

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

**Committee Members Present**

Mr. John Gamble, Member  
Mrs. Sharon Collopy, Member  
Dr. Nicole Young, Member

Mr. Robert Kleimenhagen, Jr., CFM, SFP  
Director of Facilities & Energy Management Operations

**Committee Members Not Present**

Mrs. Tracy Suits, Chairperson

**Others in Attendance**

Mr. Glenn Schloeffel, Board President  
Mrs. Jodi Schwartz, Board Member  
Mrs. Karen Smith, Board Member  
Mr. Dennis Weldon, Board Member  
Dr. John Kopicki, Superintendent

Dr. Scott Davidheiser, Assistant Superintendent  
Mr. Dave Matyas, Business Administrator  
Mr. Jason Jaffe, Director of Technology & Innovation  
Mr. Wayne Birster, District Facilities Manager  
Mrs. Suzanne Moffat, District Operations Coordinator

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Mr. Gamble.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**REVIEW OF MEETING NOTES**

The November 21, 2017 Operations Committee Meeting Minutes were reviewed and approved.

**PRESENTATION: 1:1 Update-Financial Impacts:**

Mr. Jason Jaffe, Director of Technology & Innovation, presented an update on the 1:1 Pilot Laptop program at Holicong, focusing on the goals of the program and areas that need to be addressed.

Mr. Jaffe stated that there are three major goals for the Technology & Innovation Department:

- Utilizing a learning management system for Curriculum, which has begun with the pilot program for Canvas.
- Developing a consistent classroom model of technology across the district, ensuring that every classroom has the same access to technology.
- Increasing access to student devices in every building across the district, not just at the secondary level. Goal 1:1 is the best way to implement increased access.

Mr. Jaffe noted that the question had been raised regarding how the teaching and learning impact of 1:1 deployment can be measured. He is hopeful his presentation will successfully address those questions.

The major goals for 1:1 are not necessarily focused on instruction, and aren't measurable goals through PSSA scores or any standardized test. The goals the Technology & Innovation Department are trying to measure deal with equal access, ensuring that all students across the district have the same tools and that class time is maximized. Mr. Jaffe explained that several things take up class time when you have a cart for laptops - The cart must be wheeled into the room, and devices that aren't the student's own must be handed out. Handing out papers electronically maximizes class time; the use of laptops enables that process to take a few seconds rather than the several minutes it would take when laptops are not available. For example, when the middle school schedule was changed by just a couple of minutes, that few extra minutes in a class can make a big difference.

Standardization of classrooms is a major goal, as is providing collaboration tools for all CB students. These aren't goals that are instructional goals, because technology is a tool. Mr. Jaffe noted that technology cannot be measured as a learning outcome. Technology is a tool we're trying to provide,

## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

just like a pencil, a desk, a crayon in kindergarten, or a textbook in middle school. Technology is a tool that can really impact instruction.

That impact will be measured through surveys - parent surveys, student surveys, and teacher surveys. There is anecdotal data that Mr. Jaffe's department is hearing from teachers through emails, conversations and curriculum modifications. There are classroom observations done regularly by Mr. Jaffe, Dr. Davidheiser, building principals and Dr. Kopicki. They monitor what's going on in the 1:1 pilot and make sure it's going well. There are student, teacher and parent focus groups. A parent focus group met last Thursday. Lindsay Smith and Brian Merrill (T&I Department) have run a parent group from the beginning of the 1:1 pilot at Holicong.

Seventeen teachers involved with the seventh grade 1:1 rollout were surveyed and asked several questions.

- How well is it going? With a rating system of 1 -5, with five being the highest, a score of 4.10 shows that, in their opinion, it's going very, very well.
- Do you feel as if our district should move forward with the plan? Responses from the 17 teachers was 100% yes. Although it's a small sample size, the 17 teachers are 100% of the sample participating in the 1:1.
- How has it impacted the way you teach? Again, teachers responded 100% positive. Mr. Jaffe presented three positive quotes: "The way students get information is better and faster"; "The way I teach is similar, but the way students access notes has changed"; "The one-in-one initiative has changed the way I monitor student learning. It gives students feedback and form an assessment that is much, much quicker."

The 17 teachers were also asked "What can we do to improve in the district?" Those answers provide information on the areas that need to be addressed with the 1:1 program.

Teachers noted that there needs to be someone in the building that's there specifically to help with problems when they arise. For example, a laptop might break in the fifth period, and the building tech is only there first period. Mr. Jaffe noted that is something he's trying to improve with the staff he has. A student support team has also been formed. It builds student confidence, and helps with tech support. Students can't fix screens and keyboards, but they've been able to help with small projects, and they enjoy their team. They're called "The I Team" and they're really involved in their role and appreciate what they're doing.

Another item that needs to be addressed is how students are notified when their computer comes back from repair. When a computer breaks and needs to be sent out for repair, there's no one responsible for notifying the student the computer is repaired and ready. The T&I Department is working on a notification system, which will be needed to deal with the magnitude of five middle schools.

Finally, one Special Ed teacher said that it's hard for her students to navigate OneNote, and the aides in the classroom need to be trained. Mr. Jaffe noted that was a professional development area that his department will help work on. Dr. Kopicki and Dr. Davidheiser are well-aware of professional development strengths and weaknesses, and helping train the aides is an area that needs to improve.

Mr. Schloeffel asked if Mr. Jaffe had the results from the parent survey. Mr. Jaffe responded that he will work with Dr. Kopicki to create a packet of survey results, aggregating every survey, and will distribute them to Committee members. Mr. Jaffe provided the results from the survey of all middle school teachers, who were asked if they would be in favor of a 1:1 rollout. He noted that 650 teachers responded "Yes" and 65 said "No".

