

School Facilities and Student Health, Achievement, and Attendance: A Data Analysis Executive Summary

Students who attend schools with environmental hazards that impact indoor air quality are more likely to miss class, and therefore lose learning opportunities. Yet school environmental health and safety remains largely unregulated and there is no state or federal agency in charge of protecting children's environmental health in schools. This report, *School Facilities and Student Health, Achievement, and Attendance: A Data Analysis*, looks at information compiled from all public schools in two New York counties, and from a select group of schools from around the state that have reported environmental health and safety problems. It shows that, despite the lack of an up-to-date system for collecting data on environmental hazards in schools, it is still possible to correlate existing information with state funding to repair hazards and to show that unhealthy schools rob students of valuable classroom learning time.

As a result of the Campaign for Fiscal Equity lawsuit, discussion and debate concerning New York State education policy in recent years has centered on funding. The New York State Court of Appeals has upheld a ruling ordering New York to increase the amount it spends per student in New York City, although the State has yet to act on the ruling. State political leaders are searching for ways to meet that mandate, while also increasing spending on students in school districts outside the City. Making sure students are learning in healthy school environments is one cost-effective way to meet state education spending goals. This involves holding the state and school districts accountable for spending funds on new and renovated facilities that are designed to improve student health and learning from the beginning.

Unfortunately, very little work has been done to explore the relationship between the condition of school facilities and student performance. Demonstrating such a link would provide an important new element to the discussion about the efficient use of valuable, yet limited, educational resources. With generous support from the Rockefeller Foundation, Healthy Schools Network has conducted this relatively small research project to survey the landscape that can lead to a full large scale study researching the link between the environmental health of school facilities and student performance. To achieve this goal, HSN has carried out the most thorough study ever conducted into how New York State records the data necessary to make such important evaluations.

Our report looks at schools in two of New York State's fastest growing counties: Dutchess and Columbia. These two Hudson Valley counties, typical of so much of Upstate New York, were selected for their mix of small cities, suburbs and rural communities. In the past decade, New York State has put in place rules and procedures to track environmental quality in schools, notably the 1999 Re build Schools to Uphold Education (RESCUE) program initiated by the Commissioner of Education. Nevertheless, we found that the lack of consistent reporting criteria and data collection makes it very difficult to track and correlate official individual school and district reports of hazards in schools.

This necessitated solving a problem that was unanticipated at the start of the project: the lack of an interfaced reporting system that would allow us to compare school facilities data reported to the State Education Department (SED) from building condition surveys (BCS) and annual visual inspections (AVI). Healthy Schools Network solved this problem by creating a model reporting system that worked for this report and that could serve as a template for SED to improve the future quality of its facilities conditions database.

Healthy Schools Network next correlated the results of the building surveys with existing data on student health complaints from a sample of 30 schools across the state. For the latter, we relied mainly on reports to our own student health hotline from students, parents and teachers and school staff. Through this research, we were able to determine that the current school facility assessment tool is a fair indicator of potential student environmental health problems.

Finally, we correlated our facility data from the two county area with NYS Education Department School Report Cards, reflecting a measure of student academic achievement. From this limited study we learned that there is indeed a correlation between poorer academic achievement for students attending schools where environmental hazards have been identified. Again, this limited study examines the landscape for a potential next phase, large study looking at the effect of the condition of school facilities on student achievement.

Based on the conclusions of our research, we are making the following recommendations:

1. Replace the current system of annual school facilities reports with one using evidence-based assessments actionable in a short (one year) time frame and link it to state funding that is currently available under the minor maintenance and repair (MMR) program to mitigate identified hazards.
2. Create unified linking codes for each school and collect the data via the internet for better accuracy and public accessibility.
3. The New York State Education Department should make the facilities environmental quality data available to parents and the general public to facilitate improvement efforts.
4. The methods used for this study, in particular the linked building and performance data, should be replicated in other counties around the state for more precision of analysis and targeting of priorities.

Data for this report came from 18 separate school districts, six in Columbia County and 12 in Dutchess County, for the 2002-2003 school year. It was augmented by data collected from 11 of the same districts for the 2003-2004 school year.

School Facilities and Student Health, Achievement, and Attendance: A Data Analysis

New York State is home to nearly 4000 schools, receiving over 3.33 million children everyday. An estimated 20% of the state's population is in a school facility on any given school day. Assuring the health and safety of children, teachers and all school staff should be among the highest priorities of state policymakers. Yet in New York State, and throughout the country, school environmental health and safety remains largely unregulated. School officials are, for the most part, unaccountable for assuring environmentally healthy and safe schools for students, teachers and staff. While children are especially vulnerable to school facility related environmental hazards, there is no regulatory authority equivalent to OSHA that protects children's "occupational health" at school. Many, especially parents, are also surprised to learn that neither the state nor local health departments have jurisdiction to regulate environmental health and safety in school, except for cafeterias and swimming pools. Even code enforcement officers may be denied entry to public educational facilities unless invited in by local school authorities.

To its credit, New York State has taken a few steps forward in attempting to address school environmental quality.

- Ten years ago, the Board of Regents approved the groundbreaking recommendations of the Regents Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality in Schools. They provided a groundbreaking analysis of environmental health and safety in NYS schools and a set of guiding principles and a detailed set of recommendations for addressing school environmental quality.
- In 1999, the Commissioner of Education's RESCUE (Rebuild Schools to Uphold Education) regulations represented an unprecedented effort by the State to improve school facilities. These regulations require schools to conduct periodic facility inspections, including five year building condition surveys, and annual visual inspections. Yearly school facility report cards are supposed to be made public. The RESCUE regulations also

require schools to adhere to a process for resolving environmental health and safety problems, including establishment of school district health and safety committees.

