

Rochester Board of Education

Finance Committee

March 7, 2006 at 5:30 p.m.

Present: President Garcia, Commissioners, Brennan and Evans, Ms. Rohring, Mr. Greene, Ms. Tripi, Ms. Smouse, Mr. Keysa and Mr. Wheatcraft
Absent: Commissioner Powell

Commissioner Evans convened the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

I. Receive and Review Monthly Financial Reports

Commissioner Evans requested a motion to accept the monthly financial reports. Made by Commissioner Brennan. Seconded by Commissioner Evans. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

Commissioner Evans opened the floor for questions regarding the financial reports.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know if Overtime Non-Instructional supported summer school.

Ms. Tripi indicated that the Available Funds report is an all funds document which includes grant funded summer school programs and the utilization rate is high partially because of grant funding. A large portion is due to the grant funded programs from last summer which were used at a higher rate than at prior years.

Commissioner Evans asked does grant funding support instruction

Ms. Tripi indicated yes, in terms of the elementary summer school.

Commissioner Evans asked in terms of Contract Transportation there is a statement that the increased cost is exacerbated by Managed Choice. Can you please explain?

Ms. Tripi indicated that there are cases where we have five buses going down the same street taking kids to different schools throughout the District depending on the choices made by the parents on that street. Even though there are benefits to the Managed Choice program, there are costs as well. One of the costs is a less efficient transportation model and obviously if we had all our kids attending their neighborhood schools transportation cost would be less than transporting kids throughout the District or throughout their zone. Ms. Rohring asked do we have data available.

President Garcia suggested that when a statement such as this is made, we need to have information (calculations) available supporting the statement.

Because if we don't have anything to prove the statement, then it is just an assumption.

Ms. Tripi indicated that statistics and data are available. There is a good degree of analysis done on transportation and some contracts are driven by the number of routes that the buses make; and in the case of Managed Choice there was an analysis done on cost versus benefit.

President Garcia asked what the calculation showed.

Ms. Tripi told President Garcia that she would have to go back and see what was pulled together at that point in time and she could provide the committee with the detailed information. If you are talking about benefits in terms of student achievement versus cost, it is not a cost over cost analysis, but there is definitely cost to providing a Managed Choice program.

President Garcia made an additional comment, if you are going to make statements as such in the future having the data available showing how you arrived at calculations will help us to determine whether or not something needs to be done.

Ms. Tripi agreed with President Garcia.

Commissioner Evans stated that Commissioner Powell had told him last year that by this time this year, in terms of Managed Choice, we would be able to breakout the increase in expenses if any in terms of transportation cost.

Ms. Tripi stated that we do look at it by month, by student, by school days per month and by school day. The analysis is really very thorough. She suggested having Ms. Cicero attend the next meeting if they were looking for more in-depth information.

Commissioner Evans stated receiving the information in writing would suffice.

ACTION:

Ms. Tripi will provide the committee with the detailed analysis outlining the transportation cost associated with the Managed Choice program.

Commissioner Evans asked in terms of Computer Hardware Instructional, what are the planned commitments to hardware purchases. What types of items do we plan on purchasing?

Mr. Greene indicated that Dr. Cliby had done an inventory on the number of software products that various schools have operated independently and if we take them off the individual computers in the schools and centralize them on the server it would be more cost effective and will deliver additional student management capabilities. Which does two things, it reduces the overall cost, because we can get an enterprise wide license for things that we are paying individual licenses for and we can get statistics, teacher management information, downloaded onto the system.

Commissioner Evans stated that his question is almost verbatim to the explanation on the Available Funds Financial Analysis report, "Due to the execution of planned commitments to hardware purchases" and I wanted to know what the planned commitments were.

Ms. Tripi asked Commissioner Evans if he was interested in knowing what was already spent.

Commissioner Evans once again referred to the verbatim statement from the Available Funds Financial Analysis report, Computer Hardware Instructional, Expenditure Commitments...

Ms. Tripi asked you are looking for year-to-date spending details.

Commissioner Evans stated exactly.

ACTION:

Ms. Tripi / Mr. Greene will prepare a detailed analysis outlining the year-to-date expenditures for Computer Hardware Instructional.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know why \$400K was moved back into Agency Clerical from paraprofessional salaries.

Ms. Tripi explained that this was the movement of paraprofessionals. In the past we used Kelly Services for our paraprofessional substitutes and now they are hired through the District and paid through the District instead of Kelly services.

