

**BOYERTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Boyertown, Pennsylvania**  
[www.boyertownasd.org](http://www.boyertownasd.org)

**Facilities Committee Meeting**

**May 1, 2018**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting called to order:**

**Board Members in Attendance:**

David Lewis - Chair  
Clay Breece  
Jill Dennin  
Steve Elsier  
Ruth Dierolf  
Christine Neiman  
Donna Usavage  
Brandon Foose  
Rodney Boyer

**Members of the Public:**

Barbara Furman  
Elise Watts  
Madeline Caroselli

Pledge of allegiance/moment of silence

**Approval of Minutes:**

February 20<sup>th</sup> Minutes were approved. Minutes for March 27<sup>th</sup> and April 3<sup>rd</sup> committee meetings would be approved at a future meeting.

**Memorial Stadium Options for Fall - Mr. Palladino/Mr. Gasper**

Mr. Gasper spoke to explain how he and Mr. Palladino came up with the presentation they were sharing. He explained that bleachers would be on the track and the track would have to be protected. Mr. Gasper stated that he spoke to the track manufacturing company that installed the track and they said it would work as long as it was protected. Mr. Gasper explained they will distribute the weight of the bleachers over the rubberized material and they will do it with plywood and 2x8's or 2x6's under the bleachers with a tarp underneath that and plywood. Mr. Gasper feels that should protect the track and that they'll be okay with portable bleachers. Mr. Gasper stated Mr. Palladino will share the numbers related to the portable bleachers on the track side and in the end zone. Mr. Gasper said the idea is that some of the things they will be buying they will be able to be use elsewhere in the district. He further explained that two thirds of the money that is invested is stuff that they would have probably bought in the future anyway, not that it was on the 5 year plan, but to say it was money they were not throwing away.

Mr. Palladino spoke regarding the presentation entitled "Options for Fall 2018"

Mr. Palladino shared this was based on recommendations from himself, Mr. Gasper and BASD Administration. He explained the definitions and costs/losses for renting vs away vs utilizing Memorial Stadium as follows:

Renting - neutral site (Phoenixville and Upper Perk have expressed interest) not sure about the schedules and conflicts

Away - whoever they were scheduled to play on the Friday nights, they would travel to their facility if they were willing to have them.

Utilizing Memorial Stadium - if they choose this option all football games and some other sports as well can be played at Memorial Stadium

Rental Costs:

Phoenixville - cost per game \$22,020

Upper perk cost per game - \$20,108

Upper perk costs go down a little bit due to less distance to travel

Mr. Palladino explained, this was only for football and stated this doesn't count if they can play a soccer game or to have senior night anywhere else. That was not in the mix.

Away - per season costs \$5,180

Loss per season would be a little over \$5,000 and could go up or down depending on how far they are travelling.

Costs related to utilizing Memorial Stadium

Rental bleachers - would be put on the track in front of home stand only from mid-August to mid October. Mr. Palladino explained that extending the season such as with playoffs etc. would incur additional rental costs to keep bleachers during that time.

\$35,038 for two months

Portable bleachers - buy and keep and use on other fields through the year, such as lacrosse, softball, soccer. Mr. Palladino explained that a lot of the bleachers currently on those fields are starting to deteriorate. This was part of Mr. Palladino's 5 year plan to buy some of these types of bleachers and keep to use in the district where needed.

\$70,847 - 1000 bleacher seats

Mr. Palladino also shared they would need to buy and keep two sheds as concession stands during construction. They would plan to use them for storage in the off season. Mr. Palladino explained this would allow a concession on the visitor side, where they currently do not have one, as well as one in the concourse area. These sheds would be utilized as concession and/or storage on other fields where needed when construction was complete.

\$6,348 for both - a little over \$3,000 a piece

Mr. Palladino explained the estimated profits and losses and stated that they were based on gate receipts which were affected by weather and crowd size. Mr. Palladino reviewed some of the costs including bleacher rental and what the estimated losses would be for each scenario.

