

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

In attendance: Committee: Chairperson Katherine Driban and Thomas Hezel  
Board: Mark B. Miller

Administration: Dr. Jenny Foight-Cressman, William R. Gretton III, Robert Reed and Dr. Susan Klyman.

Public: Ryan Brennan, Mike Burton, Bill Ziegler and Robert A. Shaffer.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Katherine Driban at 7:01 p.m. A motion by Mr. Hezel to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2011 was seconded by Ms. Driban. Motion carried 2-0-0.

iPad/iPod/Flip Technology

Ms. Driban introduced Dr. Susan Klyman who explained the advantages of using technology for some students who may have trouble learning in a standard way. Dr. Klyman informed the Board that the District had received AARA monies that needed to be spent in a timely manner and that this technology, that was being used in nearby school districts, had proved beneficial on a limited basis for students in Centennial where teachers had taken the initiative to introduce it into their classrooms. Dr. Klyman cited examples of the use by children in the autistic program and that this was a means to control the pace of information being received by the student. She introduced Loren Enders and Dr. William Ziegler of the Bucks County Intermediate Unit who showed the Committee different applications that reinforce learning and provide opportunities for students to communicate through other mediums.

Mr. Miller noted that although he was in favor of this proposal, he felt that the review should be through the Education Committee on Monday. Mr. Gretton responded that this was a consideration, but that the involvement had been based upon the technology, and therefore, the Operations Committee was considered the appropriate review.

Following review and discussion, it was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to move this proposal to the full Board. It was suggested that if the Education Committee would like to review the matter at their May 23, 2011 meeting that this should be a consideration. Motion carried 2-0-0.

WTHS Graduation Video

Mr. Gretton noted that two proposals had been received for video and transmission of the WTHS Graduation and although both companies had provided positive references from clients, the recommendation had been made by the High School staff for the award to Reel Productions. Mr. Miller suggested that the District should pursue the engagement of a company that would provide this service free of charge in exchange for sale of the recording to parents. Mr. Gretton responded that no one had offered this service and that this would be pursued in a year when the District returns the graduation to the indoor facility.

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

Mr. Shafer questioned why the MBIT students could not perform this service. Ms. Driban explained that many of the students were graduating or involved in the graduation and that other events at this time of year created conflicts.

It was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to move this item to the full Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### Bid Awards

Ms. Driban recommended that the Committee consider items 4-a through 4-h as one motion. Mr. Gretton provided the Board with a summary of the current “Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment” (FF & E) Budget of the High School, indicating there would be \$107,250 remaining after the portion of the proposed purchases is considered.

#### a. AV & Information Technology Equipment

Mr. Gretton explained the summary of the AV Equipment and that in some cases the low bidder was not awarded the bid because the vendor provided an “all or none” bid. Mr. Miller questioned whether the bids allowed for selection of items. Mr. Gretton responded that the bids did include this provision but this vendor specified this on the entire bid or in small groups of items. Part of the grouping in the bid was the projectors, and it is recommended that this provider be awarded the projectors.

Mr. Reed provided a slide presentation on the recommended projectors and the advantages of the short-throw projectors. Ms. Driban asked if there were other options available that would be acceptable. Mr. Reed was not familiar with the transportable projectors that Ms. Driban described. He noted that the original movable projectors ended up in a single room and not for the benefit of the entire grade level.

Mr. Miller would like to see a side-by-side comparison and questioned how it was determined the number of “Mimeo” units that would be purchased. Mr. Reed indicated that there was uncertainty about the use of this technology and that in conjunction with Dr. Cressman they had estimated that five units for each new elementary school would be used. Mr. Miller questioned how the “Chief” technology would be used. Mr. Reed responded that this technology would not be used but the “Mimeo” would be equivalent.

Discussion ensued concerning how the technology would be utilized and if the projector or the arm should have the intelligent source elements. Based upon the cost, it was recommended that the projector contain the intelligent source so that in the future, replacement of the projector would be required. Mr. Miller asked if the vendor had provided a “statement of work” for the project. Mr. Reed explained the work required of the vendor.

