

**EAST STROUDSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
April 13, 2021
VIA Zoom & Administration Center Board Room
5:30 P.M.
Minutes**

- I. **The Chairman**, Rebecca Bear, called the Finance Committee meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. Secretary, Patricia Rosado called the roll.
- II. **Board Committee Members Present:** George Andrews, Rebecca Bear, Larry Dymond and Rich Schlameuss.

Board Non-Committee Members Present: Debbie Kulick and Lisa VanWhy.

- III. **School Personnel Present:** Brian Baddick, Brian Borosh, Anthony Calderone, Matt Hirsch, Diane Kelly, Daryle Miller, Craig Neiman, William Riker, Patricia Rosado, Bill Vitulli and Jeanne Wescott.

- IV. **Community Members Present:** Jennifer Floyd and Randall Litts.

Other: Chris Bamber – Public Financial Management
Jamie Doyle – Public Financial Management

V. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE:

Motion was made by Larry Dymond to approve the agenda for April 13, 2021 and with members of the Committee reserving the right to add to the agenda and take further action in the best interest of the District. Motion was seconded by Richard Schlameuss

Motion was made by George Andrews to add on the agenda the quotes for the purchase of fertilizer and grass seed to maintain District fields. Motion was seconded by Richard Schlameuss and carried unanimously, 4-0.

The agenda with the revision was carried unanimously, 4-0.

RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE:

Motion was made by Richard Schlameuss to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2021 meeting. Motion was seconded by George Andrews and carried unanimously, 4-0.

VI. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Debt Overview & Refunding Analysis

Ms. Jamie Doyle, Managing Director and Mr. Chris Bamber, Director, PFM Financial Advisors, attended the meeting virtually to discuss refunding of bonds. Ms. Doyle reported as follows:

Page one of her presentation includes the historic prospective of interest rates and the markets. She had a bird's eye view of the interest rates between 1/1/2019 and 4/5/2021. The all-time lows were set in August 2020 and today's interest rates are a little bit higher than the all-time lows but still extremely low via industry standards.

Page two includes a summary of the district's outstanding indebtedness. The top half has the gross debt service meaning principal and interest. The bottom half has the local share after we receive State reimbursement to varying degrees. The two issues that we are talking about tonight are the 2016 Bonds and 2016 A bonds with call dates of September 1, 2021. The district has an all in short/concise debt portfolio. As you can see, the debt is fairly leveled with fiscal years until 2030. It then pretty significantly drops off through the rest of the portfolio. PFM monitors these numbers for refunding opportunities, such as the bonds they are discussing this evening.

Page three includes the refunding opportunities for the 2016 and 2016 A bonds. The principal outstanding for the 2016 Bonds is \$8,745,000 and for the 2016A Bonds is \$1,570,000. They are short in duration as the 2016 final maturity date is 2029 and for 2016 A it is 2030. The average existing rate for the 2016 bond is 2.18% and for the 2016A bond it is 2.21%. Assuming a current estimate of Bank Qualified interest rates, a partial BQ refunding is producing local effort savings of approximately \$215,000 or 2.22% of refunded principal. PFM will utilize a dual-track methodology (like they did for the 2020 Notes) and consider other financing methods including a bank loan. Whoever produces the best economic savings for the school district, will be recommended. The refunded local effort for the 2016 and 2016 A bonds is \$10,562,780. The estimated local effort for the 2021 Bonds is \$10,347,160 and the local effort savings is \$215,620 through year ending 6/30/2031. PFM is not extending the existing loan. The time line is as follows: Today, April 13th, PFM is making their presentation to the Finance Committee. On April 19th, they will need authorization from the Board in order to proceed with the refinancing. On May 17th or later the Board will need to adopt the Parameters Resolution. The week of May 17 or later competitive sale will take place in order to lock in interest rates. The week of June 21 or later the settlement of bonds will take place. PFM's sample motion is included which authorizes the Administration to work with the PFM as Financial Advisors, Eckert Seamans as Bond Counsel and the district's local Solicitor in conjunction with the issuance of General obligation bonds or note series 2021, via the dual tack process between a bank loan and a bond issue. The proceeds, of which, will be used towards the current refunding of the District's Series of 2016 Bonds and Series A of 2016 Bonds at a minimum net savings target of 2.00%.

Page five indicates if the district chooses not to do any refinancing with Bond 2016, rates stay the same as well as payments.

Page six contains the portion of the 2016 Bonds that are being refinanced, which total under 10 million dollars, in order to get the lowest interest rate and call feature. This portion has the most duration and higher rates.

Page seven contains the portion of the bonds that are not being refunded due to having a short end of the curve.

Page eight includes the 2016 A Bonds. If the district chooses not to do any refinancing with Bond 2016 A, rates stay the same as well as payments.

Pages nine and ten has information on the long end of the 2016 A Bonds which are to be refunded. PFM is leaving a small portion of the bonds outstanding. Furthermore, you can see how much principal will be needed for the refunded portion.

Page eleven includes the amount needed to pay off the refunded portion.

Page twelve has the interest rates which range from .55 to 1.44 percent to result in savings. PFM suggests a 2% minimum savings target. The Savings Allocation includes the School District's Share of \$215,619.91 and the State's Share of \$16,916.06 for a total savings of \$232,535.97.

Page thirteen includes the sample of what PFM budgeted for the cost of the issuance. The Bond issuance seems to generate a greater savings than a bank issuance. PFM will do their best to get the most savings as they can. The assumed yield of the issue is about 1.5%.

Ms. Doyle said that this refunding is similar to the one that was done in the fall of 2020. The goal is to save money as much they can by lowering interest rates.

Mrs. Bear said that Ms. Doyle always underestimates the underwriting fee when rates will not be as high as she indicates. Ms. Doyle said the average fee for an underwriter is \$7.50 and is why she budgeted \$8.00. Mrs. Bear said that the last time the underwriting fee was 95 cents. Mrs. Doyle said they previously did well and will try everything they can to come in under the amount she estimated. She said that some banks/firms have different strategies. Some have low bond discounts and a higher rate. Others have higher bond discounts and a lower rate.

