

BOYERTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
Boyertown, Pennsylvania
www.boyertownasd.org

Facilities Committee Meeting
Tuesday, July 12, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Mr. Elsier, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm in the Education Center Board Room.

Board members in attendance: Mr. Breece, Mr. Caso, Mrs. Dennin, Mr. Elsier, Mr. Landino, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Neiman, Mr. Stengle, Mrs. Usavage

Administration in attendance: Dr. Miller, Dr. Faidley, Mr. Szablowski, Paul Grenewald

Members of the Public: 3

Everyone recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and observed a moment of silence.

Public Comment Period #1

There were no public comments.

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes from the committee meetings of 5/24 and 5/31 was made by Mrs. Usavage and second motion by Mr. Landino. The minutes were adopted unanimously.

Discussion/Information/Old Business

Mr. Elsier turned the meeting over to Dr. Miller.

Monroe Street Extension Bid Results

Dr. Miller explained that what we are looking at is taking Monroe Street which currently stops at BASH and continuing it down to Montgomery Avenue. Today we opened the sealed bids and tonight we have a recommendation related to moving this project forward and hopefully putting it on next week's board meeting agenda.

Dr. Miller shared a document showing the cost estimate that we anticipated the project to entail. The final cost estimate on the document of \$679,425.85 is what we were anticipating. Dr. Miller then shared the outcome of the bids. We had 4 companies provide bids including E.R. Stuebner, H&K Group, Marino Corp and Schlouch Inc. The first line of the handout is the base bid which is the cost that we would anticipate being incurred by BASD and E.R. Stuebner is the lowest. The second line is the alternate which is related specifically to the construction work that is currently happening on Monroe Street and is not related to this project. This work is being done by BMMA for Colebrookdale Township. Instead of them finishing their work and making it look pretty and then having us start our work, the decision was made to put in an alternate for us to do the final coat beyond our point to make it look nice. We were willing to do that with the understanding that BMMA would pay for the final top coat that goes beyond the scope of the work that we were already doing. The dollar figures for the alternate is what

BMMA would be paying. When we look at the project total, keep in mind that the base bid number is the impact to BASD. When we compare the lowest base bid to what we anticipated, we see that E.R. Stuebner came in significantly lower than we expected. In keeping with state requirements, administration is recommending that we take the low bid from E.R. Stuebner.

Mr. Lewis questioned whether E.R. Stuebner provided material indicating that they understand the scope of the project since they came in so much lower than the anticipated cost. Dr. Miller stated that we set very specific project parameters and every one of these companies had to bid based on these project parameters. We have experience with E.R. Stuebner because they are on site already and Dr. Miller is speculating that because they are on-site already that is helping them cut some costs.

Mr. Breece commented that since all of the items on the project analysis are required to complete the roadway that we can feel confident that E.R. Stuebner's bid shouldn't be off. Dr. Miller stated that these items are owned in the project and are part of the contract.

Mrs. Usavage asked for clarification on whether the base bid includes every item on the list including additional work on the Franklin Street properties and the 5% contingency. Dr. Miller stated that the Franklin Street properties have already been taken care of but that it includes the 5% contingency. Mr. Stengle asked for an explanation on how Franklin Street was taken care of. Mr. Szablowski explained that we obtained the proper right of way to allow us to take some of the property from the residents that are affected. It ranges from a few inches to several feet but doesn't necessarily mean it will get paved. We had to obtain the right of way for PennDot to erect their signs. Mr. Stengle asked if the deeds were redone and if there was an economic exchange for their land. Mr. Szablowski stated that there was an economic exchange. Mr. Breece asked how much we paid. Mr. Szablowski stated that it was approximately \$10,000. Mr. Stengle asked if the deeds had to be redone. Mr. Szablowski stated that they do not have to be redone and that it is just registered as a lien against the deed and PennDot took care of that. Mr. Grenewald commented that there is some work that we will be doing on the Franklin Street properties such as moving mailboxes and repaving the end of driveways.

Mrs. Usavage asked for further clarification on the 5% contingency and whether it is actually included in the base bid and if the additional work on the Franklin Street properties is included in the bid. Mr. Clough explained that the bid was done on specifications that had the Franklin Street property work included so there is no contingency in their bid. All of the work that is necessary to complete the job on the school district property, in the PennDot right of way to widen the road and put in turn lanes, and to restore the lawns, driveways and mailboxes is included in the bid.

Mr. Clough stated that D'Huy called E.R. Stuebner to make sure they included everything since their bid was so low. We received confirmation from both their management and their cost estimator that they are confident their numbers are accurate. Mr. Clough feels this is probably due to them already being on-site and economies of scale since they are already here laying asphalt.

Ms. Neiman had several questions. First, she wanted to clarify whether district employees are moving mailboxes or whether the contractor will be doing that work. Mr. Clough stated that the contractor will be doing the mailboxes. Next, she asked what the chain link fencing would be

used for. Mr. Clough explained that we are extending fencing in areas where people aren't supposed to park and also to keep balls from going out into the street. Ms. Neiman asked if the fencing will be high enough where the houses are to keep balls from going into their yards. Mr. Clough stated that he felt the height was sufficient to prevent that and that it matches the height of the existing fence.

Mrs. Dennin asked for clarification on where the widening for a right and left turn are occurring. Dr. Miller explained that the Monroe Street extension is actually where the construction entrance is currently on Montgomery Avenue. The widening will happen on Montgomery Avenue leading up to Monroe Street in both directions. Mrs. Dennin asked if there would be a stop sign on Montgomery Avenue. Dr. Miller stated that there will not be a stop sign. Mrs. Dennin asked what the plan for the access to Monroe Street would be because we previously talked about it having limited access. Dr. Miller stated it will only be accessible at the beginning of the school day and at dismissal and possibly also during large events like football games. Mrs. Dennin asked how the gate would be opened and closed. Mr. Clough stated that it is electronic and is in the base bid of the BASH contract.

