

**Operations Committee  
Minutes  
Wednesday, December 2, 2015**

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

BOARD MEMBERS: Steve Adams, Mark Miller, Dana Morgan

STAFF: Timothy Trzaska, 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 meeting held October 7, 2015 and November 4, 2015.

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

**Motion Carried 3-0-0**

FOOD SURVEY

Information: 4.1 Student Survey – Lunch at William Tennent

Mr. Shafter stated that he was concerned about the student survey. Some students voted “neutral”, which would mean to him “no opinion”. He would like to find out what percent of the students agreed.

Mr. Trzaska stated that just over 10% of students responded. 62.35% of respondents either agreed or identified as neutral regarding their satisfaction with the lunch meal options. 87.09% of respondents either agreed or identified as neutral regarding their satisfaction with the a la carte options. 55.05% of respondents either agreed or identified as neutral regarding their satisfaction with the amount of time it takes to get their lunch meal options. 52.24% of respondents either agreed or identified as neutral regarding their satisfaction with the amount of time they have to eat their lunch.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that he was satisfied with the lunch meal options, 24% agreed. The other 76% either neutral or disagreed, which is not good. Mr. Shafter is satisfied with the a la carte

options, because 56% or more agreed or strongly agreed. As far as the amount of time it takes to eat lunch, only 24% agree.

Ms. Driban stated that she was concerned more about the response of students being satisfied or not satisfied for the amount of time to get their lunch and the fact that only got 10% of students responded to this survey.

Dr. Polinchock replied that this was a voluntary survey and was taken electronically. If we had the students take this survey in the computer labs it would have taken up instructional time. This is not a strong sample size, but for the students that took the time to do the survey, the numbers show that they feel that they do not have enough time to get their lunch. We may have to make some kind of adjustment so the students can flow through the lines faster.

Ms. Driban stated that this all stemmed from the lunch discussion at the end of last year when the Board was told that the lunches were going from four to three. The Board requested some more data and at this point it does not look good.

Dr. Polinchock responded, the balance with this is the number of lunches that we are splitting. The students may feel rushed to eat lunch and then there will be less class time with a split class. If one of our goals is to increase student participation in lunch and purchasing of lunch, we will need to work on this. We can reach out to the students again to see what they want and also see what we can provide.

Mr. Shafter stated that we need to do better. There are a lot of options out there and if we need to add another cashier to help get the students through the lines then we need to do that. Mr. Shafter feels that there are ways to make this work and we need to look at our options.

Dr. Polinchock mentioned that we need to look into staffing and location of staff. We never want any of our students not eating any kind of lunch.

Ms. Driban mentioned that we should improve the line mechanically first and then improve what we would be offering and try to balance the two.

## FACILITIES

### Information: 5.1 Facilities Projects Update

Mr. Trzaska stated that the tennis courts are being pushed out to the Spring due to the proposals that we received being too high. With the Growth Lab we only received one proposal of \$60,000 and this amount was way higher than what we want to spend. We are hoping to put another bid out there in the Spring to get more participation.

## Information: 5.2 Facility Use Fee Schedule

Mr. Trzaska stated that there have been discussions on the facility use fees. Currently the policy governing facility use is being reviewed and updated. The proposed fees have been compared to other school districts as well.

Dr. Pollock mentioned that one of the problems that he has with facility use is we have a fee schedule and then we give groups 50% reduction of fees. Why have a fee schedule if we keep giving a reduction of fees? Never has he seen the Board turn these requests down.

Ms. Driban responded that they do not have anything to compare these fees to. We don't know what the old fee schedule was or what the policy states being that this information was not included. Once policy looks at it, make sure all the backup to support the facility use is attached when presenting it back to the next Operations meeting.

Dr. Polinchock stated that this is one of the policies that will be coming forward to the Board. There has been discussion on what we rent and when we rent, along with a schedule for when the fees would be published for the upcoming year. We need to look at this more closely so we have more control over the costs.

Ms. Driban stated that we need to look at the categories so there are less exceptions so everybody fits in a category and accounts for what we are already doing. Maybe we can take a look at the groups that are currently renting to see if we need to make another category to cover these groups so that we are not always making exceptions.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that he felt that we should not rent out the stadium unless our students are involved. The turf field is very expensive and for what we receive in the rentals it does not even cover the costs for repairs or upkeep. We may want to think about the new auditorium at the high school also.