Mr. Palladino explained the Average Attendance Charts for football, soccer and field hockey and shared the current capacity was 3,916. The proposed rental bleacher capacity would be 2,410. He described the field layout diagram for placement of the proposed bleachers including where the portable restrooms and concession stands would be located.

Mr. Palladino shared positives for the students in using the stadium with portable bleachers would be that the following events could still be held on campus:

- Homecoming - (not available at away /rental sites)
- Fundraising through concessions would help to offset costs
- JV and freshman football
- Cavalcade and piggy bowl
- Soccer and field hockey games
- Powder puff football

Question asked to confirm the plan for bleachers was to use portable and rental units.

Mr. Palladino explained to bring it up to enough capacity to seat everyone they would need the rentals and the portables. This combination was the cheapest option.

Additional question asked if they (the seats) would be filled and what the attendance was for last year's football season.

Mr. Palladino reviewed the Average Football Attendance slide and stated it was little over 2,000 people. He explained he had figured a little high when he was calculating for the bleachers so he could be sure he could accommodate the possibility of a larger crowd.

Question asking about the condition of the track and the level of confidence to maintain the integrity so they wouldn't have to incur resurfacing or fixing the all-weather track.

Mr. Gasper explained that he talked to the company and said if they do it the way he suggested, by distributing the weight, then it would be fine.

Question to ask if they had reached out to the Booster Clubs and Cavalcade to find out which alternative they would want or if they have any preference.

Mr. Palladino shared that the booster groups that have contacted him preferred using the stadium and this was their only choice. They didn't want to discuss other options. Mr. Palladino explained that he presented all three options and all three were on the table. He further explained that the parents wanted the events held at BASD since a neutral site would not let them bring concessions. Mr. Palladino also shared that if they go to Phoenixville they would incur custodial costs as the stadium would have to be cleaned that night.

Statement made that after the presentation on the stadium they would have a better idea of what they were looking at. Suggestion made to seek out feedback from booster groups.

Mr. Gasper spoke to explain that the lead time on the rentals is 7-8 weeks and knowing the details of the stadium presentation that the Board would see later in the meeting, Mr. Gasper said he doesn't

see them getting in there in time for Football Season. Mr. Gasper explained that is why he and Mr. Palladino presented these options at this meeting.

Statement made to question then if any of this could be done during construction.

Mr. Gasper explained the construction would be isolated and will be behind the bleachers. He said the idea would be that they're isolating the area that they're working on away from the field. He explained that Mr. Palladino would be able to run the score board and PA system independent of the press box.

Statement made to thank Mr. Palladino and Mr. Gasper for due diligence and for thinking of everything.

Discussion regarding the importance of holding the games in the Stadium and citing the losses are fewer to use the stadium vs the neutral site option. Question to clarify the cost of the bleachers to buy and keep was \$79,847 and the rentals were \$35,038 so the total cost would be \$108,000.

Mr. Palladino confirmed.

Question raised regarding where the monies would come from, if it would be general fund or capital projects.

Mr. Gasper advised they could drop the rental cost if they decreased the number of bleachers. If the Board felt that they don't want to try to reach the 2,400 capacity number and only want to seat 2,000 they could get rid of a couple of rentals which would decrease the overall loss. Mr. Gasper said instead of losing \$12,000 you might only lose \$8,000.

Mr. Palladino explained regarding seating, there was only 12 inches per person and that if you take the capacity down it would be a tight fit for some patrons. Mr. Palladino explained some of the calculations he used to determine the number of bleachers needed.

Concern was raised that the most capacity they've ever had was 2,100. Question to ask what the attendance was for Homecoming and Cavalcade.

Mr. Palladino shared that homecoming average was right around 2,000 and that he did not have the numbers for cavalcade.

Statement made regarding the comment that many students walk around during a game and are not actually sitting in a seat asking if that could allow the decrease in seats needed.

Mr. Palladino explained that they can only sell tickets for the amount of seats they have and that was per code. He further explained that if they have 2,000 seats he can only sell 1 ticket per seat.

Question asking what impact covering the track with bleachers would have on the students.

Mr. Palladino replied the only impact would be to the community use.