Mr. Reed also provided an estimate of replacement bulb cost over five years in response to Mr. Miller’s request. In the “worst-case” scenario this would

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

amount to over \$45,000 for that period. He also showed a comparison of the projectors performed by Mr. Vinogradov and the result was the recommendation of the Epson 455 which also was the low bid.

Mr. Hezel asked where the funds were for this purchase. Mr. Gretton indicated that the projectors at the High School would come from the FF & E Funds while the others were from the Capital Projects Fund. Mr. Reed also noted that these costs do not include the removal of the projectors from the High School and reinstallation at the other locations. He indicated that he had received one quote but was considering doing the work in-house.

b. Floor Cleaning Equipment

Mr. Gretton indicated that two bids had been received for the equipment to maintain the terrazzo floors at the High School and recommended the award to Cleanzar at a cost not-to-exceed \$10,240.95.

c. Door Replacement Bid

Mr. Gretton reported that only one bid had been received although three contractors had expressed interest. Ms. Driban asked about the pricing and he responded that these prices were competitive with prior year costs.

d. William Tennent FF & E Bid

Mr. Gretton explained that this listing included the major furniture purchases recommended by the High School for placement in the new building. He noted that this total included replacement of desk/chairs for two houses rather than the entire building because upon inspection it had been determined that there was sufficient quality furniture from the current building.

e. Athletic Equipment & Supplies

Mr. Gretton noted that the Athletic Equipment would be charged to the FF & E Budget while the standard supplies would be charged to the Operating Budget.

f. Science Cabinets

Mr. Gretton explained that these cabinets were required to store chemicals and materials. He noted that one of the awards was not low bid because it was metal versus wood, which was required for this material.

g. Retail Cart/Kiosk

Mr. Gretton noted that this unusual item will be utilized in the lobby to display and market materials in the lobby area of the high school. Mr. Miller asked if these could be used to sell merchandise at the stadium.

h. Front Sign – LED Display

It was explained that a recommendation for the higher of the bids was being made based upon experience with signs, warranty and the technology related

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

to the sign. Mr. Miller requested that this contractor be asked to look at the stadium scoreboard to repair the message board at that location.

Mr. Hezel made a motion to have the items in #4-a through #4-h moved to the Board for approval. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### Technology Bids

Mr. Reed described the project as three main components; the wired switches to all of the current locations minus the elementary schools to be closed and increases the capacity of those switches; the voice over IP placing telephones in the WTHS, Region III and the two Middle Schools; and wireless connections in WTHS, Region III and the two Middle Schools. We received bids from two manufacturers, Cisco and Alcatel/Lucent, from three providers.

Mr. Reed reviewed the bids for the equipment and the maintenance contracts. He followed with a review of the VoIP system from two vendors with two different systems, Cisco and Alcatel/Lucent. Mr. Reed emphasized that the recommendation would be to utilize the same equipment and switches and not mix the two equipment choices. He noted that the Cisco solution may consider a recommendation for two vendors but with the same equipment solution.

Mr. Reed reviewed the wireless systems and the low on the Aruba equipment, which has been successfully used in the High School, and the low bid was from CWG.

Mr. Reed noted that STC has the lower cost, good local references, and a presence globally and with defense contracts. The disadvantage is their market share and the reports that they are currently for sale. The advantage to the Cisco system is the market share and performance, but they are more costly.

Mr. Hezel asked whether the District has set aside the monies for these projects at the Region I and II buildings and emphasized that this should be part of the plan. Mr. Gretton indicated that monies had been designated from the Capital projects as well as from the bond issues. Mr. Hezel recommended that the e-Plus solution through Cisco be considered.

Mr. Miller supported the Alcatel/Lucent solution based upon the relationship with the Department of Defense and he was critical of the 10-year maintenance contract comparison. He indicated that the funding of \$200,000 additional amount was considerable.

Ms. Driban asked for the District recommendation. Mr. Reed indicated this was a very difficult call and wanted to make certain that the system was reliable and complete. This is a long-term decision and needs to be an integrated solution. He has trouble “looking away” from the safe solution with the vendor controlling 70% of the market. He suggested that a delay in the decision may be recommended, but the buildings need to be

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

completed in a timely manner. Mr. Reed said that the Board may not make a “bad” decision at this time.