Mr. Miller stated that when we upgraded the track and added the concession stand, this was done so that it could be rented out.

Dr. Pollock suggested that maybe we should increase the rental fee for the stadium and the high school auditorium.

Mr. Trzaska stated that he will check with other districts on what they are charging. We don't want to out price ourselves.

Ms. Driban mentioned that she asked previous administration, when they were looking at fees, to go back a year or two and look at which facility has the highest rental rate and what kinds of groups are coming in. Ms. Driban was told from administration that it would be too much work for them to look at that.

Mr. Trzaska stated that we started using SchoolDude for facility use this year. We are starting to build history and will be able to see who is using our facilities and how much we are charging.

#### Action: 5.3 Swan Way PlanCon Parts D & E Submission Presentation

Grace Heiland from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates stated that the last time they met with the Operations Committee, they presented a design for the building at Swan Way to convert it into the new district administration building. After the meeting they met with Dr. Baugh. Dr. Baugh had some other ideas to make the space more functional and also made some program changes. The old design was compared to the new design. Currently they are at the end of design development heading into construction documents.

The changes include eliminating the warehouse and use that space for educational classrooms and conferencing spaces. The design shifts from an office suite approach to more of an open office plan which will allow us to reuse the existing configuration. The new design also changed the location of the Board room. Toilet facilities will be shared by the administrative staff and students. This will save money by not building a separate restroom for the students. This design has a lot of advantages and will be minimizing reconfiguring the floor plan. There will be better use of the high volume area and clerestory windows, all classrooms and office areas will have access to natural lighting, and it provides more space for education and conferencing. There will be the ability to lock-down offices and classroom areas from areas that are frequently used by the public, and there will be greater work station flexibility. Increasing the student capacity that we get from the educational areas will make the project eligible for more PlanCon reimbursement. There will be two main entrances; one entrance will be for district office areas and the second entrance will be for the tax office. The tax office will have their own vestibule.

Dr. Pollock asked about the mens and ladies restrooms. There are more toilets in the mens room than in the ladies room and he felt that we should have more toilets in the ladies room. Ms. Driban stated to Dr. Pollock that these are the existing restrooms and we were trying not to change them.

Ms. Heiland responded that they will be expanding the existing restrooms. We did not have enough toilet fixtures for the number of people that would be in the building. We can expand the ladies room if we need to.

Ms. Driban asked about the main entrance if it was still going to be up front were all the main administrators offices will be.

Ms. Heiland replied, it is going to be on the left side as you come in the main entrance which is off the parking lot and there will be a canopy for both of the entrance areas.

Mr. Driban mentioned that it would make more sense to flip the mailroom and the receptionist areas. There is a door to the mailroom before there is a door to the receptionist. If we are talking about security and you have that vestibule it would make more sense to have the receptionist where the vestibule is and have a small window where you can talk to people and bring them in. Only if the space works out.

Ms. Heiland replied that they could work with that. These are the existing walls that they are trying to keep.

Mr. Shafter asked if there was going to be a camera and buzzer system.

Ms. Heiland replied said yes.

Mr. Miller stated in regards to the existing configuration of the restrooms, the building previously was used for a larger capacity then we envision. Mr. Miller suggested that what we have is beyond what you would normally build if you were building to the current usage.

Ms. Heiland replied that the number of fixtures are actually dictated by code.

Mr. Miller responded, right, our usage is well below what the code would require.

Ms. Heiland stated their usage is a little higher just because of the educational spaces that were added and the Board room.

Mr. Miller asked, what is the code for education?

Ms. Heiland said she will double check the code.

Mr. Miller stated that our main concern is if we are using the building for training or something else on a one day event, we may have an equal mix or a mix that requires what is in the design. He feels it is probably best to leave the design as is.

Mr. Shafter stated that if it is to code, the architect already suggested that we could move another stall into the coat room to expand the ladies room.

Mr. Adams asked if we were to open up the collapsible wall between the Board room and the conference area the seats should be stationed west to east. On the layout they are north to south.

Ms. Heiland stated that we can arrange the Board room however we want. She also pointed out that there is a conference room right off the Board room that would make an excellent room to use for an executive session. Right below that there is a storage room and if we need to reconfigure the room we can store the furniture there.

Dr. Polinchock stated that part of this design also has the wall mount for the LCD projectors so any which way you might want to configure the room you will be able to project it on any wall. This will all be wireless and the podium as well.

