

## Recommendations for a new Transportation Facility

The Geneseo Central School Transportation Task Force

### **Executive Summary**

#### **Introduction:**

The Task force was created by the GCS BOE in January 2014. The task force has met 10 times from February 11, 2014 to October 6, 2014 and reviewed other facilities in the area.

Our charge was to “develop recommendations to the Board of Education to determine what should be done with the transportation facility on South Street, which is unsatisfactory in its current state. The Task Force will consider sharing partnerships with other districts and municipalities develop a facility plan and make a recommendation to the Board of Education ....”

The Task Force addressed the following issues: Sharing Partnership, Leasing, Land Purchase and Site Work, the Structure, Fuel Island and Soft Costs. Below are the Task Force recommendations in summary form. Following the summary below, more detail is provided on each of the recommendations.

#### **Summary recommendations:**

- **Sharing Partnership and Leasing: The Task Force does not recommend that the School Board enter into any sharing relationships at this time. But it remains open to a sharing relationship once a new facility is built. We recommend that leasing not be considered as an option.**
- **Land Purchase and Site Work: The Task Force recommends that a new facility be built on purchased property ranging from 3 to 4 acres. There are a number of possible sites but no specific site is recommended. Site work will be determined in large measure by the land purchased. The budget for the site work is based on the topography of the land originally considered for purchase.**
- **Structure: A majority (11 to 2) of the Task Force recommends a 3 bay facility – large lift, flexible lift and a wash bay. The recommended footprint of the building is 100 feet by 62 feet. The office space including storage, restrooms, mechanical room is 24 feet by 62 feet. The recommended facility is a pre-engineered steel building system with four feet of block off the ground. This structure is budgeted at \$995,279.**
- **Fuel Island: The Task Force recommends that a fuel island consisting of gasoline and diesel tanks (moved from current facility), new gas and diesel pumps, fencing around the island, canopy cover, fuel management and fuel suppression systems be included in the project. This fuel island is budgeted at \$71,000.**
- **Soft Costs: The Task Force recommends that the soft costs be budgeted at 28% of site work, Fuel Island and structure costs.**

## Details regarding each recommendation

Exhibit 1 provides a financial comparison of the proposal made to the voters a number of years ago to what the Task Force is currently recommending.

### **Sharing Partnerships:**

Over the initial few months this was a prime focus of the Committee. All neighboring school districts were contacted as well as the Town, Village and the County. After having phone contact and a few meetings, it was clear that no one was interested in a sharing partnership. In late September, the County did express some interest in selling land and considering the Geneseo School transportation facility as a possible entity to provide maintenance to the County's fleet of small vehicles. While the option of buying land at the County site is still a viable option, the Committee does not recommend that the school district take on the responsibility of providing maintenance to the County's fleet of small vehicles. The County's fleet is too large in the Committee's view for an Educational institution to manage. However, the district should continue to entertain providing maintenance services at a new facility to other school districts if an opportunity arises in the future.

### **Leasing:**

While finding someone who would build the facility and lease it back to the school might have some advantages, most notably not having to use prevailing wage, there are no parties identified who would build a building and then lease it back over a 30 - year lease. Most entities willing to do this would want a much shorter lease. The Task Force also approached Covered Wagon concerning utilizing space at their facility for a maintenance facility. While Covered Wagon was willing to explore the idea, the Task force did not favor this option because the school would be at the mercy of the leaser who could at any time, regardless of a contract and for a myriad of reasons not be able to continue to lease the facility or provide the services which would create significant problems for the school.

### **Land – Utilizing the current property or purchase land:**

The consensus of the task force is that a new facility should not be built at the current site and the current site should be sold and all proceeds from the sale should be applied to the local share of any debt service.