Mrs. Collopy inquired about the I Team of students, noting it sounded like a great idea and asked when they were able to provide tech support. Mr. Jaffe responded that students have hours, advertised on posters throughout the school. Typical hours are from 7:00-7:30 and 2:00-2:30, as well as lunch time.

## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

Mr. Jaffe noted there were six areas he felt required attention regarding the 1:1 initiative.

- The pens used with the device are breaking. The tips break, as do tips on pencils, pens and crayons. New tips for the digitized pen tips cost about \$1, and are available in the student store. In an effort to place responsibility back on the students, I Team members are showing students how to fix their own.
- There are some issues with system updates. The T&I Department is exploring a way to do this efficiently. It is easy to update the current 300 devices, but with 3,000 devices it won't be. The T&I Department is trying to find a cloud based system where devices can be updated. Mr. Jaffe has lots of support in place, if the program moves forward full tilt he will have planning meetings with experts to figure out how best to update PCs. Mr. Gamble noted that the T&I Department would control the updates and, while it may be a hassle, a systematic scheduling of a BIOS updates shouldn't be a concern because there should be extra computers that can be lent out while the updates are worked on. Mr. Jaffe agreed that a swap out of computers wouldn't be an issue on a small scale, but when there is a full-scale BIOS update needed (as happened this week) some alternative needs to be considered to not impact instruction. Currently an entire cart can be taken to the tech lab for updating. If a student has their laptop at home, there needs to be a way to collect them and complete the BIOS updates. Mr. Gamble noted that he had an opportunity to observe some classes participating in the 1:1 with Mrs. Schwartz, Dr. Kopicki and Mrs. Suits. He remarked that he did not hear one negative comment. Students were asked what the program meant to them, and they provided some great answers. Students commented that they liked taking responsibility for their own things, that they like accessing their homework instantaneously and that their work is getting graded faster. Dr. Young commented that she has a friend that is a teacher at Centennial, where there is a 1:1 program. Centennial also has issues with laptop updates, which are set to update every time they restart the computer. Students are walking down the hallway with their laptops open because they can't close them and then go to class. Mr. Jaffe assured the Committee that the T&I Department is visiting districts, local and national, to try and find the most efficient way to perform system updates.
- The rollout of 3,000 devices requires space and time. The T&I team is working to have deployment plan that involves devices already imaged getting shipped in the mail to a student's home. The plan is not complete yet, but is one that is being worked on so that the department doesn't have to touch each device to roll it out.
- Another area to address is inventory. It's challenging to have an inventory for that many devices. Mr. Kleimenhagen and Mr. Jaffe collaborate on ideas because FEMO has similar challenges for their specific inventory. Mike Decorrevont of the T&I Department has been tasked with the challenge of addressing inventory control.
- Communication is an important issue. Mr. Jaffe noted that we need to make sure that every parent knows what we're doing, and every student knows what we're doing and why, so planning will be especially important. Waiting to decide on the full rollout of a 1:1 in May won't provide enough time to manage the rollout well. Ideally communication planning for next year should begin in February or March. Mr. Schloeffel asked if the intention was to get devices to students before they get to school in the fall. Mr. Jaffe responded that was the intention. For example, sixth graders will leave Gayman and go home for the summer. A pickup day would be

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

held at Holicong in August, perhaps the day before school begins. Students would not take the device home for the summer. Mr. Schloeffel inquired if the device would belong to the student for the duration of the program. Mr. Jaffe answered that students would have them for the full three years. Laptops would be collected at the end of each school year. That collection provides another challenge – how they are collected, stored, and how they are redistributed.

Mr. Schloeffel asked if all devices would be universally the same, and if so, did it matter who received which device. Mr. Jaffe noted that the goal is to personalize each device, so it may be a matter of concern.

- Providing tech support for the program is also a concern. An assembly was held for Holicong students to show them how to fix their own pen tips. Utilizing Help Desk staff in that scenario worked well, but providing a tech support system for five schools is an area of concern. Mr. Schloeffel remarked that a video on the desktop about pen tip repair could be used. Mr. Jaffe noted that a parent helper at Holicong has been assisting with tutorial videos that are available for the students.

Mr. Jaffe presented a quote from George Couros, keynote speaker at the CB Staff Development program. Mr. Couros posted on Twitter “Technology is anything that was invented after you were born. For kids growing up today, laptops and mobile phones aren’t hi-tech tools. They’re everyday tools, just like crayons and watercolors.” Mr. Jaffe noted that he understands a laptop is much more expensive than a crayon, but his research shows that in 1903 when the crayons were invented, some teachers resisted them. Teachers are not resisting the 1:1 program, they want it to happen. Mr. Jaffe believes the district is ready to impact teaching and learning in this way.

Mrs. Collopy asked if students would pay the insurance fee prior to receiving their device. Mr. Jaffe foresees the device handout as follows:

A T&I staff member would have a printout of students that have paid their fee. Students that have paid would receive their laptop. If a student had not paid, they would be given the opportunity to go to a computer and pay the online fee or return on the second pickup day (the following day). Students with a special need that qualify for exemption of the fee would appear on the list and be given the laptop. That practice had worked at Holicong, and the parents of students that could not pay the \$50 were especially appreciative that their student was not singled out in any way. Mr. Schloeffel asked what would happen if the student did not pay the \$50 fee. Mr. Jaffe noted that the student would not receive the laptop until the fee was paid. At Holicong there were three or four students who returned the second pick up day and paid the fee. Parents can pay online on My Payments Plus.