Mr. Adams replied, if we are going to configure the Board room maybe with whiteboards etc., we should put some thought into this considering if we have any large groups using the room.

Ms. Driban asked if they made any decision about the kind of entrance the students will have. Do you need to do certain types of wiring depending on what system we use? Will the students have their own key badges, will a teacher be there when students are entering, or have some kind of security? Does that matter in this phase or will this be further down the road?

Ms. Heiland replied that they have not gotten to that point with all the details.

Mr. Trzaska stated that there is a separate student entrance.

Ms. Driban replied, right, but we had asked the last time we were talking about how this was going to work. Are we giving each student their own ID badge? It's not like here at the Administration Building where there is a secretary as you enter the building.

Mr. Trzaska stated that they have had this discussion in the past two weeks concerning student access.

Ms. Heiland stated that there are two doors off the office areas that can be locked for public events.

Ms. Driban mentioned that there is a huge break area in one area and then there is a small break area by the vestibule to Special Ed. Wondering what the thought was behind putting it there. Almost seems like people in the break room would disturb the Special Ed Department.

Ms. Heiland stated that these are the existing break rooms and plumbing is already there. There has been a door added to the break room to eliminate any noise.

Ms. Heiland provided a proposed design presentation of Swan Way and showed offices that Crabtree has designed in the past for open space offices.

#### Project Scope:

##### Building Envelope & Exterior Improvements

- A new roof is in the budget for the project and insulation to meet current code requirements.
- New aluminum storefront replacement windows (this was not included in the previous design base-bid budget)
- Two entrance canopies

- Separate door for tax office
- Exterior signage

Interior Architectural Work

- Building two new partitions
- Replace all interior doors and hardware
- Interior finishes – painting, floor finishes, ceilings
- Interior signage and way-finding
- Manually operated roller shades
- Casework for break rooms, mail room, science lab

Alternate Bid

- Folding panel partition between Board room and multi-purpose room
- Structural reinforcement for folding panel partition
- Copy center fit-out

Mr. Adams asked about storage. In the original plans there was storage included and now there is no storage. He asked what we are going to do with everything that we have currently in storage.

Mr. Trzaska stated that in the plan we are keeping the old Administration Building for a little bit longer. We are looking to have cleaning supplies shipped directly to the schools. We need a tracking system and this is the time to clean out. We are hoping that we can utilize the old Administration Building and this will be discussed in the future.

Dr. Pollock asked how often we envision the multi-purpose room to be used.

Mr. Trzaska stated that the multi-purpose room that is located next to the Board room may be the ideal spot for students to have their lunch.

Dr. Pollock mentioned that there also is a student commons there.

Mr. Trzaska replied, there is, but we will not be able to fit all of the students in that area.

Dr. Polinchock stated that we currently have approximately forty students.

Mr. Shafter asked, how are we going to serve the students? What type of program?

Mr. Trzaska stated that we will deliver prepackaged lunch from William Tennent High School to the Administration Building.

Mr. Shafter replied, basically the same kind of lunch programs that other high school students have.

Mr. Trzaska stated that we have not worked that out yet. We can set up a way that they can order in the morning.

Mr. Shafter replied, I think it has to be worked out because there is no kitchen in the plans to prepare food so there is no other way to do it.

Mr. Trzaska responded, that it's going to have to come from the high school, but he doesn't know if it is going to be a set menu or if the students will be able to choose their meal each day.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that it will need to be prepackaged meals because we have no warmers or refrigeration. The lunches need to be at the proper temperature before serving. We cannot have the lunches left on a table or we will be in violation of the code.

Mr. Miller mentioned that we have delivered lunches in the past to our CSSCA students when they were at the Dot Henry School and we are also talking about providing services to other institutions. Mr. Miller felt that there should not be any problem with the lunches.

Dr. Polinchock stated that currently the students go over to the high school for lunch. One of the options that was discussed is busing the students from the Administration Building to the high school for their half hour lunch then busing them back. Many students do bring their own lunch. We are looking at the best way to do that in a cost efficient way, but also making sure that the students get a proper lunch.

Mr. Adams replied that maybe we could look into a unit that will keep the food warm.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that we will have to make provisions with the electrical if we do purchase something to store the lunches in.

Ms. Driban asked if forty is the max that we can hold now that we have expanded that area. Did we just give them more space in different types of labs or are we looking that we can actually house more students than the forty that we currently have.

