

**NO: X**  
**Minutes of the**  
**Board of School Directors**  
**DERRY TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Hershey, PA 17033**

**December 7, 2009**

**OPENING ITEMS**

**1.01 Call to Order**

A meeting of the Board of School Directors, Derry Township School District was held on Monday, December 7, 2009, in the District Office Board Room. Dr. William Parrish, Board President, called the meeting to order at 6:24 p.m.

**1.02 Roll Call**

**Directors Present:**

Mrs. Beulah Chabal  
Dr. Donna Cronin  
Dr. Henry Donahue  
Dr. Mary Beth Hagan  
Mr. Christopher Morelli  
Dr. William Parrish  
Mr. John Gräb  
Mrs. Ellen Sheffey  
Mr. Charles Stover

**Superintendent:**

Dr. Linda Brewer

**Secretary:**

Mr. Stephen Rineer

**Solicitor:**

Mr. Brian Jackson

**Student Representative:**

Not Present

**Press:**

Mr. Drew J. Weidman  
Ms. Monica von Dobeneck

THE SUN  
PATRIOT NEWS

**Representatives of the Administrative Staff:** Mr. Dan Tredinnick, Mr. David Yarian, Ms. Sue King, and Mr. Ed Consalo.

**Representatives of the Staff and Community:** Bruce E. Bechtel, Judith Woodring, Linda V. Lehrian, Arthur Cronin, Mark Shrift, Megan Hulse, Julie Neal, Zachary Zeiber, Chuck Johnson, Richard W. Gamble.

### **1.03 Flag Salute**

Mr. Gräb led those gathered in the Salute to the American Flag.

## **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **2.01 Approval of November 9, 2009 School Board Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made by Mrs. Chabal and seconded by Mr. Stover to approve the minutes of the November 23, 2009 School Board meeting. All Board members present signified by a Yes vote.

### **MOTION CARRIED**

## **INFORMATION AND PROPOSALS**

### **3.01 Recognition of Citizens (Agenda Items)**

None.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **4.01 Unfinished Business**

Dr. Brewer: Tonight, we would like to have a discussion with the whole Board about some matters that were addressed 2 weeks ago during the Oversight meeting and during the General Services meeting. Those discussion items are related to the HVAC solution for the Hershey Middle School Phase 2 construction. I thought perhaps we could talk about that first. We have our expert consultant here to give you the options. You've seen the minutes on that and you also have given the final mechanical assessment and we can pass it around. This is what you've received electronically. Then, after we get that input, we need to know your preference on which of the solutions offered we should institute. Knowing that Phase 2 of the middle school construction is not imminent, but Phase 1 is and, therefore, the decisions on HVAC need to be determined now before we go to request for proposals.

Then, we also have expert consultants here to discuss the Master Plan. As you know, you've already voted on the scope of the proposal, but there were three interrelated items that required more discussion and that will occur tonight as well. So, we have in the audience some people that Ed will introduce to us.

Dave Yarian is always here related to the Master Plan and Sue King related to HVAC should you have any questions for them. Ed?

Mr. Consalo: We have two representatives. One is Bruce from Schraeder Group which is the architect firm and Dan Shuck is from Century Engineers who is actually doing all of our engineering. I'll let Bruce speak first. One thing that Dr. Brewer was saying is the reason we're doing this is we don't want to put in something on Phase 1 that we have to take out and change for Phase 2. So, the big deal is that we need to know what we want to do for Phase 2 so when we do the renovations that we're going to do for Phase 1, it will be the same system, rather than have something completely different or something we might even have to take out. That is what the big push is for that. We want to go out to bid in March at the latest on both projects, so we can get it done this summer. The big push is actually the cafeteria. We've got to get the cafeteria done by the time school starts. That's one of the big issues and then the other issue is the entrance which we're not sure we would have it done by the beginning of the school year, but we'll have it shortly after that. They are the two big pushes that we have to have, but the cafeteria is one of the bigger ones and that's when we'll be changing the HVAC and the cafeteria so we need to know that at that time. With that, I'll Chuck introduce himself and, unfortunately, I call everybody by their first names and I forget last names when it comes around to that part.

Bruce Bechtel: That's okay Ed. I'm Bruce Bechtel with Schraeder Group Architecture. As Ed outlined very well, the sense of urgency tonight is really about an HVAC system selection. We're pressing toward a Phase 1 bid release date of March of next year. Our mechanical engineering consultants are Century Engineering. We have Chuck Johnson with Century Engineering here tonight. They took a walk through the existing middle school, identified a lot of the existing systems and how they're used. It's all outlined, how well they are functioning, what they are actually doing out there in September. We now have a report that outlines and summarizes all that information. There were three systems that were looked at – one was unit ventilators, ground source heat pump was the second, and last was water source heat pumps. I think what I'll do is let Chuck get up here and speak to you regarding the pros and cons related to the heat pump system, so it will give you a really good summary of where we ended up after we're through with our report. Thanks.

Chuck Johnson: Like Bruce said, I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm from Century Engineering. I'm a mechanical engineer. Our firm does the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems that will be installed in the school. Bruce alluded to the fact that we did a thorough survey of your building and found it in excellent shape – old in certain cases, and in need of replacement, but in really good shape. The thing that drove the study on this was the nature of the school. The school is built for a unit ventilator system. Therefore, it didn't need to have mechanical systems above the ceiling, so, therefore, it was built from a floor-to-floor level of very small space and those spaces were required to save money.

Most of the building is going to be retained, 75% of it for the future, and we're going to outfit new mechanical systems. It was limited in what new systems we could choose to study. They just wouldn't fit in the building. That's why we arrived at the fact that we have these three systems that were in there. Now, the boiler plan is 50 years old. It's got to go one way or the other. If it was replaced, we would put in higher efficiency and that's alluded to in the report. There would be a payback on savings for the boiler plan. The same goes for the chiller water system, before we replace that, there are higher efficiencies now that we could get a better system. You'll see in the report a little bit of the savings if we would stay with the unit ventilator system, we would entertain some cost savings there.

What I really came about was that I was told that this system we have here is very unacceptable in certain ways and one was that the classrooms are extremely noisy. Well, I've heard this comment before being a mechanical engineer, this is one of my things that I fight to do. I said, okay well, it's noisy, I'll go listen. I couldn't believe how noisy these unit ventilators are. Now, we could probably replace everything and reduce it, but we're still going to have a noise of that type of a system. The system is a system that's installed along the wall, yet it's got a conditioned area on the other side of the room. So, to do that it's got to have a fan running at a higher speed that throws the conditioned air to the other side. To get a higher speed, there's noise, plus the discomfort of the students sitting right adjacent to these units get the direct heating and cooling affect off of these units right at them. It's a system that is used in a lot of schools, but it's not a desirable system in a first class building. It's in there for a reason, it's low cost and I showed it in the report that it's a low cost system, but if it can be avoided, it should be avoided.

What I want to do is go over our recommendations. Our recommendations were for water source heat pump system. This would give you the benefit of a central system and it will eliminate a lot of the inefficiency of the existing system. One of the great things about a water source heat pump is the 30% savings or more that you can receive on the operation due to the earth coupling of that system. It's a brand new building, it's a no brainer, you don't even think about it, you tend to go towards these types of systems because of the savings. When the increase of electrical costs coming up, they are even going to become more desirable to have this type of a system.

This is what I alluded to before a little bit, the #2 in my reasons, it's going to be similar to a central system. The heat pump will be in a closet adjacent to the classroom. Duct work will go up and will come out, the diffusers, it will eliminate the noise because the diffusers will be placed to the proper position. It won't need to be noisy to throw the air from one side of the room to the other. Number 3 is the heat gradient. It will work like a central system in that it will distribute the air at the ceiling, it mixes there, and the diffuser works with a quanta effect that the air goes along the ceiling and mixes with total air before it drops into the

space. Therefore, it eliminates any kind of draft, both temperature and air motion that the occupants will receive.

Again, I'll mention the other advantage is an earth coupled system. It's an environmentally friendly system. Here, again, it's consistent with the key word that we're hearing – green and wanting to sustain our environment. This is a real good thing that the heat pump system will do. If you ever want to go for lead points to get a certified system for your building, you'd need a system that would garner points that would tend to go for your lead accreditation. Unit ventilator systems are not environmentally friendly systems. You can't get a lot of extra points using that type of a system.

Maintenance is quite a bit easier with this type of system. The systems will be put in a corridor room with a door off the corridor right next to the classroom where these units could be maintained, filters changed during normal working hours and that sort of thing without interrupting the classes and the occupants within it.

The other heat pump system, the third one is not very good because of the long payback period, but it is a heat pump system which would be the same type of a system and have the same type of advantages, except it wouldn't have the earth coupled portion where we'd save energy. Earth coupled is expensive, over 200 wells are going to be required for this facility and that's where it runs the cost up. That's why the energy savings of heat pump systems pays you back for your heat pump system over time.

Life expectancy of a heat pump system, the wells, it's all heat fusion type pipes that are put in the wells. There are manufactured, the U bend loop that goes down the well is pre-manufactured and tested and right now they're saying 50 years plus. It's a special, high density plastic, polyethylene system. It's good for 50 years. Now, the heat pumps in the space have the same life expectancy as the other, but your ground source is a good long lasting system that will last forever for the life of the building.

I can entertain any questions.

Mr. Consalo: Let me explain a few more things. One, when we first started this system, looking at doing the middle school, we were asked to look at going green. This is the only system out of the three that we would get points on for green or lead certification. If we do get lead certification, we do get additional money back from the state. There are also other grants that they do have available that we could look at.

Mrs. Chabal: You're talking about 2 or 3?

Mr. Consalo: Talking about geothermal. The third one, to give you an example, the third one I'm not in favor of because we just took out the same system out of the high school that we're looking at on the third system, so I'm not really for the water source heat pumps. I'm not in favor of that, because I just went and took out 85 of them out of the high school. The first one, it would work, but if you look on the last page, I think one of the big significant parts there is payback. Yearly operating costs that you'll save by going Scenario 1 is \$42,900 from what you have. With Scenario 2, the yearly savings costs is \$107,800 savings that you would have for that year. The difference between the two is about 6 ½ years payback time between the two. So, it is more money, but in the long run, we have a far superior system. We have a more uniform for temperature control, as you see the temperature isn't hot on one side and cold on the other. You have a better atmosphere for the teachers to teach and the students to listen to, rather than hear that fan motor running at all times through that way. Also, the only way I would allow them to do this is if we do have access from the halls, so that we could work on it without disrupting the class. We could change filters during the day without disrupting the class. With the unit ventilators, you have to open up the unit ventilator, so we have to change it either before class or after class.

The other things that Chuck mentioned was the boilers and the chiller. The boilers and the chiller are not adequate enough to do Phase 2. They are not big enough to do that, so we have to change those no matter what. If we went with the ground source heat pump, we would be eliminating them altogether, because the heat pumps will be doing that. No matter what, we have to change the boilers, we have to change the chillers. Like you said, the boilers are 50 years old, they are probably at 60% efficiency if that much. If you went with new boilers it would be 96%/98% efficiency which is a big difference if you went with Phase 1. The chiller we have, we did a renovation in 1998 for the chillers, but these chillers have been a sore spot for me, because each year when I start up, I replace motors in there. I think I replaced 35 motors since we put them in, so they have been troublesome to begin with. We are, from the maintenance department, like Phase 2 because it is the way of the future. The difference in the cost is that we have to run new pipe for Scenario 2 where Scenario 1 you wouldn't have to, but you're also looking at old pipe that you're running through. The payback, the efficiency of it, the noise of it, I feel and also the architects and engineers, feel this is the best way to go.

