

**MARPLE NEWTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT
FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2008
BOARD ROOM
MINUTES**

PRESENT: **Committee:** Mr. Michael Molinaro, Mr. Richard Carpenter, and Mrs. Nancy Galbraith
Absent: Mr. Richard Sokorai.

Board: Mr. David McGinley, Mr. Edward Partridge, Mr. Fred Dewey, Mrs. Dana Kauffman, Dr. Jeffrey Shapiro

Administration: Mrs. Merle Horowitz, Mr. Michael Dumin, and Mr. Joseph Driscoll

Press: 0

Audience: 6

1. Call Meeting to Order and 2. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Molinaro opened the meeting at 7:52pm, welcomed all in attendance and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting

Mr. Partridge made a motion and seconded by Mr. McGinley to approve the minutes of the October 2008 meeting.

Mr. Molinaro called for a voice vote. All present voted affirmatively.

4. Approval of Present Agenda Items

Mr. Partridge made a motion and seconded by Mr. McGinley to approve the present agenda items.

Mr. Molinaro called for a voice vote. All present voted affirmatively.

5. Information/Discussion Items – Facilities

A. Marple Newtown High School Renovation and Additional Project's Update

Mr. Spahr stated that as much as it is scary to embark on a project like we are embarking on in these economic times there are a couple of things you should know. 1) This is going to be the cheapest time to build because people are going to want to give you the labor and materials for the cheapest prices that have been going in a long time. 2) If you listen to the strategists who are talking about how we are going to emerge from where we are fiscally right now as a country, they focus on infrastructure improvements, roads, highways, and schools because schools create jobs in the community and they keep people working and develop taxes, etc. We need to take that into account as well as all the other needs that we have as a district and a team to make the renovations to the school for the program and ultimately for the education of the children as we move forward. One of the things that we discussed at the last meeting was the dressing room area and how we would improve upon that

by making the dressing room area bigger and making sure that we do our best to the educational specifications (ed specs) regarding the size of the dressing rooms for the men and women and then finding a place for stage storage. Right now, we are committed to putting that into the program and putting that into the building. When I talk about options being evaluated, we mean finding out what these options do to the size, what they do to the cost and have a discussion about that with the Board to make decisions in design development. The options being evaluated are additional team seating at the pool (possibly at the location where the exterior windows exist now) and providing a black box theater at the large group instruction or at the 1,200 square foot music classroom that is left from the existing music area. An alternate that is being evaluated is the mezzanine at the gym for added seating capacity from about 1,275 to closer to 1,575. We have to look at the PDE impact because if we remove the roof, PDE considers that new construction and that causes us all different sorts of ramifications in terms of the PDE limits.

Mr. Dumin stated that if we put the mezzanine in the project as an add-alternate, whether or not we accept it, we pay for the design of it. We will pay 6% of the cost of it whether we take that alternate to the architect for the design or not.

Mr. McGinley replied that he says “no”.

Mr. Molinaro asked if there is a timeframe of when we have to say “yes” or “no”.

Mr. Dumin replied that Mr. Medica would have to know at what point to design it. We know that the cost for the mezzanine is about \$600,000-\$650,000. We have to decide whether or not that is worth the designing.

Mr. McGinley replied that he does not feel that we should spend that money.

Mr. Molinaro asked Mr. Dumin to find out when the decision has to be made.

Mr. Dumin agreed. I will tell him not to commence until he hears from me the actual designing of it and to spend his time elsewhere.

Dr. Shapiro stated that in consideration of this potential alternate and in consideration of what Mr. Spahr said that people are going to be hungry for work, does Mr. Spahr’s current estimates take into account the fact that material costs and labor costs are likely to be lower than where they are today.

Mr. Spahr replied that he does not take in those factors right now. When we get closer to the bid time and when we can evaluate that bid condition better we would take that into account.

Mr. Spahr stated that until we finalize a design, we won’t know how much the mezzanine will cost. We do have a pretty good idea of how this affects us in terms of PDE. I don’t think this is an uncomplicated alternate. It is a lot of structure and a lot of disturbance to the building.

Dr. Shapiro stated that he hears Mr. Spahr and appreciates that counsel. I wanted to probe a little bit on the thought that if we were thinking \$68 million, maybe we could get it done for \$67 million and therefore that alternate becomes financially feasible.