Commissioner Evans asked so movement is because of Kelly Services.

Ms. Tripi indicated yes. We no longer hire paraprofessional substitutes through Kelly Services. The District has a list of people who are registered as paraprofessional substitutes (calling list similar to our teacher substitutes list) and we call them in as needed.

Commissioner Evans stated that his question was in regards to why it moved into Agency Clerical.

Mr. Connors indicated that when the budget was first built all of the dollars were in Agency Clerical then in the first budget amendment we moved monies from Agency Clerical to the Paraprofessional Salary line which was overestimated. The proposed February Amendment transfers some of the money back into this line item from the paraprofessional salary line.

Motion to accept the monthly financial reports and recommend their acceptance to the Board made by Commissioner Brennan. Seconded by Commissioner Evans. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

II. Receive and Review Proposed Resolutions for March 2006 Board Business Meeting

a. Complete Technology Solutions

Commissioner Evans asked Mr. Greene if the two resolutions, Complete Technology Solutions and NuSoft Solutions were tied to Microsoft.

Mr. Greene stated that both resolutions were not necessarily tied to Microsoft, but the NuSoft Solutions is very close to the Microsoft partnership and our relationship with Microsoft. In regards to Complete Technology Solutions there was a SOW or SOWs that had begun before I joined the District. Due to circumstances that occurred in the May/June timeframe things got delayed and the term of the contract for this consultant expired before the completion of the work. This resolution is a request to allow the funding necessary for the completion of the SOWs. Some key items are:

- Chancery Student Management System
- Required hardware platforms to support Chancery
- Storage area network that is also a component required to support Chancery
- Training for our staff

Commissioner Evans stated I can understand extending the term, but need more information and a better rationale on the dollar amount.

Mr. Greene indicated that the dollar amount is estimated at an hourly rate necessary to complete the SOWs.

President Garcia indicated that the dollar amount is being doubled.

Mr. Greene indicated that even though it was a resource that was initially assigned to Information Systems it was used extensively in other capacities that burned hours that were not necessarily deployed to the direct benefit of the Information Systems projects as originally intended.

Commissioner Evans asked what capacity.

Mr. Robinson stated he and Mr. Greene were available to discuss details in Executive Session.

President Garcia stated that he already had a problem with one contract scope of work being diluted and the hours being used for other purposes for which the Board never approved. If we need to discuss in Executive Session we will, but that means this resolution will not be advanced for the next meeting.

Commissioner Evans stated that we could go into Executive Session as a committee which could be instructive for Commissioner Brennan and me. If we are going to advance something to the Board I need to feel comfortable with why we are doing it.

Motion into Executive Session by Commissioner Brennan, Seconded by Commissioner Evans. Adopted 2-0 at 5:52 p.m. with Commissioner Powell absent.

Reconvene at 5:59 p.m.

Motion to table the Complete Technology Solutions resolution by Commissioner Evans, Seconded by Commissioner Brennan. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

b. NuSoft Solutions

Mr. Greene told the committee, NuSoft is a preferred systems integrator for Microsoft and they are a participant in a three-way partnership between Microsoft and the District. So far they have produced SharePoint which will facilitate ease of use of all of our application systems by our constituents more specifically teachers, administrators, principals, etc. As a part of this overall project, this group has been asked to provide a SOW to continue their systems integration services which will end up with deliverables such as:

- An internal and external web presence
- A strategy for communicating not only with internal customers, but with the community, parents and students

One of the key components provided will be a Zone Integration Server. I'm not sure if the members of the committee have heard about the standardization on something called the Student Information Framework, but the State of NY has standardized on that framework as a common format for communicating student information and in order to do that NuSoft has proposed and actually partially delivered a consistent engine that will accept information from any and all outside applications. This can be integrated into the Chancery Student Management System. What this gives us is a single repository for all information relating to students within our District and that includes everything from cafeteria activity to test scores to demographic data and information currently in the student information system. Unlike now, we have to go to multiple systems to acquire information.

Commissioner Evans asked weren't there two separate resolutions last year, one with Connected Knowledge and one with NuSoft. Connected Knowledge was providing training and NuSoft would carry out the implementation.

