APPLICATION FOR USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Name of Organization Jate Represer	stative Reemary A	1. Brown	Today's Date_ 2 / c	81 120/3
Non-Profit? Will an admission fee be yes □ no If yes, amount \$	If yes This o	attach a letter of justifica	facilities fees? Yes 🗆 no ition addressed to the Board o of fees for scheduled district p	f Education.
	ices Seminar			
Name of School Requested Middle S	mithfield Eleme	entary		
DAY(S) from — DATE(S) — to 4/27/2013 4/27 - 2013	from — HOURS — 8:000m 12:00		CRIPTION ractice, game, rehearsal, perfoi	·mance,)
Facility Required: All-Purpose RoomSwimming Pool (requiresproof of certified lifeguard) Classr	ım	Cafeteria Kitchen/Preparation Fields (specify) Other (specify)	Gymnasium Kitchen/Servir	ng
Stage Lighting*Motio	ittended by school persor I System n Picture Projector ic Equipment	Record Player/Stereo Overhead Projector/S Other (specify)	creen Tables and/or t	; Chairs
The District has the right to assign additio for these services. Your organization mus	nal security and other p t provide a Certificate (personnel as needed. Yo of Insurance listing the E	ur organization will be subje SASD as co-insured as follo	ect to fees ws:
\$Bodily Injury Liab	(\$500,000 m	Property Dama	ge Liability (each occurrence)	
List at least one, but preferably two, responsi being used, and who will accept full responsi	ble officials of your orga	anization who will be pres	ent at the time facilities reque	sted are
Name State Rep. Rose mary H. Brown	Address P.	. An Ala Harshalls	Creek Phone 52 - 4	(a \$30)
Name State Rep. Rose mary U. Brown Name Linda Meglio-DIO Manager	Address	11	Phone Phone	11
I certify that I have read, understand, and ag Use of School Facilities. Further, my organ School Authority, their directors, agents, em event(s) conducted on the above-mentioned of suits, complaints, or legal proceedings of an employees and further will hold harmless an any expenses and judgments or decrees reco	ization forever releases t ployees and servants fro date(s) for which this app y kind brought against th d indemnify the said Sch	he East Stroudsburg Area m all claims, actions, and plication is submitted. My ne Board of Education and ool Directors, School Dis.	School District, the East Stro charges whatsoever arising o organization will defend all o d any of its agents, servants or trict, and School Authority fro	oudsburg out of the actions,
Francey H. Berew			Phone (day) 5/0 . 4/20 - 83	01
Signature Responsible Organization Off Billing Address 1.0. Box 869 Maso	ficial halls Cheek. P.	PA 18335	(eve.)	
APPROVALS: Principal			Date/_	
Conv. to: Business Administrator	Shahoun	due	Date 2 / 2	
copy to: □stage manager □athletic director □cafeteria				
For office use only:	FACILITIES US	SE INVOICE		
Facilities/Equipment used:		West surface seasons regard in 1970 a post of 17	Charges: \$	
Personnel Employed:			Charges: \$	s
(attach time sheets)	- 0		\$	
-			\$	====0
Other (specify):			Charges: \$\$	

BUS BUY-BACK COST ANALYSIS.XLX 2/15/2013

BID COMPARISON

					72 P	72 PASSENGER - 4 YEAR	AR						
VENDOR	# BUSES		PURCHASE PRICE	RICE		BUY BACK	<mark>%</mark>		NET COST	7	TOTAL NET COST EXCESS MI	EXC	ESS MI
Wolfington		36	\$	82,400	S	45,200	54.9%	\$	37,200	\$	1,339,200	₩.	0.45
Rohrer		36	\$ 7	78,881	Ş	50,100	63.5%	\$	28,781	\$	1,036,116	\$	0.49
					8	COST DIFFERENCE ROHRER VS WOLFINGTON \$	HRER V	, WC	LFINGTON	Ş	(303,084)		