- In 2004 State Education Commissioner Richard Mills and New York Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) President Peter Smith agreed to co-develop new healthy and high performance school design guidelines for New York State schools.
- In 2005 Governor Pataki signed the Green Products Cleaning bill. This legislation that will require schools to use healthier, environmentally preferable green cleaning products. The green products cleaning program for schools will begin with the new 2006 school year.
- This, combined with other legislation of recent years protecting children from pesticides, mercury exposure, arsenic treated playground equipment, the Minor Maintenance and Repair Fund, and other initiatives show a genuine bipartisan commitment by New York State to address issues of children's environmental health, learning and schools facilities.

For this study, Healthy Schools Network has assessed the adequacy of the New York State Education Department's (SED) school facility inspection and accountability system, as it pertains to environmental health and safety. This analysis examines a limited set of school facility data, to identify certain patterns, and to pose questions for further research regarding a potential future large-scale study to more broadly assess the condition of school facilities on student health and learning. The specific SED data used includes;

- Building Condition Surveys (BCS) -- a facility inspection report required by regulation to be completed every five years by the district and signed by a licensed architect or engineer for each school facility (see

attachment # 1)- Note that the BCS has been revised and reformatted for 2006. This analysis used the first version of the BCS.

- Annual visual Inspections (AVI) -- a facility inspection report to be completed by the district annually (see attachment # 2). As with the BCS, the AVI has been revised and reformatted for 2006.
- Minor Maintenance and Repair Aid (MMR) – forms completed by districts to apply for aid for minor facility repair and maintenance projects (see attachment # 3)
- Building Aid – data available from the SED website regarding district expenditures for renovation and construction of school facilities.

We looked at the relationship of building aid and MMR data to the school inspection data and also examined SED school facility inspection data in relationship to student health and learning. This analysis also produced findings regarding the adequacy of SED facility data and the SED facility data collection process.

Our objectives in this analysis are to determine: 1) if the current New York State facility reporting system is adequate for predicting financing needs for renovation and repair; 2) if this data suggests that the condition of school facilities has a measurable and tangible impact on student performance, and 3) if the current facility reporting system is adequate to document and measure the condition of school facilities in relation to student health and achievement.

Data Sources

- Building condition survey data for Columbia and Dutchess Counties (year 2000).
- Annual visual inspection data for Columbia and Dutchess Counties (years 2001, 02, 03).
- Data regarding building aid expenditures for Columbia and Dutchess Counties (ongoing database).
- Data on Minor Maintenance and Repair expenditures for Columbia and Dutchess Counties.
- Data regarding student academic achievement from the NYS database of School Report Cards (SRC)(?)

- Healthy Schools Network data from our NYS database of environmental health complaints for NYS schools (ongoing database).

Findings: Limitations in SED Data

In general, we found that significant improvement is needed in the content of the tools, the process to collect the data, and the process to retrieve and effectively use the data.

- The NYS SED's system of data collection is disjointed. Each data source is designed independently, using different codes and code formats to represent each school. Some data is computer collected, while other data is collected on paper, creating manual retrieval and data entry effort. Pulling together data from all sources for each school required creating of a linked table of all applicable codes for all data sources for each school.
- SED control numbers are not listed on MMR forms; we had to look up in BCS and put them in the database.
- Inconsistent building numbers for SRC and facilities inspection reports.
 - Inconsistent formats (order of fields, dashes, etc.).
 - Inconsistent within SED vs. in Districts (e.g. AVI's Codes Reformatted).
- AVI data is not available electronically and a large amount of time was spent creating this database. Note: We had received 217 hard copies of AVI Reports for 101 schools in Columbia and Dutchess Counties for years 2001-02, 2002-03 & 2003-04.
- While doing the data entry process we discovered several limitations with the AVI data.
 - 18 of 217 reports had important information on the AVI Report missing or left blank.
 - Control numbers were printed wrong for some schools, had different formats and different numbers of digits. This made it impossible to link the information with BCS. This necessitated creation of our own link table.
- SED has MMR data for districts, but not for individual schools.. There is insufficient MMR data to assess use of these funds in relation to needs identified in the BCS and AVI.

- AVI Reports look similar to BCS and are exactly the same in the information required of schools. In terms of data reported by schools, there is minimal variation (only 1.3% for unsatisfactory building components) between the BCS and the AVI.
- Inconsistent identification of school facilities across SED data sources[, many to many relationships]?
 - Several buildings for one program (e.g. mobile classrooms used).
 - Several programs for one building (e.g. Jr./Sr. High).

Part 1

Part 1. Research Question

The first level of analysis was to assess the adequacy of data tools used by the New York State Education Department and local school districts that are intended to document and measure the conditions of school facilities (the BCS, the AVI). The BCS and AVI are legally required facility inspection reports to be completed by schools in accordance with Part 155 of the New York State Commissioner of Education's Regulations, also known as RESCUE (Rebuild Schools to Uphold Education).

While required by law, it is unclear what function these inspection reports have for management of school facility health and safety. We are especially interested in the State's allotment of funds for renovation and replacement of school facilities in the aid category known as building aid. In previous discussions with SED officials, we learned that BCS and AVI school inspection data was not used by SED in their process of allotting school building aid for rebuilding and renovating schools. We are also similarly interested in the allotment of funds to school districts for minor maintenance and repair. Minor Maintenance and Repair (MMR) funds are

provided to school districts for certain facility maintenance projects. We compared the minor maintenance and repair expenditures with the building aid expenditures.

Part 1. Methodology

For this first level of analysis, we limited our study to two contiguous NYS counties, primarily to limit the scope to produce meaningful findings with limited means. Columbia and Dutchess Counties were chosen because they represent a geographic region that is broadly representative of upstate NY, with a mix of small cities, suburbs and rural communities.