Question related to reducing number of seats asking what the logical increments of either rental or portable seats were, if there was a way to scale it down slightly and would it be worth it economically and statement made to clarify that Mr. Palladino's recommendations come from his knowledge about attendance, the band, visitors etc.

Mr. Palladino confirmed and stated he is figuring high because he doesn't want to have to tell people they cannot come in to an event because they do not have enough capacity.

Concern shared about the amount of caution being taken with regard to protecting the track and ensuring it will not be damaged, as well as concern about safety of the crowds and access to the part of the stadium under construction.

Mr. Palladino shared that the grandstand would be fenced off and they would maintain that area with security to deny access. Mr. Palladino shared they would have to analyze the traffic patterns and come up with a plan to keep as many people off track as they can. The rental bleachers would be fenced off underneath and would be inaccessible.

Statement made regarding the height of the bleachers and view of the field with cavalcade in mind as well as judging, etc.

Mr. Palladino stated his goal was to keep everyone comfortable and the top row of the bleachers will be where the first row currently sits. He was not sure if there would be the same height vantage point as there is now, but due to space they could only go so far back with the depth of the portable bleachers.

General discussion applauding the efforts in the presentation.  
Mr. Lewis stated there were no objections and this would move forward.

### **Title IX Compliance for Softball** - Palladino

Mr. Palladino reviewed the Presentation entitled "Varsity softball field improvements"

Mr. Palladino explained the softball field is in need of an overhaul. He proposed to fix the safety concerns first then address Title IX compliance. He would like the improvements to be started this summer and pointed out an area on the visitors side and Berks Street where a 12 foot sloping hill presents a safety hazard to players when they are attempting to catch balls in that fowl area. Mr. Palladino continued to say the improvements are needed, will be completed in-house, and absorbed into his athletic budget. Mr. Palladino reviewed the following items:

1. Move softball field 40-60 feet away from road
2. Move backstop and dugout protection. Cost would be \$3,000-\$5,000 and would be absorbed by athletic budget
3. Build and install dugouts. Would be done by fundraising and athletic budget.
4. Use portable bleachers for additional seating. Currently can only seat 25 people. Mr. Palladino proposed using the bleachers left over from Memorial Stadium.
5. Install new scoreboard in left field. Mr. Palladino shared the current scoreboard frequently breaks and they can no longer purchase replacement bulbs. He shared this is already budgeted in the 18-19 athletic budget and will help with Title IX Compliance.
6. Install permanent outfield field fence with warning tract. Mr. Palladino said the current fence is a snow fence with no warning area. New Fence and warning tract will help with safety of players.
7. Finish installing the batting cages and bullpen mounds. This will be done in-house and was already budgeted for 18-19 at a minimal cost.

Mr. Palladino showed pictures of the current field, outlining where the new field would be. Mr. Palladino said he is confident that Mr. Dierolf and the grounds crew will do an excellent job. And he would like to start with these improvements right now.

Question asking for both slide shows to be sent to board members.

Statement made thanking Mr. Palladino for his presentation and confirming the need for changes.

Question asking if this had to be done for Title IX compliance.

Mr. Palladino explained that in a Title IX Audit they would look at comparable facilities. He shared that Upper Perkiomen had one last week. Mr. Palladino said they would look at Bear Stadium and the softball field. He said to be in compliance, it doesn't have to be on the grandiose scale that Bear Stadium is, but if Bear Stadium has bleachers, then the softball field has to have bleachers. If Bear Stadium has a scoreboard, then the softball field has to have scoreboard. Mr. Palladino stated this was just phase one. Mr. Palladino is going to meet with Mr. Lewis to see how to do improvements to bring it to total compliance in the next few years.

Question regarding what the District cost would be.

Mr. Palladino explained the labor hours would be for groundskeepers and rental of the equipment. He would be able to provide those numbers after he meets with Mr. Gasper. Mr. Palladino also said the Booster group is willing to help with the cost of materials at about \$4,000-\$5,000 and some Booster members will help with improvements and will be overseen by Mr. Gasper.

All comments were positive and in favor of moving forward.

