



**Meeting Minutes
Plant Facility Levy
Monday, August 24th, 2009**

Those in attendance: Dr. Lonnie Barber, Lynn Askew, Janet Askew, Mike Chatterton, Susie Reese, Jeff Neel, Howard Royal, David Naccarato, Joel Stobie, Paul Bates, Jerry Hutchins, Spence Ellsworth, Molly Michalec, Rob Lonning, John Gaeddert, Theresa Castellano-Wood, Sue Galgano, Julie Dahlgren, Jim Laski, Heather Crocker, Darlene Kisler

1. Welcome & Introductions:

Lynn Askew welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. I want to focus on the facilities and figure out where we need to go.

2. Committee Discussion on Proposed Costs:

Lynn Askew began the meeting by asking the committee members if they had any questions for McKinstry, or anyone else.

Susie Reese asked if the Leed certification would affect the grants.

Joel Stobie said it probably would not

Lynn Askew asked under the WRHS line item how is the turf a sustainability factor.

Joel Stobie said that there would be water savings. About half of the cost was for excavation on the original proposal. We have since changed that because we got new estimates for that project.

Lynn Askew asked about the solar return on money.

Joel Stobie said what you see here is typical because we do not have access to grants for solar projects at this time because it is newer technology. You will get a better return for the power you produce if you can classify it as green power.

Lynn Askew said so this is not a given.

David Naccarato said that is not true because we can get money back as long as we can prove the energy is clean. You have to be a tax paying entity to receive capitalized cost. McKinstry owns some of the facilities so we can then offset that with our clients. There are many different kinds of bonds that are available, and we have gotten these grants in areas that do not have the solar output Idaho has.

Lynn Askew asked if there are any other items on which we can possibly expect a 50% return.

David Naccarato said that there are many items that we expect returns on. The other items we are looking at we are trying for at least 10 million dollars in returns.

Lynn Askew asked about the line item for the auditorium.

Joel Stobie said we had updated the house lighting, carpet, seating, sound systems, projectors and drop screens.

Lynn Askew said he noticed that the dollar figures have changed and asked where we are at now.

Mike Chatterton said we are around 65 million.

Lynn Askew asked what the 61 million dollar figure is for.

Joel Stobie said it is if we pull out the auditorium, solar rays, and turf amounts. These figures do not have any monies taken out for grants. We are expecting that we could receive 5 million on the slim side.

Mike Chatterton said he feels that we could start with Hemingway with the covered side walk on the east side. There are two different options listed on this proposal. Does anyone have any thoughts or concerns about which way is better? There are safety hazards that we have to do something about.

Paul Bates asked if anyone thought about just extending the roof over the walk way.

Joel Stobie said that we talked to different people who expressed that the plowed snow also contributes to the problem.

Theresa Castellano-Wood said as a parent that we would not like to see the solar option over a roof line extension. This is a gathering place for many events and if the roof was extended it would take away those options.

Lynn Askew asked what solar means in the pavement option.

Joel Stobie said it is a means you would not have to use fuel to heat pavers.

Lynn Askew said he would like to take the input from the parents of students at Hemingway.

John Gaeddert said that he feels if we do away with the solar snow melt the price needs to go up to offset the cost.

Howard Royal asked for clarification on the two options. When the water comes off the roof, there are icicles that hang off the eaves every morning. The custodians have to clear them off each morning, so a roof extension would not help with this issue.

Lynn Askew said that maybe this is not the best option in your mind then.

Howard Royal said you will change the look of the building and it still will not solve the problem. Part of this whole plan is that all the exterior doors will no longer be available for use. We have done some projects in Bellevue that work pretty good, we may be able to implement some of those ideas at Hemingway.

Dr. Barber said he is really impressed with the Bellevue upgrades and feels this might work at Hemingway as well, and will not change the structural appearance of the building.

Joel Stobie said we have two solutions that are not perfect but both can be used together to maybe find the solution.

Lynn Askew said that we still need to define the dollar amount we will need to fix the problem. We may not need to figure out what the solution will be.

Millie Reidy asked when the doors will not be used any longer.

Howard Royal said that it will be this fall.

Lynn Askew asked if safety is still an issue.

Howard Royal said yes it is.

Theresa Castellano-Wood said that if the doors are shut off can we then just put in grass.

Howard Royal said that might be a good solution.

Lynn Askew asked if there were other concerns, ideas or questions.

Spense Ellsworth said that flexibility is a key issue. I think that having money upfront is a great idea. When we show people this proposal and if the numbers change, we can be flexible with how things are done. I think this is a great idea. Because the geo-thermal is such a big price tag, maybe we should try this is one area to make sure this is the way to go.

Lynn Askew said that the board can approve or deny this plan. It will be up to them to look at all the information and make a decision on what direction they want to take.