We asked the research question; “are school facility environmental health issues identified in the BCS and AVI related to MMR and building aid expenditures?” If building aid is expended for projects that bear a relationship to facility needs identified by schools in the BCS and AVI, then this would indicate that the inspection reports are capturing some data relevant to environmental health and safety. If there is a weak or no discernable relationship between BCS and AVI school inspection data, then this would indicate that the inspection reports themselves are not capturing relevant data.

Our working assumption is that school district officials and SED should be spending public building aid funds for projects that address the greatest needs. If building aid is allotted for projects that don’t represent a facility need as identified in the BCS and AVI, then this would indicate a weakness in the inspection reports, the building aid expenditure process, or both.

We compared BCS and AVI data with MMR and state building aid funds drawn down by schools to see any patterns and relationships between the school inspection data and actual funds used for renovation, repair and

rebuilding of schools. To do this, we created a master table to link these different data sources, since BCS, AVI and building aid reports are all collected by SED using different formats (see attachment # 4). In fact, we found that SED has no electronic database of Annual Visual Inspections, necessitating hours of effort on our part to organize and enter data manually from AVI photocopies supplied to us by SED.

Once the master table was designed and populated, we were able to link and merge the BCS, AVI, MMR and building aid data. We measured the relationship between identified facility needs from the BCS and AVI in relation to school aid expenditures and further estimated the degree of the relationship between building condition and student performance. We compared them with each other for a two county sample of 95 schools, to relevant science evidence for maintaining a healthy school environment, and to a database of reported health and safety problems. Using the merged data, we estimated the relationship between building condition and school performance.

Part 1. Findings

- Building components rated “unsatisfactory” on the BCS typically had an approved building aid capital project apparently approved to address the need, but lack of detail precluded specific verification. There is insufficient detail to address targeting of maintenance and repair funds.

Part 2 . Problem Schools Research Question

For our second level of analysis, we asked whether schools with identified environmental health and safety problems were also showing potential health and safety issues as reflected in the BCS. If we identify a relationship between the HSN data of thirty select New York State schools that had individuals reporting health and safety problems with those schools’ building condition surveys, then this would indicate that the BCS is

capturing some information indicative of a serious school environmental health issue. If this comparison showed no relationship, it would indicate that the BCS is not capturing relevant data.

Part 2. Methodology

For this phase of the study, we selected 30 schools from the HSN New York State database that have reported facility related environmental health issues. We then compared this data to the State BCS database. From the information we have the facilities complaints can be one or more of the following:

1. Construction and renovation – inside or outside the building – dust , fumes (welding, paint), cement, chemicals, big equipment kept around study areas.
2. Molds
3. Roof leaks
4. Indoor air quality – ventilation, odors
5. Temperature control
6. Lighting
7. Use/presence of harmful chemicals (cleaning chemicals, presence of pesticides)
8. Asbestos
9. Sewage backup

Similarly the health complaints were one or more of the following:

1. Asthma
2. Sinus
3. Nose bleeds
4. Sore throats
5. Headaches/migraines
6. Stomach aches/cramps ,other stomach problems
7. Various allergies (most of them unspecified by person complaining)
8. Miscarriages

Part 2. Findings

- We have information for 30 schools. Out of that 12 complaints (40 %) were respiratory tract infections/problems.
- Asthma is the most common. Among the respiratory tract problems, nine of 12 were asthma.
- There were 4/30 complaints of headaches, 2/30 miscarriages, 2/30 allergies, 1/30 Nose bleed and 1/30 case of dizziness.
- Among the facilities, complaints due to construction and renovation going on in school were highest 13 /30 (43 %).
- Out of 13 facilities complaints, 8/13 schools (61%) also had one or more of the above health complaints associated with it.
- Molds were the next most frequent problem 8/30 (26%) followed by poor indoor air quality 7/30 (23 %) and roof leaks 5/30 (16%).
- We had BCS data for 21/30 schools. The rest of the schools were not on the electronic BCS database.

Linking the BCS, Key Systems (Systems linked to Asthma) and the 30 Problem Schools.

We found that 5 schools -- Wilbur H. Lynch Middle, Ryder Elementary, Woodstock Elementary, New Windsor School and Troy High School -- had one or more unsatisfactory key systems and complaints of respiratory tract infections. Wilbur H. Lynch Middle and Ryder Elementary had sinus and/or allergies complaints and the rest of the 3 had asthma and/or sinus, allergies, bronchitis. It is important to note that four of these schools Ryder ES, Woodstock ES, New Windsor School & Troy HS also had molds.

- Linking BCS reports to problem schools we found that 11/21 schools (50%) had one or more major/important facilities listed as unsatisfactory.

Though the results are not statistically significant due to small sample size, they clearly show some relation between health complaints and schools having poor facilities. We maintain a database of complaints and once we have enough data, leading towards a larger study, we might be able to see a clearer picture.

Part 3. Research Questions

Does the school inspection data suggest a correlation between school facility conditions and academic achievement? Do these findings suggest an opportunity for a larger study regarding school facility conditions and academic achievement?

Part 3. Methodology

For the third level of analysis, we compared the two county BCS data with the SED School Report Card database to assess patterns in conditions of school facilities and student academic achievement.