Mr. Greene stated that is correct. Connected Knowledge is embedded in this resolution to deliver the training components. NuSoft and Connected Knowledge were in the same corporate umbrella. There was a reorganization and they are still very closely linked even though they have the capability of acting as independent organizations. We thought for simplicity, efficiency and pricing effectiveness we would treat as one resolution.

President Garcia wanted to know if they were separate legal corporations.

Mr. Greene indicated that they are substantially disconnected, yes. So the functional relationship is that they used to be in the same umbrella and now they are two separate organizations. The contractual relationship that Ms. Cottrell has crafted has NuSoft as the prime contractor and they will call Connected Knowledge as we require them for training.

Commissioner Evans asked who is paying Connected Knowledge.

Mr. Greene stated NuSoft.

Commissioner Evans stated, so we will not remit payment to Connected Knowledge.

Mr. Greene stated yes, that was our decision.

President Garcia stated they are a subcontractor.

Mr. Greene stated yes with NuSoft.

Commissioner Evans stated so we do not have anything to do with Connected Knowledge.

Mr. Greene indicated contractually no.

Commissioner Evans asked does the \$573k through June include Connected Knowledge.

Mr. Greene stated yes.

President Garcia stated \$83k is training

Mr. Greene answered yes. Connected Knowledge would be the delivery vehicle for training. Connected Knowledge has been here and they are an outstanding organization. As far as delivering training we are strongly considering using them for training associated with the Chancery Student Management System as we roll that out.

Commissioner Evans stated, again to be clear NuSoft will be interfacing with Connected Knowledge and two months from now we will not be seeing a resolution to pay Connected Knowledge for training.

Ms. Tripi indicated that there could be one for the Chancery project.

Commissioner Evans stated but there will not be one connected with NuSoft.

Mr. Greene stated that is correct.

Commissioner Brennan wanted to know how the NutriKid software and the new federal requirements relative to nutrition were linked.

Mr. Greene stated that NuSoft has provided a common platform which is the direction the state is moving in. NutriKid (point-of-sale software) is a separate product that we use to manage our cafeteria activity. The significance here is that each year we will be able to much more accurately report the number of free and reduced lunches that we serve. Part of that is what I call soft technology. Because the students use a bar-coded lunch card the stigma or the potential stigma of students being identified as a recipient of free and reduced lunch will be removed and I think we will get a higher participation rate and secondly more accurate counts. NuSoft has provided the direct interface between NutriKid and the student information system so once again we have one place for all student information.

Commissioner Brennan asked if the newness of the federal requirements complicates things.

Mr. Greene indicated no.

Commissioner Brennan asked on page 4, #4 of the NuSoft Executive Summary what do you mean by additional reporting capability.

Mr. Greene stated this is at the teacher level and a follow on to your previous question. Once again, you are familiar with CBT McGraw Hill and the reading assessment, all of this data relating to kids, their test scores and their achievement levels will be in a single repository. We have specked out for teachers, principals and counselors a set of charts and graphs that will automatically appear on their desktops relative to those children for which they have responsibility. It's one thing to have this big database but in our estimation it's something else to be able to display that data in useful and meaningful forms to the people who really need it, when they need. This reporting really takes all that volume of data and breaks it down by the

individual owners of the students in question and gives them the capability of doing analysis and display whether it is grades or standardized test performances, truancy, disciplinary action, whatever it might be. They are providing these easy tools for the right people to use.

President Garcia asked going back to NuSoft: this was a combined project between Microsoft and the District. The District is putting in so much money out of cash capital (regular funds) and Microsoft is supporting the balance. How is Microsoft supporting the balance? Is it indirect cost and is there a calculation for the indirect cost?

Mr. Greene stated if he is not mistaken, Microsoft, NuSoft and the District put in \$60k each which was the initial contribution during phase I.

President Garcia asked so the \$573k is all coming out of the District's pocket?

Mr. Greene stated yes, that is correct.

President Garcia asked how many more phases are there.

Mr. Greene stated as far as he knew, this would be it to get us to the point. We can always entertain using them for subsequent things that we currently do not anticipate.

President Garcia asked if we were to look at the original presentation when we started funding all of this software development – where would you say we stand, would you say we are almost completed or are there still modules we haven't even touched?

Mr. Greene indicated that we had five SOWs when he arrived and of those five SOWs four have been completed satisfactorily with deliverables delineated. One was a SOW to be defined which you see here as external communications. After that was completed it was decided by District management that implementation would be advantageous for the District. A part of what you are seeing is the implementation of the SOW.