Mr. Schloeffel asked if there were statistics on lost or stolen devices for the Holicong 1:1 program. Mr. Jaffe reported that there were zero devices lost or stolen, and 8% sent back to the manufacturer for malfunction. He remarked that he was not happy with that high percentage, and it is a warranty issue he is working on with the company. Mr. Schloeffel inquired about the process when a student has a device with a problem. Mr. Jaffe responded that the device is boxed for pickup from the manufacturer, which currently happens two days a week. The student is given a loaner laptop until theirs is returned. He noted that the turnaround time from the manufacturer has been too slow. Mr. Schloeffel asked, if the laptops are universal, did it matter that the student had their laptop returned to them. Mr. Jaffe responded that it seemed to matter intrinsically for seventh graders, it seems they can recognize which device is their own. It matters to the T&I Department because they’ve found that having multiple users log on to a device multiple times slows down the processor. Having one device assigned to one student is most efficient, and helps with device tracking by utilizing one serial number for an individual student. Mr. Gamble asked, out of the 8% malfunctioning laptops how much was

## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

software related. Mr. Jaffe responded that it was all BIOS. He has been working with HP, the malfunction percentage should be closer to 4%.

Mrs. Collopy asked what was the percentage of spare laptops. Mr. Jaffe noted that there were about 10 spares at Holicong, which was less than 10% of the total number of devices. Mrs. Collopy inquired if that seemed to be enough, Mr. Jaffe responded that it had been plenty. He remarked that since the district would be self-insuring, purchasing spare laptops for each building was more cost efficient than paying \$86 per device for insurance.

Mr. Gamble asked if students were taking better care of their laptops than they did with the carts. Mr. Jaffe noted that they were, and that placing ownership on the students was another benefit of the program. There have only been two breakages for the whole year, one was dropped, and another had soda spilled on it. There have not been any broken screens on student laptops.

Mrs. Collopy asked if there was a plan to mandate test taking on the laptops, she knew that some classes are doing that now. She noted that even for a technically adept student, there would be an adjustment from pen and paper to online test taking. Mr. Jaffe noted that there is no mandate for online testing. Canvas training is mandatory for seventh and eighth-grade teachers, and training will be provided in February before teachers receive the device. Training will be ongoing through the summer, but the administration of assessments and the taking of assessments has not been mandated.

Mrs. Schwartz noted that she teaches at the college level, as well as some high school students, and technology makes a difference for accessibility. She commented that higher education is moving toward online technology, so CB students will be better prepared.

Mr. Jaffe thanked the Committee for being patient with him because they understand that this program is a passion for him. He appreciates the trust they've placed in him, and respects the questions and concerns they've had. He noted that he had been with the district for 23 years and this program has been a long-time mission for him. He promised the Committee full ownership of the program.

Mr. Schloeffel asked what the additional department staffing needs would be. Dr. Kopicki noted that there was an initial professional development plan in place for the current year, and that will continue to be developed moving forward. There will be further discussion with Mr. Jaffe about personnel requirements. Before any additional staffing needs would be proposed to the Board, logistics will be worked out regarding disbursement of tasks and analysis of current staff responsibilities. Dr. Kopicki believes Mr. Jaffe has some creative ideas to offset some financial costs, but realistically there may be a need for another staff developer in the future, and perhaps a building tech. To make any program successful, the personnel must be in place to support the teachers and continue their professional development. Every attempt is being made to use existing budget funds to support the 1:1 initiative.

Mr. Gamble noted that the most critical part of this is the backend support for the kids and the teachers. Mrs. Collopy asked for reassurance that teachers are still actively walking around the classroom observing the students. She was extremely concerned with the situation of a student accused of cheating based on an activity log. She noted that the accusation proved untrue, and does not want that situation to ever occur again. Mr. Jaffe agreed, but commented that the situation could have occurred in any event, it was not 1:1 program related. Mrs. Collopy stated the issue was tech related, and Mr. Jaffe should have been informed of the issue. A teacher and a principal should not be hiding information because those types of situations are the district's responsibility to handle appropriately.

**Update: Plumstead Township LERTA (Airtas):**

Mr. Kleimenhagen introduced Mr. David Hughes, Director of Specialty Gas Integration with Airtas. Mr. Hughes appeared before the Committee in November to talk about the consolidation project

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

and property development that Airgas is proposing in Plumstead Township. Airgas is asking for a five-year 100% abatement of the property taxes on the development of their new property. Mr. Hughes indicated the Committee appeared to be in favor of the proposal at that time, but asked for more information.

Mr. Hughes presented a power point of statistics on current and assumed property tax contributions. The first scenario reflects statistics if 100% of the employees resided in the township, scenario two is 50%, and then scenario three is 25%. He provided a 10-year estimate of what the earned income tax and local services tax would be for each one of those scenarios, and the contribution that they would make. KPMG (consultants hired by Airgas to help with data) developed the assumptions and calculations using a nationally and globally accepted software program that analyzes the impact of these projects. The economic contribution was broken into two pieces, first for the construction phase which is roughly a \$20.5 million project. That will constitute approximately 120 construction jobs that have a direct impact. There are another 80 jobs that will be indirect impact, the total effect of 200 jobs resulting in \$1 million state and local tax revenue. Labor income will result in nine million for direct and four million for indirect, resulting in \$13 million total of income - three million of federal tax revenue. One slide provided data on what the economic impact would be for those jobs.

There are 104 current jobs at the two businesses that Airgas runs in Plumstead Township. Airgas is looking to add another 30 jobs on top of those 104, bringing the total to 134 jobs. Those 134 jobs would then influence and create another 130 support positions, for a total of approximately 264 jobs.

