I. Introduction – Mr. Shine

A. An update was provided on the status of the removal of playground equipment.

II. Current Capital Project Overview – CSArch (Greg)

A. PowerPoint Copies were provided to the public

III. Public Comments/Questions

- A. Stacey [unknown]
 - 1. Funding
 - a) Will the project affect the tax cap?
 - (1) No, we don't anticipate any shifts as a result of the project.
 - *b) Will it impact programs?*
 - (1) No programs will be adversely impacted by the costs associated with the project.

B. Neil Evans

- 1. Scoreboards
 - a) Have all scoreboards been evaluated for replacement, both exterior and interior, as a part of the project?
 - (1) Yes, all scoreboards are being assessed for the need to replace as a part of the project.
- 2. 2007 Steam Boilers
 - a) If there is a need to convert the steam boilers to water, why did it not happen in 2007 when the new boiler was purchased?
 - (1) It is difficult to speculate about what was considered in past projects. The point is well-taken, and the Facilities Committee will follow up. However, the objective is to have systems in place which are as universal as possible and that require less skilled maintenance.

C. Dave Baxter

- 1. Mechanical Systems
 - a) Has it been established, how many rooftop air handling units will need to be replaced?

(1) The rooftop units are an essential component of the project. So far, the need for one new unit has been identified in the auditorium. Otherwise, older units will be considered first to gain the most efficiency.

D. Donna Seoul

- 1. Roofs
 - a) Are the leaking roof areas around the skylights being addressed?
 - (1) Yes. Many have already been repaired as a result of vandalism. We are aware of some areas of concern (particularly, in the stage area of the auditorium), and will be using a variety of detection methods to determine where to concentrate our roof repair efforts.

2. Elementary School Bathrooms

- a) Can something be done about the sinks that don't work well, especially the circular tub-style sinks?
 - (1) Yes. Many of these were identified through the process of the Building Condition Survey. In other areas, we are evaluating for ADA compliance. These are being looked at by the architects and the Facilities Committee.
- 3. Bathrooms in the Lower 900 Hall
 - a) Why hasn't a bathroom on the lower level been considered?
 - (1) It has been considered, but has been determined to be cost-prohibitive given that the only need would be for Head Start. We do understand the concern, but it appears that the bathroom facilities at the top of the stairs will be sufficient for now.
- 4. Drainage outside lower hall entrance
 - a) Has a solution been developed to address the rain water that collects (and sometimes freezes) near the Head Start entrance?
 - (1) We have already addressed the problem to the extent possible by trenching and clearing a path for the water to get to the existing drainage. If paving of the area occurs as a part of the project, the grade to the drain would most likely get paved as well.

E. Rob Montague

- 1. Scheduling
 - a) I'm concerned that the community will be surprised with a big project budget right before the referendum. How can I be assured that will not happen?

(1) The schedule that was presented does not reflect the interactions with the Board of Education. We are in the process of collecting data beyond the December public forum. The data will then be refined with the Facilities Committee, the Board of Education, and the community, between January and March. We are also considering the possibility of multiple referendums to give the voters an opportunity to decide separately on items which may be perceived as discretionary or high-cost, but no decisions have been made in that regard. We recognize the lingering concern from the last project, but we are committed to doing the right thing for the community with this project.

2. Construction Management

- a) Do we have construction management on this project?
 - (1) Yes. Turner Construction just signed on with us and a representative is in attendance. They are working with our architects to capture the full potential scope of the project and will be working closely with us as we continue to develop it. They will assess and coordinate the need for the contractors involved in the project.

F. Dan Anderson

- 1. SED Approval
 - a) Are contingencies built in for the time lapse between cost estimating and final SED approval?
 - (1) Yes. Estimates of project costs use a cost index to account for the anticipated increase in costs over the established timeline.
- 2. Community Outreach
 - a) Have any formal means of specific/personal community outreach been identified?
 - (1) No, not yet. We have used a wide variety of communications to advertise the community forums. The suggestion is appreciated and we will look further into some the ideas presented (e.g. Galway Town Newsletter).

G. Janet Van Rijsewijk

- 1. Multiple Projects
 - a) The last project was advertised as multiple options, but ended up as successive propositions. Is that the intent for this project?

(1) Not exactly. We have discussed the possibility of multiple referendums but, again, no decision has been made about that. It is impractical to put multiple versions of a project out to voters, as it would allow for the possibility of approving multiple variations of the same project. The public forums and other opportunities for community input are intended to give voters a say in the project as we develop it. The idea is that we want to put the most favorable version of the project forward to voters.

H. Stacey [unknown]

- 1. Science Labs
 - a) There was a proposal in the last project to update the science labs. Will any upgrades be included?
 - (1) While there aren't currently any compliance issues, a number of suggestions are being considered for upgrading the science labs and avoid any programmatic deficiencies.

2. Outreach

- a) Are any additional specific communications about the project being explored?
 - (1) Yes. As discussed earlier, some more personal outreach will be discussed with the Facilities Committee. We believe that the best methods, to this point, have been utilized; however, we are open to the suggestions that have been presented and will explore them further.

I. Lee Bramer

- 1. Paving
 - a) What is the scope of paving in the project?
 - (1) Some redesign of parking lots for safety is currently included in the potential scope of work. There is also a need for replacement in most other paved areas of the district, so that is being considered also.
 - b) Will sub-surface and drainage be looked at for improvements in the scope of paving? There is noticeable heaving and disrepair, currently.
 - (1) Yes. Any of the projects that we propose to the voters will be thoroughly researched and work will be done properly.