Mr. Lewis stated he was pretty sure the Board is unanimous. No Nays. This moves forward.

### **Stadium Update - Bill Gasper, Barry Isett & Associates**

Mr. Gasper spoke to say that Mr. Tomasz Slowik from Barry Isett & Associates will share a presentation. Mr. Gasper said that Isett would give the Board all kinds of numbers and recommendations and solutions for the stadium. Mr. Gasper advised the Board to please ask many questions and get all of their answers. He stated that Isett & Assoc. would do their best to give all of the information needed for the Board to make a good rational decision.

Question asking for handouts

It was determined there were no handouts of the presentation but if there was something they would like to see they can put it in the Board packets on Friday.

Mr. Slowik spoke to say he brought two gentlemen from the firm with him. Mr. Slowik introduced Robert Karp, Project Mgmt. Dept. head and Gregory Marks head of forensic Dept. working on the project. He stated they were there to present the findings and results of their investigation and this was their final presentation to share answers to the questions from the last meeting. He continued to explain this was an extension of the previous presentation where they only showed sketches with the proposals required to reinforce the structure and extend the service life. He said now they have costs included and they would do a quick recap.

Mr. Slowik reviewed the slides

### Stadium Repairs - Summary

Mr. Slowik explained the multiple slides that contained pictures of the current stadium and sketches depicting new columns, beams and wall reinforcement, including photos showing reinforcement installation along the walkway as well as interior wall reinforcement. Pictures showed areas of the exterior wall along the track where some walls need to be repaired and some need to be reinforced.

Mr. Slowik asked Mr. Bob Karp to take over the narrative. Mr. Karp said they would show the cost and had asked Boyle Construction for feedback. Mr. Karp shared that Boyle Construction repeatedly said they would be doing a lot of heavy work in a tight space and would not be able to do it efficiently with large equipment. They reported this would entail a lot of hand work with a lot of labor and this was reflected in the cost. Mr. Karp referred to two photo slides showing tight access beneath the bleachers

### Slide Stadium Repair - Exclusions

Mr. Karp explained the concrete planks were excluded as there is no pricing until destructive testing can be done to determine structural capacity. There would be no ADA improvements. The concessions and restrooms would remain as they were and caulking would be replaced but that it was not a major waterproofing effort. Everything not touched would still be 33 years old and would be no better after completion

### Slide - Stadium Repair Cost Opinion - Qualifiers

Mr. Karp explained that the qualifiers on the cost opinion were based on the conceptual sketches to date and that these were not final design and not ready for bid. Costs were determined by what Tom had been able to observe in the field and stated they haven't done any destructive testing to know what was going on that they haven't seen. Mr. Karp stated the concrete planks and other 33 year old components are "as is". The cost of the steel concrete repair numbers are in today's dollars and "that market" will continue to do whatever the market will do. He stated they did not have any escalation in there. Mr. Karp continued to say actual costs will be determined when the forensic group is done with design and it's put out to bid. He stated they have no control over labor and availability of equipment and that will be whatever the market conditions are at that time. He stated there is no warranty on the opinion of cost and that it was based on their input, sketches to date, and Boyle Construction.

### Slide - Stadium Repair Cost Opinion - Drivers

Mr. Karp explained there is a lot of hand work to be done and there is tight access. Excavation will be taking place underneath the existing grandstand and soil has to be taken away and all of that has to be done in tight access. He explained there will be a lot of caulk put in place and he pointed out photos to show joints to be caulked. Additionally, Mr. Karp advised, this would be a future maintenance cost.

### Slide - Stadium Repair Cost Opinion (Boyle Construction)

Mr. Karp explained the cost numbers on the slides and shared the total cost opinion was \$2,520,000. Mr. Karp stated this was based on 15 sketches, site visits and input from subcontractors

### Slide - Other Stadium Repair Costs

Mr. Karp explained the other costs that would be above and beyond what would be paid to Boyle. Mr. Karp pointed out this slide contained a footnote explaining the alternative cost if the planks are not usable after destructive testing.

