

**Operations Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, November 4, 2015**

IN ATTENDANCE: Committee Chair David Shafter, Kati Driban, Dr. Andrew Pollock

BOARD MEMBERS: Mark B. Miller

STAFF: Timothy Trzaska, Dr. David Baugh, Dr. Jennifer Polinchock

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Shafter called the Operations Committee Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2.1 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES

Action: 3.1 Approval of minutes from the meeting held October 7, 2015.

Ms. Driban made a motion to table the October 7, 2015 minutes until next Operations Committee meeting. Dr. Pollock seconded.

Motion Carried 3-0-0

FOOD SERVICE

Information: 4.1 Lunch Participation at William Tennent High School

Mr. Trzaska stated that last spring the lunch schedules were reduced from four lunches to three lunches. There was some concern with back-up of lines and lower participation. The Supervisor of Food and Nutrition Services, Ms. Stone, compared the participation rate during September and October with the participation in the spring of 2015. She found that the participation rate is slightly higher this school year. Mr. Trzaska mentioned that he observed the lunch service and it took the students approximately 10 to 12 minutes to get through the lunch line. He felt that the students were able to get through the lunch lines pretty quickly and going from four lunches down to three lunches has not affected anything.

Mr. Shafter asked if the meal participation of 50% is inclusive of 12% a-la-carte or if the a-la-carte is on top of that.

Mr. Trzaska replied that the a-la-carte is on top of that.

Ms. Driban stated that the reason why she pushed for these answers so close to the beginning of the school year is that she is not hearing the same thing from the students. It's enough that gives her pause that there is such a dichotomy between the two. She would like to ask administration to take a poll from the students or bring back the student food committee so there is some way of getting their feedback. She is assuming what is being presented is accurate, therefore she is not sure where the students' comments are coming from. She said she is not hearing about great times getting through the lunch lines, but is hearing that more kids are bringing their lunch. Maybe we could look into that to make sure their perception is matching the overall facts.

Mr. Trzaska stated that he would reach out to the high school principal to see about getting a group to represent the students to get some feedback.

FACILITIES

Information: 5.1 Update on Current Facility Projects

Mr. Trzaska informed the committee that he is currently looking to get the land development approval waived for the parking lot for McDonald and is hoping this it get done this week. Mr. Trzaska would like to see if we can get around having an asphalt parking lot due to costs.

Mr. Shafter asked how we plan on plowing the parking lot without bringing up stones, etc.

Dr. Baugh stated that we are looking at the pervious alternatives, such as concrete, that will allow grass to grow through it. He estimated about 90% of the time it would not be a plowing issue. The concrete lot would help reduce the cost. Dr. Baugh had a meeting with the township to discuss some possibilities. Asphalt is a preferred solution from a plowing perspective, but it creates storm water runoff and maintenance issues and for the price tag is a pretty substantial one. He just wants to explore all of our options fully. If we can achieve cost savings, then we would like to do that.

Dr. Pollock mentioned that he was against the asphalt from the beginning. He does not think that it is necessary. Dr. Pollock thinks we need more of a savings, considering the little time that the lot will be used and the amount of money that it would cost. Dr. Pollock asked for administration to look into it again to hold down the cost of the parking lot.

Mr. Shafter stated that he and Ms. Driban voted that they should have an asphalt parking lot, so he is surprised that we are looking at something else. It probably is a good idea to look into the overall cost and the cost to maintain the two types of lots.

Dr. Baugh stated that since he is new to the district he is requesting a little bit more time just to have a good close look at this. Every dollar going into our schools is precious. Dr. Baugh had a

very constructive meeting with the township and has asked Mr. Trzaska to move forward with the project, but it is still in the planning phase.

Ms. Driban inquired that she would like to go over #15 on the project list, homeland security issues with the protected barriers.

Mr. Trzaska stated that this is only a report with recommendations for what you can do to make your building safer. It's something we do not have to do, but would like to do if the money is available.

Dr. Pollock asked, where would the two locations be?

Mr. Trzaska replied that they are located at William Tennent High School on the outside, back of the buildings where the gas lines and transformers are.

Dr. Pollock felt that it was a waste of \$15,000 and that we can use that money on other things.

Dr. Pollock mentioned that #4 on the projects list for the middle school feasible study needs to be moved along and there should be enough in the budget now for it. Dr. Pollock would like to bring it up to the Board.

Mr. Trzaska stated that we can add it to the Board agenda for the next meeting. This was approved already by the committee. The Board as a whole asked to table it.

Dr. Pollock would like to make a motion to bring back to the Board.

Mr. Shafter called second. Motion died for lack of a second.

Dr. Baugh stated that we realize that there is some cost for the middle school feasibility study, but facilities have informed us lately that they have been struggling with some of the boilers.