President Garcia asked after we finish this phase what are the maintenance requirements to maintain this software in optimal working order?

Mr. Greene indicated that one of the things he insisted on is what he calls skills transfer. And part of what this SOW provides will be the skills transfer necessary so that we can be self-sufficient in maintaining the system going forward without the need for NuSoft.

President Garcia asked when you anticipate that will.

Mr. Greene told President Garcia that he did not have a specific time. We have more urgent tactical issues to address. However, I assure you that I will keep my eye on the implementation of the SOW to ensure this happens.

Commissioner Evans asked if there would be other contributions from NuSoft or Microsoft in phase II.

Mr. Greene indicated that he has a verbal commitment from Microsoft for an additional sum of money that he is currently negotiating. But we have no contractual commitment.

Motion to advance the NuSoft resolution to the Board for consideration made by Commissioner Brennan, Seconded by Commissioner Evans. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

PeopleSoft

Commissioner Evans stated that PeopleSoft was originally on the agenda and for some reason had been removed but he would like to move forward because Commissioner Powell had asked for the information back in December.

Commissioner Brennan stated he had the same concern.

Mr. Greene apologized to the committee for not getting the presentation to them prior to the meeting.

President Garcia wanted to know if Mr. Greene's presentation included the report that was done by PeopleSoft.

Mr. Greene indicated yes.

Commissioner Brennan asked if it was the original PeopleSoft implementation audit report.

Mr. Greene indicated that Commissioner Powell had the complete report and this was a synopsis of the report.

Commissioner Brennan stated that he was not here when this was requested but wanted to know if it was important that the committee get the entire report.

Commissioner Evans stated that he would follow up with Commissioner Powell.

Commissioner Brennan told Mr. Greene that he appreciated the presentation however he would be interested in seeing the report in its entirety.

Mr. Greene stated that he had no objection to Commissioner Brennan's request.

ACTION:

PeopleSoft report in its entirety will be sent to each member of the Finance Committee and the Board President.

Mr. Greene proceeded with a review of the PeopleSoft presentation.

Mr. Greene explained that what he tried to do was condense a very lengthy document into a series of statements and actions, observations and actions. First an Oracle consultant professional came in and did an analysis of the system. We met with various operational groups to get a counter balance prospective to what the Oracle professionals had observed. Overall, there is nothing wrong with the systems; there are things that we could have done and can do to enhance the usability and to make the system more useful but there are no fatal flaws where reimplementations must take place.

Oracle Assessment: PeopleSoft 'Correction Mode' is used too frequently. This method should be severely limited since changing historical data causes spiraling impacts throughout the application.

Action: A team of RCSD staff members from Payroll, HR and IT have been working together to limit the use of 'Correction Mode' and backdating of employee records (which has also been the cause of numerous issues).

President Garcia asked how many people have access to making the necessary changes.

Mr. Greene stated only two.

President Garcia wanted to know how many had access before.

Mr. Greene thought it may have been five and the changes were not being done maliciously. It was a process change that was required.

Oracle Assessment: RCSD has had numerous instances of double-paying employees. This has occurred when an employee has changed.

Action: RCSD developed a "quality-control" query to detect any potential double-payments prior to the paycheck issuance. Since this has been implemented as part of normal payroll processing, there have been no additional double-payment occurrences.

President Garcia asked if there was an audit conducted to find out if this was a major problem.

Mr. Tripi stated the one issue of overpayment was looked at and corrected.

President Garcia stated that he heard nothing about employees being double paid.

Mr. Greene indicated that it was revealed in an audit and it was quickly fixed.

Mr. Tripi stated she was unaware of numerous instances of double paying employees.

President Garcia stated that the committee had asked if there were any instances of double paying and the answer was no.

Ms. Tripi again stated she was unaware of any employees being double paid.

Ms. Smouse indicated that the only case she was aware of was last fiscal year in the last payroll period in which about a dozen teachers were overpaid. The error was found internally and corrected immediately.

Ms. Tripi informed the committee that we do review the system, we look at audit reports and we have checks in place to make sure there are no instances where employees are showing up twice and so far I have not been aware of any problems.

Operations Review: User Interfacing is not intuitive in the Time & Labor application.

Action: This will begin to be addressed at the monthly school secretary meeting.

