

Facilities Planning Committee

September 26, 2024



Agenda:

- Introductions
- Purpose and Charge
- Review of Prior Committee Work:
- Discussion: Defeated 2024 Referendum
- Discussion: Facility Options to Solve Three Interrelated Issues:
 - Physical condition of current school buildings
 - Transportation Facility
 - Athletic fields
- Next Steps and Future Meetings

Introductions:

- Joe Dragone, Director of Special Projects, Capital Region BOCES (joseph.dragone@neric.org)
 - 20+ years of experience in school facility projects and project management (new construction and renovations):
 - City School District of Albany
 - Ballston Spa CSD
 - Capital Region BOCES

Committee Charge:

- The Facilities Committee will be tasked with providing input and recommendations to the Board of Education regarding the district's long-term facility needs, long-term capital improvement planning, and other long-term facilities-related matters.
- The Committee will review data, tour buildings, engage the community, and work collaboratively with district leadership, consultants, and other stakeholders.”

Review of Prior Work:

- Extensive review of the existing facilities, program needs and funding models was covered from 2020-2024 including:
 - The programs that drive facility needs
 - The process of the committee
 - The conclusion of a new campus to address current and future needs
 - The scope of the proposed project and project schedule
 - State aid and tax impact

Review of Prior Work:

- Capital Project Archives Webpage:
 - <https://boquetvalleycsd.org/capital-project-2/>
 - Central repository for Information and documentation related to the Facilities Committee and project planning.
 - Serves as a resource for Stakeholders to access all planning and project information.
 - Includes detailed project plans, budgets, schedules, construction documents, and other relevant information.

Multi-Year Project Development Process:

- Data Collection & Program Analysis
- Staff Interviews & Survey
- Site Selection Search (17 parcels considered) and Design Development
- Facilities Committee & BOE Oversight
- Agreement with County for Thrall Dam Site
- SEQR, SHPO & APA Permitting Applications
- SED Preliminary Review
- Finance Schedules and Tax Impact Calculations

Renovations vs New Construction:

- Identified Needs Not Addressed:
 - On-Site Athletic Fields
 - On-Site Transportation Facilities
 - Site Infrastructure & Utilities Upgrades
- Additional Challenges:
 - Extensive Demolition & Hazardous Materials Removal Cost
 - Student Occupancy/displacement/swing space while Renovating a Building (swing space)
 - Less State Aid = Higher Tax Impact
 - Protracted Timeline
 - Renovation Project Bonding Period Reduced to 15 or 20 years from 30 years

Discussion: Defeated Referendum

- No = 1008 (73%); Yes = 372 (27%)
- Exit : 494 responses
 - **Location Concerns** and/or **Financial Concerns** most frequently cited as the reason for a No vote
- What would you support going forward?
 - Renovate Mountain View Campus for all students (48%)
 - Renovate both campuses and operate both campuses (20%)
 - Make changes and revote the a similar project (15%)
- Related Comments:
 - Communication/Information
 - Staffing

Discussion: Defeated Referendum

- Understanding why the referendum wasn't approved:
 - Was it the project?
 - Was it the site?
 - Was it the cost?
 - Was the community well informed about the project?
 - Was there something not in the project that should have been considered?
 - Were there things in the project that the community didn't want?
 - Other thoughts?

Potential Options Going Forward:

- New PK-12 School, Athletic Fields and Transportation Facility on a new site (Defeated 2024 Referendum):
 - Revise the previously proposed project for a new referendum
 - Remains the most efficient and cost effective option
 - Addresses all long term facility issues on one site:
 - PK-12 Facility
 - Transportation Facility
 - Athletic Fields

Potential Options Going Forward:

- Renovations and New Construction at Mountain View Site **OR** Lake View site to accommodate all students:
 - Transportation and athletic Facilities are at a different location
- **Extensive** Renovations at Mountain View Site **AND** Lake View site to improve and modernize the buildings:
 - Transportation and athletic Facilities are at a different location

Potential Options Going Forward:

- Limited Health/Safety Renovations at Mountain View Site **AND** Lake View site to keep them both operating:
 - Magnitude determined by the Building Condition Survey
 - Not a long term solution
 - Transportation and athletic Facilities are at a different location