Mrs. Chabal: Thank you to both of you. I actually, John, am going to ask, I know that you guys have really struggled and I mean you have put a lot of time and effort into reviewing a lot for General Services and Ellen in finances really taking a look and recently you did a combined committee meeting and this . . . This was just General Services, okay. Then, I'll ask John. John, can you give us a flavor and an overview, I know since you spent a great deal of time and energy and effort on this, what the committee as a whole was thinking as they looked at these scenarios and what your recommendation to us is as a Board as a whole might be in support of one or the other? I'd appreciate that.

Mr. Gräb: Thank you. Yes, I certainly will, Mrs. Chabal. After a rather lengthy discussion in the General Services committee with input from Ed and others involved at the time, our inclination was to go toward the geothermal water source heat pump. Granted, the initial cost is somewhat more than the initial cost of the unit ventilators, but the return on operating costs and the return on maintenance in the long term would more than compensate for that initial extra outlay. Our recommendation from coming out of General Services Committee was to go with what's referred to as Scenario 2 for Phase 1.

Mrs. Chabal: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mrs. Sheffey: Actually, I had more time to look at the appendices and the calculations and I actually have a question on Scenario 2, the payback calculation. It's the increment over Scenario 1 for the numerator, but the denominator is the full savings and I would think the denominator should be the incremental savings and if you were to do that, then the actual payback goes up to about 33 years. I'm not sure how . . .

Mr. Gräb: Excuse me, could you reference a page?

Mrs. Sheffey: The very last page. The alternative comparison tables – Scenario 2, Payback. You'll see the calculation is the incremental increase over Scenario 1, so the 2.1 million divided by the total savings for Scenario 2, but I would think there is a savings for payback 1 and wouldn't we only use the increment and, therefore, if that's what we would do, then really the payback is more like 33 years.

Chuck Johnson: Scenario 2 vs. Scenario 1 is a comparison of what Scenario 1's operating cost is and that is a comparison of a brand new system, so the brand new system would be a brand new boiler, would be a brand new chiller. That's why the total difference between the one and the other is the \$107.

Mrs. Sheffey: But the savings is actually, I thought the savings is total savings.

Chuck Johnson: You're going to realize the savings of \$42,900 if you put the unit ventilator system in and replace the boilers and the chillers.

Mrs. Sheffey: Yes, we would save \$41,000, correct.

Chuck Johnson: So, once we get to that point, then you get an additional savings of the \$107,000 over that.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay, wait a minute.

Chuck Johnson: I'm sorry if it doesn't . . .

Mrs. Sheffey: So that's not clear, so you're saying then on – it doesn't have a page number – appendix B, page 1 of appendix B. When you say 30% savings for geothermal heat pump of \$107,800, that's in addition to the \$41,000?

Chuck Johnson: It's not an addition to, it's comparing it to a system. If you were going to put two new systems in now, you wouldn't put in the old boilers now, you would put in a new system with new boilers and chillers and you compare it. The 30% savings is a brand new system versus a brand new system – whether it's a brand new unit ventilator system versus a brand new heat pump system.

Mrs. Sheffey: So, if we put in a unit ventilator system . . .

Chuck Johnson: With new boilers and chillers, you can save 42, but now that's 42 just on the cost of the boilers which was, I believe, \$550,000.

Mrs. Sheffey: But, I'm still, sorry to be beating a dead horse, if we look at the calculation, your calculation above says, you put in a 30% escalation for electric, because we know that's coming. The total electric and gas [tape ends] expenditures your projecting is \$503,000.

Chuck Johnson: I'm doing that based on a comparison of the square footage you have now and what you have in the future.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay, and that's the cost, that's with the no school expansion, correct?

Chuck Johnson: Correct.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay. Then, we say, assume 40% electrical usage, so we reduce the 361 and we get a total heating/cooling cost, and then you have the savings from that. I don't understand how that includes the \$42,000 – that would include the \$42,000.

Chuck Johnson: If you would do the whole school and replace the unit ventilators with quieter unit ventilators, not real quiet, but improvements, but you wouldn't do the boiler and you wouldn't do the chiller, then you would have to operate your boiler at 60% efficiency like Ed said and your chiller at a less efficiency.

Mrs. Sheffey: Which are these current – I'm assuming these costs you are using here are . . .

Chuck Johnson: These are actual costs.



Mrs. Sheffey: Actually costs, which, with our current system that's not functioning at the best efficiency and then you inflated those numbers based on the 30% escalation. So, I believe that this 107 includes the 40, I'm sorry, I'm holding everybody up.

Chuck Johnson: No, you're not. It's confusing, because I have the same confusion.

Mrs. Sheffey: I'm sorry, I would love to do geothermal and if this were a new build, I'd be 100% behind geothermal, but I'm concerned that it's costing us over 2 million dollars more to do geothermal and I believe the return on investment is more like 30 years and the life expectancy of this, and I could be wrong, but I thought in our meeting we said it's only 20 years. I'm uncomfortable with making that kind of investment and tearing out, according to this report, pristine piping. Another, I'm sorry, Page 3 we say at the very bottom of Page 3 – analysis for total system replacement – the study assumes that the entire mechanical system will be replaced for each system studied, but we won't need to replace the entire mechanical system for Scenario 1.

Mr. Consalo: Yes, everything but the piping.

Mrs. Sheffey: Well, we wouldn't have to replace all the unit ventilators.

Mr. Consalo: The unit ventilators will be 20 years old at the time we get to . . .

Mrs. Sheffey: But not all of them. I know it says in here somewhere . . .

Mr. Consalo: All of them, except for the last addition which was 5 units.

Mrs. Sheffey: Oh, so only 5 units? Okay.

Mr. Consalo: Yes, only 5 or 6 units. Also, what you've got to understand too, this 18 year payback, really it was 19 something, then we figured the increase of 30% coming in now. It also accounts for maintenance, it accounts for the increase in what utilities will be, so it brings it down quite a bit that way. You're looking at it just as 107 every year, but there is an increase, there is also maintenance that you count on there for the savings that you have which the increase is in there and brings it down quite a bit for that.

Mrs. Sheffey: So, you would have a maintenance savings that you're saying is not included in this.

Mr. Consalo: Yes, the maintenance savings is not on this, also the increase in the utilities is not on this, so they do a rough figure. When they have that figure . . .

Mrs. Sheffey: Wait, what else is not on here?

Mr. Consalo: The increase in utilities that's not on this throughout the 18 years and that's what brings you down the years too, because of the increase. This is just at today's figures what that is. So, there is a formula they use to do this.

Mrs. Sheffey: I think he inflated it, didn't he?

Chuck Johnson: It's inflated for the increase you're going to get January. It's not for any others, it's just . . .

Mr. Consalo: So, when they do their calculation, they have a formula they use throughout the year for that, plus they are also use a formula maintenance that you would save by doing that which brings it down from the 30 years. If you just went 107 into that, it would bring you 30 years, but you have to include your maintenance, your inflation and everything else, which they calculate in that area, so that brings it down to the 18 ½ years which you don't see.

Mrs. Sheffey: I don't think that's – okay.

Dr. Parrish: Who prepared this chart, did you prepare this chart?

Chuck Johnson: Yes.

Dr. Parish: Okay. Question for you. When I look at Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, the numbers that are given in Scenario 2, are they over and above the numbers from Scenario 1? So, for instance, were you trying to say a bit ago that if we went geothermal, the expected yearly operating savings would be the 42,900 that we would expect to see from unit ventilators, plus an additional 107,000?

Chuck Johnson: No, it's not in additional, but it is 107, I really feel it is because when you compare the 30% increase, you're comparing it against a good system unit ventilator against a good system heat pump, which is brand new – two brand new systems.

Dr. Parrish: So, really then the difference between the two, in yearly savings, is 107,000 minus 43,000 essentially.

Chuck Johnson: Roughly.

Dr. Parrish: The way you've written this chart though, I mean that's what, I mean all I can do is go on what you've given us and what you're telling me is that with Scenario 1 we get a 42,900 savings over what we're doing now. Scenario 2, we get a 107,000 savings, but then we switch and we're comparing 1 to 2, so reality is, if our decision is not to stay the same, we're not going to stay the same, so what we're trying to compare is the difference between these two.

Chuck Johnson: No, there would be an argument that, okay, let's increase Scenario 1 to a good system with boilers and chillers and you would save the 42, and I'm saying once you get to that point, you would have saved another 107,000, so you could add them together instead of subtract them.

Dr. Cronin: So, you're saying they are added.

Chuck Johnson: I hate to mislead you and say you're going to save more than 30% . . .

Male Board Member: What we have to realize is, it's 107,800 is what you expect based on what we're paying now, okay for Scenario 2.

Chuck Johnson: Well, you know, you're right. You can add them together.

Male Board Member: So, you think it is additive, that it is the sum of the two?

Chuck Johnson: Because I'm comparing it against a system you don't have.

Male Board Member: Right. It's a new system.

Male Board Member: So, that's what my question is. So, it should be added. Now, when you go down to payback – is the payback period 18.9 years . . .

Chuck Johnson: Well, no it would be . . .

Male Board Member: . . . over and above the 12.8, so it is now 32 years? Because you've got columns that are disparate. So, it's still only 19 years?

Chuck Johnson: Well, if we add them together, you've still got the 2 million divided by now 150,000, so . . .

Male Board Member: It's less.

Male Board Member: I'm just trying to clarify, because I think in some instances it wasn't clear that we're looking at 150,000 savings relative to now.

Chuck Johnson: I've been doing these estimates for 30 years and . . .

Male Board Member: I know they're not exact.

Chuck Johnson: You have to make a standing. You look at them 5 years later and you say, how did I come up with that, because things change so much that you just can't anticipate, but as I see these now, this is what we're looking at.

Dr. Cronin: I just want to clarify one thing. For Scenario 1, with the numbers that are on this chart, that's not for the new boilers and chillers?

Chuck Johnson: No, that includes that.

Dr. Cronin: That is with the new boilers and chillers. Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Donahue: A more general question either for Ellen or John. What have we budgeted going forward for the HVAC system, period?

Dr. Brewer: I can answer that one.

Mrs. Sheffey: Oh, sorry, go ahead.

Dr. Brewer: We talked about that during the meeting and I actually went back to the information that Lou Verdelli had given us and we actually budgeted more than this, because the original estimate was . . .

Dr. Donahue: More than the 6 million?

Dr. Brewer: Yes.

Female Voice: No . . . .

Dr. Brewer: The original estimate, yes. He showed it to us two ways . . .

Female Voice: Okay.

Dr. Brewer: With and without the HVAC, but when we budgeted the HVAC, it was a million dollars higher than what it came in. So, they showed us a figure and it was 6.7, the entire second phase of the borrowing came up to 16, whereas the second phase of the borrowing that was estimated before the study was done on the return on investment was 17. So, we have the room in the second borrowing to do the 6.4 million.

Mrs. Sheffey: Actually, okay, I'm sorry. Lin, I thought that we budgeted 4.3 for Phase 2 for the HVAC, but that did not include Phase 1 HVAC and isn't the Phase 1 HVAC cost a little over a million? So, do I now have the most recent numbers?

Dr. Brewer: No, you don't.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay.

Dr. Brewer: Between the two, we are covered for the higher amount in what we estimated in our need for borrowing which was the conservative thing to do.