Dr. Polinchock responded that we can house more students than what we currently have.

Ms. Driban asked, what is our maximum number with this configuration?

Dr. Polinchock responded that the maximum number would be about 70 students. The potential with CSSCA in the future is having an alternative program that happens in a twilight setting after school. Right now we are doing credit recovery during the day, but for some students it may be an option.

Ms. Driban mentioned that in discussing some of this concerning meals and student security, the only thought is if we have forty now and if we hit our max we will not be able to do what we are

doing for forty students. So, if we going to bring in some kind of a unit to keep the food warm, it has to be that either we have enough for the maximum we can do or we at least know that we can get the unit very quickly if we go over our maximum.

Mr. Miller stated that when the school was in Ivyland at the Dot Henry School we were limited by the size of the building to 35 students. When we brought the program over here at the Administration Building in 2011 we intentionally built it to hold 90 students but it has never been over forty.

Mr. Bob Korp from Barry Isett & Associates talked about the proposed design site plan. Contrast to the previous site design we are doing less on the site. There are no improvements needed over to the east side and none to the north side. Everything is concentrated over to the west side because that is where the two entrances are. As to the prior design we are re-grading a small portion of the parking lot to provide full compliant ADA parking spaces. We are also now adjusting the sidewalks into the two entrances since they have been designated. One will have a couple of steps and an “L” ramp and the other one will just have a straight shot in and will be flared out a little bit. Site work is more simplified in this design. The parking lot will be restriped and resealed. There will be a concrete generator pad on the west side for one of our generators that will be brought over to the site and site lighting on the parking lot as an add on alternate, hold to property line.

Ms. Driban asked, if we need to bus students from the new administration building to the high school, if they do not have their own transportation. What is the plan, as far as, the vehicle size, students catching their bus and if the office staff are parked in the parking lot, do we have enough space for a turn-around for whatever size bus we may need to use to transport the students.

Dr. Polinchock stated that the drop off area will be around the entrance at the back of the building. We also have tech students that will be dropped off as well.

Mr. Korp from Barry Isett & Associates talked about the project scope for the HVAC system. Within the heating ventilation and air condition system we are modifying the ductwork to take it to the new loads that are in the new design. There will be an energy recovery unit with outside air for the Board room. There will be new units for the Board room, copy center and classrooms because their loads are different from the prior configuration and the new units will also have their own digital programmable thermostats. Alternate bid will be for the new mechanical system for the copy center. Total HVAC equipment replacement is not in the our budget and Mr. Korp suggested to set money aside so that in the next several years the units can be replaced as needed.

Mr. Shafter asked how many current existing roof top units we have.

Mr. Korp stated the new units that we will be adding are roof top. There are some roof top units and one of them is being replaced due to its condition.

Mr. Shafter asked, if the new duct work will accommodate the replacement of the HVAC equipment whenever it will happen in the future.

Mr. Korp stated that if you replace the units in the future, the existing duct work will be modified and will be used going forward. You will have a more efficient unit serving the same space.

Mr. Shafter responded, so we are not talking about taking out ten small units and putting in one larger unit. If we take out ten small units then will we be replacing them with ten small units?

Mr. Korp replied, that would be the approach, yes.

Mr. Shafter asked, what is the best approach?

Mr. Korp stated, if you want to make most of the existing infrastructure, “plug and play” for each one is the way to go. If you are looking at one large unit it will be a whole different control scheme and ducting at that point. Where are you going to put it and will the roof support the load of one larger unit. There are operational advantages and disadvantages either way.

Mr. Shafter mentioned, looking at the total operational cost over the life span of the equipment, is it better to have one larger unit or replace plug in existing units. Mr. Shafter asked if you were to totally redesign tomorrow for new equipment what would you do?

Mr. Korp stated that he looks at this from an operating stand point. If you have one unit and lose one unit you have nothing. If you have multiple units and you lose one you will be able to do some emergency back feed and support over it. Most of the projects that we do have multiple units spread out through the facility opposed to one large single unit.

Ms. Driban asked do we need ten units to do that or can we limit it to five and have five medium size units instead of ten smaller units and one large unit?

Mr. Korp stated again we are not replacing these units at this time other than the one that needs to be replaced. But going forward you can decide how to replace them, but it may impact the ductwork distribution at that point in time.

