

2013

***REVIEW OF THE CAFETERIA AND
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
PROGRAMS and A PLAN TO INCREASE AID
FOR THE TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT***

ADDENDUM TO THE MAIN STUDY:

*ARE THERE OPTIONS THAT MIGHT PROVIDE
MORE EFFICIENT WAYS OR PATTERNS TO ORGANIZE
HOW THE PRE- KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE TWELVE
PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED/DELIVERED
OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS?*

***KENMORE-TOWN OF TONAWANDA
UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT***

*1500 Colvin Boulevard
Buffalo, New York 14223*

*“Custom tools and research to aid a school district in defining a vision and
decision options for serving students in the future.”*

PREFACE

This second section of the study was prepared to provide a ‘snapshot’ or overview of the cafeteria and operations and maintenance departments. Additionally, information from the first part of the study regarding transportation is continued along with a possible roadmap for the district to increase expense driven aid relative to the transportation department. Here, this review will set forth options for the district’s consideration to increase the state aid it receives as a result of specific expenditures throughout the budget. Areas that could drive district savings that come from the transportation review of state aid are noted in this part of the study. Our review of the cafeteria and operations and maintenance departments focused on their present operations and examining what might be opportunities and challenges for them as they look to continue to provide the best service possible. For the O&M department, the main section of the study shows work they have accomplished as a result of the Buildings Conditions Survey and also set forth items that are being addressed and will need to be addressed in the future. Specific savings generated from either the cafeteria or operations and maintenance departments relative to reorganization would be dependent upon the possible scenarios for review set forth in the main part of the study.

The leadership teams of the departments were extremely open and accommodating throughout our review work and tours of the various facilities. These support areas are extremely important to the overall running of the district. It was more than apparent to us, as guest outside observers, that the leadership of these departments take great pride in their work and the part they play in their support of the Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Preface</i> | i |
| Purpose of This Section of the Study | 1 |
| Findings and Observations of the School Meals Program | 1 |
| Delivery Systems of the Cafeteria Program | 1 |
| Cafeteria Staffing at Each School Site | 2 |
| Observations | 6 |
| Meals per Labor Hour (MPLH) Implications | 7 |
| Observations | 8 |
| Meals Programs Expense/Revenues Review | 8 |
| Percentage of Costs to Revenues: 2011-2012 | 9 |
| Observations | 9 |
| Some Opportunities and Options to Examine | 10 |
| Findings and Observations about the Operations and Maintenance | |
| Department | 12 |
| Delivery Systems of the O&M Department | 12 |
| Central Maintenance Building Staff | 12 |
| Observations | 13 |
| Building Level Operations | 14 |
| Observations | 19 |
| Some Opportunities and Options to Examine | 20 |
| Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD Bus Transportation | 22 |
| Pupil Transportation Expenditures | 24 |
| Operations and Maintenance/Transportation Services | |
| Maximizing State Aid | 25 |

Copyright 2013
As to Original Text, Format, and Methodology.
All Rights Reserved.
SES Study Team, LLC
www.SES-StudyTeam.org

**Authorized for the exclusive internal use for planning by the
Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District and its stakeholders.**

*“Custom tools and research to aid a school district in defining a vision and
decision options for serving students in the future.”*

PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION OF THE STUDY

The purpose is to review the operations of the cafeteria and operations and maintenance departments as well as state aid review for transportation to provide background for suggestions/insights about the current organization and delivery of the programs. This section looks at how staffing is set up at the schools and offers possible opportunities and challenges associated with the long term viability of the programs.

METHODOLOGY OF THIS SECTION OF THE STUDY

- ✓ Several meetings took place with the School Meals Manager and the Supervisor of the Operations and Maintenance Department. Meetings were also held with the Transportation Supervisor to determine operating times for buses. These meetings and discussions helped us to better understand the school/community culture, thus providing a backdrop for how the various departments support the needs of students and the overall operations of the district.
- ✓ Visits were set up with each of the schools in the district. These on site tours helped us to better understand the physical layouts of the individual schools. We spent time meeting with the building leadership teams to get their perspectives of how the support departments worked with their individual buildings. We also were able to see the different departments ‘in action’ which allowed us to see how they worked at the separate schools. These tours helped give us an overall picture of the K-12 programs and how the different departments worked in support of these programs.
- ✓ The department heads provided us with pertinent data related to their separate programs. This information was reviewed and established the basis for the various data charts used throughout this section of the study.

FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE SCHOOL MEALS PROGRAM

• DELIVERY SYSTEMS OF THE CAFETERIA PROGRAM

The cafeteria program combines centralized operations with on-site preparation and cooking to provide healthy offerings of breakfast and lunches to K-12 students. This strategy of delivery allows for a combination of large-scale, cost-effective operations with individual school preparation and cooking. The menus at the various schools evidence many combinations of food groups that effectively meet federal and state guidelines for nutrition. As we witnessed at the various school sites, the cafeteria staffs do an excellent job in providing students with healthy options at both breakfast and lunch serving times. We observed students having many different options for their meals and were impressed with the way students selected fruit and vegetable offerings as part of their menu items. Students were able to choose both regular meal offerings and a la carte selections at the schools.

Staffing for both the central operations and building level programs is lean and effective. At the central level there is a manager, assistant, and secretary to run the school meals program. At the building level there is a cook manager, often times with a cook and various food service helpers. In each of the buildings, the staff has been downsized to keep pace with the declining student population and budgetary constraints. In addition, as staff has left due to attrition, new staff has not been added to take their place. Instead, the SMM (School Meals Manager) has redeployed staff to meet the needs of the individual buildings.