Mrs. Bear asked what does the total cost of issuance of \$100,000 include. Ms. Doyle said the amount is conservative and includes everything, i.e. PFM as Financial Advisors, Eckert Seamans as Bond Counsel, the district's local Solicitor Bond Counsel, credit rating, printing advertisements, bond insurance etc. Mrs. Bear said Ms. Doyle did not include the bond insurance because she placed a 0 under this item. Ms. Doyle said she did not include it because with the previous refunding there was no expense for bond insurance due to the district's great credit rating. Also there is not bond insurance fee with a bank loan. Mrs. Bear asked for a breakdown of all of the expenses when the refinancing is done. Mrs. Doyle said she will provide the breakdown. Mrs. Bear asked what is PFM's fee. Mrs. Doyle said her fee is \$29,500. Mrs. Bear asked if this fee is normal for PFM. Mrs. Doyle said this fee is lower than their usual fee because this refinancing does not entail everything that they normally would. Mrs. Bear asked does the miscellaneous expenses include. Mrs. Doyle said it includes anything to do with miscellaneous/rounding in rates, or any other expense. If there are any funds left over from a bond issue it goes into a sinking fund which has to be used, by law, with the first payment. These funds can also be looked at as an additional savings. Mrs. Bear said that she realizes that Ms. Doyle is doing her best but feels that she is overestimating. Ms. Doyle said PFM is being conservative and will save the district every dollar possible like they have done in the past. Mr. Dymond asked if there

has ever been any auction where no one bids. Ms. Doyle said no. PFM had two auctions where they held the auction and recommended that their client reject the bids until the market improved. Mrs. Bear said the bond market has been on a roller coaster in the past few weeks. She said she hopes that it is on the downhill when PFM goes out to bid for the district. Mrs. Doyle said she hopes so, too. If it is not the right time, she will let the district know in order for the bids to be postponed. The district has the right to reject a bid. It has happened with other clients in the past and she will advise the district to wait until the market settles down. Mrs. Bear asked if the district rejects a bid will they have to pay both times. Ms. Doyle said not if they are doing the bond issuance. She said she normally holds out for the credit ratings because they bill once they do their part. Therefore, Ms. Doyle said she will wait on this step until the district is sure. The district has up to six months to finalize; otherwise, the credit rating would want 75% of their fee if we go to them but do not finalize the bid.

2. Cisco/Meraki Wireless Access Points - Administration Center

Mr. Brian Borosh said the Committee members should have received a request to purchase 25 Cisco Meraki access points for the Administration Building. Currently, all access points that the district has are Cisco. The current Administration Center points are seven years old; therefore, the hardware will no longer be supported. The district does not have Meraki Cisco access points. The Administration Center currently has wireless access points deployed in the hallways only. This upgrade adds additional access points by placing an access point in each office suite and conference room in addition to the hallways for better connectivity. The new access points will also help with connectivity of the new wireless door locks that the district will be implementing shortly. They would also like to see how these will operate as opposed to the Cisco points. He said they will be updating access points in all buildings in the near future. They received four quotes for the access point. One quote was disqualified because it did not have licensing information. The lowest quote is from ePlus at \$23,733.75. Mrs. Bear asked if this purchase was budgeted. Mr. Borosh said that it was budgeted in his technology account. The purchase is not eRate funding eligible because the Administration Center is not an educational site. The educational sites, such as, each school building will receive an 80% eRate discount. Mr. Schlameuss said the district already has a Meraki platform. Mr. Borosh said the district has the Meraki set up with the 1,100 cameras. Mr. Dymond asked if Mr. Borosh has a written long-range plan in order for the Board to see what will be done from year to year. Mr. Borosh said he does and will be revisiting it and will have an updated plan to the Board during the summer. Mr. Dymond said it would be good to see what will be replaced, rebuilt or improved on a yearly basis. Mrs. Bear said the plan should be similar to what the Property/Facilities Committee has. Mr. Borosh said some items were moved up due to Federal funding that became available. He said that he and David Cooper will be starting the plan for the next cycle to align with the eRate funding. He will apply for it and hopes to receive it. Mr. Dymond asked if Mr. Borosh is buying 25 access points for just the Administration building. Mr. Borosh said he is correct. Mr. Dymond asked if they need that many for the Administration building. Mr. Borosh said they do because it will be in all suites and not in the hallways as they normally are. The Board room will also have one. In addition, the WiFi locks will also need higher signals. Mr. Dymond said two dozen locks will not take up too much space. Mr. Borosh said they won't and you can configure the locks to receive low or high communication. Mr. Dymond said six of these are not dedicated to unlocking 20 doors. One can run 25 locks. Mr. Borosh said the locks are based on radio signals. Mr. Dymond said he understands this but it is not one door to one signal; therefore, they will not take much space at all. Mr. Borosh said the access points will be for all items, i.e. laptops, computers, iPads, phones, etc. not just for computer. Mr. Schlameuss said there is potential

for many devices to be connected and not counting personal devices that employees may have. Mr. Borosh said it can be for 80 employees and visitors/guests that can attend as well as when events occur in the Board room. High School South also uses the Board room as an overflow for their events.

3. Dude Solutions – three-year agreement

Mr. Brian Borosh said Dude Solutions is a work order system. The Technology Department uses a different software for their work orders. He said that Mr. Eric Forsyth is looking to use Dude Solutions for maintenance work orders, consumables, and facilities usage request. What the Committee Members received tonight includes the technology piece. It is a three-year contract with no rate increase. Mr. Borosh said he would like to move this agreement onto Board approval but may cut the technology portion out. Mrs. Bear asked if they remove the technology portion will the price be lowered and asked if Mr. Borosh will be cost comparing with other programs. She said she would not want Mr. Borosh removing the technology part and then find out that the other program costs more. Mr. Borosh said it would not cost more. Mrs. Bear said if the technology part is removed, the total cost of everything should not exceed \$23,000. Mr. Andrews asked if the district uses Due Solution now. Mr. Borosh said the district has been using Dude Solution for the past 13 years. Mr. Andrews asked if the district is looking to add a technology solution. Mrs. Bear said, “no” but may be removing it if not needed. Mr. Borosh said Dude Solution has always treated us fairly with reference to cost. Mr. Borosh said he feels this is a fair price. He said he has seen other technology work order systems that cost about \$15,000. With Dude Solutions, preventive maintenance, work orders and facilities usage across the district are included. This will help schedule everything electronically. Mrs. Bear asked if the district has been happy working with Dude Solution. Mr. Borosh said they have been happy with the structure of the technology piece but it is old. Mr. Matt Hirsch said the new version is user friendly. Mrs. Bear asked if the renewal includes the newer version or is it the same as what the district currently has. Mr. Borosh said the district would like to purchase the newer version. Mr. Schlameuss asked if the current system is on the server and is it used that way. Mr. Borosh said the system is cloud based. Mr. Andrews asked if the district has been using the maintenance side of it for preventative maintenance. Mr. Hirsch they have used it for some of the preventative maintenance. Mrs. Bear asked if the program can be used more efficiently for preventative maintenance. Will they offer training to use it more efficiently? Mrs. Borosh said they will provide training if we ask. Mrs. Bear asked if the district has asked Dude Solutions for training. Mr. Borosh said he has for his staff and Mr. Ihle has had his staff trained, too. Mrs. Bear said it is good if we use Dude Solution fully. Mr. Hirsch said they would also like to use Dude Solutions for all consumables and include bar coding for consumables and non-consumables. Mr. Bear said this program can help Mr. Neiman with the budget. Mr. Schlameuss asked if we have a bar-coding system. Mr. Hirsch said we do. Mr. Schlameuss asked if they have a specific plan in place. He said they should work with Mr. Borosh on an implementation plan to access all contents of the system. Mr. Borosh said he can offer assistance with the inventory piece. He said they have implemented about 98% of the technology assets, which totals about 11,000 or 12,000 technology items in the system. They said the system includes a barcode, serial number, purchase date, etc. Items cannot be deleted because it has several layers of approval. Mrs. Bear asked if the district has something in place for scanning. Mr. Borosh said they have scanning in place as well as in the school libraries. Mr. Schlameuss said the Technology Department should be assisting with all areas. Mr. Borosh said Mr. Romagno has good product in place and has done good a job with his inventory. Mrs. Bear said Mr. Romagno’s items should also be included in the Dude Solutions system. Mr. Andrews asked if the district vehicles are also included in this systems such as the buses. Mr. Borosh said he