Ms. Driban asked if this is this being sent out for alternative bid or if he is just putting it out there at this point as a flag for the HVAC.

Mr. Korp stated that the HVAC replacement is not in the project period.

Ms. Driban asked, why we aren't including HVAC an alternate just in case we decide that maybe other things come in lower and we decide that this a priority.

Mr. Korp responded, if that is what you desire, we could design the replacement units and then we can see overall where the budget is.

Mr. Adams mentioned that maybe we would not want one unit anyway because for energy efficiency purposes, we may want separate controls throughout the building.

Mr. Trzaska stated that the engineering side of this project was to reuse what we have. The Crabtree proposal with Phase 1 was to reuse as much as possible and Phase 2 was to redesigning and re-engineering the building.

Mr. Shafter responded that the goal is to reuse what we can and replace everything else now so we do not have things breaking down later.

Mr. Korp talked about the project scope for electrical and data. We will use the existing lighting with some reconfiguration to serve the new floor plan layout. There will be new emergency lighting and wiring distribution to support the new equipment and work stations. The network operations center will have all of its equipment and will be supported for heating and cooling, the card access system, which was discussed before. The fire alarm system will be separate from the original system that serviced more than one building. The devices that are currently there will be changed so that we have competition in the best bid. The alternate bid would be for replacement of interior light fixtures with high-efficiency LED fixtures, new plumbing fixtures for both bathrooms, backflow preventer for the domestic and fire services and modification to existing sprinkler system for the new layout.

Rick LeBlanc from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh & Associates, gave an update on the cost estimate for the project. General requirements would be for four contracts on the project which includes plumbing, HVAC and electrical. At a cost of about \$155,620. The structure demolition cost has gone down about \$10,000 due to reusing a lot more of the interior partitions than previously. The concrete number went down less than half because we are using the existing entrances. Masonry work remains the same at \$11,200 as there will be two new doors and window openings that we will need to accommodate. The framing and joist work miscellaneous cost of \$2,400. Minor wood work repairs at a cost of \$7,334. New roof replacement, 20 year warranty at a cost of \$396,807. Replacing all windows is a part of the base bid. Replacing finishes including carpet, painting, ceramic tiles and ceiling tiles at a cost of \$389,617. Specialties cost of \$33,450. Three projector screens cost of \$15,000. Roller shades, educational case work and counter tops cost of \$59,260.

Mr. Shafter asked if we are replacing all exterior windows, can we do it with the blinds that are inside of the glass instead of the shades.

Mr. LeBlanc responded that it would be more expensive approach, but they can look at other options and will get back to the Board with the information.

Mr. LeBlanc continued the update with the fire suppression. There will be a wet pipe sprinkler system installed modified to accommodate the new layout at a cost of \$90,950. The plumbing fixtures will be replaced throughout the building, including a new hot water heater and with extending the restrooms, there will be floor trenching and patching at a cost of \$143,805. HVAC is budgeted for \$322,326. Electrical at a cost of \$283,085 for lighting, service, distribution and wiring. Communications and data at a cost of \$121,854. Security and fire alarm system budgeted at \$55,236. Exterior improvements are at a cost of \$56,353. Total budget to date including a construction contingency of 3% and escalation to midpoint of construction at 1% is \$2,462,464.

Mr. Shafter asked, what Crabtree's typical contingency for projects is that they do for other school districts.

Mr. LeBlanc replied for renovations it is a 3% to 5%. This is not a difficult project. We are retaining most of the existing building, so we do not expect a lot of change orders. He said that 3% is appropriate for this project.

Mr. LeBlanc listed the alternates:

- Folding Panel Partitions - \$38,000
- Structural Steel to support the partition - \$15,000
- New Site Lighting - \$150,000
- Replace Interior Lighting - \$120,000
- Copy Center - \$45,470

Total of \$368,470 added alternates to the base bid.

The total HVAC replacement is not included in the scope of work.

- HVAC Unit Replacement - \$300,000

Mr. Shafter asked why is Mr. LeBlanc emphasizing what is not included in the budget. He also asked if these things that should be replaced.

Mr. LeBlanc stated that the equipment is at the end of its life. It is working and the unit could continue to work for another five years. He said he is emphasizing this because we need to put this in the capital budget and plan for the future. He said that over time, the unit will need to be replaced.

Dr. Pollock asked if there was site lighting right now.