- Staff members from IS&T and the Payroll Department will participate in several sessions with the school secretaries in an attempt to alleviate some user concerns.
- School secretaries will provide additional training to users. Upgrade may enhance the intuitive nature of the interfacing.

President Garcia asked when someone uses the system, do we get an automatic registry as to who did it and what time. Mr. Greene indicated yes. A journal is created that tracks all of the activity.

Operations Review: There is no kiosk available in the office of each school building to allow substitutes/staff easy accessibility to the Time & Labor application

Action: The Operations Division will work to ensure that a workstation for general use is placed in the office of each school.

Oracle Assessment: Delivered assessment report from Oracle recommends bringing on an A/R & Billing Subject Matter Expert for 3 days to access whether issues with this module can be resolved. However, Oracle has verbally stated that the product was not installed properly and should be re-implemented.

Action: The re-implementation of the A/R & Billing module will be included as part of the PeopleSoft Financials 8.9 upgrade, or will be implemented immediately following the upgrade.

President Garcia wanted to know if the information being generated by these two modules was usable.

Ms. Smouse indicated that the modules were not operational. They never worked.

President Garcia stated, so the answer is no.

Ms. Smouse informed the committee that we have other means of getting this information just not with these two modules.

President Garcia wanted to know what the timeline for addressing this issue is.

Mr. Greene stated that the proposed timeline for implementing and re-implementing these two modules will be sometime in the March/April 2007 timeframe.

Oracle Assessment: Oracle recommends that RCSD implement the delivered Online Requisition functionality to alleviate some of the elapsed time issues that the Purchasing Department is experiencing. Oracle recommends bringing on a Purchasing Subject Matter Expert for 2 weeks to assist in this implementation.

Oracle recommends the implementation of Procurement Contracts functionality which would allow all RCSD contracts to be stored and processed through PeopleSoft Purchasing and Accounts Payable.

Oracle recommends the implementation of the eProcurements module after the Financials 8.9 upgrade is completed.

Actions: The Procurement Contracts functionality has been implemented and is currently being used by the Legal and Purchasing Departments.

RCSD attempted to utilize the Online Requisition functionality of PeopleSoft Financials 8.4. The RCSD Assessment Team determined that this product was not user-friendly and recommended that this implementation be tabled at this time.

In an attempt to provide some immediate relief to both the Purchasing Department and the departments who are high volume Purchase Requisition users, the RCSD Assessment Team is working to roll-out the 'Purchasing Card' (P-Card) district-wide.

eProcurement, in addition to Inventory and Strategic Sourcing, is scheduled to be implemented immediately following the Financials 8.9 Upgrade.

Ms. Tripi stated that Online Requisition is not the eProcurement module. It is the functionality in the existing Procurement module.

President Garcia wanted to know what the plan for upgrading all these modules is. Is this something we have already contracted for?

Mr. Greene stated he would have to bring them before the committee at a later time. Ms. Tripi is right the full eProcurement implementation has a much more user friendly look and feel. It is a very comprehensive implementation that we would like to do after we upgrade the system.

Commissioner Evans asked what is ePerformance.

Mr. Greene indicated that is putting the performance evaluations online.

Commissioner Evans stated I am assuming there will be a follow up to this presentation when you plan on rolling this out to the entire District.

Mr. Greene stated that he was not planning to do so.

Commissioner Evans clarified by stating the actual rollout of the next phase and whether you will be coming back to the committee.

Mr. Greene stated this is a proposed timeline because we have to coordinate with the user groups to make sure this schedule is acceptable to them.

Commissioner Evans stated the same thing goes with the P-Card follow up.

Mr. Tripi informed Commissioner Evans that we have a P-Card program already in place and our plan is to enhance the program by getting more people on line using it and expand the areas where it can be used.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know how many people currently had p-cards. Ms. Tripi indicated 47.

Commissioner Evans stated the only thing I will underscore again is that Commissioner Powell was told that this would have been on the agenda before and this is why he brought it to the agenda even though it was not written. Because it is important that we abide by timelines that we mutually agree upon.

ACTION:

Provide evaluation of current P-card program prior to any expansion as it was a pilot. Also provide information on additional controls proposed to balance expanded use.

III. Budget Process Update

Mr. Connors stated that the Budget office has been working with the Research Evaluation and Testing office and the departments affected in the initial listing. We are now tweaking the measures and we should be on time to deliver them as part of the draft budget book. It will be a separate section in the draft budget book. They will be the same items on the list that came to the committee in December or January.