Mr. Trzaska stated that we currently have a boiler issue at Log College Middle School and there are also issues with the domestic hot water tanks at Log College Middle School and Klinger Middle School.

Mr. Shafter said he thought there was a warranty issue on one of them.

Mr. Trzaska stated they are chasing down the warranty for the boiler issue, but there is no warranty on the domestic hot water tanks.

Dr. Baugh asked Ms. Braun to start looking at the budget for a possible budget transfer to cover the cost of the middle school feasibility study. He said if the Board wants to move it forward it's probably not a bad idea.

Mr. Shafter suggested to Dr. Pollock to take it off the table at the next Board meeting.

Action: 5.2 Swan Way Electric Service Design

Mr. Trzaska informed the committee that so far we have approved the design of Swan Way with Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates. Excluded from that design is the design of the new electric service required for the building so we can get off of the existing transformer. The District is required to have our own service, which was part of the agreement when the building was purchased. Barry Isett & Assoc. is not only is the engineer for Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates, but is also our engineer of record. This would give Barry Isett a task order to design the electric service that we need to get from PECO so were no longer on the grid that is part of the industrial site.

Dr. Pollock asked if Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates gets anything from this.

Mr. Trzaska replied no, this is direct between us and our engineer.

Dr. Pollock made a motion to move to the full Board. Ms. Driban seconded.

Motion Carried: 3-0-0

Information: 5.3 Facility Use by Outside Groups

Mr. Trzaska stated that he wanted to inform the committee and also the public of the tough situation that the Board is in regarding allowing the community to use our buildings for sports and other activities. We do have a budget that was approved to use and we are trying to work with that budget. Last year our budget was \$105,000.00 and this year it is only \$80,000.00. Administration is looking at collecting debt that they have with these groups and also looking at the staffing that is needed for the events. Mr. Trzaska wanted to let the committee know it's a difficult situation, not only for facilities, but also for the Board.

Dr. Pollock asked if when these outside groups pay "x" amount of dollars to use our facilities, if it covers overtime costs.

Mr. Trzaska replied, "No".

Dr. Pollock stated then what we need to do is look at adding the overtime fee to cover the staff to the fee that the outside group is being charged. It should not cost us and the taxpayers' money for the outside groups to use the buildings. He said it should be at least neutral for the District.

Ms. Driban wanted everybody to know that administration already has this on the docket to bring through the policy committees because this is all dictated by our policy that the Board approved. It is already in the process to go to both policy committees. She said we can fast track it as

quickly as possible. She said the Board can make an exception to policy to push it through in less than three readings.

Dr. Pollock stated that he is not worried about this year, but he wants to make sure that in the future we let the people using our facility know that we are trying to make it at least cost neutral for us. We are not trying to make money on them, but it should not cost us money for them to use our facilities.

Mr. Miller mentioned that this has been a reoccurring issue going back to 2009. He doesn't think the issues are the community groups. He said the classes of the users have been divided into four groups and somehow everything was pushed into the free or adjusted group and some of those don't belong there. This has to be addressed in policy by administration so they can get a handle on it to make it work.

Mr. Miller stated that it's a question on where we draw the line. If we have a custodian in the building that's there anyway, that custodian does not cost us any additional because the group is using the building.

Dr. Pollock replied that on weekends custodians aren't already in the building. If somebody has to come in to open up the building and be there during the event, we are paying that person overtime. We should cover our own costs. If people want to use our facilities, that's fine, but it should not cost us money no matter who they are.

Mr. Shafter asked about looking at the current fee schedule.

Dr. Baugh informed the committee that Ms. Braun was reviewing the fee schedule earlier today. He is expecting to have it very shortly. He will review it and take it through administrative policy and citizen's policy. Most of the problems stem from the fact that many of the external groups that want to use our facility are servicing Centennial youngsters and are based out of the District and they feel that they are taxpayers already so they have already paid for the facilities. The problem that Dr. Pollock is pointing out is that we are accruing expenses on the weekends. Many of the organizations are not for profit status and that puts them in a different tier. Some organizations started using our facilities in a different economic time when schools had a little more flexibility then what we currently do, which is a challenge that administration faces. He said he will provide this information to the committee by noon tomorrow.

Mr. Shafter requested to include much revenue was generated last year and what the expense was for the building usage.

Information: 5.4 Guaranteed Energy Savings Projects

Mr. Trzaska stated that we have a budget for Swan Way and we are looking to construct our fit-out for the building within the budget. He said we are investigating different ways to save

money. He said we have companies looking at Swan Way to see if there is a possibility for energy savings, which may be a little difficult because the building is not that old. We are also looking at the Administration Building to see if there is a way to retain the use of the building for a longer period of time.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that for the last 2-3 years the Board has been told that the Administration Building is falling apart and can't be used. Now all of a sudden the building is fine if and we can put money into it. Why did we buy Swan Way?