Mr. Caso asked if the \$503,000 project includes all items on the detailed list. Dr. Miller stated that it is and that is really \$486,000 because the \$17,000 is being paid by BMMA. Mr. Caso asked how this lines up with the original project plan. Dr. Miller stated that this money has been slated to come out of the BASH contingency. PennDot pushed us to split this into a separate project. The decision was made previously to pay for it out of the contingency. Mr. Clough stated that the contingency line does state that it includes the Monroe Street extension and the intersection of Montgomery Avenue and Reading Avenue. Mr. Caso asked if it was specifically enumerated and Mr. Clough explained that it included the anticipated amount of \$679,425.85 that was discussed at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Caso asked where the \$679,425.85 amount came from and Mr. Clough explained that it was an estimate provided by D'Huy, the construction management company.

Ms. Neiman asked for confirmation that everything included on the handout is included in the base bid. Mr. Clough stated that is correct but that the bid is based on much more detail including 15 sheets of drawings and a specification book.

Ms. Neiman asked about the light at Reading Avenue and Colebrookdale Township's concerns about the extension before the light is installed. Dr. Miller stated that we had a meeting with Colebrookdale Township and they are concerned about adding traffic in that area because it is already an unsafe intersection. Our discussions with them have revolved around how we can open the extension for the 2017-2018 school year without causing additional traffic at the Montgomery Avenue/Reading Avenue intersection until they get through the construction phase to install the light. The decision was made to prohibit left turns on to Montgomery Avenue from our property until the light is installed. Additionally, we will be restricting traffic from turning right from Reading Avenue onto Montgomery Avenue. Colebrookdale expects the light to be installed in January 2018. Boyertown Borough has stated that they don't want all of the traffic coming out of the high school the way it currently is. We will be meeting with the Boyertown Borough on August 9 to share the information with them. Ms. Neiman asked if we were prepared to block the road where needed and if it would damage the road. Dr. Miller stated that the current plan is to use Jersey barriers, the orange barriers we are currently using up at the high school to create the student walkway.

Mr. Landino asked if everything above the subtotal line of \$597,000 on the handout is what is included on the base bid. Dr. Miller stated that his perspective is that the \$32,000 is also included. Mr. Clough stated that the E.R. Stuebner bid includes everything we originally estimated would cost \$679,425.85.

Mr. Breece asked what the length of the extension is. Dr. Miller stated that he doesn't have the exact length but it is approximately 150 - 200 yards. Mr. Breece feels it is a lot of money for the amount of road. Mr. Clough explained that the road is a regulatory requirement from the Borough of Boyertown and had to be done in order to do the BASH renovation project. On top of that, PennDot tells us how we have to build it, we don't get to decide.

Mr. Elsier polled the board members to see if they wanted to move forward with the project by placing it on next week's board agenda. All board members were in favor of putting it on next week's board agenda.

BASH Construction Project

Change Orders

Dr. Miller discussed three change orders. All three of the changes are from E.R. Stuebner.

The first change order is for \$225,000 and involves structural repair of the 2nd and 3rd floors of Area A. The work was discussed back in April and the work has now been completed. This will be on next week's board agenda for final vote. This will come out of the 9th Grade Academy Contingency Balance.

The next change order is also for Area A to do additional removal of ceiling and old steel bracing, foundation repair, installation of existing walls to meet floor and leveling of floors for a cost of \$13,454.25. This will come out of the 9th Grade Academy Contingency Balance.

The final change order deals with fencing repair and replacement at Bear Stadium and the tennis courts at a cost of \$20,617.47. This will come out of the Project Contingency Balance.

Ms. Neiman is concerned that we are using E.R. Stuebner as the contractor for the Monroe Street extension and here we are with change orders all of the time from them. Can we expect a change order on the road project as well? Dr. Miller stated that he cannot say that there will not be change orders because we don't know what kind of issues will arise. He pointed out that we have a large portion of the BASH project contingency funds remaining. We will have roughly \$1.4 million left in the 9th Grade Academy Contingency Balance after Area A is completed.

Mrs. Dennin asked if we are over the asbestos hurdle in the 9th grade building or is that still something we might encounter. Mr. Clough stated that we are over that hurdle.

Mr. Caso asked if the new contract totals and previous contract totals are reversed on the change order handout for items #2 and #3. Dr. Miller stated that they are reversed and apologized for the oversight.

Mr. Elsier polled the board members to see if they wanted to move forward with putting the change orders on next week's board agenda. All board members were in favor of putting the change orders on next week's board agenda.

Dr. Miller continued by discussing a pending change order that does not have a formal write up yet. It deals with the tennis courts at BASH. We have 8 tennis courts that are in very poor shape. Going back to the beginning of this project, the tennis courts were bid on as an alternate to peel off the top and resurface them. When they went to roll them, the courts could not withstand the weight and the surface kept sinking because of a poor foundation in the tennis courts. Likewise, there are some water issues that have caused damage especially on the lower courts. We are up against tennis season and need to determine what to do. We looked at both sets of tennis courts and asked for the issues to be separated out for each set.

The top tennis courts would cost \$33,000 to fix it the right way, with drainage. The lower tennis courts, which are in worse shape, would cost \$119,000 which includes rebuilding the foundation and set of tennis courts from the ground up with appropriate drainage. The work has started because we already owned the stripping off and resurfacing. We have continued with the \$33,000 work on the top tennis courts because Dr. Faidley has the authority up to \$50,000. We have done nothing beyond the stripping on the lower tennis courts because of the price tag.

Dr. Miller asked Mr. Zazo to give the board more details on the work that would be included in the \$119,000 for the lower tennis courts. Mr. Zazo explained that the way the existing courts were set up there was a crown in the middle made out of macadam. Any water that got underneath of the macadam had nowhere to go because it was a flat surface underneath and created sub-drainage issues. In moving forward, they would crown the stone underneath. They would lay the macadam flat and any water that would get underneath would hit the stone that is crowned and the water will push its way out. There will also be drainage added around it. The alternate project bid that was not taken was for \$300,000 and did not include the crown and drainage. So in essence, with the \$119,000 and the \$33,000, we would be getting the tennis courts done for less than ½ of what we would have if we had taken the alternate project and they will be done in the correct manner. There will be a minimum of 8 inches of stone underneath the top tennis courts. On the lower tennis courts, the unstable soil underneath will be removed and will be replaced with 18 inches of stone.