believes that the vehicles are part of the Munis System. Mr. Schlameuss asked is Munis being used for the vehicles. Mr. Borosh said he believes so because he received a list from the Business Office. Mr. Neiman said this system is part of the financial package and helps with the audits. Mr. Schlameuss said that this agreement should have been accompanied by a 611 Form. This is the reason why the Board members are asking so many questions to Mr. Borosh of a system that he does not really know about. Mr. Borosh said he is speaking here tonight because he is familiar with it since he is familiar with it since the district has had it for quite a while. Mrs. Bear asked when was the last contract approved. Mr. Borosh said he does not know and believes they have approved a year to year contract for several years. The district has been a long-time customer of Dude Solutions. Dude Solutions is a software for school districts.

4. Field Program

Mr. Neiman said that he distributed to the Board Committee members the quotes that Daryle Miller brought to him today regarding the 2021-2022 seeding for the district fields. Mr. Miller said he got three different quotes and the lowest quote is from Genesis Turf Grass and the highest is from Mahute Trading. Fisher & Son also provided a quote. He said he would recommend choosing the quote from Fisher & Son, even though they are not the lowest quote, for two reasons. No. 1. Genesis their material in the second application with merit that is generic and that is not warrantied, which is used to get rid of grubs. If he applies the material LEBA from Fisher & Son, it would remove grubs in case of an outbreak and they have a warranty. No. 2. Fisher & Sons' service is reliable. Mrs. Bear asked if these quote are for all of the district fields. Mr. Miller said, they are for North, South, Lehman and JT Lambert fields. Mr. Schlameuss asked are we required to accept the lowest bidder due to the value of the contract and the type of procurement it is. Mrs. Bear asked what is the rule. Can we accept a procurement that is not the lowest bid? Mr. Neiman said the amount of is over the \$15,000 threshold; therefore, we need to proceed with caution. Mr. Schlameuss said it needs to be responsible and responsive. We are allowed to spec a brand name but not a material. He said that Mr. Miller spoke about the warranty of one product and not on the other product. Mr. Schlameuss said by providing them with this information, Mr. Miller is helping them understand it better. Can we make the procurement based on it being a responsible and responsive bid? Mr. Neiman said he can follow up with Mr. Miller to see if they have a solid lead and will place on the agenda. Either Fisher and Son or Genesis Turf Grass will be chosen. Mr. Schlameuss said they can look to see if due to the warranty or due to the items that were listed is enough not to accept the lowest bid. Mrs. Bear said if they did not state that they wanted a warranty, they cannot say it is now needed but rather base it on the items that were listed. Mr. Dymond said if we are paying more for a warranty, then we should have it in writing. Mr. Schlameuss said if a warranty was not specified for the quote, it needs to be reviewed. He suggested letting Mr. Neiman and Mr. Miller review all details and make a correct recommendation for the Board agenda.

5. 95% Group Inc. - 95 Phonics Booster Bundles funded by ESSER III - \$22,701.80

Mr. Bill Vitulli said the Curriculum Department would like to purchase a phonics program as a result of the testing that was done this year and knowing that the students were not in school as they should have been. He said they noticed a substantial gap in phonics and in the students' ability to read. The district would like to prepare this program for the summer for some students in grades 1 to 3. They would also like to have this program available in the fall in all first through third grade classrooms. This programs falls under the ESSER III requirement. In order for the district to be eligible for the entire funding, we have to spend 20% of the funds on programs such as this one, which will address the learning gap for our

students throughout the district. This item was not budgeted but needs to be approved and ordered so we can have it in time for summer. The program has been sampled in the district. Dr. Bradley had some classrooms and some Department Chairs working on it with some students. Mrs. Bear asked if this program is paper only. Dr. Vitulli said it is. He said we are getting bundles for all the students and teachers. Mrs. Bear asked if document can be copied. Dr. Vitulli said they cannot be copied. Mrs. Bear asked how are they using it now, with just brick and mortar students only or virtual students, too. Dr. Vitulli they have worked with the brick and mortar students but the program is also available virtually. The district received samples. Mr. Schlameuss asked if students will be participating in the summer program in-person. Dr. Vitulli said we are looking to do the program in-person. Mrs. Bear said if we cannot run the program in-person, will it be done virtually. Dr. Vitulli said they will have it virtually if they cannot have it in-person since it will be a small amount of students in the summer program. It will be a studying tool to address where the kids are academically when they come back in the fall. Mrs. Bear asked if this program is for all elementary schools. Dr. Vitulli said it is for all elementary schools grades 1 to 3. Mr. Andrews said the paperwork says it's for grades 3 to 5. Dr. Vitulli said that must be a typo because the program is for grades 1 to 3. Mrs. Bear said the material comes in packs five and he is ordering 25 for teacher and 73 for 1st grade and 21 for 2nd grade. How do you determine what to order for each grade since more is being ordered for grades 2 and 3. Dr. Vitulli said that Dr. Bradley did her homework and knows how many to order? Dr. Riker said that the district has an opportunity to get 14,000,000 of ESSERS funds. We have to spend 20% of the funds on programs for our students. When is this Board going to trust the Administration to get the correct products for our students. Mrs. Bear said that she is asking for the district to get more not less. Dr. Riker said why do we have to grill Dr. Vitulli every time he comes before the Board with his recommendations. Mrs. Bear said she wants to make sure that all students get it. Dr. Riker said if more materials are needed then Administration will order it. Administration will not let any student not have this program. It is time to trust administration since they are the educational experts and know what they are doing.