Labor income would be nine million across those 134 jobs, another six million for the additional 130 support positions, for a total of 15 million. That results in five million in state and local tax, and four million in federal tax.

Mr. Gamble noted that the figures presented were best case scenario, and asked what would happen if there were an economic downturn. He thought it was most likely that the figures would be much lower. Mr. Hughes agreed that economic impacts will change figures, the data presented is based on the best estimations at this point. Mr. Gamble commented that while he does not have an issue with Airgas, his concern was creating a corridor. The buildup in Plumstead could create an overpopulation of schools.

Mrs. Collopy stated that a corridor would not be created with this proposal. Chalfont adopted a LERTA zone for an area of vacant places where no taxes were being paid. Economic development was absolutely needed in that area. There is no such need for a LERTA zone in Plumstead. Airgas is an individual company requesting a LERTA, which is a very big difference. Mrs. Collopy remarked that, while any business can come to the school district and ask for a tax break, this proposal is not a LERTA zone like Chalfont was. She noted that, while the Committee did not state they were against the Airgas proposal at the November meeting, she did not believe they were in favor of it – they were amenable to hearing more details.

Mrs. Collopy also remarked that at the November meeting there were terms used indicating the newly created \$37,500 positions were “highly paid”. She noted that a job paying \$37,500 is a good job, but she would only call it highly paid if it were part-time. An employee making \$37,500 might not even be living in Central Bucks. They're going to be living in Palisades or up north where there is a lower cost of living. Every house for sale in a development in Plumsteadville is not going to sell now because you can't buy that with a \$37,500 income.

Mr. Hughes stated that the \$37,500 was the number KPMG used for the calculations. The reality is that most Airgas employees earn about \$25 an hour. Lab techs earn higher than that, and the management staff earns even more. The \$37,500 also doesn't take into account any benefits that those employees would have. All the jobs that are with Airgas have full benefits. Mr. Schloeffel remarked that the average salary for the Central Bucks area is at least two times that amount. He does not believe that



## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

a primary wage earner could afford to live in Central Bucks on that type of salary. Mr. Schloeffel agreed with Mr. Gamble that granting an abatement to one company could have long-term implications down the road when another company approaches the district. He stated that he would be happy to see Airgas developing in Plumstead, he is sure that it is more financially feasible than their other facility in New Jersey. However, the Committee needs to think long-term. Mrs. Collopy commented that CB real estate taxes are certainly reasonable compared to New Jersey, especially with the new governor taking office. Mr. Hughes remarked that CB taxes are higher than Montgomery County taxes, which is one of the other competitive sites Airgas is considering. Mr. Schloeffel stated that his concern was he didn't know how CB could say "No" to the next person that proposes a tax abatement, no matter what the size and however many people they want to hire. How could the district "Yes, we could do it for Airgas, but no, we can't do it for you."

Mrs. Schwartz noted that Montgomery County has a huge deficit and they've had to increase taxes. She asked if Airgas had spoken with them and if they have committed anything. Mr. Hughes indicated he had not done this presentation to Montgomery County. He noted that Plumsteadville was the desired choice, that it was a competitive situation, and Airgas needs to make the best decision they can for the company. There are many potential sites, Airgas would like to stay in Plumstead Township/Bucks County. He agreed that Bucks County is an expensive place to live and work. The Committee thanked Mr. Hughes for his presentation.

**Presentation: Facility Management Services – Penn State Facilities Engineering Institute (PSFEI):**

Mr. Kleimenhagen presented some background on the Penn State Facilities Engineering Institute, located in State College. Mr. Kleimenhagen has worked with PSFEI for a little over 13 years. PSFEI will do a presentation on some services for his department that Mr. Kleimenhagen would like the board to consider. Mr. Kleimenhagen introduced Mr. Greg Ruberto and Mr. Kurt Homan.

Mr. Kurt Homan is the Energy Program Manager for the Penn State Facilities Engineering Institute (PSFEI), Mr. Greg Ruberto manages the contracts that they provide to the commonwealth regarding facility assessment services. PSFEI is an outreach of the Penn State University and exists within the College of Engineering.

Mr. Homan presented an overview of PSFEI's history. Penn State was started at a point where engineering and agriculture was its primary focus, and still maintains a primary focus today. PSFEI's mission is to help improve facilities operations through advisory services. PSFEI does not provide engineering services of record, they help people manage their facilities. The company is non-profit and doesn't take any money from the university. They are fully funded by their service contracts.

Back in 1947, the governor of Pennsylvania came to the president of Penn State and said, "We need help." The commonwealth had all these state institutions, state hospitals, prisons, and they were primarily heated by steam. Steam's a very difficult medium to manage because of the chemistry, the change of state - The University needed PSFEI's help. The company originally focused on steam systems advisory services. There were two people in an institute who would go out to sites, evaluate their systems, and educate people on how to manage their facilities better. As building became more complex, PSFEI grew.

Today there are 36 people in the group. They cover multiple areas including electrical, HVAC, fire protection, structural and energy. PSFEI has 14 clients, many of them are state commonwealth entities, both under the governor's jurisdiction and outside of his jurisdiction. PSFEI does work for the federal government, the general services administration. They've worked for the Salvation Army.

PSFEI services vary by four primary areas. Education and Facility condition assessments allow institutions to understand where their facilities are, what are their conditions, and what do they have to expect going forward. They also provide engineering and energy services like they did in the very

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

beginning. Energy services started back with the deregulation of natural gas in the '90s, and then carried on into the 2000s with electricity. The services included in the proposal to the Central Bucks School District include education, facility condition assessments, turf grass management, grass management, and energy.