Dr. Barber said he understands the importance of flexibility but this process should winnow this down so that we don't have to make those decisions each time we need to fix or improve something.

Sue Galgano said that many people have an issue with sitting on money for the next 10 years. How do we tell them about this?

Mike Chatterton said that he is working on a time table for each of the items. Years one through three we will proceed on technology, safety, and the geo-thermal projects. Years four through six we will be saving money. The district will only then build if there is a need. If there is not a need the money will go back to the taxpayers.

Spence Ellsworth said that many people have tried geo-thermal in the valley and have not been successful. So would it be prudent to try it in one area and make sure it works.

David Naccarato said that he has never seen any problem with this type of system. The district is protected because we (McKinstry) are the ones who take the risk not you. We would not promote or suggest this system if we did not feel it is a viable system for this area. Now if there happened to be geological issues in an area we would tell you that it would not work. We are telling you that we absolutely do not foresee any issues with this project. This district is a perfect site for the geo-thermal project. Because we are the ones who take on the liability we would not even suggest this if we were not absolutely comfortable.

Dr. Barber asked what would happen if geo-thermal did not work. Would we be able to cover another system?

David Naccarato said if that became the scenario we have another system that would be extremely efficient and your budget will cover the cost.

Lynn Askew asked if the slide show would be helpful for us to view.

Joel Stobie felt that it would answer many of the questions being asked now.

David Naccarato presented the power point to the committee, which showed the cost savings of \$300,000 per year to the district if all items are implemented. (see McKinstry power point)

John Gaeddert felt that because Woodside is a new school it should be performing at a much higher rate of savings.

Joel Stobie said that is true, however we are not proposing that the system be replaced, just upgraded to get the best return on your money.

Rob Lonning asked why this wasn't done when the school was built.

David Naccarato said that in most cases it is because it was not even an option or that it comes down to the lowest dollar amount. We are looking at overall sustainability, by using what is available in your area.

Sue Galgano said that it may be that we can say this is a project that would be looked at farther down the road.

Mike Chatterton said if we can get zero percent bonds we would begin immediately so we could pay this back by the end of the 10 years. If we could not get zero percent bonds we would have to look at doing some of those projects when we could get grants.

John Gaeddert said that the geo-thermal is 12 million dollars and I am hearing some concerns from the community about geo-thermal. Now how do we tell people about this and address their fears.

Jim Laski said he has heard concerns about using geo-thermal, so I e-mailed a contractor and asked him why it is not being done here. He has not responded back with an answer.

David Naccarato said that he could answer that question. The biggest reason you do not see it done is because there are not contractors here who do it.

Lynn Askew said that we can let our patrons know that this is the highest performing system, but it is possible that this is not the system that would be used.

David Naccarato said that we only offer choice based on what has been asked for. We would not suggest geo-thermal if it was not the highest performing system and would not work here. There are areas that it will not work, but based on the information we have received we feel this is an ideal location. If we did go solar there are also some grants that we can try and access. The other part of this system is that it can be used in curriculum to teach students the benefits for green technology. There are also possible internships to work in this industry. We will go to schools and present this information to students.

Dr. Barber thought that this might be a possible academy class in the future.

David Naccarato said we give back in this way as much as you would like.

Lynn Askew said that was very helpful. We are over the levy amount by 3 million and we need to look at this and I would like to offer an opinion for getting rid of the turf line item at the WRHS.

Joel Stobie suggested that we put it on the side and if we get the 5 million dollar grant we could potentially bring it back then.

Jim Laski asked how this came into this line item.

Mike Chatterton said it was actually in the last strategic plan, but this time it appears under sustainability.

Dr. Barber said that astro-turf only lasts around 11 years and will need to be replaced, so if it takes 18 years to pay back the dollar figure it does not pan out.

Lynn Askew asked if we could take this off the list. (All agreed)

Sue Galgano asked about the property that is being purchased for food services.

Mike Chatterton said that there are a number of reasons for this line item. We need more room for maintenance and food service, and also for the transportation department. This would alleviate the congestion behind the community campus and would give us loading docks for the food services and the maintenance buildings.

John Gaeddert felt that the dollar amount in Carey should be reviewed. Again this is a new building and is this the best place to use those dollars.

David Naccarato said we did adjust those figures based on our conversation, so the new figures reflect a truer cost.

John Gaeddert said that makes more sense.

Sue Galgano asked about the older schools, and she felt we should really be looking at them first.

John Gaeddert agreed that this makes more sense.

Sue Galgano asked if we could address the auditorium.

Heather Crocker said that this is used heavily by the public, and it is a very poor place for acoustics and the lighting and seating really do not work well at all.

Mike Chatterton said if we cut that out, I would like to see that be the first project that would be addressed if we get any grants.