Mr. Landino asked for clarification that we are not paying the original budgeted amount of \$300,000 for the tennis courts but that it is only going to cost \$150,000 to fix. Mr. Zazo explained that we did not have a \$300,000 budget for the tennis courts because it was an alternate and the district did not accept the alternate at that price. What the district did have in the contract was to peel off the top and resurface them. The schedule of values may have what the cost was to peel of the top and resurface and will provide that information to Dr. Miller. Mr. Zazo believes that the combined cost of what was already included plus the change order would still be less than \$300,000.

Mr. Caso asked if this is a change order or a new capability. Mr. Clough stated that it was an additional scope of work. Mr. Caso stated that it is a lot of money to spend and asked what a reasonable Plan B would be for the lower court that would be a lower cost than the \$119,000. Dr. Miller stated that they have had multiple discussions about doing less but we will end up wasting our money because we will end up with cracks if we don't fix it the correct way. Mr.

Caso asked if we could build a whole new set of tennis courts in a different location for less. Dr. Miller stated that a rough estimate for tennis courts at a different location would be around \$500,000. The other issue is that within our permits we are only allowed to do work in certain areas because of disturbance of soil and the conservation permits.

Ms. Neiman stated she thought that the alternate bid for the tennis courts was accepted with the original project. Mr. Clough stated that it was just the resurfacing from the ground up that was included in the original project. Dr. Miller stated that there was an alternate bid to redo them more aggressively but we took the option to just resurface. Ms. Neiman would like to know exactly what the original cost of the tennis court repairs was in the project before the board approves additional money. Dr. Miller stated he will provide that information to the board in the newsletter when he receives it from Mr. Zazo.

Mr. Breece asked what surface we are covering the courts with. Mr. Zazo stated that it will be covered with asphalt and that cost was already included in the original contract. Mr. Breece questioned what our other option is if we don't do the proposed additional work. Dr. Miller stated that the other option is to resurface it without doing the work and understand that within a few years we would be back to a cracked surface. Mr. Breece asked how sure we are that cracks would develop within a few years. Mr. Zazo stated that he is very sure and that it would be difficult to resurface the way it is because the asphalt trucks would sink into the subsurface. Mr. Zazo stated the surface would fail in a year if we paved it as is.

Mrs. Dennin stated that it is her understanding that we use both sets of tennis courts for our tennis team. Dr. Miller stated that is correct. Mrs. Dennin can attest to the fact that the courts are in very bad shape and it gets embarrassing when other schools come to your facilities and they aren't in good shape. However, she also understands that \$120,000 is a lot to spend but based on what she's hearing she thinks it would be an absolute waste of money to resurface them without fixing the problems. Her opinion is that we either do it the right way or don't do it at all. The numbers always seem to be so staggering but when we put in athletic facilities it is an investment and everything has to be maintained. If we want to have tennis courts, then it's an investment. She's happy that these tennis courts are also available for community use.

Mr. Landino asked what the confidence level is that we won't have issues in the future with the courts if we choose to move forward with the proposal. Is there any sort of warranty or expectation of how long they will last? Mr. Clough explained that it has been engineered by a geotechnical engineer so we should not have a problem with the subsurface. However, there will still eventually be asphalt failure but it won't be due to settling or poor drainage.

Mrs. Usavage commented that Montgomery County paid \$200,000 to recondition two courts and remove two courts at Green Lane Park. Mrs. Usavage asked if this project would impact the tennis season. Dr. Miller stated that if the board wants to move forward, it will be put on next week's board agenda and hopefully it will be done in time for tennis season. Mrs. Usavage asked whether the fencing would also be completed by the start of the season. Mr. Zazo stated that he cannot say that all 8 tennis courts and the fencing will be done by August 15 if they can't move forward on the lower court until a decision is made next week. However, they will do everything they possibly can to get it done by then. They are planning to pave both courts at the same time. Mrs. Usavage would also like to press on the warranty issue more. Mr. Zazo stated there was definitely a 1-year guarantee on workmanship. Mrs. Usavage asked if there is

anything being done at the tennis courts to modernize or make the lighting more efficient. This has not been included in the project.

Mr. Caso asked if the geogrid system is being used for the lower courts or if it is just stone. Mr. Zazo stated that there had been discussion with the geotechnical engineer about using geotextile fabric but they determined the best solution was 18 inches of stone. Mr. Caso questioned the cost of the lower court repairs. Mr. Zazo explained that it is costing \$50 per cubic yard (\$65,000) to remove the unstable soil and put in stone and then there is an additional cost to build the crown and install drainage and that all totals \$119,000. Mr. Caso asked if there was any other alternative. Unfortunately, there is not unless you want to go offsite for tennis.

Ms. Neiman asked how many students are in the tennis program and whether we needed both courts. Dr. Miller stated he did not know the number of students off the top of his head but they can get that information to her. He knows both courts are used. Mrs. Dennin stated that last year on the boys' team there were about 25 students. The courts are also used for physical education classes.

Ms. Neiman asked if we are still using the existing lighting. Mr. Zazo stated that lighting is not included in this project. Ms. Neiman asked if we are doing anything about the lights being left on when nobody is around. Dr. Miller stated that we can look into that issue.

Mr. Breece pointed out that last fall he talked to dozens of people about their concerns about dumping a lot of money into the tennis courts. He is not convinced that we have the best options laid out and feels we need other options to look at cost wise. It's a lot of money to put out there and not know what other options are available other than just repaving. We need to more effectively watch what we are spending when we have people in the district that can't afford to put a new roof on their house or buy new tires. There is no guarantee that this is going to work and warranties on tennis courts just aren't there. It's only as good as the area and the drain and the water so maybe the problem is where we have the courts. Mr. Breece stated he has not seen the tennis courts. He doesn't know if we are looking at potholes, unsafe conditions or cracks.