Part 3. Findings

- Academic achievement relationships to facility conditions were both measurable and consistent with scientific evidence.
- Schools with “unsatisfactory” reported in one or more of 53 measured building components had:
 - higher suspension rates (2-9%)
 - lower attendance rates in middle and high school (2-3%)
 - lower total (math and English language arts) test scores (-5%)

- In the subset of schools where the “unsatisfactory” facility condition was in one or more of eight building components science evidence predicted the greatest relationship (**See other study**), differences were even greater: suspension rates 2-14% higher, attendance 2-4% lower and test scores 6% lower.
- Statewide, over one-third of schools generating a parent or staff health complaint in the HSN database had one or more major building systems rated “Unsatisfactory” in the BCS. This compares with only 4% average for schools outside of New York City and 5% for our 2 county sample.
- Performance relationships to facility condition were measurable and consistent with science evidence. Schools with “Unsatisfactory” in one or more of 53 building components had lower performance. Differences were even greater in the subset of schools where the Unsatisfactory was in the 8 building components where the science evidence predicts the greatest health relationship:

Performance Measure	1+ U in 53 Components	1+ U in 8 “Key” Components
Suspensions	2-9% higher	2-14% higher
Attendance	2-3% lower (Mid/High)	2-4% lower (Mid/High)
Test Scores (Math+ELA)	~5% lower	~6% lower

Analysis

New York has important building blocks in place for assuring that school facilities are healthy learning environments that facilitate rather than impede academic achievement. These building blocks include school inspections as required by the building condition survey, and by the annual visual inspection. The state also has a generous building aid program, worth well over \$1 billion annually, and a modest minor maintenance and repair fund, worth \$50 million annually. Yet, school inspection data is not coordinated with facility related expenditures.

Our Part One analysis shows that there is a significant correlation between funds spent for building aid, and identified school facility deficits as recorded on the school inspection reports. This is encouraging, as it shows that school inspection reports (BCS and AVI) can potentially be used by the state for prioritizing building aid. This prioritization should be geared towards remediation of school facility deficits, especially health and safety problems, as the first priority for the apportionment of school building aid. Due to the very general nature of the data, no conclusions were reached regarding the MMR reports and their relationship to school facility inspection reports.

Our Part Two study shows that schools with identified health and safety problems show a tendency to have these problems reflected in the school inspection reports. While this is a small sample, it further indicates that tools may be available for SED to allocate facility funds based on identified health and safety problems.

Our Part Three study shows that we can indeed identify a significant correlation between school facility conditions and academic achievement. This could be the basis for a much larger study that would correlate facility inspection data and facility report card data for all schools in the state.

Recommendations

Based on this research, Healthy Schools Network recommends:

- 1) Replacing the current annual report with one using evidence-based assessments actionable in a short (one year) time frame, possibly linked to targeted funding under MMR.
- 2) The state Education Department should create uniform linking code(s) for each school and use internet-based data collection for better accuracy and accessibility,

- 3) SED should make this data, including historical data, routinely available to the general public to facilitate improvement efforts.
- 4) Linked building and performance data should be compared beyond the 2 sample counties for more precision of analysis and targeting of priorities.

ATTACHMENT 1

Building Condition Survey

**New York State Education Department
Office of Facilities Planning
BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY REPORT and BUILDING SAFETY RATING**

Name of School District: School District Final Inspection Date: Final Inspection Date

Building Name: Building Name SED Control Number: SED Control Number

Building Address: Building Address

Grades Housed: K - 12 Student Enrollment: _____ Certificate of Occupancy Status & Expiration Date: _____

A/E Firm Name: _____ Firm Address: _____

Firm Phone Number: _____

Firm E-Mail: _____

Name of Professional Performing Inspection: _____ License No.: _____

Was Waiver Granted? Yes No If Yes, Date: _____

Overall Building Rating:

Was overall building rating established after consultation with Health and Safety Committee? Yes No

Program Spaces Provided. Check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Gymnasium	<input type="checkbox"/> Cafeteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Kitchen	<input type="checkbox"/> Library	<input type="checkbox"/> Lrg. Group Instruction
<input type="checkbox"/> Auditorium	<input type="checkbox"/> Art	<input type="checkbox"/> Audio Visual	<input type="checkbox"/> Computer Room	<input type="checkbox"/> Home & Careers	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/> Music	<input type="checkbox"/> Science Labs	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology/Shop	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Ed. Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please describe)
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Suite	<input type="checkbox"/> Resource Rooms	<input type="checkbox"/> Remedial Rooms	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Swimming Pool	_____

Accessibility Provided for Physically Impaired. Check all that apply.

Parking- Exterior Route Building Entrances Interior Route Toilet Rooms

Is a comprehensive maintenance plan in effect? Yes No

Was overall building rating established after consultation with Health and Safety Committee? Yes No

Building System Ratings: **E, S, U, F, or I** System Types: **C, A, H, or S**

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| E Excellent: No remediation required. | C Comfort |
| S Satisfactory: System functioning reliably, but routine maintenance and repair is required. | A Aesthetic |
| U Unsatisfactory: System is functioning unreliably or has exceeded its useful life.
A corrective action plan is in place and repairs or replacement have been scheduled. | H Health & Safety |
| F Failure: System is non-functioning, unreliable or not functioning as designed.
System endangers occupant health and/or safety, and/or has deficiencies that have resulted in serious accident or injury. | S Structural |
| I Indeterminate: Requires additional probing or testing and a summary report will be issued. | |

- Overall Building Rating: **E, G, S, or U**
- E** Excellent Systems rated in overall excellent condition. Preventive maintenance plan in place.
- G** Good Systems rated in overall good or better condition.
- S** Satisfactory Any system categorized as comfort or aesthetic rated as unsatisfactory. All systems categorized as health and safety or structural rated good or better.
- U** Unsatisfactory Any system categorized as health and safety or structural rated **F** - Building Certificate of Occupancy may be rescinded.