Ms. Driban asked if the decision could be delayed. Mr. Reed indicated that if the new systems could be installed at the new locations with patches to the older buildings. Mr. Reed noted that this was also the paging system in the buildings in which it will be installed.

Mr. Hezel made a motion suggesting that the District move to the all e-Plus solution to the Board and was reluctant to split the system. Mr. Gretton indicated that the all Cisco system could be implemented with the award to CDW and e-Plus to the full Board. Mr. Miller suggested that this solution be taken to the Board at the first meeting in June allowing for some additional research. Mr. Reed noted that Cisco would need to provide the coordination to get the product installed properly in the buildings. Ms. Driban seconded Mr. Hezel’s motion with the stipulation that e-Plus be utilized for the maintenance contract. Mr. Reed indicated that this was the expanded 24/7 contract and that most of the equipment came with a lifetime warranty. Motion carried 2-0-0.

Mr. Reed reviewed the Wireless solution of Aruba, which had been tested at the High School. It was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to recommend this solution to the Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### Transportation Study

Mr. Gretton explained that the BCIU had performed a preliminary study on potential savings in transportation for school districts related to non-public and special education transportation. He indicated that the initial study had been done for districts surrounding Centennial, but the District had not been involved. Upon review by Dr. Cressman and Mr. Gretton, it had been determined that without extensive study, the coordination effort between districts would most likely yield at least some savings for the District. Dr. Cressman asked if we had pursued “forgiveness” of the cost based upon the idea that Centennial was at the center of the service area and critical to the success. Mr. Gretton had not pursued this to date. It was recommended that the District participate at this stage of the study at the cost of \$4,876.51 to determine if cooperation between districts would yield a savings. It was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to move this item to the Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### Rental of Leary Elementary

Mr. Gretton indicated that the Bucks County Intermediate Unit had expressed interest in a centralized location and approached the District concerning the use of the Leary Elementary School. He indicated that BCIU had been in contact with several related agencies and secured commitment for these agencies to rent additional space. Mr. Gretton explained that the current rentals were approximately equal to the anticipated costs, and that the expectation was that rental of the remainder of the building would allow for some profit. Ms. Driban questioned the cost of the maintenance issues previously identified at the building. Mr. Gretton indicated that there is no accommodation of the building and that the sewer line has not been an issue during this school year. He has informed the renters that they will be providing air conditioners and

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

any other accommodations, and the cafeteria will not be in use. Mr. Miller indicated that we could satellite services from another location and Mr. Gretton responded that Head Start would need such services and they would be provided by our Food Service Operation.

Dr. Cressman reported that the District was renting the building “as-is” and the purpose of this was to keep the building operating as a good neighbor to the community while the Board determines the final disposition. There is an opportunity for some revenue, but that is not the primary reason for providing services for BCIU at Leary. Mr. Miller supported the effort of not leaving the building empty and the possibility of a charter school “squatting” in this space.

It was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to move this item to the full Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### McMahon Proposal

Mr. Gretton indicated that the attachment for this proposal was not appearing for the Board to review, and recommended that the approval be delayed until June. Ms. Driban questioned the timeliness of the work to be done. Mr. Gretton indicated that this was for the Region II School and was a traffic requirement of Warminster Township. This was an issue that could be approved at a later time and bid at a different time. Mr. Hezel asked whether this was the replacement of the signal. Mr. Gretton responded that this was an extension of the interactive traffic controls and not an additional signal.

### Region I Builders Risk Insurance

Mr. Gretton reported that this quote for insurance for the Region I project is from our current carrier and is recommended for approval. The amount is separated into two segments because the project extends beyond a single annual premium. Mr. Miller asked what would happen if the project was extended. Mr. Gretton explained that this was possible and that this project should not be extended. Mr. Hezel made a motion that was seconded by Ms. Driban to request that the Board approve the Builders Risk insurance for Region I at a cost of \$23,644. Motion carried 2-0-0.