As part of an overall strategy to keep personnel costs down, the SMM has set up a staffing pattern that has one full-time employee at each school with the rest of the staff being part-time. The FT staff member receives benefits, while the PT staff does not receive health insurance benefits. As shown in the following personnel charts, each school has site-specific personnel with the larger, combined schools having staff that is together, yet serving the different student populations.

• **CAFETERIA STAFFING AT EACH SCHOOL SITE**

The charts that follow list the school lunch program staff, as well as the lunch and breakfast program percentages of student participation benchmarked to the average daily attendance of the pupils in each school building.

| EDISON ELEMENTARY | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 53% | 11% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |
| Dishwasher | PT | | |

| FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 69% Elementary and 66% Middle School | 27% Elementary and 26% Middle School |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Cashier Elementary | PT | | |
| Server Elementary | PT | | |
| Breakfast | PT | | |
| Cashier #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Deli Cashier | PT | | |
| Deli Server | PT | | |
| Hamburg/Hotdog | PT | | |
| Dish room Elementary | PT | | |
| Dish room Middle | PT | | |

| HAMILTON ELEMENTARY | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 63% | 19% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |
| Dish Room | PT | | |

| HOLMES ELEMENTARY | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 89% | 68% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |
| Dishwasher | PT | | |
| Breakfast | PT | | |

| HOOVER ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 40% Elementary and 67% Middle School | 10% Elementary and 13% Middle School |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Cashier Elementary | PT | | |
| Server Elementary | PT | | |
| Dish Room Elementary | PT | | |
| Cashier #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Cashier #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Deli Cashier | PT | | |
| Deli Server | PT | | |
| Dish Room Middle | PT | | |
| Hamburger/Hot Dog | PT | | |

| JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 51% | 11% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |

| LINDBERGH ELEMENTARY | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| | | | |
| Cook Manager | FT | 61% | 15% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |
| Dishwasher | PT | | |

| ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| | | | |
| Cook Manager | FT | 69% | 34% |
| Server | PT | | |
| Cashier | PT | | |
| Dishwasher | PT | | |

| SHERIDAN BUILDING | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| | | | |
| Food Service Helper | FT | | |
| Food Service Helper | PT | | |

| FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 69% Elementary and 66% Middle School | 27% Elementary and 26% Middle School |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Cashier Elementary | PT | | |
| Server Elementary | PT | | |
| Breakfast | PT | | |
| Cashier #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Deli Cashier | PT | | |
| Deli Server | PT | | |
| Hamburg/Hotdog | PT | | |
| Dish room Elementary | | | |
| Dish room Middle | | | |

| HOOVER ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 40% Elementary and 67% Middle School | 10% Elementary and 13% Middle School |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Cashier Elementary | PT | | |
| Server Elementary | PT | | |
| Dish Room Elementary | PT | | |
| Cashier #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #1 Middle | PT | | |
| Cashier #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Server #2 Middle | PT | | |
| Deli Cashier | PT | | |
| Deli Server | PT | | |
| Dish Room Middle | PT | | |
| Hamburger/Hot Dog | PT | | |

| KENMORE MIDDLE | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| | | | |
| Cook Manager | FT | 53% | 17% |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Dish Room/Snack | PT | | |
| Cashier #1 | PT | | |
| Server #1 | PT | | |
| Cashier #2 | PT | | |
| Server #2 | PT | | |

| KENMORE EAST HIGH SCHOOL | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| | | | |
| Cook Manager | FT | 43% | 13% |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Breakfast/Cashier #1 | PT | | |
| Server #1 | PT | | |
| Cashier #2 | PT | | |
| Server #2 | PT | | |
| Deli Cashier | PT | | |
| Deli Server | PT | | |

| KENMORE WEST HIGH SCHOOL | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Staff Position | Part-Time/Full-Time | Served Lunches % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 | Served Breakfasts % of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Sept 2012 |
| Cook Manager | FT | 48% | 8% |
| Cook | PT | | |
| Server #4 Deli | PT | | |
| Reg #2 | PT | | |
| Faculty | PT | | |
| Reg #1 | PT | | |
| Grab and Go Line | PT | | |
| Salad/Sandwich Prep | PT | | |
| Reg #3 | PT | | |
| Server #1 | PT | | |
| Server #2 | PT | | |

OBSERVATIONS:

- ✓ The combination of centralized operations with on-site preparation and cooking maximizes productivity to provide both ready-made and on-site meals that are adapted to meet the needs of all students.
- ✓ The SMM has worked to contain personnel costs both through readjustment and downsizing of staff (where warranted) and through the utilization of part-time employees, thus reducing the high cost of benefit packages.
- ✓ Minimal staffing is allocated to breakfast programs. Typically, the school meals program provides the workers for the breakfast program and the individual schools adjust staff in order to have early morning supervision of the program. More staff may be necessary to increase opportunities for students to access breakfast programs across the district.
- ✓ The cafeteria program has adjusted lunch delivery programs at the secondary levels to meet the ‘challenging tastes’ of the older students. Deli carts, hotdog/hamburger options, and ‘grab and go’ lunches are all part of a strategy to give students as many options as possible. It is very important to have these options in order to meet the needs of the students through healthy options and at the same time, increasing student participation which is the key to driving ‘reimbursable’ revenues.
- ✓ The charts present %ADA numbers which show a school by school breakdown of lunches and breakfasts served to students. The %ADA is a function of the number of students who are present on a daily basis relative to those students who actually participated in either lunch or breakfast. Higher percentages evidence larger numbers of students taking part in the school meals program. This percentage is critical to the health of the school meals program. First, because the goal of the SMP is to provide healthy options to students to ensure they are well fed and thusly active and prepared for school

and second, the higher percentage translates to higher revenues for the program both in direct sales and in reimbursable rates. Increased participation is a win-win in both of these areas.