System	Sys Type	Sys Rating	Remaining Useful Life (Years)	Cost to Reconstruct/Replace	Last Major Reconstruction/Replacement (year)	Remarks
1.1 Site Electrical						
1.2 Site Gas	H					
1.3 Site Water	H					
1.4 Site Fuel Tanks	H					
1.5 Site Storm Water						
1.6 Site Sanitary	H					
1.7 Paving	H					
1.8 Playgrounds						
1.9 Play Fields						
1.10 Security Barriers/Fencing						
2.1 Roofing						
3.1 Exterior Walls Chimneys Parapets						
3.2 Exterior Doors						
3.3 Windows						
3.4 Fire Escapes	H					
4.1 Structural Conc. Slabs	S					
4.2 Masonry Bearing Wall	S					
4.3 Structural Steel	S					
4.4 Wood Beams	S					
5.1 Floor Finishes						
5.2 Wall Finishes						
5.3 Ceilings						
5.4 Lockers						
5.5 Interior Doors						
5.6 Hardware						
6.1 Electrical Service/Dist.	H					
6.2 Lighting						
6.3 Communications Systems	H					
6.4 Technology Infrastructure						
7.1 Water Dist. System	H					
7.2 Plumbing/ Drainage Sys.	H					
7.3 Plumbing Fixtures						
7.4 Water Heaters						

System	System Type	System Rating	Remaining Useful Life (Years)	Cost to Reconstruct/Replace	Last Major Reconstruction/Replacement (year)	Remarks
8.1 Boiler / Furnace	H					
8.2 Heating System Piping						
8.3 Ventilation Sys.	H					
8.4 Ductwork						
8.5 Unit Ventilators	H					
8.6 Air Handling Sys.	H					
8.7 Terminal Units	H					
8.8 Exhaust Sys.	H					
8.9 Control Sys.	H					
8.10 Heating Fuel Sys.	H					
8.11 Air Conditioning Sys.						
9.1 Stairs	S					
9.2 Elevators						
9.3 Swimming Pool Sys.						
10.1 Fire Alarm Sys.	H					
10.2 Smoke Detection Sys.	H					
10.3 Sprinkler Sys.	H					
10.4 Emergency Lighting	H					

System	Estimated Cost for necessary improvements	Remarks
11.0 Environmental Conditions		
11.1 General Appearance		
11.2 Cleanliness		
11.3 Acoustics		
11.4 Lighting Quality		
11.5 Thermal Comfort		
11.6 Humidity		
11.7 Ventilation		
11.8 Space Adequacy		
11.9 Evidence of Vermin		

ATTACHMENT 2

Annual Visual Inspection Report

**New York State Education Department
Office of Facilities Planning
ANNUAL VISUAL INSPECTION REPORT
Directions
for completion of the Annual Visual Inspection Report**

There are three parts to this inspection report. Across the bottom left of the computer screen you will see Directions, Working Copy and Submission Copy. To switch between parts, place the mouse pointer over the applicable tab and click the left button.

The Annual Visual Inspection Report form must be completed by November 15th and submitted to SED by January 15. The first page has information similar to the original Building Condition Survey and the remaining pages are identical to the original survey. Print as many copies of the Working Copy as you have buildings to survey. Record all your information by hand prior to filling in the submission sheet.

All the information from the Working Copies must be typed into the Submission Copy before it is sent to SED. To do this place the mouse pointer over the box you wish to fill in, click the left mouse button and type in the information. Remarks should be brief and should not exceed the size of the box.

In order to reduce the size of the report, upon completion delete all the rows that have no information in them. To do this place the mouse pointer over the gray number on

the left of the page and highlight the row so the row becomes black. Press the right mouse button and select delete. The row will disappear. To delete multiple rows, place your mouse pointer over the first gray row number, press the left mouse button, and drag the mouse pointer down the column of numbers until all the rows to be deleted are selected. Then release the left mouse button, press the right mouse button and select delete. Repeat these steps until all the rows containing no information in are deleted.

As you complete the Submission Copy of each building, print it. To speed up the process for multiple buildings, SAVE your original submission copy after you fill in page one and prior to filling the survey information. As each building is completed, return to your saved copy, change the building name and complete the survey information for that building.

Keep a copy of the completed report for your records and send the original report to:

Office of Facilities Planning
New York State Education Department
Room 1060 EBA
Albany, N.Y. 12234
Attention: Mr. Dave Clapp

New York State Education Department Office of Facilities Planning ANNUAL VISUAL INSPECTION REPORT

Name of School District	<u> School District </u>	Inspection Date	<u> Inspection Date </u>
Building Name	<u> Building Name </u>	SED Control Number	<u> Inspection Date </u>
Building Address	<u> Building Address </u>	Certificate of Occupancy Status & Expiration Date	<u> SED Number </u>
Grades Housed	<u> K-12 </u>	Enrollment:	<u> </u>
Status and Expiration Date	<u> </u>	Signature	<u> </u>
District Director of Facilities Telephone Number	<u> </u> <u> </u>	E-Mail Address	<u> </u>
Health & Safety Comm. Mbr. Telephone Number	<u> </u> <u> </u>	Signature	<u> </u>
Code Enforcement Official Telephone Number	<u> </u> <u> </u>	E-Mail Address	<u> </u>
		Certification No.	<u> </u>
		Signature	<u> </u>
		E-Mail Address	<u> </u>

Is a comprehensive maintenance plan in effect? Yes No

Was overall building rating established after consultation with Health and Safety Committee? Yes No

Building System Ratings: **E, S, U, F, or I**

System Types: **C, A, H, or S**

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| E Excellent: No remediation required. | | C Comfort |
| S Satisfactory: System functioning reliably, but routine maintenance and repair is required. | | A Aesthetic |
| U Unsatisfactory: System is functioning unreliably or has exceeded its useful life.
A corrective action plan is in place and repairs or replacement have been scheduled. | | H Health & Safety |
| F Failure: System is non-functioning, unreliable or not functioning as designed.
System endangers occupant health and/or safety, and/or has deficiencies that have resulted in serious accident or injury. | | S Structural |
| I Indeterminate: Requires additional probing or testing and a summary report will be issued. | | |

Overall Building Rating: **E, G, S, or U**

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| E Excellent | Systems rated in overall excellent condition. Preventive maintenance plan in place. |
| G Good | Systems rated in overall good or better condition. |
| S Satisfactory | Any system categorized as comfort or aesthetic rated as unsatisfactory. All systems categorized as health and safety or structural rated good or better. |
| U Unsatisfactory | Any system categorized as health and safety or structural rated F - Building Certificate of Occupancy may be rescinded. |