Mr. McGinley stated that Mr. Spahr suspects that will happen, but has no guarantees. If we pay the \$36,000 now and we decide not to do it, we are out \$36,000. I don’t think we can afford it and I don’t think we should consider it.

Mr. Dewey asked if the latest bids that Mr. Spahr received surprised him because they have come in under what was expected.

Mr. Spahr replied that he can't provide a number. If I were sitting on the Board, I would look at this and say this is complicated and PDE is going to be a problem. This would add to complications and not reduce it. If I were a Board member, my thoughts would be that this is a lower priority and we can take it off the list and concentrate on what is most important.

Mr. Spahr stated that they are working to provide technical education on the ground floor by putting more classrooms in the renovated areas. We need to make the most efficient use of our existing building. We are going there in conjunction with working to reduce the number of new classrooms being built as new because of what happens with the potential tech ed move and then working to consolidate those new classrooms from that back addition into the performing arts area addition. I would like to see us press toward the addition for the cafeteria and the infill and the addition at the performing arts area and then the toilets on the front of the auditorium.

Mr. McGinley asked if we are getting charged for the options for the team seating at the pool and the black box theater as you look at those options.

Mr. Spahr replied that those options are relatively simple and become programming within the existing building footprint and they become a function of how big is the project not a dramatic huge alternate that sits out on the side. I can assure you that you will not be charged by Reynolds. I don't think you would be charged that by Bonnett unless it adds a little bit more money into the scope and therefore they get paid their 6% on that money that is added into the scope.

Mr. McGinley asked where they are taking the space for the dressing rooms.

Mr. Dumin replied that he spoke to Mr. Medica during the last meeting who didn't see it as a major expense. Behind the auditorium, there is a grass area. We could take the two dressing rooms that we have now and make them one and double the size behind the existing room. It would be a very small addition.

Mr. Spahr stated that Mr. Dumin, Reynolds and Agooz/Lovera are completing the facilities study so that it can be turned in with the PDE submission that is being completed as directed by the Board. The enrollment study is the package that the Board has. It deserves more time to discuss than what we are going to take here. I am going to give you the abridged cliff note version. There is a decline in birthrate that puts our projections for the High School under our 1,300 student population. When you take into account unknowns like when projects are going to go for housing and how many students a renovated high school would draw from private schools, you start to go back up to that 1,300 student limit. The result is that planning for 1,300 students is the right projection.

Dr. Shapiro stated that looking at the projections for Culbertson, with the state of the Rouse Project in some doubt as to how many school age children might be there and whether or not they would choose public or private because of the assumed cost of the housing, this study is still projecting a fairly dramatic decrease in enrollment in Culbertson.

Mr. Dumin replied that this study does not include the developments. That is the piece that is missing in here that is not complete. We have this to look at and that is where Mr. Spahr came up with his statement. The report does not show any information from some major developments in Newtown and Marple because he has not received that information from the townships. When he gets that, he will give us a final page that goes with this report that gives a projection of start and finish and the projection of how many student age children and where they believe they will be attending.

Dr. Shapiro stated that where we are tonight is basically at 1,300, but it doesn't include the impact of any new development.

Mr. McGinley replied no. He is saying that the numbers should be about the same in five years, but with the impact of the other we could go up to 1,300. He feels the 1,300 number is safe.

Mr. Spahr stated that with the decline in birth rates, we are under 1,300. With some development which probably won't be meaningful until about the time the High School is finished and with some private school children coming over to the district that dip below 1,300 will come back up to 1,300.

Dr. Shapiro stated that Mr. Spahr's thoughts do include the potential impact.

Mr. Spahr replied yes. Even though we are talking about 1,300, we are designing a building that can hold much more than 1,300.

Mr. Molinaro stated that if you look at the other elementary schools, they also have a decline.

Mr. Spahr stated that is mostly relative to the birth rate.

Mr. Partridge stated that the projection for the Rouse Project for total students in the district was 19 from a study done about two years ago.

Mr. McGinley stated that their new projections show about 34 students. Originally, it was going to be a 55+ restricted neighborhood and now it is a 55+ targeted neighborhood. With the price of the homes, I can't imagine it would go up more than 10-15 students.

Mr. Partridge stated that the study that he is talking about was done on a 55+ targeted neighborhood.

Mr. Spahr stated that their design falls exactly within what we expected to see and we have been validated.

Mr. McGinley asked if we are good up to 1,500 students.