- ✓ Lunch percentages of ADA show most are in the 50-60% range (a low of 40% to a high of 89%). These are solid numbers for the most part and are indicative of students being able to access the lunch program and having options they wish to purchase. According to the SMM, these numbers have remained fairly consistent. Of note and a concern to the SMM, is the drop in the number of lunches for this present school year, specifically at the secondary level. The annual %ADA for this year will not be completed until June, however, the concern is that this number is dropping significantly and it will impact the revenues coming from the secondary program. (There was a change in scheduling which reduced the lunch time and the challenge seems to be for some students being able to get to the cafeteria and have time for their lunch. It is not unusual for schools to adjust their lunch periods for either academic scheduling or for student management reasons, yet these decisions do often times impact the lunch program.) Different delivery systems for students at the secondary level may need to be examined.
- ✓ The breakfast numbers for %ADA are significantly lower. These range from a low of 8% to a high of 68%. These numbers indicate large numbers of students are not accessing the breakfast programs at the schools. This could be an issue related to time in the daily schedule as well as the busing schedule that is not allowing students the time to access the program. It may also be a function of budgetary cuts which have reduced staffing at the individual schools thusly impacting supervision. It may be more students are eating at home. Whatever the reason, these low numbers potentially point to large numbers of students not having breakfast; a key meal in the life of young people. We know healthy, well-fed students are more active and perform better at school. At the same time, when costs to run school meals programs are rising and every dollar of revenue counts, from a financial standpoint, there is a great deal of potential revenue being 'left on the table'. The district should consider taking a strong look at this area and examine options for increasing student participation at breakfast.

- **MEALS PER LABOR HOUR (MPLH) IMPLICATIONS**

Meals per Labor Hour are a key statistic used by the School Meals Manager to track the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the cafeteria program. The MPLH is a statistic that charts the overall number of meals produced/sold relative to the number of hours worked by the employees. The industry standard for MPLH is a range of 18-22 meals per labor hour.

MEALS PER LABOR HOUR: 2010-2013

| MEALS PER LABOR HOUR COMPARISONS DISTRICT-WIDE FIGURES | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Date | Meals Per Labor Hour |
| March 2010 | 17.79 |
| March 2011 | 17.23 |
| March 2012 | 17.95 |
| March 2013 | 16.83 |

Note: Recommended MPLH Range: 18-22. It is anticipated that MPLH for school year 2013 will dip into the 15 range

Meals per Labor Hour data shows the figure was consistent for the years 2010-2012 and then dipped a full point by 2013. Due to drops in participation rates at some of the schools, the SMM is anticipating this trend to continue. Per the chart note above, it is anticipated that the MPLH will dip downward by the end of this year and end up in the 15 range.

OBSERVATIONS:

- ✓ Continued decline in MPLH points towards long-term concerns regarding cost-effectiveness of the program and ultimately the profitability of the school meals program.
- ✓ MPLH has been impacted by declining number of meals served, most notably at the secondary level. To offset this, staff that is leaving for various reasons is not being replaced. This may help to offset the declining MPLH, but will not help with the long-term actions the program may need to take to grow the overall cafeteria program. (Ex., increasing access to breakfast programs across the district.)
- ✓ It is important to have the building level administrators work closely with the School Meals Manager to analyze reasons why student participation is declining in individual schools. It is critical there be a team approach to understanding the issues and working together to come up with joint solutions to declining participation. It is in everyone's best interest to have a vibrant, healthy and profitable school meals program.
- ✓ The costs of food and supplies for the school meals program continue to rise. If the number of students participating in the school meals programs continues to decrease and pushes the effective MPLH even lower, the school meals program will continue to move towards not being in the black at the end of the fiscal year. This would be a very unfortunate situation as the cafeteria program has regularly provided revenue to be transferred to the general fund and only a few years ago was able to use \$1,000,000.00 of fund balance in support of a recent capital improvement project at the district. To go from this type of profitability to not being able to meet overall expenses would be a dramatic situation for the cafeteria program and the district.

• MEALS PROGRAM EXPENSES/REVENUES REVIEW

Similar to other areas of a school budget, the bulk of the expenses associated with the school meals program are related to personnel. Labor costs and benefit packages comprise a major portion of the expenditure budget. For the cafeteria budget, when you add on the costs for food, you end up with approximately 80% of your budget in just these two areas. The following table shows the breakdown of these expenses in comparison to revenues for the 2011-2012 school year:

PERCENTAGE OF COSTS TO REVENUES: 2011-2012

| District-Wide Comparisons for 2011-2012 | | Actual Amount Total Revenues: \$2,902,365.00 | Recommended Amount(On An Average Basis) |
|--|-------------|---|---|
| Expenses | Amount | Percentage of Revenue | Percentage of Revenue |
| Labor Costs (Includes Fringe Benefits) | \$1,475,220 | 50.8% | 45.0% |
| Food Costs (Includes Government Commodities) | \$1,123,008 | 38.7% | 43% |
| Materials and Supplies | \$62,330 | 2.1% | 3.0% |
| Contractual Costs | \$14,451 | 0.5% | 2.0% |
| Equipment Costs | \$243,496 | 8.4% | 2.0% |
| Interfund Transfer | \$100,000 | 3.4% | 0.0% |
| Fund Balance/Profit | (\$131,230) | -4.5% | 5.0% |
| Totals | \$2,887,275 | 99.5% | 100% |

The School Meals Manager has worked to control labor costs through staffing adjustments, not replacing staff when someone leaves, and maintaining a work force that is predominately part-time. These strategies help to contain the overall labor costs. However, like all of us at home realize, the costs for food and supplies are rapidly rising and this greatly impacts the profitability of the school meals program. As noted earlier, if student participation rates decline and opportunities to increase participation are not maximized, then these downward trends combined with the increased costs of expenses are cause for concern. If the SMM is going to continue to oversee a profitable operation, then there must be new ways to increase participation at both lunch and breakfast. Although she can control (somewhat) the personnel costs, there is little that can be done to contain the upward spiral of food and material costs.