Dr. Donahue: The second question. Ed, you mentioned that if we go with geothermal, there is a chance for some grant dollars. Can you expand on that a little bit and are we really going to do that, I mean saying that there is a chance for a grant isn't like applying for a grant, isn't like getting a grant. I know we can't predict if we're going to get it, but if we go with geothermal, is there a plan in place to at least apply for some of the grant funding?

Bruce Bechtel: I can't answer if there's a plan in place for the grants, but I can tell you that on a recent project that we were involved with, Bucks County Community College, there was a team that got together that put an application together for a grant. It was for a geothermal and wind. That's the most recent example I have. The amount that they were looking to get was about \$100,000. Unfortunately, I just found out, that was submitted over the summer, that the grant program ran out of money at the state. So, they were offering some low interest loans, but the big picture intent is that that grant money is available for systems like ground source heat pumps and others.

Dr. Donahue: So the issue then is that there may be grant money available and at this point, we don't have a plan in place to do it, but if it is available we would develop that plan.

Dr. Brewer: We would do that, but I wouldn't . . .

Dr. Donahue: Count on it.

Dr. Brewer: . . . expect it to be a substantial amount.

Mr. Consalo: [Not audible].

Dr. Donahue: Thanks.

Mr. Stover: I heard some different numbers as far as life expectancy for the geothermal. Originally, you said 50 years life expectancy and then I heard 20 years, which would it be?

Chuck Johnson: The 50 years applies to the piping system, the wells that are out underneath the parking lots and all this. It's only 50 years because they haven't been in existence more than that. They're going to last forever.

Mr. Stover: Okay, if we stay with unit ventilators, do you have a guess for life expectancy of that system because we'd have to . . .

Chuck Johnson: 20 years.

Mr. Stover: 20 years.

Chuck Johnson: Well, now, here again. The heat pumps that we put in are going to be 20 year units, so part of the heat pump system is going to also have to be replaced. That's where you were hearing two different numbers. The big cost item on a geothermal is the well and all that. You have to realize, this replaces all the boilers, all the chillers. This is your energy source out there. I don't know, Ed, you've taken good care of those boilers, but there's maintenance costs now, replacement and all that kind of stuff and it's pretty expensive.

Mr. Consalo: We do save. We save on the boiler repair. We have to open up the boilers every two years and get them inspected. We have about 60%-70% energy efficient on the boilers. Right now, when we run in the summertime months, we have to run each one of those boilers all summer, because we use with the . . .

Chuck Johnson: Humidity control?

Mr. Consalo: Humidity savings. We also run glycol on there in there at the present time which actually makes motors run harder and gives you more, with the glycol it keeps it from freezing. There is a lot of energy savings, there is a lot of maintenance savings. One of the things with the heat pumps is you can build a heat pump in one day, rebuild a heat pump it's about \$300 to rebuild a heat pump. The problem why we had to get rid of them at the high school was some of the heat pumps, we couldn't get to them. It took two days to get to it to take them down and took a day to rebuild and two days to put it back up. So, that part, I'm not a fan of heat pumps, but if we have accessibility where I can pull it out in one day and build it and put it right back in, you're looking at \$300 to rebuild a heat pump. That's the only moving mechanism that you have in the unit. The other thing you have with a unit ventilator, you have cold air coming in from the outside to give it fresh air. With this system, you have tempered air coming in that comes in through a plate and comes on through that way, so when the units are off in the winter months, you hear people saying, well there is cold air coming through there, well, by law we have to have fresh air coming in – so much CSM for each classroom. With the geothermal, you would have tempered air coming through in so it won't be as cold.

Male Voice: So, the system in the high school that we have now compares the closest to which one of these?

Male Voice: Number 1, right?

Mr. Consalo: Neither one. Well, we have boilers at the high school. We took out the water source heat pumps there and we put in what they call variable speed units in. We did that because we had room in the halls to take out where the heat pumps were. We can't do that system in the middle school because we

don't have the room in the halls to put them in as we did in the high school. It's the variable speed units that we have at the high school.

Male Voice: Are the boiler and the chillers that are there now, are those the original from when we built in 1965?

Mr. Consalo: Correct. The boilers are, the chillers aren't.

Male Voice: They lasted 50 years.

Mr. Consalo: Yes, we rebuilt them when we did the renovations in 1997, they were rebuilt, which is good. They are good boilers. They are the Cleveland Book boilers. They are the old antiques that last forever, but the problem is now the boilers we have, once we do Phase 2, we'll have to replace the boilers with something that's going to handle the whole load. The chillers are the same way. The chillers, we have to get something a little bigger to operate the chillers or add another chiller, but as I said, those chillers have been a problem child since Day 1. I average about 4 to 5 fan motors every year when we start them up. Now, they're talking about even the compressor is starting to go on one of them, so they haven't been the best chillers in the world. Normally, I can keep a chiller for 20-30 years and not have any problems with it, but we have to replace both of those no matter what we do, because it's not going to be big enough for Phase 2.

Mr. Gräb: Quick question, here. I picked up during the conversation this evening, but a switch from unit ventilators to the geothermal heat pump is going to have a tendency to cut down the noise in the classroom and consequently increase the educational environment in that classroom and, therefore, increase the opportunity for learning in that classroom, could you put a dollar amount on that?

Dr. Brewer: Actually, Mr. President, I was hoping that Sue could comment on that. I know she has a strong feeling about that.

Sue King: I do understand the difference in cost and that you have to look at that very carefully, but having spent time in those classrooms with the current unit ventilators as a teacher and now in classrooms observing, you really cannot appreciate how noisy it is in those classrooms with the unit ventilators. I literally, students on different sides of the classroom cannot hear each other speak when they are in the class. People strain their voices, the teachers do, to try and be heard. It really is a very negative educational environment that I begged Ed, please get these unit ventilators out. I know, and I agree, and I thank Mr. Gräb for his comment. I don't know that you can put a price tag on that, but to me, if you have the opportunity to switch to a system that both is environmentally friendly, which I agree with being the driver of a Prius, and also increases the atmosphere of the education that goes on in the classrooms, I really think is something we should consider strongly. I don't see, other than the investment of

cost, which again, I know is something you have to consider very seriously, I don't see a downside from the facility standpoint or the educational standpoint of that system.

Mrs. Sheffey: Can I then ask, there's Page 3 again of your report, bullet point number 3, it says, "the excessive existing noise generated by the older units cannot be lessened." I appreciate that, but it does say that with new equipment and systems, this problem would be able to be addressed. I'm assuming that when we put in new unit ventilators, we won't have this noise problem.

Chuck Johnson: No, this is if you put in a new heat pump system with overheads. Page 5 are you looking at?

Mrs. Sheffey: Yes. So, bullet 3, Page 3, bullet 3. So, when it says with new equipment and systems, this problem would be able to be addressed, you're not talking about new unit ventilators.

Chuck Johnson: We are, because the unit ventilators are going to be 20 years old at Phase 2 when they would go in, we were going to put in new unit ventilators. Yes, we can address the noise, but not completely.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay, so new unit ventilators will be better, but . . .

Chuck Johnson: Here again, the way we do that is we'd have to oversize the unit and run it at lower capacity to make it less noisy. You're still going to have the air blowing right on the students in the first three or four seats and you're going to have those drafty problems.

Mrs. Sheffey: Okay.

Chuck Johnson: But, we will, yes, we will lessen – I went in there and I heard Ed say about the noise and I said, "alright, I've heard this before." I went down and I just couldn't believe it. It was just . . .

Mrs. Sheffey: The new unit ventilators would help with the noise?

Chuck Johnson: We would improve it, yes, but we won't eliminate it.

Dr. Cronin: I am not familiar with a geothermal system in terms of the noise, are they silent or are they just much quieter.

Chuck Johnson: What you hear now here is what you're going to hear.

Female Voice: This is geothermal?

Female Voice: No, but it would be like this.



Chuck Johnson: Right here what you're hearing today. This isn't geothermal, but it's, I don't think it is, but it's the distribution system that going to be identical to that. The unit is going to be outside of the occupied space, so it's not going to be inside the occupied space and this is what you're going to have. It's similar to a central system.

Mr. Morelli: You talk about the wells. You said 200 wells you have to drill?

Chuck Johnson: Roughly.

Mr. Morelli: Could talk about how you drill them, where you're planning on putting them and it sounds like they may not need periodic maintenance, but what could happen if they would? Where are your plans to put 200 wells and how deep are they too?

Chuck Johnson: 300 feet. Here again . . .

Mr. Morelli: Are they like a couple feet apart from each other?

Chuck Johnson: 20 feet apart is the spacing that's required. You can go to 18 feet, but I am an advocate of getting it to the 20 feet and then you don't have to worry about it. Getting 200 wells, there are three places I'm looking at, I don't know where we're going to be able to do that.

Mr. Morelli: Where are those three places?

Chuck Johnson: One is in front . . .

Mr. Morelli: We have a campus map right over there. Where is your tentative plan?

Female Voice: And how deep did he say?

Dr. Cronin: And what's the history, do we have a history of sink holes? Where are they? Where were they?

Mr. Consalo: Sink holes?

Dr. Cronin: Yes, where were our sink holes.

Mr. Consalo: Well, we haven't had any sink holes around the middle school. We had sink holes around the high schools and most of the sink holes were due to the storm drains that were put in. We had a couple of sink holes in the [not audible] that we just did. [Not audible]. As far as some of the sink holes, we haven't really had a lot.

Dr. Cronin: We haven't been messing with a lot of the infrastructure either.

Mr. Consalo: We're in a limestone area. There is no way of getting around it. If you look at the survey around here, it's right through this area and that's what causes sink holes. A limestone will sit here, a big large piece of limestone will sit here and the water will run around and work it's way through. With drilling the wells, you actually drill through the limestone in that area. They will be looking at maybe 3 or 4 different areas they would do it. Some in the front on one corner, some in the front of the building on the other side, some in the back of the building. It wouldn't be all just one location just spread out. They would spread them out through different areas. We don't know how many it's going to be until we actually do the process and we didn't want to go into a lot of work in doing that until we had the blessing which way to go. They would come in and the first thing they would do, we would look at maybe 4 areas where we are going to do it and they would do a drilling test which would be on that area. They would drill down, see how it's going to be, maybe Bruce can say a little more, and drill through that area, see what it's going to be like and if that is an ideal area to put the well. If not, we will move to another location.

Bruce Bechtel: The answer to the question is we really haven't looked an investigated thoroughly where we're going to be putting the wells yet. We're working with Hayes Large on that and that would have been following the approval of the ground source heat pump system. In this particular case there will probably be several locations, but when we do these projects, they can be organized in a grid over an open field or we have done them under parking lots and drives. Ed has a preference not to have any of that done under drives, but we look for appropriate locations and we're going to have to coordinate them with Hayes Large. Also, like Ed had mentioned, we do need to do some conductivity testing and that will help us gauge . . .

Chuck Johnson: Number of wells required.

Bruce Bechtel: How deep and number of wells, so there is some investigation work that needs to be done.

Mr. Consalo: To give you an idea of what geothermal is, it's actually the cold water from the ground, bring it up through the pipes, and go through the system. You don't have to use a chiller to chill the water down. What the chiller does is it chills the water down to the temperature of 50 degrees and then it goes through that way. This is nothing new. I lived in Florida 30 years ago, they were doing it back then. They use heat pumps in that area. It's just that they improved it so much since and just about every new building, if they could afford it, they go with geothermal. I did some research on it for schools that have done it and all the people that have my job in there, they tell me this is the only way to go. When they first started, I mentioned heat pumps and I said I'm not putting heat pumps

in here and they convinced me to change my thoughts about that. If I had any idea that it wouldn't work, I wouldn't be recommending it, I'd say let's stay with the unit ventilators, but I feel that this is the way of the future for us to do it. The nice thing about it, in 2 or 3 years if they come up with something better on the geothermal, we still could put that in. It's not going to affect anything, except for the units that we have put in, but it's still a water source pump that we're going to put in on the units that we're putting in now.