Mr. Spahr replied that we are good something greater than 1,300. I don't know exactly what that number is, but it is probably more like 1,400 students.

Mr. McGinley stated that he is a little concerned because if we build a better school, we might attract more of the private school kids than we think. Suppose that we did attract 200-300 students, do we have an obsolete school at that point? When can we get a projection as to what it will really handle?

Mr. Spahr replied that they will get a projection to what it will really handle at the next meeting.

Mr. McGinley stated that the economy is getting worse. People might not be sending their kids to a private school if the High School is a better looking high school and they think it is a better high school. The number of kids that might come from private schools is a roll of the dice. If it is 200 students, are we prepared? If not, how do we get prepared?

Mr. Dumin stated that we are trying to keep the addition out of the back of the building. That is what Mr. Spahr and I are trying to push. That doesn't mean that it can't happen in the future. If we have to we could possibly add four to six classrooms in that back area where it was shown in Concept D. We were trying to eliminate that so we could keep our footprint smaller.

Mr. McGinley stated that at the last meeting Mr. Spahr said that we would be able to have three shifts of 500 students in the cafeteria. I thought at that time that the High School could accommodate 1,500. I would like clarification of that point.

Mr. Dumin replied that it depends on class size. If we jump it up 30-32 students in a class, I don't think that you would have any problem at all except for science labs.

Mr. Spahr replied that Mr. Medica is already figuring that out in his final PlanCon documentation to be submitted.

Mr. Spahr stated that the most important thing for us to look at on the project is the engagement of the township. What has occurred to date, mostly through Bonnett, but in other avenues too has been informal discussion with the township. The reason for that is because you want to go to the township when you have a final building footprint. We are pushing, pulling, and tugging trying to get that building footprint compressed. The other piece of that is that Bonnett is finalizing his selection of the civil engineer at this time and has to bring all that together at one time too. Don Bonnett is on vacation. When he gets back from vacation we will finalize the selection of the civil engineer and have a formal meeting with the township so that they can see where we are going because I don't want to wait any longer. I am focused on engaging the township.

Mr. McGinley asked who Mr. Bonnett is considering for civil engineer.

Mr. Spahr replied that he has heard that he is considering Chester Valley.

Mr. McGinley asked if they have experience with Newtown Township.

Mr. Spahr replied that he believes that was Mr. Bonnett's basis for that.

Mr. McGinley asked if the owner of Chester Valley is Pennoni.

Mr. Spahr replied no. Pennoni is the township engineer.

Mr. Molinaro stated that according to the timeline we are looking to have final LBP submission for March of 2009. Are we on target for that?

Mr. Spahr replied that some of that will depend on the township. All the discussions that have occurred with the township have been very amicable. The smaller the footprint for additions, the more likely that will be able to be achieved. The timeline has a date of June 30th to proceed with township approval. We are going to go out to bid in July and will be putting shovels in the ground in September. There is a little bit of float there even if we got township approval while we were out to bid. Any changes that they made on the documents, we could put out through addendum and not have change orders for. I have also with full disclosure to the Board, had to write minor changes to a scope after the contracts were awarded so that we could parallel path getting ready to put a shovel in the ground and getting our permits. There is float put in here for that reason.

Mr. Spahr stated that we are working with the district on the next newsletter and we are looking for that to occur in December. Through that process, we are going to meet with the administration so that we can unroll how this is going to play out to the township, community, and the neighbors so that as we start to get a building footprint, we can start to roll that out on the website or newsletters. We would like to come back to you in December to provide an update as well as confirm our numbers for our enrollment studies and any other questions that come up when we are finished.

Mr. Molinaro stated that we will set that Special Facilities and Transportation Meeting for December 1st.

Mr. McGinley stated that the Reorganization Meeting will be held at 7pm and the Special Facilities and Transportation Meeting at 7:30pm.

Mr. Spahr agreed.

Mrs. Kauffman asked about the Concept D drawing. At what point can that go out for public consumption? Can it go on the website?

Mr. Dumin replied that you would be safe once you get to design development because it is not nailed down yet in a couple of areas.

Mr. McGinley asked when that will happen. We wanted it in the newsletter.

Mr. Dumin replied possibly December 1st.

Mr. Spahr replied that it would be his goal to be able to roll out the footprint in the December newsletter.

Mr. McGinley stated that we will take the first page of the newsletter and talk about the project and an 8 1/2 x 11 drawing of Concept D will be included in the newsletter.