OBSERVATIONS:

- ✓ Regular interfund transfers have taken place throughout the past school years at approximately \$100,000.00 per fiscal year. (In the 2009-2010 school year, \$1,037,650 was transferred in support of the district-wide capital project.)
- ✓ The downward trend in student participation, if continued, will have a strong negative impact on the revenue side of the school meals picture. With increased costs on the expenditure side, this trend in reduced participation in some of the school buildings has the potential to cause serious revenue issues for the school meals program.
- ✓ There is a powerful nexus between a strong, profitable cafeteria program and the general fund. Many districts have to regularly transfer funds from the general fund to support a school meals program that is losing money. This has not been the case at Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD. A healthy school meals program means support to the general fund in the form of interfund transfers or support in indirect costs. It can also mean, as it did in 2009-2010, that there is enough fund balance to support capital improvements across the

district. If the district wishes to have this type of profitable program continue, then there will need to be steps taken to assist the SMM in her quest to increase access for students to breakfast, lunch and even after-school food programs.

- **SOME OPPORTUNITIES AND OPTIONS TO EXAMINE**

- ✓ Improved communication between the building level administrators and the school meals manager are critical to the success of the school meals program. There is no doubt that building principals are having their time squeezed with new regulations (APPR, in particular) and having another meeting to attend may not be a priority. However, it is important that communications between these parties take place on a regular basis. If not once a month, then at a minimum every other month, there should be a time where the school meals manager can meet with the building level administrator to review the cafeteria program and address opportunities/challenges related to that specific building and the school meals program. It is in the best interest of the building level administrators to have a strong school meals program in their building. If the cafeteria program reaches a point where it can no longer support \$100,000.00 annual interfund transfers, then this will have a direct impact on monies that are available for academic programs funded within the general fund budget.
- ✓ A ‘Council’ of the school administrators where participation and access to school lunch and breakfast are at higher relative percentages (ex. Holmes Elementary, Franklin Middle and Kenmore West) could meet quarterly with the school meals manager to provide examples of ‘best practices’ that are working in their buildings. We know colleagues learn best from other colleagues and this could be a positive way to share examples of programs that are working within the school district.
- ✓ If individual buildings are to examine potential changes to their academic schedule that impact the school meals program, then discussions should be held with the SMM to review these proposed changes. There may be very real programmatic reasons to propose the changes, but if they are to take place the SMM should have opportunities to review the changes and see what can be done to maintain (or even improve) student participation rates during the affected breakfast or lunch time periods.
- ✓ Breakfast percentages of ADA are low throughout most of the district. Students should have greater access to breakfast across the district. In conversations with various leadership teams, this may partly be a function of the time schedule and also the availability of funds to support the supervision necessary to have the cafeteria open at an earlier time period. Whichever it may be, an in-depth review of the breakfast program should take place. This could be an area where the suggested Council listed above could meet with the SMM and determine possible ways of improving the situation. The SMM may want to examine supplementing some of the cost for the aide supervision at the breakfast programs in order to encourage more time available to students. If the district could improve breakfast ADA percentages into the 30/40% plus range, this would be a benefit to students and provide a much needed revenue boost to the school meals program.

- ✓ Shorter lunch times in the High Schools appear to be impacting students' ability (real or perceived by students) to obtain lunch. Whichever it may be, the SMM is reporting a drop in participation rates at the secondary schools. If students feel they can't get to the cafeteria in time to get in line and have time to eat, then the schools could examine how to move the food closer to the students. There could be possibilities for movable deli carts, grab and go stations, or other ways to quickly get food to students. This is not dissimilar to how many people in the real world access their lunch or breakfasts. Adults working in buildings look to the quickest ways to grab food. A hotdog/hamburger/sandwich lunch stand on the corner that is accessible to nearby buildings will always do good business. The same could hold true for the secondary schools. Moving the food to the students would be a way to increase sales and send a message to the students that lunch/breakfast is important and the district is willing to adapt to meet the students' needs. The school meals program would have to meet the nutrition standards of the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act with whatever portable option it established. It also would need to take care of POS (Point of Sale) issues and ways to track '6 cent certification' issues, but these challenges could be handled by the SMM without too much difficulty. This would be a problem she would be more than willing to tackle.
- ✓ Vending Machines: The district utilizes vending machines and has profit arrangements with the various companies. This is a good way to generate revenues, as the companies are responsible for the stocking of the machines and then profits are shared with the school meals program. Districts are starting to look more closely at these arrangements and working to renegotiate the terms of the agreements with the companies. Additionally, more districts are looking at purchasing the vending machines and stocking them on their own. (Note: The cafeteria program has purchased and operates a few vending machines at the secondary level.) With this type of set up, there is more work for the local school meals program, but there also is more profit to be made as the food and drinks for the machines can be purchased at bulk prices.