6. Dairy & Bread Bid Results

Mr. Craig Neiman said in February, the Food Services group went out to bid for bread and milk products. The bid opening was conducted on March 19th. Three vendors submitted bids for bread and the lowest bidder was Rockland Bakery. There was only one bidder for dairy/milk, which was Pocono Mountain Dairy. Therefore, contracts will be awarded for these two bidders. The total bread cost increase for the 2021-2022 school year is 5% (\$2,059). Milk pricing is established by the PA Marketing Board Region 3. Dairies cannot sell milk below that established price except when offering a volume discount. Pocono Mountain Dairy is willing to honor the minimum price on all milk products, which will fluctuate. Both vendors currently service our district, have provided the lowest prices and the district is very pleased with their products and services.

7. IU20 Paper & Janitorial Bid Results

Mr. Craig Neiman said the district bid paper and janitorial supplies are part of the Colonial IU Consortium. The bid opening occurred about 2 weeks ago at the IU. Our requested paper items totaled \$3,397.16. Mrs. Bear asked if it is less expensive to go through the IU. Mr. Neiman said it is due to the volume of items that are purchased.

8. Close PLGIT Cafeteria Bank Account and Transfer Remaining Funds to ESSA Cafeteria Bank Account
Mr. Craig Neiman said the Business Office is recommending the closing of the PLGIT Cafeteria bank account. As of February 28, 2021, the account had a balance of \$41,677.05. This account has not been used in many years. In an effort to streamline our processes and simplify our banking portfolio, it is recommended that this balance is transferred to the existing ESSA Bank and Trust Cafeteria Fund bank account. Mr. Neiman provided a copy of the February 2021 bank statement for both accounts for the committee's review. Mrs. Bear asked if this is something that he previously thought should be done to make it simpler. Mr. Neiman said she is correct.

9. Payment in Lieu of Taxes – National Recreation Area, Pike County
Mr. Craig Neiman said the Application for Payment in lieu of taxes is done each year. It is for a National Recreation Area in Pike County that was acquired from the State. The assessed value of the property is \$94,371.00 and the amount due to the district is \$11,669.92. Mr. Schlameuss said that the document was already signed early on in order for the district to receive the money. If it was money going out it would have been a different story. Mr. Dymond said it is amazing that the township has all of these acres and buildings and we do not see the funds from it all.

10. Current Projects within the District
Mr. Craig Neiman said that he provided the committee members with an update of the current projects within the school district, which was given to the Property/Facilities Committee last week. Mrs. Bear said it looks like we are winding down on a lot of projects, which is good. She believes more projects may be added. Mrs. Dymond asked if Mr. Neiman can print the report larger. Mr. Neiman said he can look to see if he can provide something different. Mr. Dymond said he may be able to see it better when he gets his glasses.

11. 2021-22 Budget Update
Mr. Craig Neiman presented the 2021-22 Budget Update. He said that the agenda for this evening is on the 2020-21 General fund recap, 2021-22 general fund budget update and upcoming meeting schedule.

20201-21 - Revenues

Page 4

Local Revenues

Beginning of the year = uncertainty due to COVID-19

Real Estate Collections strong, 03% behind prior year

Earned Income Tax trending slightly ahead of prior year

Real Estate Transfer Tax trending significantly ahead of prior year and already surpassed full year budgeted amount

Investment income significantly behind prior year and full year budget due to interest rate environment

Conclusion = Local Revenue have “hung in there” so far...

State Revenues

On budget and flat to prior year

Federal Revenues

Significant one time, unbudgeted grant funds made available due to COVID-19

Page 5

Charter School Impact – the biggest driver or cost this year. This year the cost is about 10 million dollars for about 519 students.

2020-21 Rate per Student:

Regular Ed - \$15,264.54 and Special Ed - \$39,195.69

Rate per student has increased each year based on PDE 363 calculation

Page 6 – New news

ESSER II Funds

Full award estimated to be \$7,093,789

Allowable use case - As per Division Manager of PDE, paying charter school tuition is not an expense to maintain operations/continuity of services, but a redistribution of state and local funding to account for students enrolled in charter schools.

ESSER II funds can and should be used for continuation of services at the LEA, which in turn, would free up more state and local dollars to pay charter schools. ESSERII funds can be more appropriately used to fund, among other things, the continuing employment of teachers and other operational costs incurred at the district-level to offset increased charter school tuition costs. Furthermore, she stated that if a district has their own LEA run cyber, they CAN use ESSER II funds to support their own programming.

PDE Division Chief, was asked if increased cost due to the increase in number of students participating in a district run cyber would be allowable cost under ESSER. The Chief said it's allowed as long as you can make a direct connection to your cyber attendance increase to the COVID situation, it's an allowable use of funds.

ESASD is going to utilize approximately \$7.0 million of our ESSER II Fund allocation to cover the cost of salaries and benefits for all teachers who were transferred to ESACA for the 2020-2021 school year, as well as for the cost of salaries and benefits for all additional schedule B positions that were needed, as a result of the COVID-induced increase in ESACA enrollment.

Mr. Dymond asked if we transferred teachers into ESACA and we have already been paying them, how did the district incur a seven million-dollar expense. Dr. Riker said we did not incur more expense with teachers but in more students attending cyber. He said about 53 students were moved into ESACA, which now ESSER can pay for the salaries and the district can use the district funds to pay for cyber students. Mrs. Bear asked if the ESSER fund can be used to pay for the staff, i.e. bus drivers, that are delivering lunch. Dr. Riker said it will cover any additional expenditures that were incurred this year. He said the Board also allocated 5.2 million dollars from the fund balance to cover expenses this year, which hopefully ESSER can cover some money in order not to use all of the 5.2 million dollars. Dr. Riker said this is information that should cause everyone to cheer. Mr. Schlameuss said it is better to use ESSER grant on whatever is easier to document such as payroll instead of other expenses that may cause you to be gathering receipts. Mr. Neiman said ESSER grant is a one-time use of funds so the gamble is that we need for more students to come back from charter schools so that our expenses can go down. We do not want to get into the habit of using grants to cover payroll and benefits. Mr. Dymond said he did not understand the whole process of allocating the funds but now he does. Mr. Schlameuss said we, as a board, need to get the word out there that if they keep using charter schools, the district will need to raise taxes. Mrs. Bear said many people do not realize where the money for charter schools comes from. Dr. Riker said for every 50 students that attend another cyber or charter school, it costs the district about one million dollars.

