



BARKER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Board of Education Meeting Minutes
Board Room
Monday, March 30, 2020

PRESENT R. Atwater, M. Clemens-Harris, H. Ecker, C. Gancasz, L. Mead, J. Sweeney, V. Voss

EXCUSED None

ALSO

PRESENT J. Reimer, M. Eadie, C. Heiligenthaler
Public: 1

**CALL TO
ORDER**

President Atwater welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge to the Flag was given.

APPROVE

AGENDA The agenda was reviewed and no changes were recommended. Motion by Mr. Sweeney, seconded by Mrs. Clemens-Harris to approve the agenda as presented.
Yes: 7, No: 0
Motion carried.

**PUBLIC
FORUM**

None.

PRESENTATIONS None.

**SUPERINTENDENT'S
REPORT**

None:

**BUSINESS AND
FINANCIAL ITEMS**

Mr. Reimer walked the Board through the items listed under the Business and Financial Items on the agenda which were the result of the last few months of work pertaining to a proposed capital project in order to put it on the ballot as a referendum, and what steps would need to occur if the Board were to approve them to move forward. The full Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Parts 1-3, including the two Part 1 and Part 2 prepared by SEI Design must be reviewed in order to adopt the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) Negative Declaration and consider or adopt any of the resolutions associated with



the actions relating to the capital project as it relates to submitted as a proposition on a ballot.

Mr. Reimer noted that before the Board makes a decision on the aforementioned actions, he wanted to provide his views given the recent events occurring globally, nationally, and in New York State. He commented that since the Board asked him to put the project together, a lot of negative events, specifically, Statewide that the Board needs to take into account before any decisions are made. The NYS budget is currently projected to have \$15 billion deficit in revenues for next year. He stated that Governor Cuomo has commented several times that as the education piece of the budget is the largest component, most likely the cuts will come from that area. Mr. Reimer has looked at the budget that will be brought forward next month, and he does not believe the District will get the projected amount estimated back in January 2020, rather a reduction in that money that would look something closer to funds received in 2019 – 2020's level. It was also stated that the State could possibly look at a rolling review of revenues which could result in further reductions of funds. He provided a general example that if one was projected to receive \$10 million in aid, the next quarter decrease to \$9.5, and the next quarter \$9.0 million. As a result, the District can't budget the amount it knows it will receive. Mr. Reimer noted he was really concerned about putting the capital project out for vote, but noted that the Board as a group needs to determine what it should do. He stated that this is a good project to do, and is needed, but does not know if this is the right time. If things change, it could be brought forward again.

Mr. Reimer noted there are a couple items within the projects District can do without voter approval relating to energy performance pieces. The difference is that aid would be reduced by approximately 10% compared to if taken to a vote. Mr. Reimer noted there were a lot of options and the other pieces could still be done at a later date. All concurred with Mr. Reimer's view, noting the total project is the right thing to do and very important for the District and students, but all agreed it is not the right time to do it given the current situation.

Mr. Atwater reconfirmed whether the Board felt a proposition should be brought forward. All agreed again it should not. He then inquired if they were to move forward with the energy performance piece, what would be the timeline. Mr. Reimer noted that if the Board agreed to move forward, the plans would go to the architects and an RFP would be prepared and issued. Upon receipt of the RFPs, they would be analyzed, narrowed down, and the Board would approve the awarding of a bid most likely in June at the earliest, and the approved work could begin in six to eight months and would be covered with standard building aid. Mr. Atwater inquired about the payback period. Mr. Reimer noted that the paybacks would be dependent upon a number of factors and would be different for each contract. Mr. Atwater discussed if the Board was to hold off, it would lose about another six months before benefits could be gained, and the payback makes it compelling to do. Mr. Sweeney asked about the cost of the energy performance piece and was informed it was approximately \$1.6 million. He also asked about the District's cost relative to receipt of State aid. Mr. Reimer noted that the District will save money as no funds would be expended by the District upfront as it is structured as a lease purchase. He also noted that the District would not take



anything out of reserves to do the energy performance piece as the District's related cost would be covered by the savings and the building aid would cover the remaining costs.

The Board provided their individual thoughts with regard to the energy performance piece proposed. Mr. Sweeney believe the aid may not be there as NYS is in trouble, but felt it was important to do and it needs to be clear to the community why given times, the District is moving forward with this. Mr. Atwater inquired about the ability to pull the project once it is started if the economics change. Mr. Reimer stated that the work to start the process could begin, and at a certain the point the Board would need to vote on approving a contract, if it was not a good time economically to continue, it could stop. There would be some associated costs but nothing significant. Mrs. Voss noted her concern about the perception in the community. She commented that to not do would put the District back a year, and not that the project isn't worth it, but concerned at these are very bad economic times. Mrs. Clemens-Harris stated that she felt the Board should proceed with caution, get the project rolling, and then decide. Mr. Reimer reiterated that the Board can go through the process and if it does not like it at the point of decision, it could stop the project. Mrs. Voss commented she agreed based on the ability to stop, that the Board should move forward. Mr. Atwater inquired if the annual savings for the HVAC and lighting could be at least approximately \$50,000. Mr. Reimer noted it could. After discussion, with questions being responded to, the Board agreed to move forward based with the understanding it could stop the project at any time.

END OF PUBLIC

SESSION Motion by Mrs. Clemens-Harris, seconded by Mr. Sweeney, to end the Public Session and enter into Executive Session at 7:20 p.m. for the purpose of discussing negotiations.

Yes: 7, No: 0

Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE

SESSION Motion by Mr. Sweeney, Seconded by Mrs. Gancasz, to approve the adjournment of the Executive Session at 7:59 p.m., and return to Public Session.

Yes: 6, No: 0

Motion carried.

PUBLIC SESSION/ ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Mead, seconded by Mrs. Clemens-Harris, that the Board approve the end of the Public Session and adjournment of the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Yes: 6, No: 0

Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary H. Eadie
District Clerk