Male Board Member: Is there a chance you can't configure a drilling field to get 200 pumps? I mean, that's 1,600 square feet if you get just a square.

Chuck Johnson: There's always that chance.

Mr. Consalo: The last resort is I can use the athletic fields. Let me explain that to you. You drill the athletic fields and then you put the tops all back in and it's no difference to the athletic fields. It would be a disruption until you get them drilled. Sam is not here and he doesn't want to hear that, but that would be the last resort and that would be my last resort that I would want to do.

Male Board Member: So, it's not a potential issue that we, and we need to make sure this is square, because we don't want to make a decision here today and then come four or five years from now we go to Phase 2 and we don't have the capacity to drill the wells we need to drill.

Mr. Consalo: We will have that.

Chuck Johnson: The testing that we're going to do, the thermal conductivity will also be a geological testing and if we run into something like a big cavity and it won't work, the flag is going to go up and we're going to have to change.

Male Board Member: When will that be done?

Chuck Johnson: Well, we didn't want to commit that until you said, yes, let's try it. As soon as we can, we need that testing done.

Male Board Member: Two things to clarify. So, if we make a decision tonight that we think geothermal is the way to go, that the payback will be appropriate, then you would put that type of testing into play so before any firm building is made or done, we've got that information available.

Chuck Johnson: Correct.

Mr. Consalo: That would be the next step.

Male Board Member: The last comment I have is, of this 6.7 million dollar figure, you made the initial comment that it's really frontloaded in costs, so the drilling,

the piping is going to last 50 years. What percentage of that 6.7 million is construction cost relative to the hardware that we're going to need in the building? Where I'm going is, if we have to replace this in 18 years trying to think ahead for future generations, it seems to me it would be much less expensive to replace the system in 18 years if we're just replacing that part that's a minor part of this. Is that correct or not? So, how much of the system, of the 6.7 million, how much of that is the drilling, installation of your drainage fields, and how much of it is actual pipes and things in our buildings?

Chuck Johnson: I would say a good price for the wells is 6,000-7,000 dollars depending on what we find and we need.

Mr. Consalo: You're looking at roughly the difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 is your piping and your well drilling is pretty much what you're looking at. So, if you went through it again, the only thing you would have to replace if you went through that way would be your heat pumps – your unit heat pumps that are in there.

Male Board Member: Okay. That's my question.

Mr. Consalo: They are right in the closet. You pull them out and you put one in.

Male Board Member: So, the [not audible] cost down the road would be pretty similar.

Mr. Consalo: Correct.

Male Board Member: Okay.

Mr. Consalo: We can rebuild the heat pumps. We have done that. We pull the heat pump out, send it away, have it rebuilt within a day, and bring it back and put it in. I think to rebuild the heat pumps at the high school was around \$300-\$400 to do it. But the problem was, we couldn't get to it. This way, if we can get to it and pull it out . . .

Mr. Morelli: These are totally closed systems, we're not going to drill holes and cause more sink holes. This is closed system. Can you talk about these maintenance closets? Each room has it's own maintenance closet and what's that going to do to existing space and how's it going to affect construction? Does every room need to have it's own maintenance closet and what are the sizes of these things?

Mr. Consalo: I believe he said the unit was 30 inches, I can't remember off hand. You would have a closet, I think it was 3 foot by 3 foot roughly that was in. What we could do with that, if you look at the middle school, you have an area in each classroom that has countertops. We would take them to one corner, build it out

of metal studs, dry wall, cut a door open on the outside, and that's what the construction is. They are not really losing classroom space, you would lose space that you had for shelving and then the door would be on the outside. As far as the locker space that you need, we already figured out that we can replace that in the construction for more locker space so we won't be losing any locker space. There is some price, that's part of the price to change those rooms. We looked at some existing closets and the way they were they were going to be tight, so we figured we would build one ourselves just by metal studs and drywall and insulate it so it wouldn't make noise in there. So, there is some cost to do that. It has already been figured out.

Mrs. Chabal: Is it an oversimplification if you're comparing the new water source heat pump and the geothermal heat pump system to say really it's where your water is coming from? Am I understanding that the difference really between the 6.7 and the 6.0 is the well digging and the pumping to get it out of the earth and into the systems. I realize that there are differences in the mechanicals between the two.

Chuck Johnson: Since we don't have the wells now in that regular heat pump system, we have to add a cooling tower to get rid of some of the excess cooling, we have to add boilers to add heat in extreme weather conditions, so a heat pump system can be a [not audible] what they've done for many many years, but it uses these other devices to help it along.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay.

Chuck Johnson: It's efficient.

Male Board Member: It's not in the ground at all.

Mrs. Chabal: Oh, I understand that it's not in the ground. I guess my point is that as I'm listening to these two heat pump scenario systems, what I'm hearing is that you have some front loaded costs in being able to drill and see whether or not we can get in to the proper geothermic areas to tap the water, to bring it up and all the piping and all that comes with that in addition to how it's . . .

Chuck Johnson: We're not using the ground water. We're not bringing the water up.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay.

Chuck Johnson: We're filling the pipes with water . . .

Mrs. Chabal: And using that to cool them.

Chuck Johnson: We [not audible] in the pipe in the wells so it's going to be a solid thing and what we do is we transfer the heat in the surrounding water that we're pumping up and down.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay. Got it.

Chuck Johnson: We're not using any ground water. Now, there is a heat pump system that does use ground water, that's an open system.

Mrs. Chabal: But this is like Chris said, this is a closed system. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Consalo: Just to give you an idea, I did a rough calculation, just to drill a well is 1.4 million.

Male Board Member: So that's the difference in the cost. That's what I was trying to clarify.

Mr. Consalo: That's the cost that you're going to pay once. You'll never pay it again because those wells, once they're in, they're in, they just loop it through.

Dr. Cronin: I have a question, but I guess it's probably more of a comment because I doubt that there's an answer, but theoretically, what I'm thinking in my mind is if we went with Option 1 and the payback is only 13 or so years, rather than having wells that last 50 years sounds great, but at the same time I'm thinking, maybe in 20 years there is going to be a better way to do something and if we do something that's the least expensive, we're also more able to position to take advantage of newer technologies as it comes, plus have the cost savings. That's just what I'm going through in my head. I'm trying to weight the pros and cons, but one thing Chuck, I think you said it, Scenario 1 you said was environmentally unfriendly?

Chuck Johnson: I wouldn't say it's environmentally – well, it's environmentally unfriendly in the classroom.

Dr. Cronin: Okay, gotcha.

Chuck Johnson: Because of the noise and the drafts.

Dr. Cronin: The noise, got it. I was thinking not like massive pollution or anything. Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

Dr. Parrish: Any comments, questions?

Mr. Stover: It's a difficult issue, because we have to get our heads wrapped around the return on investment. I keep going back to what we did in the high

school and because of prices going up when we built the high school, we ended up going with a very substandard system that cost us a ton of money in the long run, and since then we've been very diligent to put in systems that get us the best return on investment and give us the best expectation of being able to last the longest. I think, Mr. Gräb, you raise a great point about putting a dollar on the quality of the value of the classroom without the noise. I can't classify that from a dollar standpoint, but it's certainly extremely important. So, where I'm coming down on this is I've got to be comfortable with what Ed's telling me that this is going to be the return that we're going to get. If that's the case, then I come back to my original thinking when we were in the General Services committee meeting that Scenario 2, it's a little bit more up front, but down the road we shouldn't have to touch this thing. That goes a long way with me.

Dr. Parrish: Is it safe to say that beyond that 18.9 years, these cost savings will continue because it's so much cheaper to operate?

Chuck Johnson: You're not burning gas, you're not burning electricity, you're getting it free from the earth.

Dr. Parrish: So I think then what you need from us tonight is some direction if the Board is comfortable making that decision tonight and giving you direction, is that correct?

Dr. Brewer: Actually, Brian and I talked about that, because back on November 9 you did approve the retention of the Schrader Group to design and prepare construction documents other than this HVAC and so what we would like to do, we actually prepared an oral motion for you. Brian, I don't know if you should read that or if I can go ahead and read it, but what would happen is, what we would read to you, you would vote up or down for us to go ahead and work with the Schrader Group to bring this to fruition to get it to the bid process.

Brian Jackson: Why don't I take a crack at the motion and it will sort of incorporate what we've talked about.

On November 9, the Board approved the retention of Schrader Group to design and prepare construction documents for bidding and release for certain projects related to the Hershey Middle School Phase 1 portion of the Master Plan. Based upon further discussions at the November 23 public General Services Committee meeting and here tonight, further clarifications to the scope of retention are recommended and specifically that Schrader Group be authorized to design and prepare construction documents in conjunction with a new mechanical system for the Hershey Middle School which would be

an earth coupled geothermal water source heat pump system. Upon approval of this motion, the District Solicitor would prepare the appropriate documentation as an addendum to the existing agreement.

Dr. Parrish: Can I have a motion on that?

Dr. Brewer: That would be the motion.

Brian Jackson: That is the motion. Mr. Gräb, I believe it comes with the recommendation of General Services?

Mr. Gräb: That is correct. Can Brian make the motion?

Dr. Parrish: I was going to say, can Brian make that motion?

Brian Jackson: No, that would be the motion that the Administration and General Services, I'm just simply [tape ends].

Male Voice: . . . design a system to support geothermal energy when we get to Phase 2, if we get to Phase 2.

Female Voice: Well, no for Phase 1.

Male Voice: Phase 1, so we're prepared for Phase 2. We're voting for Scenario 2.

Mr. Rineer: Can I ask who was the second on that?

Mrs. Chabal: I was.

Mr. Rineer: Okay.

Dr. Cronin: I just wanted to, I'm still wrapping my head around it. Can we focus on the pros and cons of each rather than just saying yay or nay? I mean, I'm seeing pros and cons of each, but I don't have the full sense of what really would be the most cost effective and far sighted. I keep looking at Number 1, it says it's worth maintaining. What am I missing here? So, I just want to get a better handle, because a 13 year payback sounds really good rather than a 20 year payback to me. Hearing that the newer systems would be quieter, I'm less concerned about the environment if it would be quieter with the newer system which makes sense and more efficient. I just don't want to waste replacing something if we can still get some longevity, some reasonable longevity out of it and not poke holes everywhere. There are a lot of unknown in the geothermal in my mind.



Dr. Parrish: What I've got from this discussion, correct me if I'm wrong, because this is the first time we've discussed this and read the reports, but first of all we're looking at an additional 6 years payback. We look at 13 versus 19. We're looking on the positive side, a better learning environment, number 2. Number 3, we're looking at a more green system, if you will, more environmental friendly system. I think the most important thing for me is once we get to that 19 year point, again, it doesn't take into consideration future technology, but at this point, the savings that we would realize from the system would continue on an annual basis. So, even though it may take 19 years to break even, at 25 years, we may have picked up a lot of money over that 6 year period. I certainly respect members of our General Services committee and after we've discussed this would certainly defer to their recommendation.

Male Board Member: One point for what it's worth. We changed to geothermal in our house about 15 years ago and it's been fantastic. It's really quiet and I have a hybrid car too.

Dr. Parrish: Any other discussion, comments? Everybody comfortable voting on this motion? If so, Mr. Rineer.