System	Sys Type	Sys Rating	Remaining Useful Life (Years)	Cost to Reconstruct/Replace	Last Major Reconstruction/Replacement (year)	Remarks
1.1 Site Electrical						
1.2 Site Gas	H					
1.3 Site Water	H					
1.4 Site Fuel Tanks	H					
1.5 Site Storm Water						
1.6 Site Sanitary	H					
1.7 Paving	H					
1.8 Playgrounds						
1.9 Play Fields						
1.10 Security Barriers/Fencing						
2.1 Roofing						
3.1 Exterior Walls						
Chimneys						
Parapets						
3.2 Exterior Doors						
3.3 Windows						
3.4 Fire Escapes	H					
4.1 Structural Conc. Slabs	S					
4.2 Masonry Bearing Wall	S					
4.3 Structural Steel	S					
4.4 Wood Beams	S					
5.1 Floor Finishes						
5.2 Wall Finishes						
5.3 Ceilings						
5.4 Lockers						
5.5 Interior Doors						
5.6 Hardware						
6.1 Electrical Service/Dist.	H					
6.2 Lighting						
6.3 Communications Systems	H					
6.4 Technology Infrastructure						
7.1 Water Dist. System	H					
7.2 Plumbing/ Drainage Sys.	H					
7.3 Plumbing Fixtures						

7.4 Water Heaters

System	System Type	System Rating	Remaining Useful Life (Years)	Cost to Reconstruct/Replace	Last Major Reconstruction/Replacement (year)	Remarks
8.1 Boiler / Furnace	H					
8.2 Heating System Piping						
8.3 Ventilation Sys.	H					
8.4 Ductwork						
8.5 Unit Ventilators	H					
8.6 Air Handling Sys.	H					
8.7 Terminal Units	H					
8.8 Exhaust Sys.	H					
8.9 Control Sys.	H					
8.10 Heating Fuel Sys.	H					
8.11 Air Conditioning Sys.						
9.1 Stairs	S					
9.2 Elevators						
9.3 Swimming Pool Sys.						
10.1 Fire Alarm Sys.	H					
10.2 Smoke Detection Sys.	H					
10.3 Sprinkler Sys.	H					
10.4 Emergency Light'g	H					

System	Estimated Cost for necessary improvements	Remarks
11.0 Environmental Conditions		
11.1 General Appearance		
11.2 Cleanliness		
11.3 Acoustics		
11.4 Lighting Quality		
11.5 Thermal Comfort		
11.6 Humidity		
11.7 Ventilation		
11.8 Space Adequacy		
11.9 Evidence of Vermin		

ATTACHMENT 3

Minor Maintenance and Repair Form

**2004 – 2005 Extraordinary School Capital Needs Program Aid
Worksheet**

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
 THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
 ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE AND SECONDARY
 SCHOOLS
 FACILITIES PLANNING – ROOM 1060 EBA
 ALBANY, NY 12234
 (518) 474-3906



SED USE ONLY

2004-2005 EXTRAORDINARY SCHOOL CAPITAL NEEDS PROGRAM AID WORKSHEET

(Section 155.15 of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education)

School District Name: _____ County _____

Person Completing This Form: _____ Title _____

Telephone: () _____

Complete this worksheet and return one (1) copy on or before March 1, 2005 for expenses incurred through February 1, 2005. **A final claim must be filed (if necessary) on or before August 1, 2005.** The district may elect to submit one claim for the whole year.

Enter the 2004-2005 extraordinary school capital program expenditures as recorded in the Special Aid Fund: Account Code F1621

A. Summary of Expenses to Date:

Report expenditures by object:

Object Code	
.16 Support Staff Salaries	_____
.40 Contractual	_____
.45 Supplies & Materials	_____
.80 Employee Benefits	_____

TOTAL: _____
 Claimed through: ____/____/____

*Expenditures through 2/1/05 for first claim

B. Detailed report of expenditures:

1. Site:	_____
Utilities, Paving	_____
2. Roofing	_____
3. Exterior:	_____
exterior walls, doors, windows	_____
4. Structure	_____
5. Interior:	_____
Interior Finishes, Doors, Hardware	_____
6. HVAC:	_____
Boilers, Refrigerator, Controls	_____
7. Plumbing:	_____
Water, Drainage, Fixtures	_____
8. Electrical:	_____
Service/Distribution, Lighting, Communications	_____
9. Special Construction:	_____
10. Life Safety	_____
Alarm/Detection, Fire Protection	_____
11. Energy Conservation	_____
12. Health and Safety	_____
TOTAL:	_____

C. Superintendent's Certification: I hereby certify that the expenditures claimed on this form have been made and include expenditures as provided by Section 3602, Subdivision 6-d of the Education law and Section 18 of Chapter 53 of the Laws of 2002. The information contained in this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Superintendent of Schools

Date

ATTCHMENT 4

“Unsatisfactory” Ratings in “Key” Systems

2000 Building Condition Survey – Columbia and Dutchess Counties

"Unsatisfactory" Ratings in "Key" Systems - 2000 Building Condition Survey - Columbia and Dutchess Counties

(<-Hidden Columns-Do NOT Sort) (8 Key Systems Statistically Associated with School Asthma)