Mr. Trzaska replied that there is lighting on the building shining out to the parking lot. There are no light poles in the parking lot and we are looking to add poles.

Mr. Shafter asked if we could just use the existing lighting in the parking lot.

Mr. Trzaska stated that they have talked about taking the existing lighting and just making it brighter.

Mr. Shafter mentioned about adding fixtures instead of putting poles in the parking lot for \$150,000.

Mr. Korp stated units that are on the building could be replaced. There is a limit on how much light they will provide.

Dr. Pollock also mentioned that we have not done anything with the current lighting on the building to make it more efficient or brighter. For as much as the building will be used at night, we do not need to have the whole parking lot lit up.

Mr. Shafter stated that he would like to see as part of the base bid to upgrade the existing outside building fixtures and add a few more and then the alternate would be the new site lighting, leaving the lights the way they were.

Dr. Pollock mentioned about the replacement of the interior lighting. He said it will be a payoff in ten to twelve years if we use energy efficient lighting. He said if we wait to do it, it will cost us more. He would suggest that we should go ahead and do this. He said the copy center needs to be done. He feels that the HVAC replacement should be put out there for an alternate bid. He said we should do this now or it will be more expensive later. We originally had in the budget \$5.1 million dollars for Swan Way. If we complete all of it, including the new site lighting it comes to \$4.9 million and we are still under budget.

Mr. Miller stated that his understanding is that the cost of the HVAC equipment through the manufacturing efficiencies and the energy economy is trending downward not upward. So, if that's the case then it might pay us to get the end of the useful life out of the existing equipment and then look to see about new equipment.

Mr. Trzaska stated that the 5 year capital plan has HVAC work included for Swan Way for next year. If the Board feels we have the money to move ahead and do the HVAC work now and put it in the bid or create an alternate, we can do that.

Dr. Pollock responded, wouldn't it be cheaper putting it in the building and the bid then going out in the future and bidding it separately?

Mr. LeBlanc replied that it would be better doing it has one project and it would be more economical.

Mr. Shafter asked Mr. Trzaska if he looked into the guarantee savings contract for the HVAC.

Mr. Trzaska replied, yes, because of the building not being that old no company is going to come in to do the project and make money and have savings generated from it.

Mr. Shafter asked, if we include the HVAC as an alternate. How much design work is that going to be?

Ms. Driban stated that that if we make the folding panels an alternate, can we look at doing it in-house later?

Mr. Trzaska responded that a contractor should do the structural steel for the folding panels. Mr. Trzaska does not think we should do this project in-house.

Ms. Driban asked if we can use the partitions on wheels instead of the folding panels that go into the wall.

Mr. LeBlanc responded that the difference with the folding panels is that it has a thickness to it that helps keep the noise down between the separations of the two rooms.

Ms. Driban stated that if the folding partition can be installed later and it is more important to do the steel structure now, then why is this only an alternate?

Mr. LeBlanc replied, if the intent is to make sure to be able to accommodate it then we probably should put it in the base bid.

Ms. Driban asked, in reference to replacing the interior lighting is this something we can do later in-house? Are we talking about different fixtures? How much wiring are we talking about?

Mr. Korp replied that the fixtures will be replaced and the wiring will not change.

Ms. Driban responded, so then we can do this in-house down the road.

Mr. Shafter replied, we are already paying for the labor to take down the 25 year old fixtures and put the new ones back up. So all were are talking about is buying the material. If we do this down the road it will cost us more.

Ms. Driban stated that we will not be paying a contractor on a bid price. We will be paying our own people.

Mr. Shafter stated that our people cannot do this. This is a big job to do.

Mr. Trzaska responded that this would have to be completed during the summer and worked on little by little.

Ms. Driban feels that it is more important to replace the HVAC than replacing interior fixtures and putting in a folding partition. The cost of interior lighting and the folding partition is close to the price for new HVAC. If the unit could go anytime, then that's first priority to keep the building running.