Dr. Miller stated that we have already started the work that was in the scope of the original project which entailed stripping off, rolling and resurfacing. So right now, as you drive by, you will see that there is no tennis court surface on either of the courts because that was part of the project scope to begin with. It was when they started to roll them that we hit problems and the work stopped.

Mr. Breece asked when the courts were originally put in. Mr. Breece would like to see the bill from the original court installation because he would like to know when they were put in. If we picked the wrong location in the first place, we may need to pick another location because water drainage always affects asphalt. If it was 15 years ago, then we probably have them in the wrong spot. If it was 30 years ago, then they are probably not in the wrong spot. Mr. Grenewald stated that he knows it was before 1992 and believes the upper courts went in before the lower courts. Mr. Zazo stated that intention of the stone materials they are using underneath and the drainage around the outside is to alleviate the drainage issues so the courts will not fail again because of water related issues.

Dr. Faidley asked Mr. Zazo if the courts were originally installed with crowning and if the cracking was due to them being installed improperly. Mr. Zazo stated it is safer to say they were installed improperly than that they were put in the wrong location.

Mr. Elsier polled the board members to see if they wanted to move forward with the additional tennis court repairs by placing it on next week's board agenda. All board members were in favor of putting it on next week's board agenda.

PlanCon I

On the board agenda next week, following the change orders will be the PlanCon I submission for them. This is done at no cost to us but must be done with every change order because we exceeded \$300,000 in changes so any changes above \$18,500 require a PlanCon I form.

Mr. Stengle asked how much of our expenditures get reimbursed. Mr. Clough stated that the reimbursement is set by the capacity of the building. So we will not be getting additional reimbursement for the change orders and that historically we received 23-25% back. Mr. Stengle asked if we only have to pay prevailing wage because of PlanCon. Mr. Clough stated that prevailing wage must be paid no matter what.

BASH Complex Field Watering

The BASH Water and Field Watering document provided at the meeting is the same as provided at a previous facilities meeting with the addition of estimates at the bottom. Estimates were included in the newsletter this past Friday. Basically, we are looking at a price quote from Garber to drill a well for the football field of \$33,427. There is also a price quote from Little Squirt Irrigation to add piping (\$11,610) and irrigation controls (\$8,000-\$15,000) to the existing well at the baseball field to take water up to the soccer fields.

Mr. Stengle asked if the 28,800 gallons of public water is what we are purchasing. Dr. Miller stated that is the amount we purchase/use for each watering. Mr. Stengle asked if the cost includes the sewage treatment as well. Dr. Miller stated it does and that we are looking at getting a dedicated water meter so we could eliminate the sewage cost. Mr. Stengle asked why we needed additional piping to water the soccer fields if we are already watering it now. Dr. Miller stated that we do not currently water the soccer fields and that if we don't want to water fields outside of football and baseball then we don't need additional piping or an irrigation control system. Mr. Stengle pointed out that the new well would pay for itself in 5 years but we could cut our currently watering bill by getting a separate meter. Dr. Miller stated that Mr. Grenewald is still working on getting a separate meter. Mr. Stengle would like to know what the cost will be to get a separate meter installed and whether they will agree to deduct the sewer cost and what our water bill would be if they allowed it. Dr. Miller stated that the cost of the water bill would be approximately ½ based on information we received. Mr. Stengle stated we need the information about when a separate meter can be installed before we can make a decision.

Ms. Neiman is concerned as to why we never put a separate meter in to determine how much water we are using because we have been wasting money for years on watering and it's not our money to be wasting. She would also like to know if we have checked into any other well drillers besides Garber. Dr. Miller stated that we only have an estimate from Garber at this point. Mr. Grenewald stated that this is just an estimate to give the board an idea of what the potential cost would be and it would be a competitively bid project if the board decides to move forward.

Mr. Breece commented regarding watering the soccer field. The soccer field is the 2nd highest used field next to the football field. He stated that our fields are not taken care of. They are in horrible condition and it is a safety issue. If we're spending \$140,000 on tennis courts that hardly anyone uses, we should be looking hard at the fields that a lot of students do use.

Mrs. Usavage pointed out that even though there is a 6 year payback period comparing current costs to irrigation costs, there will still be operating costs in terms of electricity. She would also like to know how long well pumps typically last because they are very expensive to replace. In addition, if we are adding more of a burden to the existing well are we reducing the lifetime of that well? The estimate is based on drilling 300 feet and in her experience it might have to be dug deeper and increase the cost. How comfortable are we that 300-500 feet is reasonable?

Mr. Landino asked if we would need to get the piping in before the road is done so we don't tear it up. Mr. Grenewald stated that he thinks the road is done where we would need to cross for the piping but they can take a look at it.

Mrs. Dennin stated that one of the benefits we would get from the well is that we could water the soccer fields. She is assuming that if we spend the money to dig a new well that we would want to include the piping to water the soccer fields so the estimated cost would be approximately \$56,000 plus electricity costs and that would be an 8-10 year payback.

Mr. Stengle stated that he doesn't want to spend more money to drill a well than we would save on water costs. If we drill, it is a gamble as to how far we would have to drill to get a good water flow. Can we get some sense of how deep wells are in this area? If we don't expand where we water and we drill a well, we'll save \$2,500 per summer if we had a dedicated meter or \$6,000 per summer if there isn't a dedicated meter.

Mrs. Dennin said we need to research the likelihood that we could tap a well easily. If we don't drill a well, can we still water the soccer fields? That is the option for additional piping to water the soccer fields that is listed on the handout.

Mr. Stengle thinks we are just scratching the surface on this information. Just because we already have a well, doesn't mean we will have enough to water the soccer fields. Also, if we expand our watering and don't drill a well, our water costs could double or triple.