DistrictName	BuildingName	System Name	Remarks-BCS	Cost- Repair Replace	Prob. Life	Last Major	Rating	AVI2001	AVI2002	MMR-Category	Minor Maintenance and Repair Projects	CSL Code -BA	Building Aid Projects
BEACON CITY SD	GLENHAM UNION SCHOOL	5.3 Ceilings		\$0.00			U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	Small District Investment of \$4,500, no cost listed or remarks in BCS.	9	No cost or details in BCS. Major Project initiated 3/2004, not yet approved
HYDE PARK CSD	ELEMENTARY-HYDE PARK	2.1 Roofing	Slate/EPDM - Repl Metal Skirt/Cafeteria Roof	\$150,000.00	5	1997	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Roofing		7	No Roofing project until 2005
HYDE PARK CSD	ELEMENTARY-HYDE PARK	3.3 Windows	LBP / Repl All Units	\$300,000.00	5	1990	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02); 8/2002 (SED approv. 3/03); and 1/2005 (not yet approv.)
HYDE PARK CSD	ELEMENTARY-HYDE PARK	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	Repl 1939 Fixtures	\$50,000.00	5	1990	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02), 8/2002 (SED approv. 3/03), and 1/2005 not yet approved.
HYDE PARK CSD	HAVILAND JUNIOR HIGH	3.3 Windows	Planned Replacement 2001	\$350,000.00	5	1965	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02) and 1/2005 (not yet approv.)
HYDE PARK CSD	HAVILAND JUNIOR HIGH	5.1 Floor Finishes	VAT Replacement Req'd at 1965	\$150,000.00	5	1991	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	District Spent \$ 21,935 in MMR-interior. Need listed on BCS's totaled \$650,000 for floors in 3 schools, \$500,000 for ceilings in 2 schools.	9	Finishes projects initiated 9/2002 (SED approv. 1/03) and 1/2005 not yet approv.
HYDE PARK CSD	HAVILAND JUNIOR HIGH	5.3 Ceilings	1940 ACBM Plaster / 1957-65 ACT Poor	\$250,000.00	5	1998	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	District Spent \$ 21,935 in MMR-interior. Need listed on BCS's totaled \$650,000 for	9	Finishes projects initiated 9/2002 (SED approv. 1/03) and 1/2005 not yet approv.

										floors in 3 schools, \$500,000 for ceilings in 2 schools.			
HYDE PARK CSD	HAVILAND JUNIOR HIGH	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	Orig Fixtures at 1940-57	\$250,000.00	5	1989	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing projects initiated 9/2002 (SED approv. 1/03) and 1/2005 not yet approved.
HYDE PARK CSD	HAVILAND JUNIOR HIGH	8.3 Ventilation Systems	Toilet Rm Ventilation Req'd	\$150,000.00	5	1965	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	HVAC	Small HVAC project (\$12,036) and Energy Conversation project (\$42,675) in district.	155	HVAC projects initiated 11/1999 (SED approv. 3/03); 10/2000 (SED approv. 5/03); 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02); and 9/2002 (SED approv. 1/03)
HYDE PARK CSD	NETHERWOOD ELEM SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	Planned Replacement 2001	\$350,000.00	5	1960	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02) and 1/2005 (not yet approv.)
HYDE PARK CSD	NETHERWOOD ELEM SCHOOL	5.1 Floor Finishes	Repl VAT at N. Corridor, Gym Poor - ACBM	\$300,000.00	5	1960	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	District Spent \$ 21,935 in MMR-interior. Need listed on BCS's totaled \$650,000 for floors in 3 schools, \$500,000 for ceilings in 2 schools.	9	Finishes project initiated 1/2005 not yet approv.
HYDE PARK CSD	NETHERWOOD ELEM SCHOOL	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	Repl Fixtures	\$125,000.00	5	1960	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing project initiated 1/2005 not yet approved.
HYDE PARK CSD	NORTH PARK ELEM SCHOOL	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures		\$150,000.00	5	1966	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02) and 1/2005 not yet approved.
HYDE PARK CSD	NORTH PARK ELEM SCHOOL	8.1 Boiler / Furnace	Planned Replacement 2001	\$250,000.00	5	1966	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	HVAC	Small HVAC project (\$12,036) and Energy Conversation project (\$42,675) in district.	155	HVAC projects initiated 10/2000 (SED approv. 5/01); 10/2000 (SED approv. 3/03); 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02); and 9/02 and 1/05 not yet approved.

HYDE PARK CSD	RALPH R SMITH ELEMENTARY	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures		\$100,000.00	5	1963	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing project initiated 1/2005 not yet approved.
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	2.1 Roofing	Slate/EPDM - Repl Metal Roof at Library Bay	\$50,000.00	5	1993	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Roofing		7	No Roofing project until 2002, not yet approved by SED as of January, 2005
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	3.1 Exterior Walls	Planned Upgrade 2001 - LBP	\$150,000.00	5	1989	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		4	Special Project SED approv. 5/2000
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	Planned Upgrade 2001	\$350,000.00	5	1939	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02); 8/2002 (SED approv. 3/03); and 1/2005 (not yet approv.)
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	5.1 Floor Finishes	Refin 1939 Classrm Flrs/Repl Toilet Rm Flrs	\$200,000.00	5	1998	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	District Spent \$ 21,935 in MMR-interior. Need listed on BCS's totaled \$650,000 for floors in 3 schools, \$500,000 for ceilings in 2 schools.	9	Finishes projects initiated 9/2002 and 1/2005 - both not yet approv.
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	5.3 Ceilings	Repl Corridor/Cafeteria Clgs	\$250,000.00	5	1998	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior	District Spent \$ 21,935 in MMR-interior. Need listed on BCS's totaled \$650,000 for floors in 3 schools, \$500,000 for ceilings in 2 schools.	9	Finishes projects initiated 9/2002 and 1/2005 - both not yet approv.
HYDE PARK CSD	VIOLET AVE ELEM SCHOOL	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures		\$7,500.00	5	1939	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing	Minor District investment in Plumbing (\$6,775.58), 6 school needs total \$682,500. May address small need at Violet Ave. of \$7,500.	15	Plumbing projects initiated 2/2001 (SED approv. 7/02), 8/2002 (SED approv. 3/03) and 9/2002 and 1/2005 not yet approved.
MILLBROOK CSD	ALDEN PLACE ELEM SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	REPLACE ORIGINAL SINGLE PANE W/ INSULATED PANE	\$450,000.00	4	1964	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows project part of New/Addition initiated 1/2002 and not yet approved by SED.
MILLBROOK CSD	HIGH SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	SINGLE PANE - REPLACE W/ INSULATED GLASS	\$800,000.00	4	1960	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows project initiated 8/2000 (SED approv. 8/01)
MILLBROOK CSD	HIGH SCHOOL	5.1 Floor Finishes	TOILET & LOCKER ROOMS FLOORS DAMAGED	\$30,000.00	3	1960	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior		9	Finishes projects initiated 8/2000 (SED approv. 8/01) and 8/2001 (SED