Should the district look to reorganize based upon various options listed in part one of the study, then staffing patterns would need to be examined and adjusted. Through economies of scale, there is the potential to efficiently staff the school meals program and at the same time, provide a school meals program that best meets the needs of all students. How the district and the school meals program chooses to adjust to any changes that take place will need to take into effect the culture of the schools and what parents and students hope to see in a highly effective school meals program. This program has been in place at Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda and there is no reason to believe that it won't be able to adjust and continue to best serve the students of the district.

FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

- DELIVERY SYSTEMS OF THE O&M DEPARTMENT**

The O&M department leadership team consists of a Director, Operations Manager, and office personnel consisting of clerks and clerk typists. This team coordinates and oversees the district-wide functions associated with all buildings and grounds of the district.

At the central level, the department has a buildings and grounds maintenance shop. The shop consists of staff with expertise from HVAC, plumbing, electrical, welding, carpentry, painting, maintenance mechanics and grounds maintenance. Snowplowing and garbage removal is also headquartered out of the central department. This organizational pattern provides centralized, district-wide expertise that can handle most emergencies and preventative maintenance tasks throughout the district. It is a cost effective strategy that builds in a strong core of expertise and staff members who are invested in the overall viability of the districts' building and grounds. The next table shows the staff makeup of the central maintenance shop:

CENTRAL MAINTENANCE BUILDING STAFF

| | | TOTAL ACRES/ BUILDING SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Buildings and Grounds Maintenance Shops | | 4.75 | .75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/ RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Carpenter | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Carpenter | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Painter | Multi-Trades | N | Nights |
| Painter | Multi-Trades | N | Nights |
| Plasterer | Multi-Trades | N | Nights |
| Heat Technician | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Heat Technician | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Heat Technician | Multi-Trades | N | Days/Nights/Seasonal Shifts |
| Heat Technician | Multi-Trades | N | Days/Nights/Seasonal Shifts |
| Electrician | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Welder | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Groundsman | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Plumber | Multi-Trades | N | Days |
| Motor Equipment Operator | Material Deliveries/ Sanitation | N | Days |
| Motor Equipment Operator | Material Deliveries/Sanitation | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic | District Fleet Maintenance | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic A | District Small Engine Fleet Mechanic | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic B | Electrician Assistant | N | Days |

| | | TOTAL ACRES/ BUILDING SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Buildings and Grounds Maintenance Shops | | 4.75 | .75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/ RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Maintenance Mechanic B | Plumbers Assistant | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic B | General Trades | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic B | General Trades | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic Helper | Assist General Trades | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic Helper | Assist General Trades | N | Days |
| Maintenance Mechanic Helper | Assist General Trades | N | Days/Nights Staggered |
| Labor | Labor | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor | N | Nights |
| Labor | Labor | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor/Temp Assignment | N | Days |
| Labor | Labor | N | District Courier |
| Stores Clerk | | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaner | N | Nights |

OBSERVATIONS:

- ✓ The centralized building maintenance shop allows for various skillsets of employees who are on salary and responsible for specific areas of repairs and maintenance across the district. This allows the district to have their own staff, versus more costly contracted services, responsible for repairs and maintenance.
- ✓ Centralized plowing and garbage removal is an efficient, cost-effective way to handle these two major maintenance activities. Garbage removal is providing some income to offset expenses and we will examine ways to offset the cost of snow plowing later in this review.
- ✓ District fleet and small engine mechanics allow for repairs to be done on-site; both cost-effective and efficient. Repairs can be done quickly, thereby getting equipment back into the hands of staff without delay.
- ✓ Weekend grounds work is utilized to get large green space and playing fields maintained on a regular basis without worrying about student times. This is an effective way to deploy staff to the schools to handle the larger areas of green space. At the individual schools, much of the trim mowing and trim work is handled by staff at those buildings.

At the building level, the centralized approach provides support to the team approach of each school. The schools typically have a head custodian who oversees the schedules and operations of that particular school, including routine HVAC responsibilities. Depending on the size of the building, there may be a senior custodian, stationary engineer, and then other custodian, cleaner,

and labor staff. The size of the building generally dictates the amount of staff on hand. The custodians are responsible for maintenance and cleaning work, while cleaners are tasked to specific cleaning responsibilities throughout the building. Grounds work that includes push mowing and trimming will be handled by the school staff and in the winter they will do snow removal around the steps and walks of the school. Larger green space areas mowing and field prep and snow plowing will either be handled by the centralized building maintenance crew or a combination of that crew with building level staff.

BUILDING LEVEL OPERATIONS

The tables below show the staffing at the individual schools, their part-time or full-time status, and the amount of square footage and acreage involved at each of the schools:

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Edison Elementary K-5 | 88,240 | 9.01 | 1.75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning, maintenance, and engineering | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and maintenance | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights/Rotational |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY K-5 | 176,085 (INCLUDES MIDDLE SCHOOL) | 12.13 (INCLUDES MIDDLE SCHOOL) | 2.0 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Middle School | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Middle School | Nights |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | 50% with Middle School | Days |
| Custodian | Grounds, Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Middle School | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and maintenance | 50% with Middle School | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | 50% with Middle School | Rotational: Days and Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Days |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Hamilton Elementary K-5 | 78,880 | 7.32 | 1.75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights/Rotational |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Holmes Elementary K-5 | 72,700 | 3.33 | .75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | |
| Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Hoover Elementary K-5 | 201,957 (Combined with Hoover Middle) | 18.58 (Combined with Hoover Middle) | 3.0 (Combined with Hoover Middle) |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Middle | Days |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | 50% with Hoover Middle | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Middle | Nights |
| Custodian | Grounds, Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Middle | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Middle | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | 50% with Hoover Middle | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Jefferson Elementary K-5 | 66,198 | 5.16 | 1.75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITES | SHARED Y/N | Days/Nights |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Lindbergh Elementary K-5 | 81,885 | 3.09 | .5 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITES | SHARED Y/N | Days/Nights |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights (Rotational) |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Roosevelt Elementary K-5 | 70,988 | 2.25 | 1.0 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITES | SHARED Y/N | Days/Nights |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights (Rotational) |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Sheridan School | 91,690 | 6.95 | 4.0 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITES | SHARED Y/N | Days/Nights |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning, Maintenance and Engineering | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| Franklin Middle School 6-8 | 176,085 (Combined with Elementary School) | 12.13 (Combined with Elementary School) | 2.0 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Days |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Nights |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Days |
| Custodian | Grounds, Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | 50% with Franklin Elementary | Nights (Rotational) |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Hoover Middle School 6-8 | 201,957 (Combined with Hoover Elementary) | 18.58 (Combined with Hoover Elementary) | 3.0 (Combined with Hoover Elementary) |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Nights |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Days |
| Custodian | Grounds, Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | 50% with Hoover Elementary | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Kenmore Middle School 6-8 | 176,145 | 3.85 | .75 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Kenmore East 9-12 | 288,965 | 13.68 | 5.0 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | N | Days |
| Groundsman | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Kenmore West High School 9-12 | 282,662 | 7.83 | 3.5 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Head Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Senior Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Stationary Engineer | Engineering | N | Days |

| SCHOOL | SQUARE FOOTAGE | TOTAL ACRES/BLDG SITE | PLAYING FIELDS ACREAGE |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Kenmore West High School 9-12 | 282,662 | 7.83 | 3.5 |
| STAFF | POSITION/RESPONSIBILITIES | SHARED Y/N | DAY/NIGHT |
| Custodian | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Nights |
| Groundsman | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning and Maintenance | N | Days |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Cleaner | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |
| Labor | Cleaning | N | Nights |

OBSERVATIONS:

- ✓ Building operations employ day and night shifts maximizing cleaning and maintenance times and operations. This model also has staff available for evening programs at the schools, which ensures a ‘community model’ of use of the schools that the district supports. At the same time, security of the buildings is enhanced as well as guarding against the potential of systems failure during the night shifts. This night coverage helps to ensure that buildings that may have problems during the evening will be open the next day.
- ✓ The district effectively combines centralized work operations of grounds maintenance and snow plowing with support from the individual school staff. Large scale work can be completed through central operations and smaller maintenance, trimming and snow removal can be handled by the on-site employees.
- ✓ The operations at the individual schools are based upon a site-based team model to maintenance and cleaning. Staff members are assigned to their specific building and work together as a team to provide maintenance/cleaning, preventative maintenance, and crisis/emergency repairs. Another model for maintaining schools is to employ a job specific district-wide approach. Here, teams of cleaners, maintenance, groundsmen, and other maintenance teams are deployed district-wide to clean, maintain grounds, and provide other maintenance functions. The latter generally can be used with less staff and may be efficient in terms of designated jobs with designated equipment, but they do not have a direct relationship with the individual school operations, staff, and students. Further, they tend not to have the same sense of pride in maintaining a specific building, as their job is to go building to building or area to area in order to perform a specific task. The former process, which takes place in the district’s schools, provides an efficient use of resources, creates teams who know the individual school/systems, and at the same time builds relationships with the school staff and students. The end

result is a building level team that takes pride and ownership in how their individual school looks and operates.

- ✓ We had the opportunity to tour all of the district's school buildings. We were able to meet and interact with many of the staff. We were impressed with the overall conditions of the schools, the amount of pride evidenced in the work of the O&M staff, the cleanliness of the exteriors, interiors, hallways and bathrooms. We witnessed daily cleaning, ongoing maintenance activities, staff working and interacting with faculty, and project work. Throughout the district we saw a focus and commitment to maintaining and preserving the district's resources for both the short and long term.
- ✓ Most supplies for the buildings are procured through the regional BOCES cooperative purchasing service. This gives the district the leverage of purchasing their supplies with other schools, thus creating a larger pool of purchasing power that can be used to keep prices at lower levels. The district also utilizes the BOCES for ESH reviews and recording, yearly fire and safety inspections and Hazmat reviews, inspections and record keeping. These are smart, cost-effective ways to handle these various inspections which demand highly specialized and certified personnel.
- ✓ In support of the maintenance activities at the schools and district buildings, the district has established connections with their local municipalities for assistance. As examples, the municipalities help with sewer line vacuuming and vectoring during backup, provide parking lot sweeping when possible, and the district is able to access large leaf collection equipment to assist with fall cleanups. This is a wise strategy and the district is to be commended for establishing these connections.
- ✓ The leadership of the operations and maintenance department has invested in new portable equipment to help with cleaning and maintaining buildings. Kaivac portable cleaning machines have been incorporated to assist with cleaning in larger, difficult areas to clean such as bathrooms at the secondary levels. This equipment has allowed staff to clean more space with greater efficiency in specialty areas.
- ✓ The leadership team has examined different ways to perform complete cleaning strategies at the school. For the most part, major cleaning that calls for floor stripping and total room cleaning takes place during the summer with some of the work done over breaks. The central reason stopping complete cleaning on a rotating, during the school basis is due to the prevalence of wood flooring throughout the district. In some districts that do not have wood flooring throughout, a rotation schedule of complete cleaning during third shift hours can take place. This keeps the school up to date on their more intensive cleaning and does not leave the bulk to the summer when other preventative maintenance activities can take place.