Mr. Breece pointed out that his contention is that we spend more on watering than \$6,000 per summer because the buildings aren't used as much during the summer. When you see that the summer bill is comparable to what it is during the school year, then it seems like the watering usage must be higher than stated. If we put a separate meter in, we could learn that it is a whole lot more than \$6,000 per summer. Without a meter, it is impossible to get a real effective read on this issue.

Ms. Neiman stated she thinks that we should break the watering issue into 2 phases. If we want to start watering the soccer fields, we should do that before the road is finished since it doesn't have anything to do with drilling a new well.

Mr. Landino agreed with Ms. Neiman that we have 2 different decisions to make. He recommends that we defer the decision on the well. He thinks we should get the separate meter installed so we have a real understanding of how much water we use for watering and the costs. The other decision about watering the soccer fields needs to be made sooner rather than later so we don't have to disturb the new roadway.

Mrs. Usavage is supportive of doing this but as Mr. Stengle stated we need more information to make a decision.

Ms. Neiman asked whose well is over at Bear Stadium. Did the district put it in or did the Legion put it in? Dr. Miller stated his understanding is that because it is on school property it is our well. Ms. Neiman stated that we need to make sure that is correct. Dr. Miller agreed. Ms. Neiman stated that if the Legion put the well in she doesn't want to create any problems with them. Let's ask them as a courtesy if they mind us tapping into it to water another sport field whether or not it is considered our well. Dr. Miller agreed.

Mrs. Dennin agreed that we should check with the Legion before we do anything with the existing well. She also agrees with Mr. Landino's point that we can do the additional watering project now and postpone drilling of a new well for a later time. She asked Mr. Grenewald if he has an opinion in terms of whether tapping a new well is a good idea. He stated that the reason they had Garber do the estimate is because they have drilled many wells in this area and know the history of how deep they have to go to get the quantity of water we are looking for. There's always concern when you water fields with public water because the chlorine in the water is not necessarily good for growing grass. There are pros and cons to using city water and the cost savings is one of the driving factors. There is also maintenance associated with it. The water cannon takes a substantial amount of manpower to operate. We would need more water cannons if we are going to water more fields.

Dr. Faidley asked if there has been a volume analysis done on the existing well to determine if it can handle the additional volume to water more fields. Mr. Grenewald stated that he doesn't know if anyone has done an analysis but he knows it has run all night by accident and pushed water out all night long. Mr. Grenewald believes there is a lot of capacity in the well and that we should be able to water them once a week. He pointed out that there is more to field maintenance than watering, such as aerating and seeding.

Ms. Neiman asked how many hours we water the fields and at what time of day it is done. Mr. Grenewald stated that we currently only water the football field and it is done early in the morning and takes 8 hours to do the entire field. Ms. Neiman asked if it would be more beneficial to water it later in the day. Mr. Grenewald stated that would make it more susceptible to growing mold and mildew.

Mrs. Usavage asked if we will be making the soccer field safer just by watering it. Mr. Grenewald stated that watering will make it safer.

Mr. Caso thinks we have to do homework on the numbers in order to do a proper analysis. He doesn't have enough information to make a decision on it. It's hard to discern a with and without analysis and breakeven analysis with what the board has been given.

Mr. Elsier summarized the board comments by stating they are collectively saying we need more information on wells in Boyertown, we need to follow through on the separate water meter, we need to talk to the Legion about tapping into the existing well and we need to refine numbers and come back to the board. Mr. Elsier stated that the majority of the board, himself included, are concerned about the condition of the soccer fields.

Ms. Neiman asked how much an additional water cannon would cost. Mr. Grenewald stated that he did not know the exact cost but he thinks it is less than \$5,000. Dr. Miller stated they would get the exact cost for the board. Ms. Neiman asked if it could be left out at the soccer field. Mr. Grenewald said it could be left in that area of the facility. Ms. Neiman also requested that we look into options other than the water cannon.

District Wide Flag Installation

The board gave direction to the administration at a previous meeting to put larger flags in the classroom as well as the Bill of Rights. Dr. Miller presented a cost estimate for 2' x 3' flags to be put in every classroom along with a Bill of Rights poster. The estimated room count is 600 and the estimated cost is \$13,200 not including installation. Dr. Miller found that some classrooms already have a 2' x 3' flag but in many classrooms there is a smaller flag (roughly 1.5' x 2'). One piece that he is concerned about is if we make a decision today to replace all flags we will be wasting money because there are rooms that already have a 2' x 3' flag. Also, the 2' x 3' flag may require the shaft to be cut to hang at the correct level. In addition, some of the classrooms have no flag and this could be because they are packed away due to summer cleaning. In order to get an accurate count of what we already have, Dr. Miller would like to wait until all of the flags are back out in September so we aren't purchasing flags we don't need.

Mr. Breece asked what exactly the Bill of Rights poster price is for. Dr. Miller stated that it is a poster sized Bill of Rights that is laminated so that it will hold up and last longer. Mr. Breece stated that the direction the board gave at the last board meeting was to put the Bill of Rights poster in every middle school and high school classroom not all 600 classrooms. As far as the flags are concerned, he does understand that there are some existing flags that are appropriate but he doesn't understand why anyone would put a flag away due to cleaning.

Mr. Breece asked who was contacted to get the price on the Bill of Rights poster. Dr. Miller stated it was a teacher supply vendor that supplies that type of material and he had difficulty finding just a Bill of Rights poster. A lot of vendors had it combined with other posters as part of a social studies set. Mr. Breece stated that the direction he gave at the last meeting was to print the Bill of Rights on 11" x 18" cardstock which would be \$.30 a piece at Staples. What concerns him is that we didn't get the directions right.

Mr. Breece got pricing on 3' x 5' flags and that price is less than the price on the estimate. It is imperative that when the board asks to get something done that is going to affect money that we make sure that we efficiently and effectively put together a proposal because \$13,200 is a lot more than he anticipated. Mr. Breece also stated that the flags should not be taken down and put in the closet and would like to know which teachers or custodial staff was responsible. Mr. Breece also expressed a concern about the estimate not including installation. He expects that our custodial staff should be able to handle the installation in a short amount of time and wants it completed before the start of the school year. He stated that with his pricing the project can be done for less than \$5,000. We might even be able to get the flags donated for free from Senator

Toomey's office. We need to teach our kids the significance of the flag and instill patriotism in this generation. Mr. Breece suggested that we get a student to design the Bill of Rights poster on white cardstock with black print.