Slide - Stadium Repair Duration Estimate - after NTP

Mr. Karp explained the details of the timeline from destructive testing of planks through final design, bidding, construction, and completion and shared the total time was 48 weeks

Question regarding what a ball park figure would be to build new.

Mr. Karp responded that would be explained in the next two slides.

Slide - Stadium Replacement Option

Mr. Karp explained in this option they would reuse the footprint. The upfront cost was to remove the existing entire structure, create a clean site and start with concrete foundations. The structure would be a steel and aluminum grandstand. Mr. Karp stated it would roughly be the same capacity but they do not have a design to date. Mr. Karp continued to say there would be no restrooms, no concessions, no press box and cost would roughly be \$1 million.

Slide - Stadium Replacement Option (2)

Mr. Karp explained this option would be to do something that looks a little bit more like what is existing. It would still be the same structure as the first option with steel and aluminum, but they would wrap the entire exterior with brick so it would look more consistent with the current stadium. He stated this option would have a freestanding press box, concessions and restrooms. Mr. Karp shared the broad numbers to complete this project would be \$2 million

Question asking if new construction would be ADA compliant

Mr. Karp responded to say that with a company such as Southern bleacher they would have detailed drawings that would show an aluminum walkway up from grade into the area. The wide swath at the bottom would create an ADA accessibility path with seating areas there for folks with wheelchairs.

Further question to ask if the Wheelchair area would be able to see the field.

Mr. Karp explained that would all need to be determined, saying that the code in the 80's is not the same as you can do today. Sightlines may be a bit different, capacities may be different.

Question, partially inaudible, possibly asking how many ADA seats there would be.

Mr. Karp replied to say that it would be whatever the code required.

Question suggesting to consider, beyond the base cost, what the timeline for replacement options would be.

Mr. Karp replied that it would probably be a little faster but there would be a lot of "if's" and "maybe's" behind all of that. He explained with the new construction they would have more material costs, but the labor would be less expensive since they're clearing the site in a demolition and building from the ground up. He concluded it probably would be a little faster to do it brand new, but certainly no longer than that (48weeks).



Additional question asking how this would impact the plan to host the home games this year with the temporary bleachers.

Mr. Karp stated the notion would be that everything happens behind the fence and the track is on the other side and not directly in the path. Mr. Karp explained a logistics plan would need to be developed and at the outset they would be looking at many weeks of design and processing and equipment ordering before anything would happen. He stated that if it was agreed to do this now the football season would go on without anyone being there.

Comment regarding maintenance stating that one of the things the presentation showed was that they would have the supports that would bring the facility back to being safe, but much of it would remain a 33 year old structure with water damage and other various deteriorating aspects. Question asking what would be the expected life of the repairs vs a new facility and what type of maintenance costs would there be.

Mr. Karp shared that simplistically, brand new would be less to maintain than existing. He said steel gets hosed down and concrete does not.

Mr. Gasper spoke to advise the Board stating the last two options with the new design is the way they should go. Mr. Gasper cited they would be getting separate restrooms, pressbox and concessions and explained, when you have a failure, like what they have now, they wouldn't lose everything. Mr. Gasper continued to say that by having independent units it would be easier to maintain. Aluminum seating is easier to clean while concrete is very porous. Mr. Gasper said the black stain is from algae buildup and from water laying. He said bird droppings would wash off fairly easy.

Question was asked to know how many years would they get out of doing the repairs; how many more years would the 33 year old structure have.

Mr. Gasper spoke and explained that they're (the contractor) only going to caulk the stadium. He stated they were not going to take it apart and get in between it, so as the building expands and contracts, eventually the caulk will do the same thing it has done and it will lose its elasticity. Mr. Gasper was unsure if it would take 5 years, 2 years or 10 years. Mr. Gasper said the motion would be eliminated a little bit because of the steel structure, so that should help to get a little longevity out of it, but Mr. Gasper stated he does not know how long it will last.

Barry Isett Associate spoke to say that on a normal caulk job they would get 5 years of expected usable life, but in this situation it could even be less.

Question regarding an earlier slide that indicated no warranty. Question to clarify.