- **SOME OPPORTUNITIES AND OPTIONS TO EXAMINE**

- ✓ The district has worked out some sharing arrangements with grounds and landscaping equipment with Sweet Home Central School District. This is cost effective for both districts and should be continued, where feasible. Large grounds equipment including

specialized mowers and aerators are very costly. As the district looks to replace or add on with this and other large equipment items, it would be wise to continue this arrangement.

- ✓ In a similar manner, municipal cooperative agreements should be continued and expanded where possible. Local arrangements for leaf removal and sewer work are helpful. There may be opportunities to expand this arrangement with equipment sharing and other areas. Some school districts are able to make arrangements for sharing with plowing, as an example.
- ✓ There is an opportunity to improve the district's state aid position through examination of operations and maintenance purchases and functions. Many operations that are budgeted in the O&M budget can be recoded to the transportation budget as they are supplies or services that are connected to the transportation department. Since transportation costs are partially funded through reimbursable state aid, it is important to maximize this portion of the budget to bring back as much aid as possible. In the next section of the study there is information that details how this can take place.
- ✓ The district has successfully incorporated building site operations with some centralized maintenance strategies. This has worked well as evidenced by the excellent manner in which the buildings and grounds are maintained. If the district does decide to reorganize some of its programs/buildings, then this would be an opportunity to review some of the O&M delivery systems. As an example, it may then make sense to examine the possibility of district-wide grounds/field care by a specialized team of staff. This staff, on a rotating basis, would be responsible for grounds throughout the district. This can become an efficient use of time, staff and resources since the only area the team focuses on is full-scale ground maintenance.
- ✓ The leadership team has done an excellent job maintaining and upgrading building level cleaning/maintenance equipment. Where practical, it has budgeted for and brought in new equipment that has the ability to speed up the cleaning process. The Kaivac machines are an example of this type of foresight and leadership. We would suggest that if additional resources are able to be generated through recoding of budgeted items for aid purposes, then some of that new funding could be used to continue purchasing these types of equipment items.
- ✓ As the district moves forward, the operations and maintenance team will need to continue to monitor the items they are addressing and that still need to be addressed through the Building Condition Survey. The main part of the study detailed these areas and it is evident the work is being addressed and future needs are being planned for by the team. There is a strong pattern of leadership in the district operations that fosters a shared sense of purpose among those responsible for maintaining the buildings and grounds. As 'guest outsiders', it is apparent to us that the focus on maintaining and improving the districts' resources is clear. The commitment to protecting and enhancing the buildings and grounds facilities is evident throughout the school district.

Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD Bus Transportation

We reviewed transportation opportunities and challenges with the Director of Transportation and head bus drivers. They shared with us the various issues they have to deal with in providing timely and safe transportation to the different school buildings. They have adjusted routes and pick up times to do the best they can to get students to the buildings in as short a time period as possible.

Charted below are snapshots of the pupil transportation service provided in 2012-2013 to transport pupils to school in the morning and home in the afternoon.

| | EDISON Elementary Attendance Zone |
|--|--|
| Earliest pick up | 8:32 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 30 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 4 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 4 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 251 |

| | FRANKLIN Elementary Attendance Zone |
|--|--|
| Earliest pick up | 7:58 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 26 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 5 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 5 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 279 |

| | HAMILTON Elementary Attendance Zone |
|--|--|
| Earliest pick up | 8:24 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 36 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 4 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 4 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 248 |

| | HOLMES Elementary Attendance Zone |
|--|--|
| Earliest pick up | 7:08 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 32 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 5 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 5 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 307 |

| | HOOVER Elementary Attendance Zone |
|--|--|
| Earliest pick up | 7:51 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 30 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 7 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 7 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 453 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | LINDBERGH Elementary Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 8:36 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 23 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 5 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 5 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 322 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | ROOSEVELT Elementary Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 8:12 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 12 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 2 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 2 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 140 |

| | |
|--|--|
| | KENMORE Middle School Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 8:12 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 32 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 2 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 2 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 97 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | FRANKLIN Middle School Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 8:19 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 22 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 1 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 1 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 44 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | HOOVER Middle School Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 8:03 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 32 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 5 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 5 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 257 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | KENMORE WEST High School Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 7:30 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 31 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 5 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 4 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 261 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | KENMORE EAST High School Attendance Zone |
| Earliest pick up | 7:32 |
| Estimated longest pupil ride on a bus | 30 minutes |
| Number of bus runs AM to school | 4 |
| Number of bus runs PM to home | 4 |
| How many students bused to this school? | 223 |

If the district determines to reorganize into different school building patterns, then the attendance zones with established student pick up spots would have to be adjusted based upon those changes. Once the new attendance zones are selected and student day times are identified, then the transportation supervisor can establish new routes. Until one to two scenarios are focused on by the Board one cannot state that it will take fewer, the same or more bus routes to implement the scenario. For example, most of the scenario options centralize grade levels district-wide. This may allow fewer student day time schedules among the grade levels and buildings. The study is cautious about estimating savings or any added expenditures to the transportation program at this time. The information below gives a breakdown of the costs associated with transportation and provides a basis for estimating what the potential transportation savings or added expenditures of a reorganization might be:

2011-2012 To and From School Pupil Transportation Expenditures and How the State of New York Supports Bus Transportation of Ken-Ton Pupils