Mr. Ruberto discussed facility condition assessment. He remarked that he understood CB was well aware of facility condition assessment. His discussion will focus on the term "facility condition assessment program" because when a true program is used it becomes integrated with the capital planning process.

A facility condition assessment begins by assessing the condition of what is owned. Assessment of the condition, prioritizing the work based on professional opinions, and assigning cost assessments for repairs create strong metrics and key performance indicators that can be used to support the capital budget planning decisions. PSFEI implements this kind of a program through a custom web based application called WebiFM. WebiFM becomes accessible to users, such as Central Bucks School District, where users can track performance.

The last step of a facility condition assessment program is tracking performance. Performance tracking is done over time, checking the status of item identified. WebiFM offers that tool for everyone, users will be able to see priorities, what should be completed first, dollar values to complete. PSFEI gets the chance to interact with this application by providing concise details.

PSFEI groups look at code issues, mechanical issues, accessibility issues for schools. Very detailed information comes back, which has cost data, priorities, etc. PSFEI is not interested in the design aspect. The company does not want to be the architect of record, the engineer of record, or to carry some of these projects through. They like to think of themselves as having an unbiased opinion that carries through with the construction cost estimating. PSFEI uses a nationwide service called RSMMeans Construction Cost Data. That cost data stays dynamic over time and updates itself every year.

Getting caught in an assessment taken in a snapshot of time creates a situation where long-term decisions (several years down the road) are made from old data. PSFEI is proposing a cycle where they will return to CB over time to keep refreshing this data, assessing if deficiencies have gotten worse, or what new items have appeared. Another part of staying subjective is comparing one of the key performance indicators called facility condition index. Facility condition index (FCI) determines what building or floor of facility, the cost estimated to take to repair the items, divided by what the facilities are worth. The same decision process commonly made if you take your car to the garage is utilized with the key performance indicator. The mechanic tells you, "You have a large repair to your vehicle." The first thing you determine is, "Is this repair worth it? Should I repair this vehicle? It's only worth this much." The district will also be able to use this tool, this facility condition index, to compare the buildings across the district. If someone feels the building on one side of the district is worth more compared to another, FCI is the unbiased opinion telling a true story as to how it looks from a facility condition standpoint.

PSFEI is proposing to offer the school district a variety of educational services in the form of annual safety training courses, which are intensive in HVAC, electrical, etc. These will be offered at the district as a one-day seminar, but occur on an annual basis. They also include something PSFEI calls a certificate program offered at the facility manager level. These courses are multiple day courses. PSFEI offers these courses in 25 or 30 seat settings, there would be five seats offered annually for CB staff.

Mr. Ruberto noted that he understood the emphasis the district would like to place on the natural grass fields. PSFEI has reached out to the Penn State assistant athletic director who's in charge of outdoor fields facilities. Turf grass is at the roots of Penn State. It's a very important program that PSFEI prides themselves on, and would like to bring that expertise to the district. They've chosen to do that in



## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

the form of a one or two day visit to meet with the CB grounds crew. Fertilization, drainage, mowing, and all those practices that make natural grass turfs look great will be reviewed.

Mr. Homan stated that PSFEI got involved in energy primarily to support the commonwealth. The company began helping the commonwealth procure natural gas, getting supply offers from the various suppliers. Initially, it was handled through spreadsheets, and orders were made through email. That practice didn't really work for very long, particularly as PSFEI grew into electricity. PSFEI has nearly 10,000 accounts across the commonwealth. PSFEI built and are maintaining a risk management application called ERMA, the Energy Risk Management Application. It is a unique tool that is used by suppliers who are qualified in the commonwealth to offer good prices for electricity and natural gas.

What ERMA provides is the analytics to tell PSFEI and their clients, "The best offer would be a three-year term versus a two-year term." ERMA may indicate that, "You would be better off staying on utility for now. The utility is a less expensive alternative." PSFEI helped the commonwealth manage a quarter-billion dollars of energy. They have energy business and finance experts. The platform is unique, one of a kind in the industry. What PSFEI offers in this program is the ability and the transparency to know what you're paying for, and where it's going. Over the last couple years, the program has grown to not only include the commonwealth of Pennsylvania entities, but PSFEI is also growing it through the COSTARS program.

The other part of the energy proposal is called demand side. The demand side proposal includes time to help you really "get your arms around your energy". PSFEI is helping the commonwealth implement a utility bill management system, and they propose to help the school district find the best solution to implement an effective utility bill management system. PSFEI also proposes to offer services to help identify energy saving opportunities.

Mrs. Collopy noted that the district had just paid for a large facility survey, and wondered what PSFEI would offer that was different. Mr. Kleimenhagen agreed that the district had just finished a feasibility and facility conditions study, taking a ten-year look at the district's facility needs. The money for the study was well spent, deficiencies were identified. As PSFEI noted in their proposal, that data was taken as a snapshot in time. The information gives the district a good roadmap, Mr. Kleimenhagen would like to see the data built into the WebiFM platform. He has personally used that platform over the last five years, and considers it a fantastic tool that allows him to "slice and dice" all projects. Utilizing the WebiFM platform is not putting aside anything that the KCBA report was. It's taking all that information, reporting it in a usable format (as opposed to a PDF report or a hard copy report) and being able to work current with data that's basically already six months old. Having true, current RSM means estimates for projects where data is old would be invaluable. Mr. Schloeffel asked for clarification that information from the feasibility study would be input into WebiFM, Mr. Kleimenhagen indicated that was the intent. Mr. Schloeffel noted that in the presentation it looked like PSFEI were re-examining sites and wondered if they would be doing that at CB as well. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that he felt it was a missing part in a feasibility study – you must continually re-audit what's been corrected and check for new deficiencies. Mr. Kleimenhagen would be proposing a five-year contract with PSFEI. In year three PSFEI would return for an audit, using the WebiFM module. Deficiencies could be assigned to individual facility specialists at the site, or outside consultants. Those deficiencies could be capital projects, and as those projects are corrected they will link back and deduct those dollars off the WebiFM system. Mr. Kleimenhagen will be able to present the Committee with a true facility condition index, as opposed to a snapshot taken six months ago. PSFEI's facility condition index will take the true cost of the deficiencies, divided by the replacement value of the building (provided by the CB appraisal company), and come up with that index. This three-year cycle would allow Mr. Kleimenhagen to provide accountability to the Committee and say, "These are the actual dollars you've given me."

## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that PSFEI is a third-party, unbiased data collection entity that provides data to FEMO so decisions can be made. FEMO will then come to the board and make recommendations based on that unbiased data. He stated that his job is to work with his team to educate them, to identify deficiencies and correct them before PSFEI returns to audit. Mr. Schloeffel asked if that was already being done by CB staff. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that they are not doing true facility condition assessments. They are maintaining and running the building day-to-day, but do not do condition assessments. Mr. Weldon inquired if the KCBA survey would need to be repeated in the future. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that the PSFEI contract would take the place of that survey.

Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that the proposed five-year contract would build CB an ongoing facility condition assessment program. The contract was broken out year to year, with a small fluctuation in cost because in the third year the engineering team would be coming out. Mr. Weldon asked if the decision was to not contract with PSFEI, would the district need another feasibility survey in ten years. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that he would recommend the survey be done in five years. The KCBA survey was a very good one, but does not have the robust dynamics to be able to provide comprehensive analytics. Mr. Gamble asked about the ability to do a four-year contract instead of a five, noting that he did not want to saddle future board members with the contract. Mrs. Collopy remarked that she did not have a problem with a five-year contract if better terms could be reached. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that terms could be whatever the Committee was interested in. The contract proposed is a five-year contract with a yearly breakdown of costs and a 90-day cancellation point. He noted the document in the packet is not a final cost document. One of the things that PSFEI can provide is a reduced rate for fringe and administrative costs. Mr. Kleimenhagen can work with the PSFEI director, compile final costs, and propose it to the board at the next meeting. He is asking for Committee consideration to do that moving forward.

Mr. Kleimenhagen feels the education component of the contract is absolutely critical. Mechanics, ground staff, and custodial staff would have professional development from some of the best safety speakers who travel across country and speak to federal and state facilities. He noted that he would not suggest bringing them in if he wasn't confident that there would be value on the dollars spent.

Mrs. Suits asked what the district was currently spending on professional development for FEMO staff. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted there is nothing budgeted for training, FEMO employees receive Safe Schools training through HR. That training does not address best management practices when it comes to what should be done to protect district employees when they're doing their job. PSFEI training would not happen all at once. It will be on a quarterly basis, where several employees would be trained on a given day.

Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that he knew how important turf management is to the Board. A resource like PSFEI can be contacted for ideas, training of ground staff, improvement of turf management including fertilization and drainage. With several projects forthcoming, a contract with PSFEI would give FEMO an engineering and consultation resource that is at a fraction of the cost of what the district currently pays for outside design professionals.

Dr. Kopicki asked if the PSFEI training would be the best professional development that this district has seen. Mr. Kleimenhagen responded that for our facilities staff, it would hand's down be the best training they received. He noted that he had personally gone through many of the courses and they are among the best he's been involved in. Mr. Kleimenhagen thanked Mr. Homan and Mr. Ruberto for their presentation.

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

Mr. Gamble requested that the agenda be moved forward to Capital Projects Updates before items were considered for board action.

**Capital Project Updates:**

**Construction – CB West:** Phase Two site work has begun including removal of the existing fences. Foundations for the new concession stands have been completed and installation of the sewer, lateral from the new concession stand to the edge of the Memorial Drive, has been completed. Work has started on the foundation for the field house addition, demolition of the existing field house and storage building is nearly complete. Plumbing underground work for the new bathrooms has started, and electrical demolition and relocation work is proceeding as needed. The project is scheduled to be completed in May. However, due to the exceptionally cold weather over the past several weeks, the project is about one week behind. Mr. Kleimenhagen believes that we can recoup that time and be on schedule to be completed in May before Memorial Day.

**Construction – Educational Services Center:** For the HVAC improvements some of our contractors are in the building throughout second shift. We've asked them to stay out of the area and limit noise on meeting days. The contractor's staging area has been set up in the rear of the building, demolition of the existing ceiling is proceeding ahead of schedule. The general contractor is proceeding with ceiling work and work in the boiler room. The HVAC contractor is working on the demolition of existing systems and installation of the new hot water piping. The electrical contractor is continuing with all demolition and wiring for new LED lights. The project is scheduled for completion at the end of June and is currently on schedule.