Mr. Karp explained that relative to the Opinion they have a common disclaimer when providing a cost opinion stating that it is just that. An opinion. He explained it was not a guarantee that if they finish the design and put it out for bid that it will come in at \$2 million. He further explained, the contractors would be warranted and so the work would be warranted.

Question asking if Mr. Karp knows what the warranty would be or what was standard in the industry.

Mr. Karp replied that he was unsure but typically he thought 1-2 years based on materials and workmanship.

Mr. Gasper spoke and shared that he had contacted a company that deals with grandstands, GT Grandstands, to find out costs to compare. Mr. Gasper said the information he received was \$250/\$300 per seat. Mr. Gasper said doing the math, the cost for 3,000 seats would be \$750,000-\$900,000, which was comparable to the Cost Option on the slides quoting \$1 million.

Question to clarify if the existing stadium was refurbished, would it be ADA.

Mr. Karp answered no, and explained that they would be doing structural repair only and current capacity and current degree of accessibility and inaccessibility would not be changed by refurbishing the existing structure.

Question asking if cost to demolish was included  
Mr. Karp responded yes.

Question asking if the timeline was 9 months for the new stadium.  
Mr. Karp was not sure but stated that it was 48 weeks for refurbishment of existing, so replacing with new should be less. He stated they did not do a detailed take off on that.

Question asking what would be the life of new bleachers.  
Mr. Karp answered that it would vary with different Manufacturer's and suggested they defer to Mr. Gasper's earlier reference. He also stated the Board could check with any School District's that have put in steel and aluminum bleachers to see what their experience has been. He also shared that they (Barry Isett & Assoc.) have been involved in a project in Lehighton that was currently entering their 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> season.

Question to clarify that warranty was one year for labor  
Mr. Gasper replied yes, and stated the bleachers and stuff is 5 years.

Further statement questioning that the presentation didn't say anything about what the life was and asked if they would get 3 years, 40 years or 50 years.  
Mr. Gasper was checking in notes, but did not respond or it was inaudible.

Question asking if there was any chance of getting any grant money.  
Mr. Krem deferred the question to Kristine Parkes who answered and advised there was Major League Baseball grants for baseball and softball fields and the National Football League has grants also. She continued to say that Boyertown might be a little far from the Philadelphia Eagles area and she wasn't sure if it covered grandstands or just field repair. Mrs. Parkes offered to look into it.

Question asking what kind of money would be possible with the grants.  
Mrs. Parkes stated that this was just one grant opportunity and she would have to research and get back to them. She stated it would only take a couple of hours to research a grant.

Statement made regarding the life of the new stadium, whether it would be 20 years or 30 years and commenting whether the existing stadium would have lasted longer than 33 years if maintenance had been kept up. Question asking if a 30 year lifespan was typical, or if they just did not know that.

Mr. Karp answered to say they would have to check with the manufacturer and stated that products are constantly being improved and optimized. I'm sure they would be happy to suggest what their longest facility in use is.

Comment on previous statement agreeing with finding out the longest facility in use and suggesting to also find out what their maintenance was so that Boyertown could mimic that. Question if the track would need to be changed or altered in any way.

Mr. Karp responded that it hadn't been fully designed, but he believed that everything will happen behind the track.

Statement questioning that the track butted up against the current stadium wall and suggesting that there wasn't much room there.

Mr. Karp replied that there might be spot repair required there.

Comment related to the cement testing and cost and stating that is all they thought would be included in this meeting. Statement made they were surprised and thankful for all of the additional information they had received this evening.

Question asking how the repair numbers were assessed. How did they come up with fair market value?

Mr. Karp answered that Boyle Construction had determined the numbers and that Isett & Associates provided their 15 sketches to Boyle. Boyle reviewed the sketches, did a site visit with Mr. Gasper and brought subcontractors out to look at the area. Mr. Karp explained that Boyle determined the numbers based on all of the details they were shown and with some imagination on how to fill in the blanks and allowances of things that weren't quite detailed yet.