Julie Dahlgren felt that this should not be thrown out because this is a community used building. I feel that this is really a selling point showing how strongly the district approves of the use of this building, and what it brings to the community.

Paul Bates felt that because this was thrown out in the last levy we should really consider keeping it in this time.

Sue Galgano asked if this dollar amount could be reduced or be done a little at a time.

Howard Royal felt that could easily be done.

David Naccarato said that he has seen prices reduced then promised a certain amount to be used, and it ended up being used on other projects.

Sue Galgano asked if we could get rid of the solar arrays completely to save money.

Rob Lonning said that we talked about putting this on the side and using it if we get the grant money.

David Naccarato said that McKinstry may want to own the solar arrays then lease them back to the district.

Lynn Askew said that following John Gaeddert's comment about the Woodside project; maybe we can put that aside, and then designate it as one of the first items to put back in if we get grant money. What do we think about Woodside, can we agree to take this off the list? (All agreed) I would also like to look at the high school.

Mike Chatterton said that WRHS is the highest footprint we have in the district. It is also tied to three other buildings.

Rob Lonning asked would this impact the grant if we take off schools.

Joel Stobie said the grant has already been sent in and we showcased all the schools. We thought the diversity of using all the schools by going geo-thermal would show the cost savings in a way that would give you a better chance for receiving the grants.

Mike Chatterton said that we would really need to look at putting these systems in within the first three to four years because after that time, the price to put them in will increase and we will not see enough savings to offset the cost.

Spense Ellsworth asked what retro-commission is.

David Naccarato said it is where we evaluate your current systems and make recommendations based on cost savings. This is where you will see the biggest cost savings. I am very optimistic about getting money to see this solar system used in this district.

Rob Lonning said he sees how excited McKinstry is for this project and that we can put it on the side, knowing we will be able to do it in the future.

Dr. Barber suggested we take all the solar off the list which will bring us under the dollar figure.

Mike Chatterton agreed with the exception of Hemingway because he felt that the community there is very pro-green.

John Gaeddert felt that we should lower the cost in Carey for improvements and take out the solar arrays at all schools with the exception of a pilot site of Hemingway.

David Naccarato said that you really need to look at the best site for the solar pilot then you would pull the geo-thermal from that site. I would like to add that the Ketchum area is a very good geo-thermal site.

Dr. Barber felt we really should focus on technology because that is what the community really wants.

John Gaeddert said we should pull the geo-thermal from Woodside, and the middle school, and pilot the solar arrays at Hemingway and Bellevue.

Lynn Askew said that where and what schools should be pilots will be the board's responsibility. They will decide the location(s) for potential success.

Theresa Castellano-Wood said that if the district is increasing the numbers or classes at the community campus and the district support services building, would we then want to take the community campus back for another school.

Dr. Barber said that it will cost less to build another school than to retrofit the community campus. Mike and I have talked with a firm that is putting that information together for us now, so we can show the dollar difference.

Lynn Askew said that this topic was discussed at another meeting and we all agreed how important the community campus is for everyone. I think that we are on the right track now and we are getting this number down to where it should be at 60 million.

Paul Bates said that we should really try and look at this as 6 million a year over 10 years as opposed to 60 million dollars. Then this dollar figure is not so imposing.

Millie Reidy said she agreed because the conversations she has had with people their focus is on the entire 60 million and that seems like such a large dollar figure. When I tell them that it is only 6 million a year it puts that figure into perspective.

Lynn Askew asked if there are any other areas we can look at to trim costs.

John Gaeddert said he was looking at the irrigation systems at the schools. They are not big dollar items but asked if they are necessary.

Joel Stobie said these systems really measure the water content in the ground. So if there is enough water in the ground and the irrigation system is set to go off tomorrow it will not water if there is enough moisture content.

Rob Lonning felt that this is very important for the conservation of a very precious resource. (All agreed)

Jerry Hutchins asked what the transformers move is.

Howard Royal said that a number of transformers need to be moved according to Idaho Power and will be a joint effort. He also mentioned how much money has been saved by using water conservation systems already in place at the middle school and the high school.

Dr. Barber said that any time we can conserve water we should do it, because water becomes more precious each year.

Lynn Askew asked if all agreed to keep the water conservation line item. (All agreed) Next time we meet, we will discuss how we will present our information. We now need to set the dollar amount and adopt these measures. The dollar amount is **\$59,080.00**. (All agreed)

Heather Crocker said that the brochure we handed out tonight is the first draft. Rich Bauscher feels we should get this out as soon as possible. Please e-mail Kate Heinecke or myself by this Friday if you have any suggestions.

Lynn Askew said at the next meeting we will also discuss steps we need to take for the elections. What publication reports we will give to sub-committees and how to present the information to the public.

3. Adjournment of meeting at 4:45

4. Next meeting on Tuesday September 8th at 2:00