Building on a Foundation of Excellence

Proposed Turf Field Repair Project Work Will Have No Impact On Tax Rate

Background Information

October 18, 2016

Community members pass a \$25,000,000 capital project to fund campus-wide renovations and upgrades.

Winter 2017 - Winter 2018

Capital project plans are developed by SWBR, our school architectural firm.

Winter 2018

Architectural plans are submitted to the New York State Education Department for approval.

Spring 2018

Architectural plans are approved by the New York State Education Department and VCS Board of Education.

Spring 2018

Capital Project work goes out to bid. The cost of the work comes in under budget.

Spring 2018

A turf field "G-Max" inspection is done and it is revealed that the 10 year old surface is nearing the end of its life expectancy of 10-12 years.

Summer 2018

VCS proposes a special turf field repair vote.

September 4, 2018

Community Forum on the turf field repair proposal, at 7:00 pm, Intermediate School Auditorium.

September 18, 2018

Vote on turf field repair proposal, from Noon – 8:00 pm, Primary School Gymnasium.

Fall 2018 - Winter 2019

Turf field work begins after fall athletic season.

Spring 2019

Project completion.

Why is VCS proposing turf field repair work now?

This spring, following what is called a G-Max turf test, it was revealed that the integrity of our current turf field is nearing the end of its life expectancy of 10 to 12 years. The G-Max test, which measures the shock attenuation performance of the surface, averaged 160. An average score of 200 would deem the field unsafe and unusable.

Our turf field is only 10 years old. Why is it wearing out sooner than the 12 year maximum life expectancy?

The VCS school community has used the turf field for many wonderful activities over the past ten years. Unfortunately, due to greater than average use, it has aged more quickly than expected. Each year, there are approximately 230 interscholastic-athletic practices/games, 400 physical education classes and 160 other events and/or community organizations and teams that utilize the turf field seven days a week. Our field band also holds multiple practices and a large annual competition on the field when weather permits.

Will the new turf field last longer?

Yes. The mono grass product we currently have on our field represents the first generation of turf fields. Turf technology has changed considerably over the past decade.

The average annual hourly use of mono grass turf is approximately 2,000 hours. The VCS community uses the surface nearly 33% more than that, approximately 3,000 hours per year.

The new proposed vertex prime turf material is a multi-strand technology designed to with-stand a much higher capacity than the original turf technology.

FieldTurf Vertex Prime is comprised of specially designed slit-film fibers and high performance

rigid monofilament fibers. The fibrillation process of the slit-film component allows for proper infill encapsulation while the monofilament fibers facilitate grass-like ball roll. Both fibers are tufted together in the same stitch for a superior aesthetic appearance.

Is our current turf field safe?

Yes. While current conditions are not prime, the existing field is safe and will be reliable through the fall athletics/activities season.

If approved, when will the new turf field be installed?

If the community supports this proposal, the new turf field will be installed after the fall 2018 athletic season and available for use in the spring of 2019.

Why didn't we include this turf work in the original 2016 Capital Project proposal?

The turf repair was not included in the 2016 Capital Project plan because two years ago, the surface was in better shape. Since 2016, the integrity of the field has declined substantially as was revealed in the G-Max test.

If we already approved the expenditure of \$25,000,000 in the original 2016 Capital Project, and we have the funds to pay for it at no tax rate increase to residents, why do we have to vote on the turf repair?

Since the turf field repair was not needed at the time of the 2016 capital project vote, it was not specifically outlined as part of the 2016 Capital Project's planned scope. In order to use the residual funds on a new scope item, the District is legally required to obtain voter approval to allocate these funds to the new item.

Why does the Bond Proposition state only \$21,000,000 when voters actually approved a \$25,000,000 proposal in October, 2016?

When voters approved the original 25,000,000 proposal in October, 2016, it included two parts: \$4,000,000 for an Energy Performance Contract to replace outdated lights and equipment with high quality, high performing, energy efficient systems designed to reduce maintenance and utility costs, and \$21,000,000 for capital project work, totaling \$25,000,000.