Boquet Valley CSD

Conceptual Facilities Cost Comparisons

Construct K-12 Facilities at 1 of 3 Possible Sites	Thrall Dam Site	Mountain View Campus	Lake View Campus
Total Construction Costs	\$ 54,643,618	\$ 46,014,000	\$ 54,758,187
Incidental Costs	\$ 9,071,357	\$ 7,400,000	\$ 9,521,869
<i>Total Project</i>	\$ 63,714,975	\$ 53,414,000	\$ 64,280,056
<i>Projected State Aid</i>	\$ 34,856,888	\$ 26,840,813	\$ 26,840,813
<i>Local Share</i>	\$ 28,858,087	\$ 26,573,187	\$ 37,439,243

- 1 This scenario assumes a 120,000sf K-12 facility at Thrall Dam, or 110,000sf facilities at either existing campus, a 5,000sf transportation facility, and a minimum 14 acres of developed land.
- 2 State Aid projections are based on the June 2022 Cost Index Allowances.
- 3 Thrall Dam site includes 307 additional BAU's negotiated during the SED Preliminary Submission process.
- 4 Off-site athletic field purchase and development will not receive aid.

Upgrade Existing Facilities and Maintain the Elementary and Secondary Program at Separate Campuses	Mountain View Campus	Lake View Campus	Combined Costs
Total Construction Costs	\$ 31,914,365	\$ 24,268,263	\$ 56,182,628
Incidental Costs	\$ 6,382,873	\$ 4,853,653	\$ 11,236,526
<i>Total Project</i>	\$ 38,297,238	\$ 29,121,916	\$ 67,419,154
<i>Projected State Aid</i>	\$ 17,489,693	\$ 8,979,871	\$ 26,469,564
<i>Local Share</i>	\$ 20,807,545	\$ 20,142,045	\$ 40,949,590

- 1 This scenario assumes extensive reconstruction and renovations to both existing facilities and sites to bring them up to par with a new facility. It includes a new off-site transportation facility which costs are included in the Mountain View calculations.
- 2 State Aid projections are based on the June 2022 Cost Index Allowances.
- 3 Building Aid Units are based on the Teaching Station Method for Lake View, and SED granted future BAU's for Mountain View adjusted 10% for program space size.
- 4 Off-site athletic field purchase and development will not receive aid.

New Campus Proposal: Examples of Tax Impact for Two Property Values (True Values) When Compared to Pre-Merger Tax Impact

\$100,000 True Property Value

Boquet Valley Tax Data Set				
FY	Tax on True	\$100,000 Property	Cost Change	Cumulative Savings
2018-19 Pre-Merger	\$14.25	\$1,425	\$0	\$0
2019-20	\$13.50	\$1,350	(\$75)	(\$75)
2020-21	\$14.00	\$1,400	\$50	(\$25)
2021-22	\$14.00	\$1,400	\$0	(\$25)
2022-23	\$12.76	\$1,276	(\$124)	(\$149)
2023-24	\$11.26	\$1,126	(\$150)	(\$299)
Cap Project	\$13.99	\$1,399	\$273	(\$26)
Rounded to nearest dollar				

\$200,000 True Property Value

Boquet Valley Tax Data Set				
FY	Tax on True	\$200,000 Property	Cost Change	Cumulative Savings
2018-19 Pre-Merger	\$14.25	\$2,850	\$0.0	\$0.0
2019-20	\$13.50	\$2,700	(\$150)	(\$150)
2020-21	\$14.00	\$2,799	\$100	(\$51)
2021-22	\$14.00	\$2,800	\$1	(\$50)
2022-23	\$12.76	\$2,552	(\$247)	(\$298)
2023-24	\$11.26	\$2,252	(\$300)	(\$598)
Cap Project	\$13.99	\$2,798	\$546	(\$52)
Rounded to nearest dollar				

Next Steps:

- Over the next 7 weeks:
 - Update the current Building Condition Survey to determine scope of improvements and reassess renovation and construction costs
 - Update the proposal at the Thrall Dam Site to assess program, design and construction costs
 - Determine the location for the Transportation Facility and Athletic Fields if all the facilities will not be on one site
- Next Meeting: November 21, 2024, 5:30 p.m.
- joseph.dragone@neric.org

Facilities Planning Committee

.....
September 26, 2024