Mr. Rineer: Excuse me, is this a roll call vote or an up and down?

Dr. Parrish: I think is going to be a roll call vote.

Dr. Cronin: So, we're just saying yes or no on this, but it's not saying that we're – I mean we're obviously in favor of one option.

Male Board Member: What we're authorizing is a design . . .

Dr. Cronin: Not that we want them to do anything.

Female Board Member: I think if it doesn't pass for geothermal, then we're going to have make a separate motion.

Male Board Member: We're going to have to make a decision.

Male Board Member: We're voting design for geothermal, not just a general . . .

Dr. Parrish: It's a design Phase 1, they have to design it so that it will accommodate one of these two systems, because we can't support Phase 2 if we get there. Mr. Rineer.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Cronin – No

Gräb – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Sheffey – No

Donahue – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Stover - Yes

7 Yes, 2 No

## **MOTION CARRIED**

Dr. Parrish: Thank you. That was some good discussion.

Dr. Brewer: The next discussion is related to the District Master Plan. Again, in November, you approved the retention of Hayes Large for the construction documents to prepare for bid related to the bus corrals and the music room and so on. What required further discussion was the idea of the safety corridor versus the emergency corridor. If you'll recall the safety corridor will be used for buses and it went through our property and out onto Cocoa between the Library and the Antique Barn. The emergency corridor on the other hand, which is designed just for emergency, not for use of buses at all, would go directly through the Library parking lot and out and that would be an exit and entry. I'm not sure where you are in pursuing the original safety corridor which was, as we discussed back in July to go along the side of the Library parking lot and using their entrance/exit for ours. I did give Jim Nagley a heads up that we would be discussing that publicly tonight because I didn't want our Friends at the Library to feel like we were sandbagging them in any way, that we were going to have a discussion about this tonight. So that's one thing that we're going to discuss.

Then, interrelated to that, is the idea of the small faculty parking lot, because if you'll recall the main high school parking lot right now has 378 spaces in it. By putting in the bus corral where that parking lot is, we will lose 94 of those 378 spaces. So, what remains in the high school parking lot is 284 spaces. The proposed faculty parking area which would be now not along 322, which was a larger parking area, but right beside the building as you're facing the building to the far left would be about 32 spaces. The other thing you asked us to look at is, what if we limited student parking? Mr. Murphy and I talked about that today in relation to the figures that I just gave you that Mr. Shrift can certainly elaborate upon, but I said to Mr. Murphy based on the discussion we had during General Services, what if we would eliminate sophomores being allowed to drive to school? How would that impact on these numbers? He said, well at the beginning of the year there's less sophomores, then in the middle, it climbs to the end of the year when you have the most. So, for example, right here, right now at the beginning of the year, we had 50 sophomores that asked for parking spots and now we're up to 65. We have 15 more. So, certainly by the end of the year we'll have more than 65. A consideration in relationship to parking is also whether or not, we should simply eliminate sophomores being allowed to drive to school. Those interrelated topics are where we're asking for authorization to move forward to drawing ready designs which is not a part of the Hayes Large contract yet. Can you describe that a little bit more, Mr. Shrift?

Mr. Shrift: Sure. Good evening. Again, to go back with the handout now in front of you. I think this is a document that most of you have seen before, maybe with the exception of the two new Board members that we have tonight. Originally when we looked at the safety corridor, we looked at using a portion of the Library parking lot. We have brought that back still as a valid option, because of the essentially, after exploring using our own right of way onto Cocoa Avenue, it became fairly evident that there were going to be some approval issues and ultimately resulting in functional issues for the District. I mentioned, I think a couple weeks ago, that we do have an open channel. The Township has confirmed that that open channel is going to remain, which then makes us design a culvert much like the one that exists at the Library. After our discussion a couple weeks ago, I think it was deemed that we probably don't want to go that direction. We don't want to go that route, simply because of some of the limitation that are going to be placed on the use and we have talked to PennDOT although we've not gotten official answers, we've stated previously that a left hand turn out of the school site onto Cocoa Avenue will probably be prohibited. PennDOT, although no formal message indicated that probably would be very likely. That really then opened up the idea, if we really wanted to keep talking about the safety corridor, really the only other option, the only other route for that would be what we originally had shown and that is circumventing around the existing Library parking lot joining back to right at the culvert and exiting through the existing Library entrance onto Cocoa Avenue. At that point then, we have no restrictions on turning left or right and I think for Mr. Yarian, that would be the preferred option strictly in terms of turning movements.

That's where we're at with the safety corridor. Again, when we talk about just the emergency corridor, no buses. No buses involved at all, but still having a secondary egress from the campus would be to provide a short connector again from our rear driveway to the Library driveway and using it for emergency purposes only.

Mrs. Chabal: On that particular comment you just made on the emergency corridor itself, so the short connector would go through the Library parking lot itself?

Mr. Shrift: That's correct.

Mrs. Chabal: And it would be used by both the Library and the School District in the event of emergency, which would be agreed upon by both parties what that meant and then, but it would either barricaded or at some level obvious to folks that this is not an available route during a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Shrift: Correct. Whether it be through a gate or an emergency bollard that can be removed by emergency officials.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Donahue: I had a couple questions. First, just to reiterate what you said, so I make sure I understand the route that's coming by the Antique store is too close to 322 to make a left turn so that's off the table. What sort of approvals from the Township, if any, would we need for what I'll call the original bus safety corridor which goes through the exit of the Library?

Mr. Shrift: We would work through with the Township Supervisors on that because they control the Library property. We simply would work through as part of our land development approvals with the Township.

Dr. Donahue: I guess my other question is for Ed, and I think you've answer it in the past, but it's been a while so I want to make sure I'm clear on it, you and perhaps Mr. Yarian, your estimate is that you can safely operate the bus corral without the so-called bus safety exit onto Cocoa, correct?

Dr. Brewer: That might be for Mr. Yarian.

Mr. Yarian: Yes and no. We can operate the bus corral safely, however, if we are going to have students parking in the back, then I have a concern with taking the buses all the way back through there to get to that exit if we're going to have students parking in that very back parking lot over by the Library, because then we're going to mixing the students with the buses again.

Dr. Donahue: Would we need students parking there if we restricted the sophomores from getting permits?

Dr. Brewer: We don't think we would, but one of the points before we give up on the small faculty parking lot – we do have issues with any visitors that come to the high school finding a place to park. It would allow enough space for faculty, especially if we don't have the sophomores driving, but we could use more space.

Dr. Donahue: So, let me summarize that so I understand. If we didn't give parking passes to sophomores, we could use that parking place behind the Library for visitors or faculty, is that correct?

Dr. Brewer: No, we would allow the kids to park where they are now. We wouldn't need as many spaces, because we wouldn't allow the sophomores to park, but we still could use, my view is that we should at least go to a drawing, which would not be very expensive for us do and go to bid as an alternate bid to look at the small faculty parking lot which could then also be a visitor parking lot.

Dr. Donahue: And where would that be?

Dr. Brewer: Right beside the school.

Mr. Consalo: Right on Homestead.

Dr. Cronin: Where do the teachers park right now?

Dr. Brewer: They park where the kids do, they park right in the front.

Dr. Cronin: So, is the front reserved partial for visitors right now and partial for teachers?

Dr. Brewer: Yes, and there's very few left for visitors.

Mr. Consalo: There are 4 visitor parking spaces.

Dr. Cronin: Here is something to think about. I think limited sophomores is a great thing to have on the table, but then I think if you could then very easily take the next step because, for example, my son's a sophomore, he's knows he's not driving. It's a lot easier for him to still not drive as a junior unless he gets the application approved. I would love to say sophomores can't drive and a lot of kids don't turn 16, or you have to turn 16 and then six months later get your driver's license, so it's definitely the older part of the class that won't get to drive as sophomores. But, then to say as juniors, you have to apply and have a good reason and not just tick them off so we, in essence, can control the number of drivers in an evolutionary phase, so that by the time the sophomores become juniors they're not all driving and then we don't need to have all this construction possibly. Just as an idea, because once again, I really think it's not a right but a privilege for these kids to drive.

Dr. Brewer: Related to that, Mr. Shrift, what do you estimate the small faculty parking would cost?

Mr. Shrift: I think it was about \$130,000 in round numbers for the small space and that includes paving and curbing and lighting, landscaping, erosion control, storm water management, so it's a fairly inclusive cost.

Dr. Brewer: My view is that we could consider what you're saying and we'd have to, I'm sure Dave has some concerns about that, but if we at least authorize going to drawings so that we have the drawings, we saw how the bids came in, we had it if we needed it, that's what you would be authorizing tonight.

Mr. Consalo: By doing an alternative bid, you're not locked into that. What you do is an alternate bid, you can accept it or deny it. We can bid the other part, have that as an alternate bid, which we did with the fields. The fields came in a lot lower than we had, or we can come back and say the committee says no, they still don't want to do that. But, at least it would give you an option to see how much it is going to cost. Who knows? It could come in a lot more and you can

say now, but an alternate bid gives you an option to say yes or no without destroying everything going out to bids again. That's an advantage of that. One of the questions about the buses, if you came out on Cocoa, you would relieve about 70% of Areeba traffic because of the buses in the morning. You also relieve some Homestead traffic because the buses would be going out that way. That is something else you look at.

Dr. Brewer: But related to what Dr. Cronin was saying, Dave what are the implications? Sophomores, the buses could accommodate 65-80 kids, but now if we didn't allow juniors. What are the possible scenarios with that?

Mr. Yarian: Well, the thing that I'm concerned about is when you eliminate a parking space, that's not one child if you look at the students going out. There are 2, 3, 4 students in a vehicle. That's my concern. If you eliminate 50 spots, it could be 200 students, that's 4 buses.

Dr. Cronin: But aren't there already spaces on the buses for these kids?

Mr. Yarian: What's that?

Dr. Cronin: Aren't there already spaces on the buses? Do the kids give up their right to ride the bus if they have a parking pass?

Mr. Yarian: They don't give it up, but I plan, for example now, I may plan 100 students on a bus knowing that 20 end of up riding. Yes, they don't give up their right. If they say tomorrow I want to ride the bus we find a spot for them, but I don't run a whole bunch of extra buses just in case they might change their mind.

Dr. Cronin: Right now what is the capacity, what is the actual filling percentage of each bus on average? Are they filled up 100%, 80%?

Mr. Yarian: Now?

Dr. Cronin: Yes.

Mr. Yarian: Now, no. Now the high school only is probably, it varies a lot, but maybe only 20%, because we have to run enough buses for high school because of time, because we run out of time and they have get back. Now, with the two tier system, then I'm looking at putting 40 to 45 students on a bus. That's two to a seat.

Dr. Cronin: Right. But in essence, it is less cars, it is greener, there's less impervious space. It's aesthetically more pleasing. I'm just looking at the big picture to avoid that parking lot, I see a lot of green things that's consistent with what we were talking about from our last proposal, so the 100,000, sure that's

significant also, but it's not as significant as all the other downsides to more parking space I guess is what I'm thinking. Thank you.

Dr. Donahue: I just want to make sure I'm clear once again. So what you're saying in general is that you'd be comfortable with not having safety corridor emptying onto Cocoa if we didn't have students parking in the parking lot behind the Library which we may not need to do if we restricted sophomores from having driving passes.

Mr. Yarian: That is correct, yes.

Dr. Donahue: Do you have a recommendation on either one of those scenarios or is it . . .

Mr. Yarian: The advantage of having a safety corridor that we could go out and turn left on Cocoa would be relieving some traffic on Areeba and Homestead.