Mr. Spahr stated he and Anna Deacon discussed the idea of an insert into the newsletter that had an update with all the considerations that we've talked about. We will have to decide how to disseminate it. I won't want to disseminate something that could be potentially used in any harmful way against the district. I would show quarters and blocks of areas that are dedicated to certain programs, but I am not going to show details. We will work with the administration that it is done appropriately within the bounds of reasonable security.

Mr. Dumin stated that he will let Mr. Medica know that we are looking at December 1st for what he presents to the Board to acknowledge that this is the direction that we are taking so that we can move ahead with that.

Dr. Shapiro stated that he has somewhat of a concern about not letting our communication run ahead of our discussions with the township. You don't want to be out there saying something where the township hasn't bought into in concept. That could antagonize the situation.

Mr. McGinley stated that they have seen Concept D already.

Mr. Spahr stated that he has not been at the meetings that Mr. Bonnett has been to. The two places where it is important that we pick up on so that it gets rolled out with appropriate priority so that the people involved in the process understand what is being rolled out is the township and a courtesy to neighbors. The neighbors need to understand what is going on right behind the township and then everybody else. It takes the form of a meeting with the township, the neighbors that are local just getting that part and then the general public.

Mr. McGinley stated that you will let us know in December whether or not we should hold off doing the newsletter.

Mr. Spahr replied that he wants to know when the newsletter is to be put out and I will back off from there and we are going to meet with the township.

Mr. McGinley replied December 14th.

Dr. Shapiro asked if we are contemplating having a separate meeting with the neighbors.

Mr. McGinley replied that he doesn't know.

Dr. Shapiro stated that it is something to think about.

Mr. McGinley stated that his feeling is that if we hear any rumblings then we will definitely have a meeting. If we don't hear any rumblings and we are proactive with keeping them updated then that will be our communication with them.

Mr. Spahr stated that the reduction of the building footprint reduces all of the crazy stuff that happens all around the school which reduces the impact on the neighbors. We are already thinking in the right way to make sure that the neighbors aren't overly burdened with what is going on.

Mr. Partridge stated that a lesson learned from the stadium is that the township is very concerned about the neighbors and have heard a lot of their input on the plan before they made some of their key decisions. The communication to neighbors is really important. It might be worth having the meeting to be proactive.

Mr. Spahr stated that he has other school districts that he has participated in meetings like that. I will discuss different types of format options that I am aware of with the administration so that we can look at doing that. I am trying to make this project a whole lot less an impact on the neighbors than what probably occurred at the stadium. I think your point is valid and I was simply going to do that with the administration before you made note of it. That is the plan that we will take.

Mr. Molinaro thanked Mr. Spahr. We will see you on December 1st.

B. District Wide Security Renovation Update

Mr. Dumin stated that we have Andy Demidant from Seraph who was given the charge to re-look at the district-wide security renovations and prepare an RFP based on the contract going to a state contract bidder. That is what he will present tonight.

Mr. McGinley asked why the High School is in this menu.

Mr. Dumin stated that we were asked to put it in there. We are probably going to be cutting it out, but we are still going to get prices on it.

Mr. McGinley asked how you can get prices on a concept. I think the High School should be taken out.

Dr. Shapiro asked if this was part of what Reynolds and Bonnett are doing for us.

Mr. Dumin stated that when this was requested, we weren't nearly as far into the renovation. That is why it was still included.

Mr. Demidant stated that Seraph gave the Board the option of menu. What we heard you saying was that you wanted building by building menu pricing so that when you sit down with that vendor and the final best offer negotiations, you can say we want this and this, but not this.

Mr. McGinley replied that he remembers that, but since we have started the High School renovations, that is already in those prices.

Mr. Demidant replied that he would still leave it in so that Mr. Dumin could use it with any of the work that you may do with the renovations.

Mr. Dumin replied that he wants to hand over whatever we are doing to Bonnett to make sure that it is the same equipment.

Mr. Demidant stated that it will give you a very clear understanding of what the pricing is going to be. The pricing that you are going to see in today's market is probably considerably less than what it would have been a year or so ago. We have talked about a scalable expandable solution for all schools and reduced the cost without sacrificing building security. We have built in a project specification list that covers virtually every aspect of school security, but it gives you the option and it requires each bidder to be able to give you that option to say this is a product that we feel is needed in this building but may not be needed here and vice versa. You have full control. You will receive definitions and scoring rubrics so that when you look at the vendors proposals, you will have some sense of how it fits into the overall objective and the primary objective. The primary objective was to control the building perimeters. From there on in and depending on costs and depending on availability, you will make that decision of how it fits into the overall scheme of what you want to do. The scoring definitions will be written as much as possible in the rubrics in layman's terms.