Dr. Baugh stated that the only reason why we are exploring the current Administration Building at this time is because administration was approached by the BCIU for the use of the building, if possible, for a childhood learning center. Part of the reason for doing the study is to see just how bad the building is. We do have a facilities report that suggests an out of pocket renovation would probably cost in the neighborhood of \$4.9 million dollars to renovate it. It does not hurt to explore options so we are exploring the energy savings project, cost neutral solution, and turning this into revenue generating property.

Mr. Shafter stated that if we turn the current Administration Building into a usable building and the lease falls through, then we have a vacant building and then any charter school can come in and say that they want our building.

Dr. Baugh replied that it will be upon us to keep the tenants in the building. There will be new homes being built in our area and the township has already asked if we are prepared for our enrollment to go up. Answer to that is, yes we are. The answer to the second question is we are fairly confident that assuming that we can get this building up and running and keep the tenant in. But that will be four to five years down the road when we will need to figure that out. One option would be to possibly lease out Swan Way and move back into this building if that is the situation were in. We will have a number of options open and if we can do it not on the back of the tax payers then you will hear more about this. If we have to ask for lots of money for the renovations then you will not be hearing from administration about that.

TRANSPORTATION

Information: 6.1 PA School Bus Driver Safety Competition

Mr. Trzaska wanted to share some good news from the Transportation Dept. On October 21, 2015 our bus driver Larry Hannon Sr. was honored by receiving two awards at the 2015 Safe Driver Award Ceremony. He received second place at the 39th Annual PA School Bus Driver Safety Competition and seventh place at the 45th Annual International School Bus Driver Safety Competition.

Mr. Shafter inquired if there has been any more work regarding purchasing new buses as opposed to using a contractor to bring routes in-house.

Mr. Trzaska stated that we are still working on that, but currently there is no money in the budget to purchase buses this school year. This would have to be put into next year's budget.

Mr. Shafter stated that next year's budget is going to be very tight. The only way that it will work if we do a multi-year lease purchase and the savings on the routes that we are contracting out will pay for the bus driver.

Dr. Pollock replied that we need to buy at least four buses every school year. If we don't do that we can't do a lease purchase because at the back end it will catch up with us.

Mr. Shafter stated that for the first four years, our normal bus replacement schedule will continue. What we are talking about is buying additional buses to bring back the routes.

Dr. Pollock replied that we have only had one year that we did not buy buses so we are about four buses behind. If we bought five buses for the next four years that will catch us up. It is a twelve year cycle that we have for buying buses.

Mr. Shafter said we're talking about the contracted routes that we have contracted out for years. We're talking about getting buses to take care of those routes so that we do not contract them out anymore. This would be over and above our normal bus replacement schedule.

Mr. Miller mentioned that at one point we had a schedule listing all of our buses and their remaining life span. Does that document still exist in the District?

Mr. Trzaska replied we do have a master list of all of our buses in the District and their ages, but not the ones that need to be replaced.

Mr. Miller suggested that it might be helpful to look at the schedule before we get into the long term budgeting plan.

Mr. Shafter asked about the district having a mandatory bus replacement list for our buses.

Dr. Baugh stated that there is no mandatory bus replacement list in Pennsylvania. They talk about an average life of a Pennsylvania school bus is 10-14 years, use, mileage, wear and tear, use as well as effectiveness of our maintenance department. The maintenance department is doing a very good job keeping our fleet on the road, but it is not mandatory to retire a bus. Every bus is inspected annually. We are monitoring some of our buses that are older and higher mileage.

Dr. Pollock mentioned that in the eight years that he has been on the Board, one of the things that we always have done is when a bus reaches twelve years is when we have taken them out of service, bought a new bus and sold the old bus to cover part of the cost. It has been on a twelve

year rotation basis that we were replacing buses and purchased about 4 or sometimes 5 a year except for this school year.

Dr. Baugh replied that from an administration perspective this would be an almost ideal scenario. But, Mr. Trzaska said that the budget was not built with vehicle replacement. Some of the routes that we are talking about trying to buy back or pick up ourselves would be covered with small buses or vans. We expect to receive the report from the bus consultant at the end of this week or early next week and will share with the committee as soon as we receive it.

Mr. Shafter replied that he would like to see us go back to purchasing 4 or 5 replacement buses per year.

OTHER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Shafter made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Driban.

6.2 The next Operations Committee meeting will be held December 2, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Trzaska
Operations Director

READ AT HOME

None