Comment made that it was hard to believe it would cost more to repair the stadium than to tear it down and build a new one, suggesting that the numbers may be increased to sway the Board towards building a new stadium. Statement made that Board Members need to be careful moving forward to a new stadium and need to be sure the numbers for repairing the stadium are correct before they get into the cost factors of a new stadium. Suggestion made to get fair market values from other companies as to what it would cost to do similar work.

Mr. Karp explained that Isett & Assoc. got Boyle Construction involved because they had a better idea of the cost and materials. He explained that Isett gave Boyle all of their input and asked them to provide a number (for refurbishment). Isett further requested Boyle to provide another number to indicate some type of replacement for that (build new). Mr. Karp continued to say, the folks from Barry Isett are forensic engineers so if the Board elected to replace the stadium, then Barry Isett & Associates would be gone because they do not do that work. Mr. Karp concluded by saying, the Board has their sketches and could give them to any contractor they wished and ask them to price it.

Comment made to recap what the Board had heard so far in the meeting stating that with the intense labor having to be done in tight spaces to refurbish the existing stadium, cost would be \$2.5 million. The cost for a comparable stadium with restrooms and ADA compliance and new and improved press box would be \$2 million. Further comment to say the missing link is that if the Board spends \$40,000 they can get a better idea on the concrete slabs, whether they could be reused or will need to be replaced. If they have to be replaced that would be another \$750,000 cost. The total would then be \$2.5 million plus \$750,000 resulting in about \$3.2 million to \$3.3 million to refurbish. Question asking if that was accurate?

Mr. Karp answered to say that was correct.

Further comment stating the difficulty of the decision based on the numbers and the need to not delay. Statement made regarding the feeling of not wanting to tear down the stadium and that they didn't think anyone was trying to sell the Board a stadium, however, finding out about the concrete might help to make a decision.

Mr. Lewis spoke to say the meeting was quickly running out of time and although it was an important subject he would like to try to move to the public comment portion of the meeting after the next few comments. Mr. Lewis also suggested postponing the last two Agenda items, Paper Retrieval Bins and Vehicle Replacement, to another meeting.

Comment made contradicting the idea of spending another \$40,000 in hope that the total to refurbish would be \$2.5 million and cited the issue of not having ADA. Further statement made that the Board would likely end up doing concessions and restrooms and a press box and spending more money anyway.

Comment made to add that Issett Associates has put a lot more contingency in the repair because of stuff cannot be seen.

Comment in favor of new construction both because of cost and the fact that refurbishment would not be able to solve all of the problems. Statement agreeing that the stadium was beloved and a result of a lot of hard work from the community, but structures do not last forever.

Statement made that the Board should look to have a safe structure that's going to last well into the future and question asking when the next Board action or decision needs to be taken and what they will be deciding on.

Mr. Lewis responded saying that was a good question that he could not answer right now and said he believes they have to digest some of this stuff. He started to say that they could vote today, and Mr. Krem interrupted to speak on that thought, saying the Board was elected as public figures, they were not on any time, they set the time and everyone else dances to their tune. He stated, "That's the law of the land". Mr. Krem further spoke to suggest if they would gut the stadium and take out all of the pressures on those walls, fix the exterior walls, and drop the aluminum stadium inside would that be a feasible idea?

Mr. Karp responded to say the replacement of aluminum on the interior would have a greater durability and longer useful life than the repairs that they would do to everything that's in the middle, but he cautioned that when there is an integral structure and everything is removed from the

center it requires some repair to the exterior walls. He explained they will still have brick and masonry and will still need repointing and joint repair. Mr. Karp concluded by saying, for conversation sake, it falls somewhere between the two extremes they that have described here, but there is still a lot more investigation needed to determine about what gets taken out and what has to be reinforced and what remains in order to insert the new in there. He also stated one fear he had was the economy of brand new construction out of the ground is that they've got all that room to work. If the walls remain they do not have all that room to work.

Comment made to reiterate that the Board needs to make sure that the cost estimates are correct on the repair end.

Comment made that the Board owes it to the Community to move fast so that they're not talking about fall sports in 2019.