Mr. McGinley asked if this was the second time that we are doing this.

Mr. Demidant replied that if you look at this proposal compared to what you received before, you will see some major differences in just the kinds of specifications that the bidders are going to be required to adhere to.

Mr. McGinley asked why we didn't do this originally.

Mr. Demidant replied that you didn't receive the things that we are talking about so you engaged in a lot of conversations about what you needed and how it would fit.

Mr. McGinley asked why Mr. Demidant didn't offer the Board a menu.

Mr. Demidant replied that he was not involved before the first proposal.

Mr. McGinley replied okay.

Mr. Demidant stated that his goal is not to get the district to buy anything. My goal is to get the district to look at what it is that the vendors propose to you and then how it fits with the overall mission. This document is what the prospective bidders are going to get. It is a way for them to understand what the expectations are which were not as clearly defined previously. Vendors are going to have to assure that the overall scheme is available to you this year, but also next year. It will also give you leverage when they present their pricing. If you choose to cancel something out and then choose to add it a year from now, you have some leverage in terms of price negotiations based on what they proposed on this market. This will be sent out to the first ten vendors that we are going to be sending this to who are approved on the state contract list. This is not going to cost you to build into your wish list. The responsibility for building it into the RFP process is on the bidder. It doesn't cost you if you choose to "x" it out, you didn't pay for them to design it. It is built right into the system. The deadline for vendor final proposals is December 12th. If you wish, I could send you a summary of what we have to date or I could be here for your December 1st meeting. That is up to you.

Mr. McGinley replied that the Board will wait until the update on December 12th.

Mr. Demidant stated that the next stage is December 15th, when he will sit down with Mr. Dumin and whomever you designate as your evaluating committee and we will look over the proposals that we have. We will do the menu pricing sheet and we will do the rubrics to start scoring them to see where they fit in conjunction with what we are asking people to do. Each facility would have an independent system that would tie into a central platform. You will have the capability of monitoring everything district-wide from one central location.

Dr. Shapiro stated that you are referencing Windows 2000 and Windows XP. That will not be supported for very much longer.

Mr. Demidant replied that for the access control system that will be suitable. In the specification itself there is flexibility for the particular vendor to offer their suggestion.

Dr. Shapiro asked that when Microsoft stops supporting XP and our system is based on Microsoft XP and Microsoft Windows 2000, is that not going to cause us a problem.

Mr. Demidant replied that they are responsible for making sure that whatever you buy is going to work with their systems.

Dr. Shapiro stated that our energy management system was put in during the last renovation which was not that many years ago. The software is no longer compatible. You can't get replacement parts anymore. While I like very much what I hear you saying that the system is scalable and changeable, based upon not only the experience with the energy management system, but the experience with our phone system and some other systems is that we buy stuff and are told that it is going to be repairable and it is going to be upgradeable and it is not.

Mr. Demidant replied that there is language in there that addresses that sort of a thing. For instance, whatever cameras you buy should have longevity of more than two or three years that you can make sure that the cameras are going to be applicable well into the life of this project and not just a short term investment.

Dr. Shapiro asked if we are talking about buying a system that has a useful life of 10 years, 5 years.

Mr. Demidant replied that if you buy a system that is IP based, in terms of video technology it contains event based video analytics then yes, you are talking 10 years. If it is going to be 802.11 compliant, that is where the technology is going for the foreseeable future.

Dr. Shapiro asked for example, if a door access card reader gets trashed five years from now, we have some comfort that the way this is written is basically plug and play. We can get another one put in and not have a problem.

Mr. Demidant replied yes.

Mr. McGinley asked if Mr. Violanti has looked at this in light of what has just been said.

Mr. Dumin replied that Mr. Violanti was involved when we had a phone conference. Mr. Violanti was involved in telling these gentlemen what we had in the district and what we are functioning on and how that currently works and how we are connected building to building.