			28	28-30 PASSENGER - 4 YEAR	1 YEAR					
VENDOR	# BUSES	_	PURCHASE PRICE	BUY BACK	%	NET COST	TOTAL NET COST EXCESS MI	T COST	EXC	SS MI
Wolfington		12			NO BID	BID				
Rohrer - Diesel		12 \$	5 55,461	\$ 27,712	\$ %0.09	27,749	\$ 3	332,989	\$	0.49
Rohrer - Gas		12 \$	\$ 44,545	\$ 16,904	37.9% \$	27,641	\$	331,692	❖	0.49
				COST DIFFERENCE GAS VS DIESEL	GAS VS DIESI	EL	\$	(1,297)		

				15	3+2 P	18+2 PASSENGER - 4 YEAR	EAR					
VENDOR	# BUSES		PURCHA	RCHASE PRICE	_	BUY BACK	%	NET COST	01	TOTAL NET COST EXCESS MI	X	CESS MI
Wolfington		4					NO BID	ID				
Rohrer - Diesel		4	\$	\$ 752,65	\$	31,470	53.1% \$	27,787	\$	111,147 \$	\$	0.49
Rohrer - Gas		4	\$	48,344	Ş	20,662	42.7% \$	27,682	₹Ş.	110,727 \$	\$	0.49
					SOS	COST DIFFERENCE GAS VS DIESEL	AS VS DIESEI		Ś	(420)		

FUNDING FORMULA REVIEW

1/23/2013 12:00 to 2:30 PM Sheila White Don Jennings Joe Colozza Jeff Bader Susan Famularo

Reviewed PMSD proposals and their suggested goal Review PMSD formula and impact of the proposal

 Consensus: formula too volatile, could not determine costs until after the fact which does not lend itself to budget planning

Reviewed with Jeff (new to ESASD) the current formula and prior formula discussions and recommendations Reviewed enrollment and quota numbers for the last five years

- · Consensus: ADM is better than enrollment
- FYE ADM, after reconciliation is more reliable than enrollment or mid-year ADM

To minimize the impact on any one SD, 3 or 4 year averaging smooth's the impact, less volatility

Splitting a portion of costs evenly among the districts is not a fair way to apportion costs due to large variation in size, population and use. le: splitting 20% of the costs evenly to the districts)

Important factor that gets lost: each school's numbers are important, but that number as compared to the total number really drives the equation

Brainstormed some additional ideas for funding:

- Available slots determined by average of new students, added to returning students to create percentage.
 This would mean returning students drive 2/3 of the funding. Too volatile from year to year relies on class sizes, success rate of students and recruiting.
- Total "quota" per school based on 4 year average
- Possibly 90 formula/10 fixed costs, but now real idea on how to allocate fairly
- Came back to original proposal of 3 or 4 year rolling average of students as the best plan

MCTI to put together another four options to look at:

- 1. 3 year rolling ADM = pulls the numbers to a little more recent numbers
- 2. 4 year rolling ADM to review the differences
- 3. 3 year weighted rolling ADM = yr 1 60%, yr 2 30%, yr 3 10%
- 4. 4 year weighted rolling ADM = yr 1 40%, yr 2 30%, yr 3 20%, yr 4 10%

NOTE: 2 year phase in of costs endorsed by all

Recommended developing these numbers and meeting again to review. Friday or Monday, Feb 1 or 4.

Percentage calculations

	4 YEAR AVE	RAGE ADM			
					TOTAL
4 YEAR INFORMATION					TOTAL
ADM per PDE report	ESASD	PVSD	PMSD	SASD	MCTI ADM
MCTI ADM 6/30/12	197.027	278.961	299.016	161.530	936.534
MCTI ADM 6/30/11	191.944	234.519	325.635	184.281	936.379
MCTI ADM 6/30/10	182.651	243.827	348.275	193.817	968.570
MCTI ADM 6/30/09	170.423	301.546	326.439	175.290	973.698
Total 4 year ADM's	742.045	1,058.853	1,299.365	714.918	3,815.181
4 year Average ADM	185.511	264.713	324.841	178.730	953.795
4 year Average Abivi	100.011				953.795
4 yr ADM avg Budget % :	19.45%	27.75%	34.06%	18.74%	100.00%
Single year percentages	for compariso	n			
Single year percentages	for compariso	n			
MCTI Enrollment 1/2013	213	281	291	176	961
Percent Enrollment 1/13	22.16%	29.24%	30.28%	18.31%	100%
MCTI ADM 6/30/12	197.027	278.961	299.016	161.530	936.534
Percent ADM 6/30/12	21.04%	29.79%	31.93%	17.25%	100.00%
MCTI ADM 6/30/11	191.944	234.519	325.635	184.281	936.379
Percent ADM 6/30/11	20.50%		34.78%	19.68%	100.00%
	400 CE4	243.827	348.275	193.817	968.570
MCTI ADM 6/30/10	182.651		35.96%	20.01%	
Percent ADM 6/30/10	18.86%	23.11%	33.30 /6	20.0170	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
MCTI ADM 6/30/09	170.423	301.546	326.439	175.290	973.698
Percent ADM 6/30/09	17.50%	30.97%	33.53%	18.00%	100.00%
MCTI ADM 6/30/08	155,443	276.318	390.185	173.866	995.812
				17.46%	100.00%