Mr. Gasper spoke to recap where they were now with numbers and stated they have a few options. He explained that the number they had received from Boyle was not a "golden number" and Boyle had not "put all of their cards on the table" Mr. Gasper stated that was because if Boyle had to go out to bid, everyone would know what they were bidding on. Mr. Gasper continued to say that without the solicitor he wasn't sure if what he was going to suggest would be allowable, but he said the Board could decide to put together a pre spec including materials and design sketches and put it out almost like a bid. Mr. Gasper explained if a number comes back that the Board likes, they would be halfway there and if they would still like to do forensic testing they could do that as an alternate bid. Mr. Gasper cautioned this would cost money to prepare and to advertise and would take time, but may help the Board in their final decision.

Mr. Krem suggested the Board take straw vote and see where people are with respect to new vs repair.

Mr. Lewis suggested to continue with comments.

Question asked when was the next facilities meeting.  
Mr. Lewis responded that was not currently scheduled

Question asking if they could have one within the next week or two and suggested they reach out to the community to find out thoughts on keeping the current stadium or building new.

Question to Mr. Gasper to confirm if the bid he was referring to putting out was for new construction or repair?

Mr. Gasper replied the bid would be just the repair.

Mr. Lewis spoke to say they were out of time and they would schedule another facilities meeting very soon to continue this discussion. They would move to public comment.

#### Public comment

Barb Furman spoke to say she was part of the Victory Mile Committee that raised a half a million dollars for the track and that the track was the only thing that was "state of the art" in the Stadium. She wants to be sure that the district has spoken to the people that did the original track installation and that they were comfortable with putting bleachers on the track. She continued to say she hoped

the Victory Mile Group would have a meeting on this process so they can be assured. Mrs. Furman shared information about some of the repairs that had been done to the track in 2006 and that in 2018 it was in very good shape. She questioned what was the guarantee? Mrs. Furman shared her thoughts that the stadium reached this state of disrepair due to the Board's culture of not raising taxes and not spending money. She stated that the beginning of the story cannot be changed, but they need to change the process and move forward with mutual respect, upgrading the facilities to the standards of the league and neighboring school districts.

Elise Watts spoke to say she that she couldn't decide if she was really angry or really happy. She shared her thoughts that Mr. Palladino's alternatives were very good and that she was happy the Board came to a decision for next year's sports season. Mrs. Watts continued to say that the "nonsense" with the stadium that has been happening for years was overwhelming and she referred to a previous Board Member comment that the Board owed it to the community to move faster, that is has been on the docket too long. Mrs. Watts was unhappy that the Board would think about decreasing seating to save money, but they were willing to spend money to test concrete that Mrs. Watts feels is not functional anyway. Mrs. Watts further stated that decreasing seats with the portable bleachers would decrease gate sales and impact their bottom line. Mrs. Watts commented on the finances Mr. Palladino asked for, stating they should be included in the Stadium budget. Mrs. Watts spoke to the Board with her comments stating that she expected them to behave like they were in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, expected them to be aggressive, proactive, and spend a little money on the children. She continued to say that every decision they make should be about doing what's best for the children. She appealed to the Board to set an example and stop catcalling at each other and picking each other apart. She asked the Board to be respectful of each other, stating it was embarrassing. Mrs. Watts concluded by asking that she wanted to know why it's so slow, why there's no decision in moving forward and why these projects can't take place simultaneously.

Madeline Caroselli spoke to say she "echoed" everything Mrs. Watts said and asked the Board to keep moving forward, not to wait another 7 months to make a decision.

Mr. Lewis apologized that the meeting ran over.

Tom Johnston stood from the audience to speak and said one thing that wasn't brought up regarding the question on how they can buy a new stadium cheaper than the cost to repair the old one, was to keep in mind that they were not talking "apple to apples". He explained they're replacing a concrete structure with aluminum and steel which is not the same as replacing with what they already have. Mr. Johnston thought it would be good to bring that up. He continued to say that it's the same number of seats but not really what we already have and concluded by saying that he had not heard that brought up but thought it was something to consider with the cost.

No further Committee Comment

Mr. Lewis thanked everyone and asked for motion to adjourn  
Meeting adjourned