										385,000 on BCS's.			
NORTHEAST CSD	WEBUTCK JR-SR HIGH	5.3 Ceilings	Acoustical Lay-in	\$170,000.00	5	1956	U	Same As BCS=U		Interior	District spent \$9,001 total. 3 School buildings listed floor needs totaling \$165,000 and 4 buildings with ceiling needs of \$ 385,000 on BCS's.	9	New/Addition project initiated 8/1998 (SED approv. 8/01)
NORTHEAST CSD	WEBUTUCK ANNEX JR-SR	3.3 Windows		\$540,000.00	5	1970	U	Same As BCS=U		Exterior		8	New/Addition project initiated 8/1998 (SED approv. 8/01)
NORTHEAST CSD	WEBUTUCK ANNEX JR-SR	5.1 Floor Finishes	Vinyl tile flooring	\$70,000.00	5	1958	U	Same As BCS=U		Interior	District spent \$9,001 total. 3 School buildings listed floor needs totaling \$165,000 and 4 buildings with ceiling needs of \$ 385,000 on BCS's.	9	New/Addition project initiated 8/1998 (SED approv. 8/01)
NORTHEAST CSD	WEBUTUCK ANNEX JR-SR	5.3 Ceilings	Acoustical Lay-in	\$125,000.00	5	1958	U	Same As BCS=U		Interior	District spent \$9,001 total. 3 School buildings listed floor needs totaling \$165,000 and 4 buildings with ceiling needs of \$ 385,000 on BCS's.	9	New/Addition project initiated 8/1998 (SED approv. 8/01)
PINE PLAINS CSD	SEYMOUR SMITH SCHOOL	5.1 Floor Finishes	gym and class rooms need new floors	\$350,000.00	0	1997	U		Same As BCS=U	Interior		9	
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	C B WARRING SCHOOL NO. 10	3.3 Windows	replace non thermal windows	\$660,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01), 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	C B WARRING SCHOOL NO. 10	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	replace outdated fixtures	\$54,000.00			U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing		15	Plumbing projects initiated 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	GOV CLINTON SCHOOL NO. 8	3.3 Windows	change to energy efficient units	\$400,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U		Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01), 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH	5.1 Floor Finishes	new vct at corridors	\$563,000.00	5	1991	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Interior		9	Windows projects initiated 12/1999

	SCHOOL																		(SED approv. 5/00) and 5/2001 (SED approv. 3/04)
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	KRIEGER SCHOOL NO. 11	3.3 Windows	replace nonthermal windows	\$500,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01) and 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	KRIEGER SCHOOL NO. 11	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	replace old fixtures and drinking fountains	\$45,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing		15	Plumbing projects initiated 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	MIDDLE SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	replace non thermal windows and curtain wall	\$870,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U		Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01), 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	MIDDLE SCHOOL	5.1 Floor Finishes	carpet	\$260,000.00	5	1986	U	Same As BCS=U		Interior		9	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01), 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	SFB MORSE SCHOOL NO. 5	3.3 Windows	Replace non thermal windows	\$380,000.00	5		U		Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01) and 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	SFB MORSE SCHOOL NO. 5	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	replace service sinks, drinking fountains, orig. fixtures	\$82,000.00	10		U		Same As BCS=U	Plumbing		15	Plumbing projects initiated 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01)						
POUGHKEEPSIE CITY SD	W W SMITH	3.3 Windows	replace non thermal windows	\$450,000.00	2		U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Windows projects initiated 12/1999 (SED approv. 5/00), 10/2000 (SED approv. 6/01), 5/2001 (SED approv. 6/03) and 5/2003 (SED approv. 3/04)						
RHINEBECK CSD	CENTRAL H.S./M.S ADDITION	3.3 Windows	REPLACE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ADD LABELS	\$722,000.00	5	1950	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8							
RHINEBECK CSD	CENTRAL H.S./M.S ADDITION	8.3 Ventilation Systems	REPLACE UNIT VENTILATORS	\$687,000.00	5		U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	HVAC		155							
RHINEBECK CSD	LIVINGSTON ELEM SCHOOL	3.3 Windows	REPLACE EXTERIOR WINDOWS AND INTERIOR SIDELIGHTS	\$307,000.00	5	1964	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Exterior		8	Major project intated 3/2000 (SED approv. 2/01)						
RHINEBECK CSD	LIVINGSTON ELEM SCHOOL	7.3 Plumbing Fixtures	INSTALL WATER SAVING AND HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE FIXTURES	\$586,000.00	5	1964	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	Plumbing		15	Plumbing project initiated 9/1999 (SED approv. 5/00)						
RHINEBECK CSD	LIVINGSTON ELEM SCHOOL	8.3 Ventilation Systems	PROVIDE MECHANICAL VENTILATION TO ALL STUDENT SPACES	\$260,000.00	5	1964	U	Same As BCS=U	Same As BCS=U	HVAC		155	HVAC project initiated 9/1999 (SED approv. 5/00)						