Mr. Demidant stated that the old approach is that security systems have been designed to be reactive in their approach and to protect assets. What we are trying to do is to take an assessment of what your current school needs are and then build a system that is not reactionary, but preventative. From the hardware standpoint, the old systems were all designed for asset (building) protection. In the meantime, the kids and the teachers in the building were still in jeopardy. Now, we are looking at designing a system that educates staff, not just in how to push buttons, but to also develop a cultural change.

Mr. McGinley stated that our main priority is the safety of the children first then protecting our assets. Our main concern is making sure that nobody gets into this building and the safety of our children come first. If you have that in mind, then we are on the same page.

Mr. Demidant replied that is exactly what this whole system is designed to do. The RFP requires the vendors to not only provide any hardware that you purchased, but with the purchased hardware to make sure that they know how to use it and understand why it is used. At the end of this week, the document that you have in front of you will have its final legal approval. We will begin sending out the document to at least ten vendors on the state's approved contract list. They will be returning them to us around December 12th. On December 15th, I will be working with Mr. Dumin to start evaluating those vendor proposals to see which meets the overall objective that we have established. That process goes from December 15th to December 31st. On January 6th we will start working with the vendor that you decide to go with to do final best offer. By January 13th, we hope to have in front of the Board who was chosen and why and provide the rubrics and the menu pricing list of that vendor that we are recommending to you and all the other bidders for comparison.

Mr. McGinley asked how much Seraph's fees are.

Mr. Dumin replied \$16,000.

C. Repair of Heating System at the Gauntlett Center

Mr. Dumin stated that we have previously discussed the steam line running through the court yard. I did some research and I found out that the steam line controls about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the building. If we blow a hole through that, which would look like a geyser in the courtyard, we would still be able to function in the building but would have to constantly add water to the system. I got an estimate from a vendor of what it would cost to do that and we are well over what I can do without putting it out to bid. It is over \$23,000 to replace that pipe in the courtyard. I already spoke to Bonnett. For a \$1,000 fee, they would do the scope of work and specification that we would need. I would do the front end and I would manage the project once we found someone. They could design the scope of work that would have to be done. The pipe that runs through the courtyard blew a hole in it. We have sealed off both ends so that the sleeve that the pipe ran through is now the pipe. Bonnett's engineer agrees with me that it is not designed to be a steam line. We don't know how long it is going to last. My recommendation is to hire Bonnett and ask them to do a specification for us for \$1,000. Bonnett thinks that he may be able to design it differently so the price isn't as high, but we won't be able to get under \$10,000.

Mr. Molinaro asked if Mr. Dumin is looking to be proactive and fix that pipe before it blows.

Mr. Dumin replied yes.

Mr. Carpenter asked if we do this, will it help control the uncontrolled heating system in the Board room.

Mr. Dumin replied no. That is a lot more in depth. All this is going to do is continue to provide heat. To control the heating system throughout the building would be a lot more work costing a couple hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Partridge asked if there was a sleeve around the pipe that runs the whole length and then at each end, you sealed that off.

Mr. Dumin replied yes. We welded a plate on each end and that was the temporary fix so that the sleeve became the pipe.

Mr. Partridge asked what the diameter of the pipe was.

Mr. Dumin replied that it is probably an eight inch sleeve with a four inch pipe running through it.

Mr. Dumin stated that he would like to bring to the Board a motion to hire Bonnett for \$1,000 to do a specification so that we could then get a price.

Mr. Molinaro replied that this motion will be brought to the Board.

D. Implementation of Property Use, Policy 707 Update

Mr. Dumin stated that someone has been hired to start working on this. She is diligently filling the computer system with what is already scheduled. I worked with our IT department. We are going to have a schedule for each building so there will be seven schedules. Those schedules will be accessible to anyone with an email. I tried to get it accessible to the public through the web site, but we couldn't do that and keep the schedule current. If someone goes to any school and says that they want to have an event at a certain time, they can look at the schedule there. I am planning a meeting with our administrative and building staff so they can understand it. Once we get to that point, Mrs. Horowitz and I will talk with the press to see if we can get a press release.

Mr. McGinley stated that he thought he remembered in Policy 707, that if an event came up, and the timing wasn't appropriate for the Board to act that the administration would make a decision. The Board received an email regarding a request. Why did the Board get that request? Let the administration decide.

Dr. Shapiro stated that the Board can't take action, but there has to be some flexibility in the policy to allow the administration to make a decision on requests between Board meetings. That is what the President is trying to get to and I support what he is saying. Otherwise, we run certain risks.