There was a discussion on the list of alternates among the Board members to see if they want to keep items as an alternate or for base bid. Listed below is what was agreed upon:

1. Folding Panel Partitions – Alternate
2. Structural Steel for Folding Panel Partition – Base Bid
3. Building Lighting – Base Bid
4. Replace Interior Lighting – Alternate
5. Copy Center – Alternate
6. HVAC Unit Replacement – Alternate
7. Plumbing – Base Bid
8. Blinds within the Windows – Alternate

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

### **Motion Carried 3-0-0**

Action: 5.4 Swan Way Architect Contract Fees

Mr. LeBlanc talked about the copy of the proposal dated November 16, 2015, showing a total of additional services for redesign of \$25,520. This would be for interior lighting replacement, structural and the civil revisions. He will need an adjustment to get an additional proposal to accommodate the additional alternate that was discussed for replacement for all mechanical equipment. He will work with Barry Isett & Associates and obtain the revised number for that and then will resubmit to the Board.

Ms. Driban stated that she was a little unhappy about the \$25,520. Reading the proposal this is saying that Crabtree essentially went back to reusing the existing space. During the interview with Crabtree Rohrbaugh & Associates the Board requested to reuse the space as much as possible. Not sure where this all fell through.

Mr. Shafter responded, we had a plan that was presented to the Board at the last meeting. After that meeting we had a long discussion and the superintendent went to the architect and requested to do redesign work. Crabtree did a complete redesign of the building. This was at our request from the Administration.

Dr. Pollock made a motion to resubmit the \$42,770 to the full Board. Mr. Shafter second.  
Ms. Driban abstained.

### Further Discussion

Mr. Miller mentioned that he agreed with Mr. Shafter. It would have been a mistake to continue with a poor design that was on the table. The changes were made by Dr. Baugh to improve the building.

### **Motion Carried 2-0-0**

#### Information: 5.5 Capital Improvements 5-Year Plan

Mr. Trzaska stated that he was asked to take the capital improvements five year plan back to the operations meeting for review.

Mr. Shafter stated that the presentation for the Finance Committee showed that there was no exceptions included in the budget and no contribution to capital projects. Grand total for budget in 2016-2017 is 1.4 million dollars. School buses are bought out of the capital fund and the report from transportation is stating that we need to buy ten buses for next year, but the list of capital projects is saying that we only need to purchase four buses. Is there funding right now in the capital projects fund for all the items listed in the 2016-2017 budget.

Mr. Trzaska responded, not sure what we are going to have left over for this year into next school year and may not even have enough for what is listed in 2015-2016 right now.

Mr. Shafter replied, we need to make sure that we do something so that we have enough funds and we also need to buy ten buses after reading the report. It is also being recommended to use CDL drivers only.

### TRANSPORTATION

#### Information: 6.1 Bus Route Optimization Report Summary

Mr. Trzaska stated that in the optimization report it is recommended that 10% of the bus fleet be replaced each year. We did not do 10% this year, so we will need to make up for it next year. The report is also suggesting to look at other routing software, consolidate bus stops, when purchasing new vehicles stay with one brand so there is consistency with repairs and maintenance, training for all staff, purchase the scrapper for snow removal from the buses and look at the IU routes to see if routes can be shared.

Mr. Shafter mentioned that the report states that we should replace a minimum of thirteen buses not ten. We will need to put in for thirteen buses and the Finance Committee will need to determine how to fund it.

Dr. Polinchock stated that looking at the assumptions that we had as we built the budget for 2016-2017 there was \$450,000 allocated for five buses.

Mr. Shafter recommended for the 2016-2017 budget to put in everything that we need and then we can determine what to take out to the level that we can afford.

Mr. Miller stated that in the past we had a schedule of buses that was twelve years out and were not kept over the twelve years. Overtime, to conserve cost we moved it to thirteen years. There were two years that we did not replace buses because we were going to extend the use of the two years. We did not sell the buses, we traded them in and did not get much for them. The first time we sold buses they were sold on eBay and got a lot of money for them. We now get money for our used buses. What we didn't do is retain the discipline to put the money back into the budget to get back on the schedule. A five year capital plan for buses is not sufficient. We need to have our entire fleet on a schedule so we know when they are going to be replaced and when the service life is over.

Mr. Shafter stated that we know that we cannot buy thirteen buses, but it needs to be put into the budget. Then we can look at how many can we purchase.

Information: 6.2 Bus Replacement Schedule

Mr. Trzaska presented a list of the ten buses that will need to be replaced next year.

See discussion in 6.1 (combined 6.1 & 6.2)

#### OTHER DISCUSSION

None

#### ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Pollock made a motion to adjourn, second by Ms. Driban.

7.12 The next Operations Committee meeting will be held January 13, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Trzaska  
Operations Director

#### READ AT HOME

None