

**Testimony of Daniel Hudspeth, Hope Community Public Charter School
 Bill 18-564, the "Healthy Schools Act of 2009"
 March 26, 2010**

I Thank you for the opportunity

Hello, my name is Daniel Hudspeth and I am the Compliance and Finance Officer for Hope Community Public Charter School. I've worked in public education for three years, and I live in the Adams Morgan neighborhood of Washington, DC.

~~Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.~~ **IT** Mrs. Baker, Mr. Heuse - Four staff already commented

ABOUT some of the problems at Charter Schools and Facing

II Hope Community Public Charter School (HCPCS) was approved in 2005 and currently operates two campuses in Wards 4 and 5. HCPCS serves a total of 665 students, 65% of whom are eligible for free or reduced price meals. ~~And we~~ ^{currently} must all ~~admission~~ ^{admission} requirements with the N.S.L.P.

Thank you for the opportunity to

~~comment~~ ^{comment} on Bill 18-564, the "Healthy Schools Act of 2009." First, we wholeheartedly support two specific provisions which will help create a safer environment for our school children:

- IV**
1. Eliminating the minimum 600 square foot requirement for a school nurse suite, and
 2. Prohibiting the idling of vehicles within one-hundred feet of school property.

V ~~While we at Hope Community PCS applaud the intent of this bill, we feel that some sections will~~ ^{Despite THE COUNCILS' best efforts to address costs, AND I would like to place these costs in context} ~~pose financial hardships and cause us to shift resources from academics to the school meals program and other wellness programs in order to comply.~~ ^{for an individual school} ~~Without the city providing strong financial support for implementation, many of these provisions amount to unfunded mandates.~~ ^{discuss some of the local}

Title II, Section 203 (b) requires schools with more than 40% of students eligible for free and reduced meals to offer universal free breakfast in the classroom. This will require our teachers to change their working schedule and ~~would require us to begin purchasing breakfasts for more students at an additional operating cost of upwards of \$40,000 per year~~ ^{35% of this students (= 232 * 180 * .15 = 41,760.)}

~~60% = 400 students~~ ~~400 (100 * 1.50/200) x~~

Title II, section 203 (c) requires schools to not charge students who qualify for reduced meals under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). We estimate this cost to be between \$4,000 and \$6,000 per campus, per year. (8-12k yr)

— skip — to next part —

Also, the proposed requirements for nutritional improvements (in addition to those required by NSLP) will present extra costs. Our school will be forced to charge more money to students who pay for meals in order to keep our operations sustainable. Additionally, the imposed fine of \$500.00 per day could cripple our ability to eventually reach compliance with these goals since the biggest barrier to implementation is cost. [While **Title 2, section 204** notes that while an

additional \$0.10 may be added to reimbursements for meals which comply, funding may also be withheld from schools which do not comply. Therefore, schools still risk losing funding if they are unable to meet all requirements of this bill.

We also do not have the capacity nor the expertise to consistently regulate the nutritional quality of food purchased from vendors. The burden of determining the origins and quality of food should be managed by OSSE through an NSLP vendor approval process. The bill does nothing to help manage the costs of regulation and would require the hiring of additional personnel. We estimate this would cost the school an additional \$40,000 to pay for a single salary and benefits.

~~SKIP~~ **Title III, Section 301**, The Farm to School Program, also increases our overall operating costs.

Whether our current vendor increased their meal prices to comply with regulations, or if we switched to a vendor that purchased local food, we would still pay more per meal next year. Even if the price-per-meal cost were increased by fifty cents per meal, we estimate a cost increase of \$50,000 per year. The \$0.10 increase in reimbursement amounts would not likely cover the entire cost under this regulation.

Next, because **Title IV, sections 401-A through D and Title VI, section 602** require charter schools to provide at least 150 minutes of physical education per week and at least forty hours of health education (grades K-2) per year, our school will need to hire additional employees to meet these demands. Administrators will be forced to re-allocate salary funding from academic positions, which would harm the school's academic advancement.

~~SKIP~~ **Title V, section 502**, which prohibits the use of non-eco-friendly supplies, presents an economic concern, given the failure of the city government to provide the additional funding to maintain these programs. Also, no study or information has been provided which tells schools whether or not these supplies will be readily available at an affordable cost.

conclude Overall, we estimate that the passing of this bill in its current form will cost our school an additional \$100,000 to cover increased food, operations, and personnel costs. Even with the increase of \$0.10 per meal, our school only stands to gain between \$8000-\$9000 dollars in additional yearly revenue, and this revenue is tied only to meals purchased by students. The additional costs will place serious financial strains on our school in the coming year.

*Nonrevenue
Break
Even
Budgets*

Thank you for your time, QUESTIONS?

*• encourage incentive Programs.
• encourage the city council to
cover the entire costs presented
in this bill - otherwise we
will face extremely large budgetary
shortfalls -*