Dr. Donahue: As I recall from reading the traffic assessment, there was a change, I forget the jargon they used in these, but there was a change in level of . . .

Male Voice: Level of Service.

Dr. Donahue: Level of service, that's it. So, there was a change of level of service which doesn't necessarily mean safety or doesn't necessarily infer safety, but very well could infer safety, but there is a change in level of service not having the exit on Cocoa versus having the exit on Cocoa – level of service at Areeba.

Mr. Shrift: Correct, yes.

Dr. Parrish: So, there's two things here. I assume we're going to have another motion to have an alternate bid prepared, which I'm fine with. The second thing, I'd like to make a comment, maybe I'm out of line, but we can't make a decision on this bus corridor tonight irregardless. It's a decision that needs to be made in conjunction with our Township Supervisors and I would maybe suggest, after talking to a good friend of mine who is very active in the Friends of the Library, the misinformation that's out there. People don't understand, I think, a lot of the issues behind this and when I sat down with her and she approached me about this, it was sort of like, I understand now, it makes more sense. Might I suggest we consider at least having a work session in which we actually invite the officers or people from the Friends of the Library, perhaps a couple of our Supervisors where we can actually discuss this openly with the facts on the table so that people aren't hearing this second, third, and fourth hand before we move forward on any decision about how to pursue that.

Dr. Brewer: Dr. Parrish, what we'd have to do is run that by the Board of Supervisors, because the last correspondence they had with us was that we were to meet with them and not anybody associated with the Library, but I do think it's a good idea that all the stakeholders be in the room.

Dr. Parrish: I think at some point we need to do that, because the level of misinformation that got out there about this was dramatic. In fact, the person who approached me said, do me a favor – vote against any of this bus corridor. But, I said, well, if you sit down and listen to the facts behind it and then give me your impression and it was really 180 degrees when they heard the details and the facts, so I think we really need to get a forum together in one way, shape, or form where we can discuss this with the people who have a vested interest so that the facts are on the table.

Dr. Brewer: I think that that would be a healthy thing to do as well. I agree that we don't even have the authority to make the decision. However, we do have to draw this thing and know how much it's going to cost. That's all you'd be doing tonight. So, if we're saying that the safety corridor which went between the Library and the Antique Barn is going to be cost prohibitive, it's going to be a long shot, then we're back to asking for authorization for either just an emergency corridor which is a very inexpensive solution for them to draw or do you want us to have Hayes Large continue to do the concept of the drawing through the Library.

Female Voice: Around the Library.

Dr. Brewer: Around the Library.

Dr. Donahue: Let me make sure I'm clear. We can vote for drawings on either one of those options, correct?

Male Voice: Or both.

Dr. Brewer: In regard to the drawings, and you've already been pretty far down the road on the first option anyhow, so that's not a huge cost to us to just authorize that scope.

Dr. Parrish: Frankly, from my standpoint, it seems that, as you said, we're really pretty far down the road, we've got a pretty good idea if we did option 1 which is the bypass of the museum parking lot. Option 2 really won't have any impact on our busing system at all, is that something we really need to know now? Is that something that, is that a decision we really need to make today based on the safety corridor, because I think if we would think that option 1 was the way to go, as time moves on, then option 2 is sort of moot.



Dr. Brewer: Except that Hayes Large is preparing the concepts and the drawings to go out to bid. This is something that they would have to draw if we're going to get it done.

Mr. Shrift: If I could make a suggestion. Really, the short emergency connection to the Library is minimal effort, very little grading associated with it, very little, if any, storm water management. What might be of benefit is to take the safety corridor through the Library and take that to the next level and look at it in terms of an earth work, a grading point of view, and see what the true impact of that corridor is. I think that might, if nothing else would be good conversation and a good document to have for a joint meeting.

Dr. Parrish: Certainly if we authorize this. I think we have to realize that this is something that we really need to discuss with our colleagues and the Board of Supervisors and I don't want to step on their toes, I don't want to overreach what we can do.

Mr. Shrift: But we have to have something solid to show them which is . . . .

Dr. Parrish: But that would be the point, but I want them to understand that and I want that to be reflected in the meeting notes that. . .

Dr. Brewer: I'm hoping that because of the conversation that I had with Mr. Nagley, who in turn was going to talk to the Board of Supervisors, I said, we're going to discuss this tonight.

Dr. Parrish: Okay.

Mr. Morelli: I just had a comment. First of all, I thought this Cocoa pass was off the Board 100% along with the other road over by the Antique Barn. I don't know if I could support even going forward with a preliminary drawing without some sort of easement agreement, because without that easement agreement, you don't know where it's at, so you can't create a drawing with earth sketches and stuff like that with the detail you really need if you don't know exactly where that easement is. That's quite a road there. If you move it 50 feet left or right that could drastically change your drawings and obviously waste a lot of money. I have no idea what these preliminary drawings cost, but I certainly don't want you drawing 3 of them. I'd like to get a good first preliminary drawing before you go into final drawing. So, I would recommend that we find out, number 1, we should talk to the Township, but number 2, do we even entertain drawings without figuring out the easement, because it's not our property.

Male Voice: If I could make a clarification. Right now, there is no easement that exists through the Library, so it would be determined by the routing of the driveway. So, the easement would follow the driveway. Once we got that driveway location pinned down and did the earth work to know whether we had to

push it right or left to avoid anything, then the easement would simply follow ahead. It's not where the easement's in place and we have to make sure we engineer around it, we need to engineer it and then have the easement follow suit.

Mr. Morelli: Who approves the easement, is it the Township?

Male Voice: That would be the Supervisors.

Mr. Morelli: You're going to draw where you'd like it and probably have the least impact and probably, from an engineering standpoint, the best place, but unless they approve it, or give you a pretty good idea that they're going to approve it, you're wasting your time and money, because, like I said, they may not want you going there. They might want you going 50 or 100 feet left or right.

Male Voice: Chris, I sort of agree with you. I think in some ways we need to agree on this conceptually with the Supervisors, because I don't think – it's a 50/50 chance whether or not this would ever be approved anyway. I think conceptually, just conceptually, it would be nice to know where they stand and make some decisions on this.

Male Voice: I'm a little concerned it will slow down the whole process though.

Female Voice: But this would be an alternate bid, so we're not saying stop everything else, correct?

Male Voice: No.

Female Voice: We wouldn't stop anything else. I'm not saying we shouldn't do this. I actually think this is a great idea, but I'm not prepared to vote tonight one way or the other about even drawings until we've had conversations with the Board of Supervisors.

Dr. Cronin: And just a quick comment, Bill. Maybe, I'm too simplistic, but when I look at this, this is conceptually a good starting point to say if we want to want to have that dialogue.

Dr. Parrish: Conceptually, what we want to do.

Dr. Cronin: And then find out if any of these are viable to take the next step.

Dr. Parrish: I think you're saying the same thing I am.

Mr. Consalo: Mr. President, one thing we can do if we have to is we need to go with the bus corrals to get that done for the summer.

Dr. Parrish: Sure. Yes, that's not what we're worried about.

Mr. Consalo: What we could do is if we have to go farther along with the Library or just do the other part, we could actually do a change order into our contract that would give us some more time to work on this part where we're not pushed as much as we are with trying to get this other part done. If we have to, that would give us some more time to work with the Township, work with the Supervisors, to see if they're even interested in it, if not, we don't do it. I might be talking out of turn, tell me if I'm wrong, Dr. Brewer, but I think what we need to know now is we already have permission to go with the corrals and all that, one of the things is the parking lot in front of the high school. We would like to know if we could do that as an alternate bid. We don't have to accept that, but we have it ready to go if we want to and then let us work with the Township trying to get parts to know what we want to do for the Library to give us a little more time to work with that, because we're pushed with the other part and we need to get that part gone. We can't just hold up on there, and that will give us some time. I might give us another month or two to work with the Township, feel them out, see how they are going to go. One of the items is the one at the Antique Barn. I think . . .

Male Voice: It's cost prohibitive.

Mr. Consalo: In my opinion, it's a dead subject, we'll eliminate that part. But, I think we need to pursue it, but give us permission if you want us to pursue the Library further with the Township to meet with them and start talking to them about that and let us know. If you don't want to pursue it, then we don't pursue it. That's what we need to know now and then also about the other part of it.

Male Voice: If I might had to what Ed has already said, we have scheduled another meeting with the Township, a very informal meeting to, again, give them an update as to where we're at today as compared to where we were several months ago when we met with them. At that point, we can certainly, if the interest is here, we can certainly bring it to their attention at that time and report some feedback from them. The other thing to note is though that, if in fact we do that safety corridor, that will take land development. I think the way we're going right now is we're looking and we're hoping that in January, we'll be submitting plans for land development. So, ideally, it would be nice to have an answer to say yes or no prior to that submission. Otherwise, it could result in a separate submission, so I just wanted to put that out there.

Dr. Parrish: I don't think we're likely to have a thumbs up or thumbs down from the Supervisors by January. Irregardless. I mean, this is an issue that's not going to be solved overnight.

Dr. Donahue: I think the meeting you suggest is a good idea, but I think we should have some Board representation there, maybe John, because it's a General Services thing, isn't it? This whole thing is General Services, right?

Mr. Gräb: Depending on when the meeting is scheduled and who is assigned to the General Services committee.

Dr. Donahue: So, whomever is the Chair of the General Services committee, I think, should be at that meeting so we don't – because you're always losing stuff in translation, so we need a Board representative there at that meeting.

Male Voice: The other thing we can do, again, if this isn't going to happen, and I understand that it will take time is, we can move ahead with the rest of the project and we'll just come back, and if we have to go back and make a separate land development submittal for that corridor, then that's what we'll have to do. If we have to word it as a potential change order, we can do that. If have to put it out as a separate bid, we have that option as well.

Mr. Consalo: Even August that we have to put it out for a change order, we'll still be able to get it done, because it's not going hold up the school. It would be nice for Mr. Yarian to have it done at that time, but if we have to, since you want to work with the Township, which I think we have to no matter what, it's not going to be overnight. So, we don't want to hold up the first part we want to do, but we just need to know if you want to pursue it with the Township. We can start working on that and we have some sketches to show him what it is.

Mrs. Chabal: I'd just like to ask a quick clarifying question focusing back on what we're actually hoping to accomplish this evening and that is the additional parking for our faculty. I don't recall a space, how many spaces are we talking about?

Male Voice: 32. After refining the design.

Mrs. Chabal: It's an opinion that those 32 will do two things: it would, in conjunction with eliminating our sophomore student parking and following the other suggestions as to whether or not we may ask for a reduction at the junior level, but let's just talk about the sophomore – that these 32 will be helpful, not only for faculty, but, would it strictly be faculty or would there be some opportunity for visitor parking?

Dr. Brewer: For visitor parking also.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay. So, we would garner faculty parking and visitor parking and then we would be able to go forward with the bus corral. We are going forward with the bus corral, so that would just, since we are losing some spaces in the bus corral, this new proposed parking lot would allow additional parking that

we're losing to come back onto the field, so to speak, for our faculty and visitors, is that correct?

Dr. Brewer: Yes, and I've been trying to sort through everything you've been saying because these are interrelated. If you are saying yes, you want us to pursue that we do not have sophomores driving to school, that helps us with knowing how many spaces we have.

Mrs. Chabal: Okay.