Ms. Neiman stated that we used to have a printing department and inquired what happened to it. Dr. Miller stated that we still have a printing department and he will get pricing from them to see how it compares to Staples. Ms. Neiman stated that we could also check with the Berks Vo-Tech so the students could be involved.

Mrs. Usavage likes the Bill of Rights idea but we need to decide if we want something that is more durable than just cardstock. She does not have a strong opinion on that. Now that she has seen the flags, she doesn't see much of a difference between the two sizes so as long as every room has a flag she thinks we are fine. Only rooms that don't have a flag should have one purchased for them. There was some brief discussion about the flag style at Junior High West which is a small fabric flag hung on the wall with a cord.

Mr. Breece commented on the size of the current flags. He thinks we should replace flags with 2' x 3' or 3' x 5' flags. If we can get a far better price on the 2' x 3' flags, then he is fine with purchasing that size. In his opinion, at least 1/2 the classrooms have a flag that is unacceptable.

Ms. Neiman asked if Mr. Levengood in the printing department could also laminate the Bill of Rights and get a price on it. Mr. Breece stated that Staples wants \$3 each to laminate them. Dr. Miller will check with Mr. Levengood.

Mrs. Usavage stated the direction was to get the pricing information for the board so they could have a discussion and decide whether to move forward. With respect to the flags, she feels the requirement for her is that there is a flag in each room that meets flag etiquette.

Mrs. Dennin is on the same page as Mrs. Usavage. She does not want to spend \$5,400 for the Bill of Rights poster but is fine with getting it done on cardstock. She is fine with either size flag. Moving forward, before we do anything and before we commit to spending any money, she would like to have an inventory taken of what we have and replace any that aren't 2' x 3' or 3' x 5'. She was under the impression that we weren't moving forward tonight with any estimate.

Mr. Breece disagreed with Mrs. Dennin and stated that the motion was to have something in place for the board meeting next week. He expected to have a plan tonight that would be approved to be put up for a vote on next week's board agenda. He stated that is what was voted on unanimously at the last meeting and that it was for 3' x 5' or 2' x 3' flags and no other sizes. He expected us to know the quantity of how many needed to be ordered tonight and we don't have that information. We also received information for the wrong number of Bill of Rights posters because we only need them for middle school and high school. He doesn't feel that administration failing to get us the numbers we asked for should stop us from moving forward in order to have the flags in place for the start of the school year.

Mr. Landino's concern is the way this was presented at the June board meeting was that there were non-compliant flags and this was to replace them. The visual was very helpful because that is what we were missing. He doesn't have a problem with the smaller flags but would have concerns if we had smaller pieces of paper or stickers. He doesn't know from a compliance

standpoint what is compliant but it seems like the smaller flag is. First we need to figure out if we as a group think the smaller one is compliant and then we need an accurate count based on what is decided. If we can get the items cheaper someplace else, we should do that.

Dr. Faidley stated that it will be difficult to assess each classroom and get an accurate count before next Tuesday because the teachers aren't in the classroom to give us access to closets. He doesn't want to slow down the process of getting flags but he is concerned about the accuracy.

Mr. Breece replied to Dr. Faidley's comment and stated that accuracy is important but 4 weeks ago would have been the time to figure out what we needed and that didn't happen. He is fine with the 2' x 3' flag if the price is comparably less than the larger flag. If it's only \$.50 less, then he'd prefer the 3' x 5' flag but if it's \$1.25 or \$1.50 less then we would save money by getting the 2' x 3' flag. We need to get something done for next week's board meeting because that is the only way we will have them in place for the start of the school year.

Mr. Elsier summarized that the board needs to come to a consensus on the size of the flag. We need to get some other costs for the materials and Mr. Breece will forward Dr. Miller his pricing information. We need a labor cost as well. As far as a time frame, he doesn't recall that there was a need to do this before the start of the school year although it makes sense. His recollection is the direction was to come back to the board with some costs on flags and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Elsier polled the board members regarding the size of the flags. Mr. Breece, Mrs. Neiman and Mr. Caso would like 2' x 3' flags. Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Usavage, Mrs. Dennin, Mr. Landino and Mr. Elsier stated that either size (2' x 3' or 1.5' x 2') is fine assuming that we investigate proper etiquette and find both sizes are compliant. Mr. Breece wants a 2' x 3' or bigger in each classroom and doesn't want the smaller flag in the classrooms. Mrs. Dennin stated that the rest of the board is saying that either size is fine and we shouldn't replace the flags that are 1.5' x 2'.

Mr. Breece asked for a vote on who wants to put it off and who wants to get it done by the start of the school year. He stated the direction was very clear at the last board meeting that this was supposed to be ready for the July board meeting.

Dr. Miller stated that all he needs is direction and he will get whatever we need in place and that he did misinterpret the poster piece and apologizes for that. As far as which classrooms and getting that done, once he gets direction he will take care of it. He stated he can have a number by Friday if he has an answer to the size of the flag that is required for each classroom.

Ms. Neiman stated there are only about 150 classrooms at the elementary level so she would be fine with putting the Bill of Rights in all classrooms because it is good education for our students. As far as the flags go, she would like to know how many of the flags still look like new and how many are faded. Dr. Miller stated that he walked through 5 buildings and that he did not see any that he felt were in bad shape. Junior High West was the only building where he found flags that were significantly different than the other buildings. Ms. Neiman stated that she would have no problem purchasing 600 flags to make all of our schools identical. She believes we should have all of them hanging exactly the same way.