Charted below is the 2011-2012 cost per AM and PM bus run and a calculation of the State of New York support of the transportation program and the per run cost to the local taxpayer. 2011-2012 is used as a baseline because the expenditures are historical and final. Transportation expenditures for 2012-2013 are still in progress until June 30, 2013.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Total Expenditure Pupil Transportation 2011-2012 including field and athletic trips | \$6,733,157 |
| Non public/Special Education/Late Bus/Mid Day transportation | \$4,681,447 |
| In district AM to school and PM to home | \$1,821,163 |
| Total number of AM bus runs in the district | 52 |
| Total number of PM bus runs in the district | 51 |
| Average cost per AM and PM bus run | \$17,681 |
| Percentage of transportation aid expected as a revenue for 2012-2013 based on transportation expenses submitted for 2011-2012: | 63.1% |
| Estimated average cost per each bus run for AM to school and PM to home transportation: \$17,681 | |
| Estimated local Ken-Ton taxpayer average cost per each one way bus run: | \$ 6,525 |
| Estimated average state support of each Ken-Ton one way bus run: | \$11,156 |

Therefore, there would be savings to be seen through a potential reorganization with fewer bus routes. At the same time, however, the fewer routes also means there would be less transportation aid coming back to the district. Since transportation aid is an expense driven aid, the more you spend, the more aid you receive and conversely, the less expenditure, the less aid. In the earlier section on operations and maintenance, the report noted suggestions we have regarding driving more aid to back to the district by maximizing budgetary expenditures through the transportation budget. The following information details this process.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE/TRANSPORTATION SERVICES: MAXIMIZING STATE AID

Suggestions for Recoding of Charges to Transportation

The challenges of running a school system in this era of fiscal difficulty are enormous. At a time when school expenses are quickly rising and revenues are just as rapidly declining, it is imperative that districts make every attempt to maximize their opportunities for state aid reimbursement dollars. At Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD, this process has taken place as the district already uses their transportation codes to provide additional revenue. Major costs of utilities are already coded there to drive aid back to the district on this expense, as are other areas of the budget. With a 63.1% reimbursement rate on actual expenses, this aid can help to increase overall revenues. It is important to note that these expenses are allowable and approved expenses that can be coded to transportation. The expenses that have been moved have been done so based upon SED guidelines related to transportation aid. That said, should the district have any questions about specific areas reviewed here, it would be prudent to contact SED for guidance.

This section of the study review lists additional areas the district can consider for the purpose of increasing state aid revenues. The coded changes would be eligible for reimbursement in the next fiscal year, given they are submitted prior to June 30 of 2013. The district may also go back one year to recoup aid on the expenses submitted, but this also must be done prior to June 30 of 2013. (Note: the aid from the prior year's expenses may not be received for up to five years after the June 30 submittal.)

| ITEM FOR REVIEW | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| Snowplowing Costs | Includes the cost for plowing the transportation building and all school areas where buses/school vehicles transporting students are used. Pro-rated costs for workers including salaries/benefits/fica is allowable as are any supplies, i.e. salt which is used in the process. Note: The trucks are not aidable. However, should a new plow be purchased, a percentage of the cost can be coded to transportation. |
| Building secretaries performing transportation related duties. (Phone calls, bus notes, etc.) | For each secretary involved in am/pm transportation duties, transfer that percentage of their day spent in this area. Typically, may be in the range of 10-15% of their total day. (Depending if they are elementary or secondary.) Salaries, benefits, fica all are allowable. |
| Custodians | The district assigns custodians and maintenance staff to the transportation building. Their salaries, benefits can be coded directly to transportation based upon their FTE in that building. Note: specific equipment (vacuum cleaners, as an example) used to clean the bus garage and used for that area can also be coded in transportation. |
| Cleaning Supplies | All O&M supplies used in the cleaning and maintenance of the bus garage can be broken out of the O&M budget and recoded to transportation. |

| ITEM FOR REVIEW | DESCRIPTION |
|--|---|
| Cell Phones Phone Charges | Cell phones provided to the supervisor and any other staff, if coded in another area of the budget, may be coded in transportation. Also, if the district phone costs are not broken down for the bus garage, then a percentage of the costs can be broken out and moved to transportation. |
| Garbage Removal | If garbage removal is all coded in O&M, then the portion that involves the bus garage can be moved to transportation. |
| Copy Paper, Toner, supplies related to copying | If these supplies are all coded in instructional technology areas and then provided to the transportation department, the amount used in transportation can be moved over and recoded. |
| Legal fees associated with bus bonding | Attorneys' fees specifically for the bonding of buses can be moved to transportation |
| Fire alarm contract and fire extinguishers | Monies used in these areas may be proportionally moved to transportation |
| Comprehensive Insurances | Fleet insurance is already coded in transportation, however, additional liability and comprehensive insurances can be proportionally coded to transportation |
| Water service fees | Water fees may be broken out and proportionally coded to transportation |

The business office will need to work with the areas noted to gather information about the expenditures and the percentages to be broken out and moved to transportation. All work regarding these transfers should be maintained and kept on file for auditing purposes.

Once the amounts have been calculated and agreed upon, then the recoding to transportation can take place. It is recommended that both a composite spreadsheet of all transportation items and an individual recoded expenditure list be kept in order to best explain and track the changes. It will need to be reviewed and noted that there will be an increase in the transportation budget, but this increase is due to recoded items for the purpose of recapturing aid. Since this work can impact aid for the upcoming school year, the district will need to review and meet with appropriate staff to ensure correct amounts are transferred. Once completed, these areas can then be finalized for the aid to be recaptured for the prior school year.