Mr. Molinaro stated that this is why we did a polling of the Board and that is why the use (even though it already occurred) is going to the full Board at the next meeting.

Mr. McGinley asked what happens when we have a field trip that we can't authorize until after it happens.

Dr. Shapiro stated that the administration in the policy has the right to make the authorization.

Mr. McGinley stated that if there is an event that comes up and Mrs. Horowitz has to know and she can't get a hold of five Board members...that is ridiculous.

Mr. Partridge suggested a compromise. Maybe the administration can have the flexibility as long as the Board President or Board Vice President concurs.

Mr. Carpenter asked why we can't let the administration do their job.

Mr. McGinley replied that was his point.

Mr. Molinaro stated that initially we wanted to protect who and when the stadium was used. Now, you are going from that to giving the administration full run of it.

Dr. Shapiro stated that is not what he is saying. I am saying that we should consider having the policy have language in it that having special circumstances which includes the request to use the stadium for an open period of time in between the periods when a Board meets to vote on it should be at the administration's discretion to allow that usage so that the Board isn't put in the position of having to possibly break the Sunshine Act. We have that with field trips. There is no reason why Policy 707 can't have similar language. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Carpenter stated that he is suggesting that we wipe out all of that stuff and let the administration make the decision about who uses the facilities according to Policy 707. Why does the Board have to get involved at all?

Mr. Dumin stated that in Policy 707, there are six categories. Maybe we could state that the administration can make a decision between Board meetings on Classes 1 through 3. That covers our tax payers. Anybody on the outside would need Board approval at a formal meeting.

Dr. Shapiro stated that this is a good compromise. I like that. If we go with Mr. Dumin's suggestion, we would need a slight revision to Policy 707.

Mr. Molinaro replied correct.

Dr. Shapiro stated that he would be perfectly happy to see that happen.

Mr. Partridge asked if this discussion could be deferred to when we have more time to develop it further.

Mr. Molinaro agreed.

Mr. Dumin stated that the revision to Policy 707 will be brought in writing to the January Facilities and Transportation Committee meeting.

E. To approve to use the Stadium for the Marple Newtown soccer Association for a playoff soccer game on Sunday November 9, 2008 from 12:30pm to 3:00pm per Property Use, Policy 707.

Mr. Molinaro stated that this motion will be brought to the November Board meeting.

F. Recommendation for a motion to approve the modification of the lease between the Marple Newtown School District and Mid County Senior Services.

Mr. Dumin stated that this is as per what was asked for by the Board at Executive Session. Mr. Sereni wrote it and the County Senior Citizens agreed with it and signed it.

Mr. McGinley asked Mr. Dumin to add this motion to the Human Resources Committee agenda this Thursday.

G. Recommendation for a motion to approve the Statement of Agreement between the Marple Newtown School District and the Southeastern Chapter of the American Red Cross for the use of facilities as mass care shelters.

Mr. Dumin stated that this was pointed out that the agreement states "Bucks County" instead of "Delaware County." I am sure that I can call the gentlemen at Red Cross and have that changed.

Mr. McGinley asked that this motion be added to the Human Resources Committee agenda this Thursday.

6. Information/Discussion Items – Transportation

A. Recommendation for a motion to approve the disposal of a 1991 Chevrolet Astro Van VIN # 1GCDM15ZGMB177116, this van was replaced during the 07-08 school year.

Mr. Molinaro stated that this motion will be brought to the November Board meeting.

B. Recommendation for a motion to approve the disposal of a 1996 Ford Windstar Van

VIN # 2FMDA5144TBA17525, this van was replaced during the 07-08 school year.

Mr. Molinaro stated that this motion will be brought to the November Board meeting.

7. Other Business

Mr. Dumin stated that he received an email from St. Anastasia and St. Pius asking if they could play their Thanksgiving Game on Wednesday night instead of on Thanksgiving morning. The Board did vote on the date and time to be Thursday.

Mr. Molinaro stated that he will poll the Board for their consensus on this.

Aye: Mr. Dewey, Mrs. Kauffman, Mrs. Galbraith, Mr. McGinley, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Molinaro, Mr. Carpenter, Dr. Shapiro

Nay: 0

8. Public Comment

No comments were made.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Molinaro adjourned the meeting at 9:21pm.

Respectfully submitted by Heather Welsh, Confidential Executive Secretary to the Board.