**CB East – Patriots Stadium Arch:** Mr. Birster, District Facilities Manager, provided an update. Mr. Birster, Dr. Lucabaugh and Mr. Hayes (Principal and House Principal, East) met with the vendor and finalized all designs. The archway is no longer going to be part of the gate, it will be an archway that attaches to both ticket booths. The district was able to work with a local vendor and reduce the price considerably from initial proposed prices last year, which were in the range of \$45-\$55,000. The current price is under \$4,300. The archway is going to be created out of extruded aluminum and is going to be both powder coated and nickel lettering. It will have a large E on the top for the Patriots Stadium East symbol, which will be vinyl wrapped to be blue and red - the school's colors. At this point everything is finalized. All the materials have been ordered, and the arch is being fabricated. The anticipated completion date is approximately four weeks from today. Mr. Gamble asked if the fencing on the visitor side has been fixed. Mr. Birster noted that it had not been fixed yet, but is being looked at. Mr. Schloeffel asked what the damage was, Mr. Birster stated that a portion of the fence had been damaged by someone trying to get on the field. Mr. Gamble asked if the camera issues had been addressed. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that a request was made to add additional cameras going into the entrances, looking to the visitor and home entranceways. The existing cameras did not have a clear line of sight - It was difficult to be able to see, there might be a need for additional cameras. Mr. Birster and his staff are working with district camera consultants regarding cost, and whether additional cameras need to be installed. Dr. Kopicki noted that the vandalized fencing is important and needs to be addressed immediately. When there's vandalism of any kind it should be immediately rectified. He noted that he understood the priorities for Mr. Kleimenhagen and his department, stating they were doing a great job of taking care of things. Dr. Kopicki would like any damage to be kept at the forefront, addressed immediately and fixed immediately. He does not want to leave the impression that it's okay to vandalize, and it's a poor reflection back on the district and our work ethic. Mr. Gamble noted that the district has since walked away from the contract with the people cutting our lawns, but they've damaged our fence by driving around a pathway and couldn't quite make the turn - our fence is damaged all the way around.

## Operations Committee Meeting

January 24, 2018

Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that the district has mutually terminated the agreement with our previous contractor. We are holding payment for the last invoice. Mr. Birster is collating all the damage that has been done, and those costs will be deducted from the final invoice. There will be no additional payment until all the issues of damage have been reviewed. Mr. Gamble asked that the next contractor be notified that they cannot take their mower through the pathway. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that the RFP is being worked on and he hopes to have that out in mid-February. He will make sure that we tighten up all the requirements for future vendors, as well as having very explicit pre-bid requirements. He assured the Committee that his department is fully aware of what their expectations are. Dr. Kopicki noted that he appreciates and commends the idea and effort to hold people accountable and ensure that the district pays only for services received.

Mr. Schloeffel applauds the efforts to reduce the cost of the archway from \$45,000 to \$4,300. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that it was all due to Mr. Birster's efforts. Mr. Schloeffel asked about the quality of the archway, Mr. Birster indicated that the quality is excellent. The gentleman who is doing the graphics portion is an East graduate, he's taking a considerable amount of pride in his work. Mr. Schloeffel asked if the archway was going to stand a test of the weather and sun. Mr. Birster noted that, compared to the existing gates and fencing which is a lighter grade aluminum, the archway is being made by heavy gauge aluminum and should really stand the test of time. Mrs. Collopy inquired how the class of 2011 came to pay for the archway. Mr. Birster stated that they had afforded East money for improvements, and while the Stadium Committee was originally going to pay for the archway, it was determined that it would come from the 2011 graduate's donation. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted the CB grounds team will be installing the archway. Mr. Schloeffel asked if the committee that was waiting to give the district a check for a substantial amount of money once the arch was completed had been notified. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted they had been updated.

**Change Orders – 2017 Paving Projects (Linden, Barclay, Administrative Center):** Mr. Kleimenhagen stated, due to remediation of unsuitable soil for paving projects during construction over the summer, there are several change orders for Committee approval to move to the next board meeting. One is at Linden Elementary for \$58,172.49. The second is at Barclay Elementary for \$17,296.53, and the third at the Administrative Center project for \$28,595.94. These change orders are all related to unforeseen conditions. Information from our contractors was received at the end of December, after the November Operations meeting. Capital Projects coordinator John Giannini reviewed the change orders with a fine-tooth comb, they total close to \$100,000. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that they need to be brought to the board for approval at the next meeting. Mr. Schloeffel commented that it seemed like almost every time there is paving they're finding unsuitable soil. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that for future paving projects additional core sampling and testing at the site is being required.

**Design Updates:**

**CB West – Athletic Field Renovations:** The district's attorney for the zoning hearing board application worked with our consultant and their consulting engineer. They finalized the site plans for submission of the application to the Doylestown Township zoning hearing board. The hearing board meeting took place on December 18<sup>th</sup> and Mr. Kleimenhagen was present. Conditional approval for all variances was obtained. The plans were then submitted to the Township Planning Commission. The meeting took place this past Monday evening. CB did receive Planning Commission approval for the project. We will be on the schedule for the Board of Supervisors meeting on February 20<sup>th</sup>, and we've also obtained our NPDS permit from the Bucks County Conservation District. Tomorrow morning Mr. Kleimenhagen has a meeting with his staff to finalize our bidding schedule, we should be going out for bid mid to late February and are targeting an early May construction time frame. FEMO is working closely with District Athletic Director Danielle Turner, who is now housed at the FEMO building. They are looking at alternative field locations for the sports that will be impacted by the project starting in May. Originally

Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

the project was going to start in March and be done by September. Instead the project will start in May which will impact our fall sports. Mrs. Turner, Mr. Birster and Mr. Hunt (CB West Athletic Director) are all working on alternate locations for those sports. The project will probably continue all the way into November. One other update - with the changes that were made to the project back in August, costs are down to about \$3.5 million.