Page 7 –

Potential 2020-21 Year End Position
Budgeted Revenue = \$160.1
Budgeted Expenditures = \$165.3
Budgeted Deficit = (\$5.2)
Charter Spend over Budget = (\$5.7)
ESSER II Revenue –ESACA \$7.0
Potential Year End Deficit = (\$3.9)

ESSER II funding offsets ongoing operational costs related to ESCA Program expansion due to COVID-19 Pandemic. One time, temporary cost relief.

Dr. Riker said that the district’s ESACA program has afforded the district many savings. If we did not have ESACA, about 250 students would have left to another cyber school and cost the district about five million dollars. ESACA has benefitted the district financially and educationally.

Page 9

2021-22 Budget Themes
Structural Deficit Budget Issue continue
Unfunded State Mandates – Dramatic increase in Charter School costs and pension costs continue to increase.
When/How many cyber charter students return to ESASD
When/How many ESACA students return to ESASD buildings
Assumed flat funding from the State
Federal Funds – ESSER III
Federal cost/contracted cost growth
COVID-19 impact/uncertainty i.e. Local revenues (EIT, interest income), costs, and federal funding.
Focus on maintain educational excellence for all ESASD students

Page 10

Budget Change from last Presentation

	<u>2021-22 Budget As of December</u>	<u>2021-22 Budget As of April</u>	<u>Change from December to April</u>
Revenue	\$159,636,866	\$160,215,366	\$578,500
Expenditures	\$169,236,892	\$170,978,781	\$1,741,889
Revenue over Expenditures	(\$9,600,026)	(\$10,763,415)	(\$1,163,389)
Beginning fund Balance	\$43,964,036	\$43,964,036	0
Ending Fund Balance	\$34,364,010	\$33,200,621	(\$1,163,389)

Page 11

2021-22 Budget Comparison to Prior Year

	<u>2020-21 Budget</u>	<u>2021-22 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
			<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>
Revenue	\$160,104,718	\$160,215,366	\$110,648	0.07%
Expenditures	\$165,285,625	\$170,978,781	\$5,693,155	3.44%
Revenue over Expenditures	(\$5,180,907)	(\$10,763,415)	(\$5,582,507)	
Beginning Fund Balance	\$49,144,943	\$43,964,036		
Ending Fund Balance	\$43,964,036	\$33,200,621	(\$10,763,415)	-24.48%

Page 12

2021-22 Budget Cost Drivers

	<u>2021-22 Budget</u>	<u>Increase over 2020-21- \$</u>	<u>Increase over 2020-21- %</u>
PSERS	\$24,300,044	\$1,044,650	4.5%
Charter Schools	\$8,000,000	\$3,600,000	81.8%
Everything Else	\$138,678,737	\$1,048,505	0.8%
Total Expenditures	\$170,978,781	\$5,693,155	3.4%

Page 13

PSERS Employer Contribution Rate, which has increased from 2002-04 at 3.77 to 2020-22 at 34.94

Page 14

Charter School Cost Trend from 2015-16 at \$3,726,824 to 2021-22 at \$8,000,000

Page 15

2021-22 Budget Cost Categories Compared to 2020-21 Cost Categories

2021-22 Budget	2020-21 Budget
Supplies – 3.5%	Supplies – 3.9%
Purchased Services – 4.4%	Purchased Services – 4.6%
Contracted Services – 5.1%	Contracted Services – 5.0%
Charter Schools – 4.7%	Charter Schools – 2.7%
Debt Service – 10.1%	Debt Services – 11.4%
Salaries & Benefits – 71.2%	Salaries & Benefits – 71.4%

All categories equal or are down from year over year except for Charter Schools.

Page 16

One time Federal ESSER Funding

ESSER I - \$1,746,134 (2020-21 Budget)

ESSER II - \$7,108,040 (2020-21 Budget)

ESSER III - \$14,541,856 (2021-22 Budget) - 20% required to support learning loss

Both Revenue and Expenditure amounts will be included in 2021-22 Budget

ESSER Funding is one-time temporary funding

Use of this funding to supplant or pay ongoing expenses will further increase the district's structural deficit

PDE Caution: LEA are advised that CARES Act funding is one-time, emergency aid. As such LEAs should consider how CARES Act funding might interact with other federal funding and the role of enhanced funding flexibilities to ensure strategic and substantial use.

Mr. Schlameuss said that with the ESSER grant funding we have to buy 20% of expenses and we have about two years to do so. Dr. Riker said we have until 2024 to spend the funds. Mr. Neiman said that on page 17 he breaks down the expenses as follows.

Page 17

ESSER III – Blended yet Separate

<u>2021-22</u>	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Expenses	\$170,978,781	\$14,541,856	\$185,520,637
Revenue	\$160,215,366	\$14,541,856	\$174,757,222
Total	(\$10,763,415)	\$0	(\$10,763,415)
Capital Projects	\$0	\$?	\$0

Stimulus Operational & Learning Loss expenses will be reflected in the General Fund Budget, although they are one-time funds.

Potential for ESSER III Funds to be used for approved use Capital Expenditures (mainly HVAC)

Mrs. Bear asked if the ESSER III Grant can cover expenses for air quality. Mr. Neiman said it can.

Page 18

Act 1

Act 1 of 2006 limits the percentage increase of real estate tax millage to an amount established by two factors:

- a. Statewide Average Weekly Wage (SAWW)
- b. Employment Cost index (ECI)

Average of both factors determines base Act 1 index

- 1. 3.0% For 2021-22

Adjustment for districts with a market value/personal income aid ratio greater than .4000

- 1. .6646% adjustment for ESASD

Adjusted Act 1 Index for 2021-22 is 4.2%

- 1. 3.0% x (.75+.6646) = 4.2438%

Resolution not to exceed approved at December 2020 Board meeting.

Page 19

Tax increase history compared to index
2010-11 3.9% to 2021-22 4.2% and a tax increase in 2012-13

Page 20

Millage Scale and Associated Revenue
2021 Millage Rates based on STEB (State Tax Equalization Board) Market Value
Rebalance:
Monroe = 30.75 and Pike = 123.66 (down \$5 a mill from 10 years ago)

	<u>New Millage Rate Monroe/Pike</u>	<u>Revenue Generated</u>	<u>Annual Impact on Median Homestead Monroe/Pike</u>
1.0%	31.06/124.90	\$939,974	\$37.71/\$29.86
1.5%	31.22/125.51	\$1,409,961	\$54.67/\$44.80
2.0%	31.37/126.13	\$1,879,948	\$71.64/\$59.73
2.5%	31.52/126.75	\$2,349,935	\$88.61/\$74.66
3.0%	31.68/127.37	\$2,819,921	\$105.58/\$89.59
3.5%	31.83/127.00	\$3,289,908	\$122.54/\$104.52
4.0%	31.98/128.61	\$3,759,895	\$139.51/\$119.46

Mrs. Bear asked what was the median house prices that he used to calculate the median.
Mr. Neiman said he does not have that with him but he used the assessed value.