Dr. Brewer: But, if you're saying that you don't want to limit student parking and you don't want the faculty parking, but you do want the safety corridor, we're defeating our purpose. So, those interrelating things had to be discussed. You know, during the General Services meeting, I think that that committee was landing on just considering an emergency corridor, just for emergencies, nothing more, and that's where Mr. Morelli is probably thinking the whole thing was now done. But, what I heard some of you saying is, if we don't do this now, if we don't talk to the Township Supervisors about this now, it's never going to happen. I wanted to give you one last opportunity to see if you at least wanted to strike that dialogue with the Township Supervisors because you have not done that yet.

Dr. Parrish: Absolutely.

Mrs. Chabal: I'm guilty as charged, because that was something that has been weighing on my mind for a long time. One of the things that this Board has done over time and done well has been to address our issues, but also to look forward. I think that if we don't at least look forward to a corridor that would allow the buses ingress and egress, then we have limited future Boards in a way that we don't have a way to preserve. I think that we at least need to discuss it and either lay it to rest, but just to have it not brought back up since last summer is something that I wasn't willing to do, because I think it's important that we look at this and if this Board says, okay, we just want to do just the safety or none of that. I thought it was extremely important not to limit future Boards, especially as our Township grows, there is going to be more congestion, not less. Our two tier system is going to have an impact on Homestead, I certainly am an advocate of making sure that we are not limiting future restrictions to a Board for those decision making – because I believe Dr. Brewer that you're right. If we really put this to bed, it will be down. It will be down. If that's proved completely off, that's fine, but I just think it's worth the value added of a discussion.

Mr. Stover: I agree totally with that. I'd like to talk about the small parking lot in the front. I think it's integral that we at least get the bid for that and look at that. Let me just do the math here a little bit, because I don't think the loss of spaces is all that great. Mark or Ed, the 19 spaces of the middle school faculty that are parking in the high school, when we get done with everything, would those

people have adequate parking over at the middle school then or would they continue to park in the high school parking lot.

Mr. Shrift: We would still need a few people to park in the high school parking lot. We're only picking up, I think, about 15 additional spaces at the middle school, so we would still need some middle school faculty to be parking in the high school lot.

Mr. Stover: Okay. So, if I look at the 378 spaces, we lose 94, we gain 32 with the small lot. That's a net loss of 62 and then we have another 15 that we gain because of the middle school. We're talking approximately 47 net loss immediately. My question is, are we at maximum right now with our students?

Dr. Brewer: Pretty much so. If you go there on any given day, if you're not a student or a faculty member, you're not going to find a place to park. It's tight.

Mr. Stover: I think limiting the sophomores is something that we need to investigate. I think you are going to get some push back from some sophomore parents and maybe we would be able to do it to where they would have to get an approval – yes, in fact, you are in a sport. Some of the sophomores may be able to drive, but the real point of what I want to get out is that there are going to be some unintended consequences as a result of what we do. By that, I mean, kids are going to try and park in that back parking lot, they are going to try and park in the Library. They will probably park down in Memorial Field. I don't think that's a bad thing, but we just need to be prepared for the unintended consequences that are going to occur if we don't have enough spaces, but I think we need to go down that path of limiting the amount of parking lots that we build and we've got to deal with what we have. The small lot in the front, I think we should get the price on it because while the machinery will be there, it will be cheaper to do it now as opposed to doing it later and we need to think forward for the future of spaces that we're going to need.

Dr. Brewer: So, what you're saying, excuse me I want to make sure I have this clear Dr. Cronin. So, what you're saying is that we would authorize constructing two construction ready documents for the faculty. It would be an alternative bid just to see what we'd have. For the safety corridor, we're not going to authorize that yet because we need discussions with the Township. Now, my question then, Mark will that work for what you have to do?

Mr. Shrift: Yes, and if we can get discussions with the Township and we get some results of that discussion yes or no, we'll see where we're at in our planning process and if we can include it, we'll include it. If not, we'll have to create a second set of documents strictly for that corridor.

Dr. Brewer: And then finally, then I think I have my direction. I think I do hear consensus to at least pursue the sophomores, study the juniors, but at least

pursue the sophomores not parking and looking at whether or not we can have all of them not park on our property or if there can be some exceptions that we should study that.

Female Voice: Yes, I agree with that, but I just want to make sure, I think I heard you say and I'd just like Dave to confirm that if we said sophomores could not drive that he has the capacity on his buses for them? Okay, thank you.

Dr. Cronin: And I just want to take it one step further, because I think, I agree with what Chuck said, I want to take it one step further in the sense that I think the additional parking lot is almost a philosophical decision that we have to make. Do we always want to try to build and accommodate for what is definitely going to be a growing population rather than making our guidelines satisfy the limited space that we have. For example, if we just keep it the way it is and lose some, we just have to make it up by limiting the drivers. If it can be done by just limiting sophomores, great. I think, obviously, the easier way to do it is to get them as their coming in. To give someone a parking pass and then yank it, that's where you're going to have more repercussions, but as you gradually work it in, it's a lot easier for incoming freshman to know, guess what? As a sophomore, you're not going to be able to drive, etc. So, I would rather get a sense philosophically, I know how I feel that we use the space we have and allow enough parking passes and that's it and once we're out, we're done. But, philosophically, that's something that we have to decide if we're going to keep building as we get more, we're going down a path that could be never ending, or we can nip it in the bud now.

Dr. Parrish: I don't think that's what we're deciding tonight.

Dr. Cronin: No . . .

Dr. Parrish: What we're really deciding tonight is should we get the alternate bid and I think that's a no brainer. Get it, and then later on down the road we decide whether or not we exercise it. How much is the cost of an alternate bid?

Male Voice: For us, the design, you're talking a couple thousand dollars, so that's the cost. There is no cost at all from a contractor to give us a cost proposal for that alternate bid.

Mr. Consalo: We'd have to bring it back to you to approve anyway, no matter what. It has to come back to the Board to approve it. If that's a requirement for all bids.

Dr. Donahue: One last question. Can we get this meeting, is it realistic to get the meeting with the Supervisors before our next school Board meeting, which is, I believe January 7 or something?

Male Voice: January 11.

Mr. Shrift: It sounds reasonable.

Dr. Donahue: I don't mean from their perspective, because you can't control them, but is that within your schedule and you're able to do that if they're willing to meet.

Mr. Shrift: Yes, yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Gamble: I'd like to make a general comment to the benefit of the Board as a taxpayer and citizen.

Dr. Parrish: I'm sorry, sir. Make it quick, because you're out of order.

Female Voice: And he needs to be at the mic.

Dr. Parrish: Can you come to the mic to and state your name, please.

Mr. Gamble: I come to these meetings and you vote on these things and obviously the townspeople aren't aware. What I'm saying and I attend the Township meetings and the President of the Township Board mentioned that with a new Board coming in after the new year, they said things could change. I think for your knowledge setting this date for January 7 is unrealistic because the new Board won't even be in place yet and, like he said, 40% of the Board changing there could be [tape ends] . . . and to spend this money for drawings and sketches and everything else, I think you ought to take it one step at a time, focus as Dr. Cronin said on eliminating your students that are driving. If you eliminated those 60 right off the back, that would solve your shortage right there. If you advance further to your juniors you're going to have more space for visitors and not have private parking or paying \$190,000 for 32 spaces when by eliminating a number of drivers you could save that money and have a better control on your students and safety.

Dr. Parrish: Thank you Mr. Gamble. One question Mark and I'm going to wrap this up. The scope of this is pretty big. The one thing that comes to my mind when I've driven through the high school, it seems to me that there are a fair number of empty spaces. Is the number available to tell us how many teachers and how many students are parking in that lot every day? How many permits are there? Relative to the capacity? And what, on any one day, this would be an easy study to do, it's not a traffic study, on any one day at 10:00 in the morning and 1:30 in the afternoon, how many spaces are open in that lot? I don't know for sure, and I'm probably there toward the end of the day, but . . .

Mr. Consalo: The biggest thing depends upon sports.



Dr. Parrish: That's why I said 10:00 in the morning.

Mr. Consalo: Kids drive more for football season than you will for basketball season, because you have football, field hockey, soccer and then in the spring it picks up again. The winter months kind of slow off a little bit, because a lot of parents don't want you to drive in the snow. Then in the fall and the spring . . .

Dr. Parrish: Makes sense.

Mr. Consalo: There are periodic spots. During those times, there are quite a bit. Are they all full? Maybe not, but it depends upon a lot. I agree with what Mr. Stover said. It's not going to hurt that much to make the drawing and have it for an alternate bid on the project, whether we do it or not, it doesn't matter. We have to go to the Township and work with them. We can push that back farther along, but we'll proceed. We already have the sketch drawings, we're not spending more money right now for drawings. As far as the parking lot, if we don't do the parking lot and we run out of space like Mr. Yarian said, if you take away the juniors, he's got four more buses. There is another \$300,000-\$400,000 you're going to have to have plus four more drivers. It's over \$100,000 for the 32 parking spaces one time than the \$400,000 for buses plus four more drivers you have to spend to have in there because you don't have enough people in the buses to drive, so you have to look at it that way too.

Dr. Parrish: Mark, given the scope of this project, if you put this drawing out to the very end, would it delay you much if – there's a little bit of indecision I think here tonight. Would it delay you much if this decision was mad on January 11.

Mr. Shrift: Yeah, it would. That would probably not give us enough time to make the . . .

Dr. Parrish: So, it's decision we do need to make tonight. Any other questions or comments?

Dr. Cronin: I just want to remind him that those points are very, thank you very, I appreciate that, very well taken, but I also want to make sure that we remember that buses are safer than having more kid drivers, so the cost there is definitely, you can't put a price on that in my mind.

Dr. Parrish: So, we need a formal motion. Did anybody draw one up?

Brian Jackson: The Administration recommends that, based upon the General Services committee meeting of November 23, 2009 and the discussion here this evening, that further clarifications be made to the scope of the Hayes Large retention. Specifically, to authorize the design and preparation of documents for alternate bidding and release for a faculty parking lot in front of the high school along Homestead Road. Upon approval, the Board will further authorize the

execution of an amendment to the standard form of agreement between owner and architect, which would be drafted by the District Solicitor.

Dr. Parrish: I'll make that as a motion.

Mrs. Chabal: I'll second that.

Dr. Parrish: Second from Beulah. Any further discussions? John.

Mr. Gräb: No further discussion, I am not in favor of the additional parking, so I will be voting no and that's why I'm voting no.

Dr. Parrish: Okay. Any other comments? Mr. Rineer.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Cronin – No

Donahue – Yes

Gräb – No

Hagan – Yes

Morelli – No

Parrish – Yes

Sheffey – No

Stover - Yes

5 Yes, 4 No

**MOTION CARRIED**

Dr. Parrish: Moving forward, Dr. Brewer, scope of project, I think this is in addition.

Male Voice: I thought we just did that.

Dr. Brewer: That's what we just did.

Male Voice: We just did that one.

Dr. Parrish: Is that essentially the same, because it's in here differently.

Dr. Brewer: Yes. We did both.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**5.01 Requests for Payment - Construction Projects**

The Administration recommended the approval of the following invoices as reviewed and approved by Mr. Consalo:

<b>Multi-Purpose Practice/Playing Fields:</b>	
---	--

1.	Township of Derry Invoice: 67067-10	\$467.95
2.	Austin Mohawk Invoice: 05252	545.00

Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the request and was seconded by Mrs. Sheffey.

Mr. Gräb: Ed, I'm sure you can answer this question for me. Austin Mohawk Invoice 05252, miscellaneous materials \$420.00. Could you define what those miscellaneous are?