NOTE: This is a sample calculation of a two year implementation process using a four year average ADM.			-						
ער וווי ויי מיווויוי כמוכבייייי	of a two yea	ır implementat	tion p	orocess us	ing a fou	r year averag	ye ADM.		
No changes have been approved at this time.	d at this tin	.e.							
	Calc	Calculated				2013-14	sample	Estimated	sample
	201	2013-2014	2	2013-2014		percentages	calculation	percentages	calculation
	Current	TOTAL	-	4 year		Average	2013-2014	4 year	2014-2015
	formula	DISTRICT		average	combined	% PIO	restated	average	+ 1.7% est
	% OF	BUDGET		% OF	rate to	+ New %	Budget	% OF	Budget Incr
DISTRICT	BUDGET	Art.Agree.		BUDGET	illustrate	"halfway"	Increase	BUDGET	estimated
October Manual Control Dietrict	24 04%	\$ 1911 734	+	19.45%	43.49%	21.75%	\$1,729,135	20.63%	\$1,668,628
East Off Outsburg Concor District				decrease	/2	decrease	(\$182,598)	decrease	(\$60,508)
to rate of the state of the sta	26 12%	¢ 2 076 549	+	27.75%	53.87%	26.93%	\$2,141,681	27.31%	\$2,208,130
Pleasant Valley School District	21.07	0.06	++	increase	/2	increase	\$65,133	increase	\$66,449
Docono Mountain School District	32.67%	\$ 2.597.649	+	34.06%	66.73%	33.36%	\$2,652,864	33.24%	\$2,687,946
Occino Modificani Scripto District				increase	/2	increase	\$55,215	decrease	\$35,082
Ottoridohum Cohool Dietrict	47 17%	\$ 1365.499	+	18.74%	35.91%	17.96%	\$1,427,750	18.82%	\$1,521,900
Tollog Bings				increase	72	decrease	\$62,251	increase	\$94,151
TOTAL	100.00%	\$7,951,430		100.00%		100.00%	\$7,951,430	100.00%	\$8,086,605

integraONE

7248 Tilghman Street, Suite 120 Allentown, PA 18106 www.integra1.net

02/22/2013

Quote Number:

AAAQ19695

Rev. 1

Proposal For:

East Stroudsburg Area SD

50 Vine Street PO Box 298

East Stroudsburg, PA 18301

Brian Borosh

brian-borosh@esasd.net

(570) 424-8500

Account Manager

Ashley Miller

Phone: 800-582-6399 x1115

Fax: 484 223-3427

amiller@integra1.net

Qty	Part Number	Description	Unit Price	Ext. Price
1	SG900-45-M5	Blue Coat SG900-45, MACH5 Edition	\$35,100.0	0 \$35,100.00
1	SW-FLASH-SG900	Flash Proxy License, SG900	\$1,080.00	\$1,080.00
1	SL131Y-SG900-45- M5	End Customer Support, 24x7 L1-3 Software Only, SG900-45-M5, 1 YR	\$7,800.00	\$7,800.00
1	HNBDS1Y-SG900-3 0-M5	Next Business Day Delivery Hardware Support, SG900-30-M5, 1 YR	\$3,251.00	\$3,251.00
		**support is co-termed to 6/30/14		
1	Service	Ancillary Services	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
			SubTotal	\$48,731.00
nor	COSTARS	~	Тах	\$0.00
hei	COSTANO		Total	\$48,731.00