Page 21

Potential Deficit Closer Scenario – Revenue over Expenditures
Current Deficit – (\$10,763,415)
Expenditure Cuts - \$1,000,000
Use of Fund Balance - \$7,413,480
Millage Increase (2.5%) - \$2,349,935
Remaining Deficit – (\$0)
\$1 million of fund balance usage could come from Pension committed fund

Page 22

General Fund balance as of June 30, 2020
1. Non-spendable - \$343,075- prepared expenses
2. Committed - \$24,545,532 – Future Pension increases and future healthcare costs
3. Assigned - \$18,181,209 – Future Budget Expenditures, Future Educational Program and Capital Projects
4. Unassigned - \$6,075,127 (3.8% of expenditures)
5. Total General Fund balance as of June 30, 2020 - \$49,144,943
-2020-21 Budget assumes consumption of \$5.2 million to cover budget shortfall
Mr. Schlameuss asked if the new hires are no longer on the PSERS funds. Mr. Neiman said they are on their own PSERS but there is no savings to the district. They are eligible for a

PSERS program. Mr. Schlameuss said so they are still on PSERS. Mr. Neiman said yes they are and we don't necessarily render a savings on these employees.

Page 23

Capital Reserve Fund Balance Review

From 2010-11

July 1 = \$5,271,385

Revenues = \$29,120

Expenditures = \$4,565,418

Bond Issuance = \$3,736,689

Transfer From GF = \$1,714,000

June 30 = \$6,185,776

To 2019-20

July 1 = \$20,735,337

Revenues = \$312,243

Expenditures = \$7,669,453

Bond Issuance = \$0

Transfer From GF = \$0

June 30 = \$13,378,127

10-year Average

Revenues = \$112,483

Expenditures = \$3,680,240

Bond Issuance = \$676,169

Transfer From GF = \$3,702,262

June 30 = \$12,404,726

Balance as of March 31, 2021 = \$10,325,713

Funding Strategy needs to be determined

Page 24

Board Discussion

1. Is the Board open to a tax increase?
2. Is the Board comfortable using fund balance?
3. Administration continues to monitor local revenue health and status of State and Federal budgets
4. Administration continues to work on recommendation for best utilization of Federal Pandemic Grants.
5. Administration continues to look to cost reductions.

Mr. Neiman said we have to vote for the budget in May and hopes not to present it with a ten-million-dollar deficit. He said his first question is does the Administration move forward with a tax increase and use of fund balance. We do not have information about the State funding yet but does not expect a miracle. We have some information from the Federal Government with reference to the Pandemic grants. We need to find the right mix. Mr. Dymond said there has been several online PSBA classes that spoke about Governor Wolf's budget and charter schools. He asked if anyone felt that progress will be made. Dr. Riker said he does not. Mr. Neiman said he was on a meeting on Friday and someone asked the legislators what is the timeline on charter schools and no one said anything; therefore, for the moment, we cannot bank on anything different. Dr. Riker said we are taking an aggressive approach to solicit the families to bring them back to our district from charter schools. He said we did a survey two weeks ago that closed on

Friday and we are analyzing that data now that we will put out to families next week to firm up numbers. If we can bring more cyber charter students into the district, we will be our greatest savings. We can probably take an eight-million-dollar expense and reduce it by at least one million dollars. Mrs. Bear asked if Cyber Charter students were sent the survey. Dr. Riker said these families will be receiving a letter. We will know more at the end of April. At that time, the district can get a better idea of what the numbers will be. Mr. Schlameuss said there is still a five-million-dollar gap that was budgeted for this school year. The district will not be able to escape certain costs such as for salaries and PSERS. He said we cannot keep spending the fund balance. We can assign some of it for contingency purposes but not every year. Mr. Schlameuss said he is not saying next year will be exceptional but we need to plan for years to come. He said he would recommend a reasonable tax increase. Mrs. Bear said the tax increase will probably be just \$30 a month spread across the mortgage. Mr. Schlameuss said we just had reassessment issue. Mrs. Bear said and as a result, some people are paying less. Mr. Schlameuss said some are paying less and some are paying more. Mr. Andrews said we have not had a tax increase in years. He said a small tax increase should have occurred across the years. Mrs. Bear said if we had a tax increase each year, the district would still have spent the money. Mr. Dymond said we are behind on keeping up with the maintenance of our schools, which is contributing to the expenses. Dr. Riker said if we use the numbers that Mr. Neiman presented, the money in the fund balance will be used up within the next three years. If that happens, we will need to borrow money. Mr. Schlameuss said the bonds that were done were issued for construction and once we pay them off the maintenance will be less than the building. Also, as teacher retire, staff will be hired at a lesser salary but none of this helps us today. Mr. Dymond said even with teachers retiring salary contracts will still be rising. Mr. Schlameuss said the reason they are having this conversation is because they not know the actual expenses for about charter schools next year. Mrs. Bear said she wishes the district can do an educational meeting to inform parents how cyber/charter schools affect our districts. So many people say it's free. Dr. Riker said he does not disagree but he takes a different approach. He wants to focus on how to keep the students in our district by the development of learning options for next year. The district is cautiously optimistic that these choices will help parents want to stay in our district. We have been beating the drum many years regarding for cyber charter funding but we need to spend our energy in making our school relevant so that the students do not want to leave ESASD. This is a different approach than most school districts are doing. We need to keep them in our school district. Mrs. Bear said she would like to share with parents the district's electives that cyber charters do not offer. Mr. Schlameuss said we have to sell them on what our district is doing. Mr. Dymond asked who oversees the day to day operations of charter schools. Dr. Riker said they have to answer to the Board of the school district where they reside. We do not have one in our district. He said he does not know how the school districts oversee them but they have a role in it. Mr. Neiman said cyber charters are different. They have to come and ask permission. Mr. Dymond who inspects these schools to insure they are having the correct curriculum. He said there was once cyber school in our area that was substantial and it took them a while to close down. He said he would be upset to find out that we are throwing all this money out there and they are basically a babysitting service. Mr. Neiman said another issue is when these students come back to our buildings, they will not be at the same educational level from when they left. Mr. Schlameuss said if you look at their Form 990 for non-profit status, their revenue is quite appalling. Dr. Riker said their CEOs are among the top five with their multi-million dollar salaries. Mr. Dymond asked how many charter school students are we transporting. Mr. Neiman said he does not have this information but it is not a large cost to the district. Mr. Dymond asked if the district is transporting many students to many miles. Mr. Neiman said the district cannot transport beyond 10 miles so he believes there may be just a van of students being transported. Mr. Dymond said, hopefully, when the district opens back up a good percentage will be coming back here so that parents do not have to transport their own children. Dr. Riker said this is our hope. Mr. Schlameuss said many students went to cyber charters not a