### Region I Testing and Inspection Services

Mr. Gretton reviewed the quotes for testing and inspection services and recommended the appointment of David Blackmoor Associates for the testing of all aspects of the Region I project. Mr. Hezel asked who had been used at the High School and Mr. Brennan responded that the same testing group is being used. Mr. Hezel asked about the services and if there would be extras at a later time. Mr. Gretton pointed out the “scope of work” and indicated that this should include all known aspects of the project.

The motion by Mr. Hezel to move this item for approval by the full Board was seconded by Ms. Driban. Motion carried 2-0-0.

Ms. Driban asked whether the agenda could be presented in a PowerPoint format rather than the current attachments. Mr. Miller suggested that the public be provided with all of

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

the attachments. Dr. Cressman indicated that she would place this on the agenda as part of the Superintendent's Report.

William Tennent High School Construction

Mr. Brennan reported on change orders for the alteration of the Ceramics Program and CAD Lab, the addition of the stage doors, some added steel into Area "F" because it was not shown on drawings, and other steel that need to be fabricated

Ms. Driban asked whether these had been reviewed. Mr. Gretton responded that although approvals were necessary, the questions still remained as to the responsible party for these changes. He noted that the stage doors existed, had been closed up as per the design, and now needed to be re-opened. He reported that the elevations of the buildings continue to be an issue, and these were a measurement taken by the Architect. Ms. Driban asked about the report on the change orders, and Mr. Gretton responded that the report, which was promised two weeks after the April meeting, has not yet been received.

Mr. Preston has not found in their notes that they were instructed to remove the stage doors, but that he could not imagine that they would have removed the doors without some instruction. He indicated that there had been a lot of meetings and he could not imagine that they just removed the doors.

Mr. Preston reported that by contract the firm was required to have insurance coverage, and when there is discussion related to litigation, they cannot provide any written reports that may imply some liability. The firm would lose their insurance if they provided that information. Mr. Miller asked if the firm had placed their liability carrier on notice and Mr. Preston indicated they had. Mr. Miller recommended an Executive Session and Ms. Driban agreed. She explained that the elevation issues continue to be a problem and does not understand how the District could be responsible.

Mr. Preston indicated that construction is a process and this is a difficult project with twenty-three level changes, but there is a standard of care that is required and they are not happy with the number of changes. The firm had confirmed there would be change orders with an additional 2% fee and that there would be more change orders with a multiple prime contract. The firm is embarrassed by some of the changes but have issues with others and how they are classified. He indicated that the change in personnel had been an issue.

Ms. Driban asked if what would happen if she would not go forth with these. Mr. Brennan responded that every day is critical. Mr. Gretton explained that the issues would not be resolved at this time, but reviewed in the future as a whole and a determination of liability made then. It was moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to move these change orders to the full Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

Mr. Brennan reported that the Township officials have been in to inspect the cafeteria area to use as overflow in the event of rain on the day of graduation. The flooring of the Library will be completed by next week to begin transition. Area "C" and Area "A" will

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES – MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011

be done before mid-August. There are some issues with Area “F” which shows a late September completion, but we will be discussing some expediting of the schedule.

Region III Update

The flex space in the Kindergarten area has been turned over and the rooms are being utilized ahead of schedule for Administration and the Reading Resource Room. The Kitchen and Bathroom demolition will be complete by end of the week and the classrooms will be turned over in mid-to early-August.

Part F for Region II

Mr. Preston indicated that this was the PlanCon form for the request to go out to bid with the plan to issue bids by the end of May, bids received on June 21<sup>st</sup> with an Operations Committee meeting to be scheduled for June 22<sup>nd</sup> for Board review. He indicated that the building was similar to Region I with the additional storage spaces.

Mr. Hezel made a motion which was seconded by Ms. Driban to move the PlanCon “F” form to the full Board. Motion carried 2-0-0.

Ms. Driban noted that the next meeting of the Operations Committee is scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on June 22, 2011 which is the third Wednesday in May.

Adjournment:

Moved by Mr. Hezel and seconded by Ms. Driban to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 2-0-0. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Gretton III  
Assistant to the Superintendent