School Board Committee: Capital Facilities

Date: May 19, 2010

Committee Members: Chair Jack Dunn, Clint Cogswell, Kevin Fleming

Other Board Members present: Kass Ardinger

Administrators: Rob Prohl, Michele Croteau

Others: Mark Saltsman and Peter Bloomfield, Concord Steam; Tom Chapman, Chad Monterose and Andy Lane, RFS Engineering; Laura Wernick, HMFH

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Jack Dunn at 4:35 p.m., who then appointed Kass Ardinger to sit on the committee in the absence of Eric Williams.

Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Saltsman explained the process of obtaining financing for Concord Steam’s new woodchip plant in Concord’s South End. They are still expecting to have this plant online by 2012. Jack Dunn and RFS Engineering presented a chart showing the estimated construction costs of steam vs. gas. Steam is $18,000 less. In addition, Mr. Dunn and RFS displayed the relative costs of the two fuel sources: gas @ $1.38 vs. steam @ $1.75 for the new Conant School. Given these assumptions on cost (including the cost to replace gas boilers) there is no financial advantage using gas or steam. Dr. Fleming pointed out that if the District uses a lower gas price some savings with gas would be realized; however, there are so many variables in the analysis that making a decision on this basis is not prudent. Mr. Saltsman and Mr. Bloomfield listed the advantages to using Concord Steam: wood as a fuel cost has been more stable in price than other fuel sources; Concord Steam is a locally-owned company in Concord that has been in business since 1938 and provides employment in the Concord community; wood is carbon neutral. There is a possibility that a carbon tax may be levied in the future on fuel sources that are not renewable. It was also noted that the new Conant will have space in the boiler room to add a gas boiler in the future if needed.

The committee voted 4-0 to approve Concord Steam as the fuel source at the new school at Conant. Mr. Cogswell made this motion with a second by Dr. Fleming.

Mr. Dunn presented a consultant’s assessment of the feasibility of selling and moving buildings in the Kimball block. Given the large number of trees and utility poles that
would have to be taken down to allow a building to be moved off the Kimball site (at
the buyer’s expense), it is clear that this is not a feasible option. Members of the
committee agreed with consultant’s report.

No votes were taken. The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Dunn, Chair
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