brick and motor school. Mr. Dymond asked if the district is aware of the PSERS issue. Dr. Riker and Mr. Neiman said they are aware. Mr. Dymond asked if the PSERS issue will cause a problem to the district. Mr. Neiman said currently there is no issue but they can change the rate on us. Mr. Schlameuss said right now there is a lawsuit for fair funding so that districts like ours will be able to receive allocation on a revised funding formula. Mr. Andrews said our district is being shortchanged about \$2,600 per student which is about 14 million dollars per year. Mr. Schlameuss said this case is going to the courts. Mrs. Bear some of the districts are saying they will have to raise taxes so they do not want the revised funding formula. Mr. Schlameuss said the court date for this case is September 8th but it may end up like the turnpike case so they will not approve it. Dr. Riker asked if the Committee members would like to suggest a tax increase percent so that Mr. Neiman prepares a proposed budget. Mr. Schlameuss said a 2.5% tax increase is reasonable. The Committee members agreed. Mr. Schlameuss said if the budget is looking more promising, we can use fund balance for this next year, too. Mr. Andrews said that the community needs to be aware that there has not been a tax increase since 2013. Mrs. Bear said since 2011. Dr. Riker said any money they chose to take from the fund balance, will take the district a year to look at how to recuperate those expenses so that we are not in hole. Mrs. Bear said the public needs to realize that we do not have 49 million dollars in the fund balance. Mr. Andrews said that the public believes we have 49 million dollars in the fund balance. Dr. Riker said that Mr. Neiman is asking if you want to use the 1million dollars that was allocated to PSERS in the fund balance. We may want to recommend next year to the board a reduction of expenses of 1 million dollars. Mr. Schlameuss said he agrees because we will need to buy new buses soon. Mr. Dymond said he was going to bring up the buying of busses expense. He said they met with a bus dealer and right now the cost of a bus is approximately \$330,000. Dr. Riker said everything else has just gone up 1 percent. There is no room to squeeze any money out from other expenditures. Mrs. Bear said interest rates are low and bond refinancing is not substantial.

Page 25

Meeting Schedule

1. April 19th Board Meeting 2021-22 Budget Update
2. May 10th Finance Committee Meeting – 2021-22 Budget Update
3. May 17th Board Meeting – Budget Update and Proposed Final 2021-22 Budget Vote
4. June 14th – Finance Committee Meeting -2021-22 Budget Update
5. June 21st – Board Meeting – Budget Update and Final 2021-22 Budget Vote

Mr. Neiman asked if the Committee would like to discuss the budget at the Regular Board meeting. Mrs. Bear said we need to discuss the budget again and again. Mr. Schlameuss said the public needs to understand what the budget entails. Mrs. Bear said more public Zooms into the Regular Board meeting; therefore, they need to see the presentation in order for them to understand. Mr. Schlameuss thanked Mr. Neiman for a very well done presentation. Mr. Andrews said the fund balance needs to be detailed per category to show what it is made up of. Mrs. Bear said the more we explain it, it will be easier for people to understand.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PROPERTY & FACILITIES COMMITTEE:

1. D'HUY ENGINEERING INVOICES
 - a. Resica & Middle Smithfield Elementary Water Filtration - Invoice #52491 \$865.00
 - b. North Campus Sanitary Liner Replacement - Invoice #52492 \$3,495,00
 - c. Transportation Underground Tank Removal – Invoice #52493 \$1,749.85
 - d. High School South Pool Repairs – Invoice #52494 \$3,535.20
 - e. High School North and Lehman Intermediate Window Replacement - Invoice #52495 \$1,302.70

- f. Lehman Intermediate and Bushkill Elementary Flooring Replacement - Invoice #52496 \$559.98
- g. High School's North and South Hand Wash Stations - Invoice #52497 \$1,737.30
- h. J.M. Hill Vestibule Renovation - Invoice #52498 \$1,297.49
- 2. S&G Asphalt Service, LLC - Application for Payment #2 - Smithfield Parking Lot Sealcoat - \$3,352.45
- 3. TERP Consulting – Lyman & Ash Invoice #7821 \$2,800.
- 4. Jottan Roofing – High School North and Lehman Intermediate Roof Project – Application for Payment #12 \$160,488.38.
- 5. TRANE 5 YEAR SERVICE AGREEMENT-- July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2026. Total cost of the 5-year agreement is \$318,423 and covers all 10 District Buildings.
- 6. J.T. LAMBERT DOOR #25 REPLACEMENT A.G. Mauro Company - \$7,270.00
- 7. District Vehicle Scrap/Recycling – 1995 Mitsubishi Box Truck, 1999 Ford E-350, 2000 Ford E-450, 2001 Ford Dump Truck, 2005 Dodge Coupe. Alpha Recycling Purchase - \$3,800.
- 8. Keystone Fire Protection Proposals –
 - a. Middle Smithfield Elementary – Convert Fire System to Cellular in place of landline - \$1,303.00 Proposal #21-0572
 - b. Middle Smithfield Elementary - Service Agreement - \$535.00 Proposal #21-0573
 - c. J.T. Lambert Intermediate – Convert Fire System to Cellular in place of landline - \$1,303.00 Proposal #21-0570
 - d. J.T. Lambert Intermediate – Service Agreement - \$535.00 Proposal # 21-0571
- 9. Bushkill Elementary – Gym and Stage Floor Sand and Refinish
 - a. Quote – Miller Sports Construction \$21,450.00
Mrs. Bear asked if this a quote or are we paying this. Mr. Dymond said it is only a quote. Mrs. Bear said; therefore, they are not paying it.
- 10. District Capital Projects – Winning Bid Results
 - a. Sanitary Lagoon Liner Replacement North Campus – Atlantic Lining Company - \$549,833.60
 - b. Flooring Replacement –
 - i. Bushkill Elementary – Cope Commercial Flooring and Interiors - \$299,995.00
 - ii. Lehman Intermediate – H&P Construction Base Bid - \$448,734, alternate #1 - \$124,449.00
 - c. Curtain wall and Storefront Replacement – High School North and Lehman Intermediate – D&M Construction Unlimited \$560,000.00 (pending additional review by D’Huy Engineering)
Mr. Neiman said the review happened therefore it’s ready to recommend.
 - d. Vestibule Modifications and Interior Gym Door(s) Replacement – J.M. Hill Elementary – Bognet Inc. - \$138,286.00

Mr. Schlameuss asked Mr. Dymond if the Property/Facilities Committee discussed everything; therefore, do not need to address any items at tonight’s meeting. Mr. Dymond said they did. Mrs. Bear asked if the items they recommended are in line with the Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Dymond said they are. Mrs. Bear said she is not sure what a curtain wall is but it is expensive. Mr. Dymond said they need to be done. Mrs. Bear said that sanitary liners are also expensive. Mr. Dymond said they were mandated by the State. He said he thought the liners were going to be more expensive. Mrs. Bear asked what is a vestibule modification. Dr. Riker this needs to be done for security reasons. Mr. Schlameuss asked if this expense will be coming out of the Safety Grant. Dr.