Mr. Landino's concern is that when it came up at last month's board meeting we were told there were non-compliant flags. The samples tonight appear to be compliant so he feels a motion was put forth at the last meeting with incomplete information about the state of what was in the classrooms. He is hedging because he saw the physical sample looks compliant so he doesn't know why we need to repurchase for every classroom. He is in favor of purchasing flags only for classrooms that have non-compliant flags.

Mr. Breece stated that Dr. Miller brought in samples of what he found in some classrooms. The 12 classrooms that Mr. Breece visited did not have either one of those. He agrees with Mr. Landino that we are not looking at buying a flag just to buy a flag. He agrees that those that already have a 2' x 3' flag or 1.5' x 2' flag do not need to be replaced but we should have known the number we needed today. He wants them to be correctly mounted and the place to mount a flag is at the head of the classroom. He thinks that when you walk into the classroom it should be at either corner at the front of the classroom.

Dr. Miller asked for clarification on mounting. He stated that many classrooms have a mounting bracket that goes on the white board or chalk board but not all of our boards are located in the position Mr. Breece described. Dr. Miller would like direction from the board on this issue because it will determine what type of mounting bracket is required. Mr. Breece stated that they must be mounted on a wall and be prominent and visible when you walk into the room.

Mrs. Usavage stated that this seems overcomplicated and the motion she would suggest is that we install a 2' x 3' flag in any room that doesn't currently have a flag.

Mrs. Dennin said that we have to make it very clear what direction we are giving to administration so there is no confusion on what they are doing. She would like to give administration direction to put a 2' x 3' flag in any classroom that does not currently have a 2' x 3' or 1.5' x 2' flag and to mount it using a bracket. If we can't get the classroom count until the teachers get back to school, she is okay with waiting.

Ms. Neiman stated that if Dr. Miller goes into a classroom and doesn't see a bracket it should be assumed that they need a flag. Dr. Miller is in agreement.

Dr. Faidley wants to know before we purchase these flags if there is a preference on where we purchase them and whether they are made in the United States or made somewhere else. Dr. Faidley feels it is important that they are made in the United States.

Dr. Miller summed up the discussion that for the first day of school administration needs to ensure that there is a 2' x 3' or 1.5' x 2' flag in each classroom mounted by a bracket. In the event that there is not a flag of that size in a classroom, we will purchase a 2' x 3' flag that is made in the United States for that classroom. Dr. Miller asked if it needs a vote at a board meeting or can he just go and do it based on the direction of the board. The board agreed that Dr. Miller should proceed with the purchase of flags and report back to the board when it is completed. He should also proceed with printing the Bill of Rights on cardstock after it is designed.

Board Discussion/District Vehicles

Mr. Elsier stated that there has been some discussion on vehicles for the district. He would like to know if it would help the board in making decisions if we had the transportation director, Steve Missimer, who manages vehicles for students, and Paul Grenewald, who manages the vehicles for the maintenance team, come to a future facilities meeting to discuss strategies for vehicle maintenance and replacement.

Mr. Breece stated that we don't have anything in front of us that he asked for to discuss the district vehicles so there is no way to have a discussion on district vehicles. All we know is that we have 11 of them and we have 2 that have been in question but we have nothing else to tell us about the vehicles. Every entity that has a fleet of vehicles has a plan for the fleet and knows exactly what the vehicles are used for. Trying to fit the district needs with what we are looking to purchase is the board's responsibility. We shouldn't be driving vehicles that aren't safe and it's apparent that we are because they are in need of repair. He has a concern about the safety of the vehicles and also with that fact that we are looking to replace current vehicles with ones that are different. He does not have the information that he asked for. He wants a breakdown of what the vehicles are used for and who drives them so we know what the district needs are.

Mr. Elsier proposed that we bring the experts that manage the fleet to the board at a facilities meeting to have a discussion so that the board can get a better understanding. Mr. Breece stated that he would like a summary sheet as well.

Mrs. Usavage has lost track of the discussion on vehicles. She remembers hearing about the strategy to buy new vehicles for students and then push them down for maintenance purposes when they get too bad for the students to use. She sees that as a cost conscious way to manage the fleet. She doesn't know what the goal of further conversation is because she feels that every time the board asks a question about the need for a vehicle there is a very good explanation provided. So she has no interest in spending time on the details of every single vehicle and what it is used for and who is driving it.

Mrs. Dennin believes the original discussion came up when we were doing the budget and administration requested to replace 2 vehicles. The rationale was laid out by administration and by Mr. Grenewald's team as to why we needed to have them replaced. At that time, she was fine with the explanation and the board voted on a budget to move forward with the replacements so any further discussion of that is not necessary. As far as the fleet, she is satisfied with the explanation that Mr. Grenewald and his team gave us in terms of what we are doing with the fleet and why it's not cost effective to repair instead of replace. Like Mrs. Usavage, she doesn't feel she needs any more information about managing the fleet. She feels Mr. Grenewald and Mr. Missimer do an adequate job in reporting to the board and bringing us information when there is a problem with the fleet. We already have a strategy so she doesn't feel the need to have more information.

Mr. Landino would like to see the list as a best practice. He would like to see a list of the vehicles, their general usage, mileage, and condition so we can understand what the plan and strategy is for the vehicles. He does not feel the need to know who is driving the vehicles. We want to make sure the vehicles suit our needs and if they don't we need to determine how to bridge the gaps. We also need to address any safety concerns. It will help us see everything at one time instead of piecemeal.

Dr. Faidley commented that administration wants to do its best to provide information to the board. There are implications with the utilization of vehicles and the cost of running extra routes. If we have to contract with our current transportation provider, for example to get students to BCTC and we need an extra run, there is a contractual amount we have built in to the contract to make that run. This district over time has utilized existing fleets that we own with our personnel to make some of those runs at a much cheaper cost than if we had Quigley do it. If the board chooses to have information, they should have information both about the contract with Quigley and the implications that may have if we decide not to have a fleet. We also need to have information from Mr. Grenewald regarding the maintenance fleet because the maintenance fleet is used for multiple purposes. It is unrealistic to say how many hours these vehicles used for this purpose and that purpose for every day of the year. We are working to be as frugal as we can in our expenditures so when Mr. Grenewald or Mr. Missimer make a recommendation to have a vehicle replaced Dr. Faidley takes it very seriously because they are very frugal. If you take a look at the years of the vehicles that are in question, some they don't make the parts for any more and some of them are close to being historical vehicles. When our experts in the areas that oversee vehicles make a reasonable request, we'll provide any information the board wants but he respects their input. As far as putting all of the information together, we have had information in at least 4 or 5 newsletters about the 2 vehicles. In the last newsletter, we saw that the repairs to those vehicles would be in excess of \$5,000 and it's not acceptable to put that amount of money into vehicles that don't have much useful life remaining.

