

# TEAM MEETING MINUTES

## FCPS BUS FACILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY

MAY 12, 2016

### Attendees:

Steve Bolling  
Ruth Biser  
Todd Eudy  
Tom Buckley  
Pam Wein  
Holly Nelson  
Amanda Rhoderick  
Beth Pasierb  
Brad Ahalt  
Tiana Haile  
Mark Maggitti

#### 1. Summary of bus driver surveys

Bus inspections were held over nine days. During those nine days, staff collected survey information. There were 287 responses for a 64% response rate. We received good information, and it was good to work with the bus drivers to become familiar with them and to let them know what the committee is doing. There was a positive correlation between the availability and of quick service and those who use it to positive bus inspections. Discussion of overall responses. Strong input for a wash bay and more fuel pumps.

#### 2. Discuss Phase 1 draft report

History of the current facility which was built in 1975. An addition was constructed in 1979 or 80, due to increased enrollments requiring a larger fleet. A Parts Room will be constructed in 2016. Concerns with the current facility are for refueling and parking.

In 1996 an Engineering Study was done. At that time contractor buses were maintained by the contractors. The use of contract buses began to be phased out in 1997 and ended in June 2009. Mr. Boling asked when did the system start using contract buses. It is not known when this began. It was proposed that maybe the original garage was not intended to handle buses. The conclusions of this study are similar to the needs we see today. The report was never presented to the Board of Education, maybe because of funding issues. Also, the enrollment projections were not as consistent at the time.

In 2005 Adtek developed a Master Plan. This plan, too, was never presented to the Board of Education. Mr. Eudy asked how did this plan compare to the previous plan.

Ms. Nelson presented information regarding the specifications for updating the bus garage. Her information supports the need for 10 to 12 bays. Mr. Maggitti would like to

see 20 to 21 bays. He feels we need 21 mechanics to service the number of buses we currently have at 20 buses per mechanic. They all need work space, so he would expect one mechanic to one bay. Ms. Pasierb asked does our current need compare to the previous needs. Mark stated the buses are not getting the kind of service they should. We have to send too many out to be repaired because we don't have the facilities. Mr. Maggitti said we currently have 12 mechanics and that averages 47 buses per mechanic. Ms. Pasierb stated if we jump to become fully staffed it could lead to unused space and mechanics. Mr. Maggitti stated we have down times when we have to wait for parts and we do not have shifts during the summer. Mr. Buckley pointed out that during the school year many of the buses can't be brought into the garage until 6:00 in the evening, so some mechanics start later and end later in order to work on these buses. When school out, there is no need for the shift. Mr. Ahalt asked the group where do you want to be in comparison to the national average. We need a rationale to meet the national average. Mr. Buckley suggested we compare our needs to other school systems in Maryland. Ms. Pasierb asked that the group define our needs and then compare our needs to others, building an argument for our needs. Mr. Ahalt suggested we use the national average and the other state groups as a guide to support our needs. Ms. Nelson said we should also consider the county and city bus fleets. Ms. Haile asked how do our labor rates compare to the other groups? Mr. Maggitti said we have straight Grade 9 mechanics. Others offer incentives and compensations but we are limited by our facilities to be able to utilize additional training. Mr. Ahalt asked how has your staff grown? You need to be able to answer that. Mr. Eudy suggested we include Montgomery County for comparison as well. Ms. Wein also suggested we break out the white fleet from the bus fleet. Mr. Maggitti also said we need to include our 52 extended life buses. Washington County and Baltimore County do not have any. These buses require more repairs, and more frequent inspections. Ms. Wein added that we need to show how the use or non-use of these buses affects our costs.

Mr. Ahalt asked where do you think we should be? How can we support our requests with no consensus? We need a consensus of our wants and needs. Our recommendation may be 16 to 20 bays based on other locations. Ms. Nelson will get more data and we will talk about our bus to bay ratio.

3. Efficiencies – Adequate storage for parts. Mr. Maggitti said we cannot realize savings by buying in bulk because we don't have the storage. Brakes and filters may make sense to buy in bulk for savings. Ms. Nelson asked how much space do you need?

Bus Washing – There is broad consensus that we need washing facilities. Savings would be hard to gather since the majority of buses washed are washed at home. However, clean buses give a positive perception.

Replace buses after 12 years – It would take until 2030 to get to no longer having extended life buses. We also need to look at the benefits of using extended life buses. Mr. Maggitti pointed out we have retired 6 extended life buses this year. Mr. Eudy stated with a larger facility and more mechanics we would reduce the number of buses waiting for service and would allow for fewer extended life buses.

#### 4. Next steps

Ms. Nelson stated we still have a lot of questions. We want to make a presentation to the bus mechanics either as a presentation or an online link. Mr. Buckley said there is a lot of benefit to having a presentation here with the mechanics all together.

Ms. Nelson asked the group to look through the rest of the report and space summaries. On Monday, May 16 she is to make a presentation to the Superintendent's cabinet. Mr. Maggitti stated that on June 20 there is a shop in-service and that may be a good day to make a presentation to the mechanics.

The next meetings of the committee will be on May 26 and June 2.

Phase 2 will begin July 7.