Riker said that is correct. He said Chief Mill does inspections of all buildings and makes his recommendations. Mr. Dymond said the vestibule at JM Hill will be for handicap access.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE EDUCATION P&R COMMITTEE

None

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – LIMITED TO ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

Mrs. VanWhy said all of her questions were answered. She said that Mr. Neiman did a great job in his budget presentation. She suggested that he include the page that has his recommendation when he presents the budget to the Board on Monday.

Mrs. Bear asked if the Education Committee will recommend 95 Phonics Booster Bundles to the Finance Committee. Dr. Riker said they won't because they meet after the Finance Committee but they will be informed.

X. ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by Larry Dymond to recommend that the Board consider for approval the following items. Motion was seconded by George Andrews and carried unanimously, 4-0.

1. Mrs. Jamie Doyle will be presenting the refunding of the issuance of General Obligation Bonds or Note, Series of 2021, via the dual track process between a bank loan and a bond issue, the proceeds of which will be used towards the current refunding of the District's Series of 2016 Bonds and Series A of 2016 Bonds at a minimum net savings target of 2.00%.
2. The quote from ePlus in the amount of \$23,733.75 for the purchase of 25 wireless access points in the Administration Center.
3. The three-year agreement from Dude Solutions beginning July 1, 2021 at an annual cost of \$23,485.00, including Asset Essentials Core Plus, Dude Analytics, and Event Manager Enterprise (if needed).
4. The purchase of "95 Phonics Booster Bundles" for all District students in grades 3 to 5 at a cost of \$22,701.80 from the 95 Percent Group.
5. The award of the Food Service Bids in the estimated quantities and unit prices as presented.
6. The award of bids by the IU Joint Purchasing Board for paper and custodial supplies.
7. To close the District PLIGIT Cafeteria bank account and transfer the balance to the District ESSA Cafeteria bank account.
8. To ratify and affirm the authority of the Superintendent, Board President, and Board Secretary to execute and submit to the Pennsylvania Department of Education an Application for Payment pursuant to Section 604 of the School Code for payment in lieu of taxes for property acquired by the Commonwealth for the National Recreation Area project located in Lehman Township, Pike County.

9. The fertilizers bids. It will be reviewed and the best choice will be presented to the Board. Mrs. Bear asked if it will be with the warranty or not. Mr. Schlameuss said it will be need to reviewed if the warranty was part of the bid. Dr. Riker said it is a preventative piece for the fields. Mrs. Bear asked if they had a grub problem. Mr. Dymond said they have had it. Mr. Schlameuss said for Administration to use their best discretion and send the correct motion to the Board. Dr. Riker said they will present the best choice to the Board.
10. The following Property/Facilities Committee meeting items:
 - D'HUY ENGINEERING INVOICES
 - a. Resica & Middle Smithfield Elementary Water Filtration - Invoice #52491 \$865.00
 - b. North Campus Sanitary Liner Replacement - Invoice #52492 \$3,495,00
 - c. Transportation Underground Tank Removal – Invoice #52493 \$1,749.85
 - d. High School South Pool Repairs – Invoice #52494 \$3,535.20
 - e. High School North and Lehman Intermediate Window Replacement - Invoice #52495 \$1,302.70
 - f. Lehman Intermediate and Bushkill Elementary Flooring Replacement - Invoice #52496 \$559.98
 - g. High School's North and South Hand Wash Stations - Invoice #52497 \$1,737.30
 - h. J.M. Hill Vestibule Renovation - Invoice #52498 \$1,297.49
 - i. S&G Asphalt Service, LLC - Application for Payment #2 - Smithfield Parking Lot Sealcoat - \$3,352.45
 - j. TERP Consulting – Lyman & Ash Invoice #7821 \$2,800.
 - k. Jottan Roofing – High School North and Lehman Intermediate Roof Project – Application for Payment #12 \$160,488.38.
 - l. TRANE 5 YEAR SERVICE AGREEMENT-- July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2026. Total cost of the 5-year agreement is \$318,423 and covers all 10 District Buildings.
 - m. J.T. LAMBERT DOOR #25 REPLACEMENT A.G. Mauro Company - \$7,270.00
 - n. District Vehicle Scrap/Recycling – 1995 Mitsubishi Box Truck, 1999 Ford E-350, 2000 Ford E-450, 2001 Ford Dump Truck, 2005 Dodge Coupe. Alpha Recycling Purchase - \$3,800.
 - o. Keystone Fire Protection Proposals –
 - p. Middle Smithfield Elementary – Convert Fire System to Cellular in place of landline - \$1,303.00 Proposal #21-0572
 - q. Middle Smithfield Elementary - Service Agreement - \$535.00 Proposal #21-0573
 - r. J.T. Lambert Intermediate – Convert Fire System to Cellular in place of landline - \$1,303.00 Proposal #21-0570
 - s. J.T. Lambert Intermediate – Service Agreement - \$535.00 Proposal # 21-0571
 - t. Bushkill Elementary – Gym and Stage Floor Sand and Refinish
 - u. Quote – Miller Sports Construction \$21,450.00
 - v. District Capital Projects – Winning Bid Results
 - w. Sanitary Lagoon Liner Replacement North Campus – Atlantic Lining Company - \$549,833.60

- x. Flooring Replacement –
 - i. Bushkill Elementary – Cope Commercial Flooring and Interiors - \$299,995.00
 - ii. Lehman Intermediate – H&P Construction Base Bid - \$448,734, alternate #1 - \$124,449.00
- y. Curtain wall and Storefront Replacement – High School North and Lehman Intermediate – D&M Construction Unlimited \$560,000.00 (pending additional review by D’Huy Engineering)
- z. Vestibule Modifications and Interior Gym Door(s) Replacement – J.M. Hill Elementary – Bognet Inc. - \$138,286.

XI. NEXT MEETING – May 10, 2021

RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE:

Motion was made by Larry Dymond to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Richard Schlameuss and carried unanimously, 4-0

XII. ADJOURNMENT: 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia L. Rosado
Board Secretary