President Garcia wanted to know if we were still following our commitment to the City to have something similar to what they requested.

Mr. Connors indicated that we are pretty much following the same format as last year. The major changes this year would be the section with the Program Based Budgeting that will be enhanced and grown in future years until the entire budget is developed along those lines. The other area is the department narratives. We've reformatted them to make them easier and cleaner to read. We are attempting to get people to tie what they do to District goals and objectives and delineate that on the narratives as well.

President Garcia departed from the meeting at 6:41 p.m.

IV. Draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Mr. Keysa stated that the packet that had been submitted shows the five years that are in the CIP and what the totals are. The first year is \$16,351,225 and then the following pages review the schools that will be addressed and the items that will be worked on. At the end we provided a few supplemental pages that expand on the list where it had four bulleted items of very large amounts. Ms. Tripi informed the committee that the CIP addresses each of our school buildings on a three year rolling cycle and these are the buildings that were

addressed three years prior and this is the work that will be done in the summer of 2007.

Mr. Keysa informed the committee that the actual flow of money for the Facilities Modernization Plan (FMP) will probably be six months to a year from now. Where we can actually start using those funds to hire the firms to start doing the necessary designs, etc. So one of the things we are doing in this CIP is we are adding \$1.5M in bond dollars and we also added \$1M on the cash capital side to more or less jump start the architectural engineering portion- and in some cases site acquisitions. If the FMP does not go forward in that timeline we would not borrow the amount or we would redirect it. Obviously we would come back to you for that redirection. So right now there is a placeholder of \$1.5M in bond dollars. What we are looking at is increasing the placeholder for FMP at least in years 2 through 5 of the current CIP but as that changes it will crowd out some of the work that has been historically included in the plan. Commissioner Brennan wanted to know what is chemical feed and water softener.

Mr. Keysa indicated that is really for the boilers. It is a way to treat the water so that it is not hard water.

Commissioner Evans wanted an update on the Central Office renovations and the Bevier building.

Mr. Wheatcraft stated that contracts have not been signed but negotiations and legal documentation are complete for the donation of the Bevier building. The District will be purchasing the parking lot and the Board approved the resolution to purchase the parking lot last month for \$100k. However, the resolution will need to be amended to reflect the new purchase price of \$111k. The amendment will go before the Board at this month's meeting. The goal is to have everything approved by City Council by mid-April and close the deal by the end of April.

Commissioner Evans asked Mr. Keysa to explain what the \$1.5M Edison redesign was all about.

Mr. Keysa indicated that this has been going in the CIP for four years. Originally, we put in \$8M and we have tried to hold the cost down as best we could but it was for creating the four separate high schools and what we have to do internally to the building to make that separation work; it is also upgrading equipment. There has really been no capital investment put into the actual classroom equipment (i.e. blaze, drill presses, etc.) since we opened the building. They are in the 25 year range at this time. It includes upgrading equipment, computers, etc.

Ms. Rohring asked if we were making a significant investment in skilled trades.

Mr. Keysa indicated yes.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know when the renovations would start at Central Office.

Mr. Keysa stated that we have to get the Bevier component completed in order to move forward.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know when we would be able to open the door at the Bevier building and see someone sitting at a desk.

Mr. Keysa stated probably next year.

Commissioner Evans asked if architects had been involved.

Ms. Tripi indicated that we had a design for the Bevier building but a lot has changed in the District since then. At that point in time we were using part of Lofton and part of the Bevier building. Since then, other groups have been moved to the Service Center or are planning to be moved to the Service Center. So we have to do it again. We do have some preliminary designs, but we have not engaged the architects. We have made a commitment to the Planning Committee that we would not engage the architects until we physically owned the Bevier building.

Commissioner Evans wanted to know what departments would be moving to the Service Center.

Ms. Tripi stated the print shop, facilities and some helpdesk employees (staging of computer hardware).

V. Next Meeting – April 4, 2006 – Budget Deliberations

Ms. Rohring stated that we also meet on April 6, 2006 at 5:15 p.m. to address resolutions and financial reports for the April Business Meeting.

Commissioner Evans stated that April 6, 2006 is the business portion.

Adjournment: Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Brennan, Seconded by Commissioner Evans. Adopted 2-0 at 6:52 p.m. with Commissioner Powell absent.