Mr. Breece pointed out that it is insane if anyone suggests to get rid of the fleet and stated that no one has suggested that. The board needs information as to the utilization so that we can get a picture of the district needs. Part of the problem is that we have no mechanism, such as a log book, in place to measure when these vehicles are being utilized. We know from the mileage that they aren't being utilized very much. We should have a better system to keep track of repairs so we know what we are spending on the vehicles for smart fleet maintenance. Governance is giving direction to do something about providing smart fleet maintenance. He wants an effective maintenance program and he wants to get an effective picture of the needs the district has for buying new vehicles. It is smart and prudent for the board to figure this out and any board member that wants to abdicate that responsibility is being irresponsible with taxpayers' money. He is concerned about why we are replacing a vehicle that is currently being used for parking lot security as well as moving students in it when it doesn't have an instrument cluster that works. We are looking to replace it with a totally different vehicle. If it is parking lot security we are looking to do, we could hire an individual and pay them a mileage rate to use their own car. He would like to know what the actual utilization is on the vehicles so we can utilize them better. If we are replacing a car with a van, we need to know why we are doing that. He understands that we do need to change vehicles out at age intervals due to parts being unavailable or gasoline make-up changing but he doesn't think that's what we are talking about doing here.

Mr. Elsier reminded the board that the purchase of the 2 new vehicles was presented as part of the budget process and the board voted to do that. The whole discussion tonight was meant to find out if it would help the board to get more information by having Mr. Grenewald and Mr. Missimer attend a facilities meeting.

Mr. Caso agrees with Mr. Landino that we need to see if what we have meets our needs. He also commented that just because we have a budget doesn't mean we have to spend it. He is in favor of having more information about the vehicle usage.

Ms. Neiman would like to see a presentation showing what the trucks are being used for but doesn't need to know who is driving them. She would like to see how many miles are being put on per week and the maintenance information. As far as vans for transportation of students, she wasn't aware that we were doing that anymore because it's just not a matter of the vehicle, it's a matter of insurance on the vehicle and driver and maybe it would be better to contract it.

Mr. Lewis stated that when the issue first came up the board received several packets that described the condition of the vehicles and in general what they were used for. His impression at the time was that we have a staff here that we pay well and they do a very good job of managing the costs. He trusts that Mr. Grenewald and his staff know when a vehicle needs to be replaced. He doesn't perceive that this is a bunch of spendthrifts trying to spend taxpayers' money. He wouldn't mind seeing a list of what the vehicles are and what they are used for but he trusts Mr. Grenewald to know when a vehicle needs to be replaced. He does not believe it is the board's job to be second guessing every decision like this.

Mr. Elsier stated that what he is hearing is that it would help the board to have a one-page document put together on the fleet so it can be discussed at a future facilities meeting.

Dr. Faidley stated that the information on the trucks and vans was included on a one-pager in the newsletter a while back and he would like clarification on what the board is looking for in addition to that information.

Mrs. Dennin stated that she remembers the document and she thought it had every vehicle listed with mileage and what it was used for.

Mr. Breece stated that it did not have the vehicle use but the document could be modified to include that information. We need to understand the utilization and need to know how many children we move a week. If we know the drivers, we can put together the timelines of when the vehicles are actually being driven. The community wants to know that we are utilizing our vehicles correctly.

Mrs. Dennin still feels that we have not clarified for the administration what information they are supposed to be providing. First we all seemed to agree with Mr. Landino's suggestion to list the vehicles with mileage and usage. That's a lot different than asking administration to redo the original information and adding how many students we transport and what times of the day. She personally is fine with the one-pager that already exists and adding what each vehicle is used for.

Mr. Elsier stated that he is hearing the board wants usage, needs, maintenance information and safety concerns. There will be a one-pager on maintenance vehicles and one-pager on transportation vehicles. Mr. Breece stated that part of the utilization is how many children we are transporting. Mr. Elsier stated that he will work with Dr. Miller and/or Dr. Faidley on what information is needed.

Public Comment Period #2

Mrs. Dierolf asked for clarification on what supervision for \$40,000 and temporary facilities for \$10,000 are for the Monroe Street extension. She also stated that the preference for school flags is 16" x 24" and she is glad to hear we will be ordering flags made in the United States.

Mrs. Curry asked what source of water is causing problems with the tennis courts. She wonders if there is a spring underneath that is causing the issue and if putting in the proposed drainage would take care of it or if we could end up with the same problem again. She also asked if the fields are being used equally throughout the district. She would also like to know if any of the district vans are used for trips and staff and if anyone has looked into leasing the vehicles instead of purchasing them.

Board Member Comments

Ms. Neiman asked if we roll our fields to keep them level. Mr. Grenewald stated that the fields at BASH are rolled as needed, usually in the spring.

Mr. Breece commented that since some of the district vehicles are not driven very much, a lease may not be a bad idea.

Announcements

July 19, 2016	Personnel Committee, Education Center – Conference Room A, 6:00 p.m.
July 19, 2016	Board of School Directors, Education Center – Board Room, 7:00 p.m.
July 26, 2016	Policy Review Committee, Education Center – Board Room, 6:00 p.m.
August 16, 2016	Board of School Directors, Education Center – Board Room, 7:00 p.m.
August 23, 2016	Curriculum Committee, Education Center – Board Room, 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Elsier adjourned the meeting at 9:52 pm.