Work is underway to find a new site for the facility but the task force cannot recommend a specific site at this time. Due to the many variables and options available, the task force believes the Board should review all options and select the property that is the most cost effective. The Task Force believes the District should purchase between 3 to 4 acres of land for the new facility. This decision by the Task force is based on input from Bob Bringley from Marathon Engineering. The Engineers report is attached as Exhibit 7

### **Site Work:**

This area of the project has been discussed but until a specific site is selected, it is impossible to determine what this cost will be. Some of the factors involve the amount of fill required, amount of leveling involved, and availability of utilities, water and sewer. At this point, the budgeted amount is \$650,000 which is based on a site with similar topography to the original

site south of the Geneseo School complex. This amount includes the fuel island budgeted at \$71,000 which is addressed as a separate issue below.

**The Structure:**

The size and layout of the building involved a great deal of discussion. Major issues included the number of bays, size of the office space and a second story storage area vs ground floor storage. Ultimately, a majority of the task force by a vote of 11 to 2 favored a 3 bay facility – Large lift bay, flexible lift bay and a wash bay. Two people favored a 4 bay facility. The overall footprint of the building recommended is 100 feet by 62 feet. The office space including storage, restrooms, mechanical room is 24 feet by 62 feet. The facility structure budget was based on unit heaters fueled by natural gas, and air conditioning in the office area excluding the mechanical room and storage room. The wash bay has a manual system with no water filtration nor water reclamation system. A storage area for flammable items and a heater closet in the wash bay are included. \$10,000 was budgeted for wash bay equipment. Outside lights are not included in this section of the budget. A flexible lift should be considered for one of the bays in order to support work on large and small vehicles. The proposed facility is a pre-engineered steel building system with four feet of block off the ground.

While the recommended cost for the facility is based on the above footprint, there remain some issues to finalize:

- Concern was expressed that the storage area allocated might be too small. This is a detail that needs further analysis in the design phase.

- 

This item created by far the most debate in the process of finalizing these recommendations.

While the current allocation of space for storage may or may not be adequate, a majority (7 to 8 members) of the task force believe that adequate storage can be provided within the overall footprint of the building (6,200 sq. ft.) and that expanding the overall building for storage should not be considered.

A minority (5 to 6 members) of the Task Force believe that this language is too restrictive and does not allow adequate latitude in the design phase.

The task force does realize that many details of the final structure have not been analyzed and therefore are left to the design phase to resolve.

- It was also suggested that there should be direct access to outside the building from the storage room.
- In floor heating should be reviewed prior to the final determination of the heating system to be used in the facility.

The recommended budget for the facility is \$995,279. A summary breakdown is attached as Exhibit 2. Exhibits 3 and 4 are layouts of the facility and an external view of the proposed facility.

## Details regarding each recommendation

### **Fuel Island:**

There has been considerable discussion on this subject. The current proposal being considered is for \$71,524 which includes relocating existing tanks and providing diesel and gasoline at the island, purchasing two new pumps (gas and diesel), fencing around the island, canopy cover, fuel management system, and a fire suppression system. Exhibit 5 is a more detailed budget plan. Exhibit 6 is a draft layout of the fuel island. This budget is based on the district buying most of the equipment directly from the selected vendor.

There was considerable discussion regarding the need to have gasoline at the fuel island as well as whether a card management system was a requirement. Based on input from the Superintendent and the possibility of buses going more to gasoline from diesel in the future, the committee accepted the current plan which is attached.

### **Soft Costs:**

Soft Costs include the following:

Design – 9%

CM-In house – 0%

Contingency – 10%

Cost Inflation – 3%

Miscellaneous – 6% which could include legal, insurance, bonding, short term financing, moving, furniture and other expenses

At this point, soft costs total 28% of the site work, fuel island and facility budgets combined.

### Attachments:

Exhibit 1 - A summary of the budget we started with and the current status.

Exhibit 2 – A budget for the facility.

Exhibit 3 – A layout of the proposed facility.

Exhibit 4 – A drawing of the external view of the facility.

Exhibit 5 – A budget of the Fuel Island.

Exhibit 6 – Fuel Island layout.

Exhibit 7 – Marathon Engineering Report