Mr. Consalo: Yes. We put another sliding window in the ticket booth at the soccer field. We bought the window and put it in ourselves. What it was, the window was on one side, we figured that when they have the games that they charge, they could use both sides to take it in, so we bought another window to put in there.

Mr. Gräb: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Parrish: Any other comments?

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

## MOTION CARRIED

### 5.02 Approval of 2010 Township of Derry Tax Collection Association

**Budget**The Administration recommended the approval of the Township of Derry Tax Collection Association Budget for 2010. The proposed budget totals \$496,128 and represents a 3.00% increase over the current budget of \$481,660. The school district's contribution toward this budget will be \$243,000. Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the request and was seconded by Mr. Stover.

Moved by Dr. Cronin. Second by Mr. Stover. Any comments?

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

**MOTION CARRIED**

**5.03 Approval of Overnight Field Trip/Excursion - High School Choir - Roxbury, NJ**

The Administration recommended the approval of the following overnight field trip/excursion:

<i>Group:</i>	High School Cantabile Choir
<i>Destination:</i>	Roxbury, NJ
<i>Purpose:</i>	Choir Adjudication
<i>From:</i>	March 26, 2010
<i>Return:</i>	March 28, 2010
<i>Trip Leader:</i>	Joseph Farrell

The District reserves the right to cancel the excursion based on events that could pose a heightened or security risk.

Mrs. Chabal moved the Board approve the request and was seconded by Dr. Cronin.

Mr. Gräb: I hate to be a bugger here this evening. I take notice there are 36 students scheduled to go on this trip and reading through the documentation, I saw one chaperone, Mr. Farrell. Further reading, this trip is going to cost a little over \$10,000 and I was not able to decipher the hieroglyphics that told me where the money was coming from.

Dr. Brewer: All through fundraising and student expense.

Dr. Parrish: No expense to the budget?

Dr. Brewer: No expense to the District.

Mr. Gräb: No expense to the District, okay. Back to my initial question of the one chaperone and the 36 students.

Dr. Brewer: We'll need to look into that, that does seem excessive and I don't know if parents are going along or not.

Mr. Gräb: Okay, for that reason I will be voting no, then.

Dr. Parrish: There are established guidelines, correct?

Dr. Brewer: There are.

Dr. Parrish: There are guidelines by which they have to meet based on the number of participants if I'm not mistaken.

Dr. Brewer: And there may be some others going, I'm just not aware.

Mr. Gräb: I agree with you on that point though, they are not listed on the application, so for that reason, I'll be voting no.

Dr. Parrish: John, if we amended this as an approval based on provision and acquisition of the appropriate number of chaperones per policy, would you vote yes?

Mr. Gräb: Then I will vote for it, yes.

Dr. Parrish: Can I have a motion to amend this, then? Can we do that?

Dr. Hagan: So moved.

Dr. Parrish: I would like to amend it then. Let me state it first so that this motion would be amended to include certification or provision of the appropriate number of chaperones for this trip. If somebody will second that?

Dr. Cronin: Second.

Dr. Parrish: Do we have to vote on that? Is that okay, Brian? Or are we out of order.

Brian Jackson: You now can vote on the amended motion.

Dr. Parrish: Okay. Now we can vote on the amended motion.

Mr. Morelli: I'm sorry. I just had one comment and this is probably the first time this has come up, I was just wondering, do we give these kids and these groups some sort of memo. We're right in the middle of this H1N1 thing, it's not over yet, do we at least raise some level of awareness when they are going to some sporting event or some music event, New York City, or wherever with a couple thousand other folks and you're coming back to Hershey. Is anything like that in place when they sign up to go on these field trips?

Male Voice: We typically have a security statement in here that if there is a heightened, that's not in this one, but typically . . .

Response: It is.

Male Voice: We can retract this and quickly at any point if there is a safety issue?

Male Board Member: Yeah, I was thinking more or less of just a caution to the parents when they get these consent forms sent home saying I'm giving my child permission to go on this trip, on top of that typical consent form, maybe another sheet or something that says we're still in the middle of this issue.

Dr. Parrish: There has been information sent home about H1N1 and vaccinations are ongoing this week, is that correct?

Female Voice: Right now.

Dr. Parrish: Right now as we speak. Any other comments? Mr. Rineer on the amended motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

## **MOTION CARRIED**

### **5.04 Request for the Use of School Facilities**

The Administration recommended the approval of the following Request for the Use of School Facilities:

<i>Group:</i>	Hershey Soccer Club (Formerly Hershey Youth Soccer Association)
<i>Date/Time:</i>	Fridays December 4, 2009 through March 12, 2010 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	Primary Elementary Gym
<i>Event:</i>	Indoor Soccer Training for Hershey Soccer Club Travel Program
<i>Fee:</i>	None

Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the request and was seconded by Mrs. Sheffey.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

**MOTION CARRIED**

**5.05 Personnel – Resignation**

The Administration recommended the approval of the following resignation:

**Guenter, Lindsay**  
Grade 4 Teacher  
Elementary School  
Reason: Personal  
Effective: 12/23/09

Mrs. Chabal moved the Board approve the resignation and was seconded by Dr. Hagan.

Mr. Gräb: I notice this is a classroom teacher and on the subsequent agenda content for hire, there is no replacement. Will it be a long term sub?

Dr. Brewer: Yes. We'll certainly have a short term plan as we look for the long term sub.

Mr. Gräb: Thank you.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

**MOTION CARRIED**

**5.06 Personnel – General**

1.	The Administration recommended the approval of the following appointments:
	<b>Classified:</b>

	<p><b>Grigsby, Martha</b>  Substitute Teachers' Aide  District-wide  Salary: \$10.34 per hour  Effective: 12/08/09</p>
	<p><b>Harrington, Nicole *</b>  Teachers' Aide  Elementary School  One hour per day/daily  Salary: \$11.70 per hour  Effective: 12/08/09 and not to exceed the end of the 2009-2010 school year</p>
	<p><b>Limited Service Contracts:</b></p>
	<p><b>Mack, Shane *</b>  Volunteer Assistant Varsity Wrestling Coach  High School  Effective: 12/08/09</p>
	<p><b>Taliani, Anthony *</b> (replacing Mark Painter)  Weight Trainer  Middle School  Level II, Group F, Step 8  Salary: \$1,541  Effective: 12/08/09</p>
	<p><b>Transfer of Limited Service Contract:</b></p>
	<p><b>Painter, Mark *</b>  From: Weight Trainer  Middle School  To: Weight Trainer (replacing Robert May)  High School  Level I, Group F, Step 19  Salary: \$3,217  Effective: 12/08/09</p>
2.	<p>The Administration recommended the approval of the following addition to the 2009-2010 Substitute Teacher List:</p>
	<p><b>Colucci, Robin</b>  B.S. in Elementary Education from University of Pittsburgh</p>
	<p><b>* This individual is currently an employee and/or volunteer. Clearances are on file.</b></p>

Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the personnel recommendations and was seconded by Mrs. Sheffey.

Roll Call Vote:  
Chabal – Yes  
Cronin – Yes

Gräb – Yes  
Hagan – Yes

Parrish – Yes  
Sheffey – Yes



Donahue – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

## **MOTION CARRIED**

## **DELEGATES REPORTS**

### **6.01 Dauphin County Technical School Report**

Mr. Gräb: The Technical School will be meeting on Wednesday evening, December 9. We had previously scheduled this for our reorganization, unfortunately, some of the participating Districts will not have reorganized by that time so we pushed reorganization of the Joint Operating Committee back to the 13<sup>th</sup> of January.

### **6.02 Derry Township Tax Collection Association Report**

No report.

### **6.03 Harrisburg Area Community College Report**

No report.

### **6.04 Capital Area Intermediate Unit Report**

Mrs. Sheffey: Our next meeting is December 17, 2009.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **7.01 School and Community Information Report**

No report.

### **7.02 Board Members' Report**

Dr. Donahue: The Curriculum Committee met today, I'll make it very brief. In old business, we discussed the elementary core reading program. They selected a textbook vendor and that will be brought to the Curriculum Committee in February and then Board approval. We approved the Humanities course in high

school being split in two semesters. I don't think that needs Board approval, I can't remember if it does or not, but it has been approved by Curriculum Committee. Mr. McFarland discussed the curriculum review schedule that they're undertaking now, it's a sort of between 5 and 7 year cycle that they go through. We also had a informational description of the Collins Writing Program which is actually pretty interesting, but I won't go into it right now. It's actually using writing to learn subjects. It's a way to learn through writing, so they do this in math and science. It's a very interesting program that's already been implemented partially and is now being fully implemented. That's it. Our next meeting is January 4.

Dr. Parrish: Thank you. Any other Board members?

### **7.03 Superintendent's Report**

No report.

### **7.04 Board President's Report**

Dr. Parrish: No report, other than thank everybody for your input tonight. It was very good discussion I believe and I'd certainly like to wish everyone a happy holiday personally.

## **RECOGNITION OF CITIZENS (Non-Agenda Items)**

### **8.01 Recognition of Citizens**

Richard Gamble: I've been coming to these meetings for the simple point to emphasize the impact the Board has, what the Board does in relation to the community members of the Town that pays the taxes. I guess you're all aware of our economic situation is not the best and it doesn't look good for the next 5 years as far as decreasing the number or percentage of unemployment, which means Hershey in itself, the senior citizens, the land owners that are out of work, it means our tax base could change and our income as far as money to work with could change. I'm asking that the new Board, particularly with the new ideas and the exchanges that they go slowly. Spending \$190,000 and spending money to draw this and draw that, we don't know. Again, the simple way first. Dr. Cronin brought up the suggestion that I strongly support, I think if we take a look at limiting the number of cars driving here. I think Mr. Stover brought up are they going to park here, are they going to park there. Well, when I come to an area that says no parking, tow away, or fine, we're going to teach these students to respect the law, respect the rules. If they want to park in the parking lot here or there, they say no students may drive to school. That's the rule. We're here to teach them. Teach them respect, and that's one of the things we're looking at.

Right now, it's a tax issue, it's a money issue, and it's expanding again. The athletic field was expanded. A lot of the townspeople were not in favor of it. It had some negative impact, more and more going on with what's going to happen. It's going to be negative impact. Open communication, good communication. On some of these things like tonight, I'm sitting here listening to you vote on things and I'm saying well there's some information you should have known, particularly the new Board. I'm recommending that when you have something major such as cutting a path through the Library, get it to a Town meeting like the Township does. Let the Town know what you're doing, not let them find out about it and read it in the newspaper and then again, unfortunately, the newspaper is a one sided report. I think Mr. Stover said, getting the people involved, getting them to participate with you. When it's quiet and nobody knows, that's when where we run into problems. I mean, one of our older members, I met with him a couple weeks ago, and he said, what they should do and I told him, his name is Mr. Casentini, come to the Board and tell them. He said, if our school taxes go up, that's how much we should reduce the administration's salary. Now, that's a good thought. That will make you more conscious of what you're doing. You're spending money based on loans and whatever else. Somebody has to pay it back and our senior citizens are getting older. As a matter of fact, I talked with one of the realtors here, most of our senior citizens are selling their property, not they, because most of them are dead, but the children are selling the properties because they can't afford the taxes. So, we've got to think about our tax base.

Dr. Parrish: Thank you very much. Any other public comments?

## **ADJOURNMENT**

### **9.01 Adjournment**

Mrs. Chabal moved to adjourn, with a second by Dr. Cronin and, approved by unanimous voice vote by all members. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Stephen E. Rineer  
Secretary to the Board  
Approved at the January 11, 2010 meeting

---

Dr. William Parish

President of the Board

LDM