**Unami – Modular Classroom Removal:** Based on the recommendations in the district-wide facility assessment, the utilization study was begun about a month ago to review instructional support spaces. Potential options will be reviewed for absorbing activities now occurring in modular classrooms. Design meetings have taken place and several options are under consideration. Final deliverables are due by the end of the month. Mr. Kleimenhagen provided the Committee with some cost estimates and preliminary design costs. The construction estimate is about \$2.5 million, design is \$175,000. Monies are in the FEMO budget for next year. With Committee approval, Mr. Kleimenhagen would like to be able to start design so the project can be substantially complete by the beginning of the school year.

**CB West – Coach Pettine Brick Paver Memorial:** Mr. Kleimenhagen provided a rendering, showing about 330 bricks right behind the rest room facilities. The statue is not part of the project, but will be addressed later.

Dr. Kopicki asked Mr. Kleimenhagen about the updated spreadsheet on the capital projects. He noted that the original budget was roughly \$7.5 million. With the addition of about \$2.5 million for the Unami project the budget becomes \$9.5 million. Dr. Kopicki asked for confirmation that the total was still under budget and left FEMO with about 20% in reserve for any future projects. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that was correct, total cost for design and construction of projects for the 2018-2019 school year was \$9.5 million. Dr. Kopicki asked if all projects tie back to the vision document, Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that they did.

Mr. Gamble remarked that while he did not like having to utilize learning cottages, he did not want to lose space without a guarantee from Dr. Kopicki and Dr. Davidheiser that Unami would not be overcrowded by removing their cottages. Dr. Kopicki noted that preliminary design shows an actual gain of space by putting a STEM situation in place and repurposing some classrooms that are currently computer labs. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated that, pending approval of the 1:1 project, converting computer labs to additional classroom space will efficiently utilize available space in the building. Principal Lang and Dr. Davidheiser were involved in design meetings, and all believe the building can easily accommodate the students from the learning cottages. Mr. Gamble noted he would like to see the design before approving removal of the learning cottages. Mr. Kleimenhagen stated he would provide the design to Dr. Kopicki for distribution to the board members. He will have the architect at a future Operations meeting to make a presentation to the Committee, but noted the actual design process will need to begin before that for the project to be completed before school begins in the fall.

**Information:**

**Buckingham Township Manager Meeting:** Mr. Kleimenhagen met with the Buckingham Township Manager Dana Cozza and the Director of Code Enforcement Jim Kettler. He noted it was an excellent meeting, providing him an opportunity to learn more about the collaborative relationship between the township and the district. They did some research on the original development approval and there is nothing that precludes the district from moving forward with designing and presenting a lighting project at CB East. The land development plans originally proposed and approved for the stadium were reviewed, and Mr. Kleimenhagen shared some language from the proposal: "The school district acknowledges that the present plan does not propose any new lighting or loudspeaker facilities."



Operations Committee Meeting  
January 24, 2018

Should the school district propose the installation of any new lighting or loud speaker facilities, they shall be required to obtain a zoning permit from the township. Lighting and/or loudspeaker facilities shall meet the requirements of the township zoning ordinances in effect at the time of the permit application". He noted that the district would follow normal procedures for any proposal by review the zoning requirements. If we did not meet the zoning requirements, the district would request a waiver. Mr. Schloeffel asked if the stadium was pre-wired. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted that there was conduit in place, but it was not pre-wired. The recently reviewed cost estimate for lighting is about \$500,000. If a lighting project at East were added to the already established \$9.5 million for next year, FEMO would still be within an 18%-19% cost for next fiscal year. He believed the construction could be done quickly if design were started right away. Mr. Gamble asked how much money the district has from the stadium committee. Mr. Kleimenhagen noted the Stadium Committee fund is about \$120,000. The Committee asked Mr. Kleimenhagen to move forward with the lighting project.

**Items for Committee/Board Action (resumed):**

**Plumstead Township LERTA (Airgas):** The Committee wishes Airgas great success in our area, but declines to approve the LERTA proposal.

**Plumstead Township Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Grant Application – Proposed Pedestrian Trail:** Plumstead Township is requesting a letter of support from the district for their grant application and access easement for Groveland, Tohickon and Gayman. Dr. Kopicki noted there was a concern with safe access due to crossing major roads. He has reservations about putting people on district property during the school day. Mr. Gamble stated that traffic in that area will only get worse as the years go by, and there was no way he could support writing a letter of support from the district. Mr. Weldon commented that he lived Plumstead and understands their push for trails. He does not believe this proposed trail is a good plan, for safety reasons alone he would not encourage students crossing Rte. 611. He stated that trail systems are great, but must be done in a smart way. The Committee declines to submit a letter of support for the proposed pedestrian trail. Mr. Kleimenhagen will notify the township manager.

**Agreement for Facility Management Services with PSFEI:** Mr. Kleimenhagen provided the Committee with several costs for the five areas of the contract: the facility condition assessment program, the web based information for facility management, the energy advisory services, educational services and the turf grass management. He is asking for a five-year contract with PSFEI, noting there will not be a budget increase necessary to cover the cost. The Committee agrees to move the proposal to the full board for approval.

**PJM Capacity Market (Energy Curtailment) Program – Cpower Agreement:** FEMO Department is requesting committee support and board approval to enter a three-year contract with C power for energy curtailment services. This is at no cost to the district, pending compliance with the program. The district solicitor has reviewed this agreement. All the comments and concerns have been addressed and incorporated. With approval of this agreement the district will enroll in the base capacity program for the next two years. C power has offered a three-year term. There is an annual projected program revenue of \$294,000 and \$139,000 for the district for the next two fiscal years. The Committee agrees to move the agreement forward for full board approval.

**Capital Projects Overview – Summer 2018:** The Committee approves the budget presented.

**FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE**

The next scheduled meeting is Wednesday, February 28, 2018.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.