without the turf field, the bond is heavy in the area of athletics. In her role as a board member, she believes the turf field should be presented as a separate proposition.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2015-2016 Board Goals

It was the consensus of the board to postpone discussion of the 2015-2016 board goals until the August 26, 2015 meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Giuliano, seconded by Ms. Gaughan, and carried unanimously (7-0), the board moved to Executive Session at 10:45 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the employment history of a particular individual. Dr. McDonagh left the meeting at 11:30 p.m. The board reconvened the regular meeting at 12:02 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Giuliano, seconded by Ms. Gaughan, and carried (6-0), the board adjourned the special meeting of July 22, 2015 at 12:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon M. Whelan
District Clerk