1. Agenda
   
   Documents:
   
   CCAGC MEETING AGENDA - MARCH 16, 2016.PDF

2. Packet
   
   Documents:
   
   CCAGC MEETING MATERIALS - MARCH 16, 2016.PDF
A. Opening Remarks

B. Approval of Agenda

C. Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes/ Action Items

D. Business Items
   2. Project Updates:
      i. Manchester, Beulah, Enon, Monacan
      ii. Remaining Project Schedules

E. School Building Prototype Strategy

F. A Summary Report on School Cash Proffer Revenues

G. Next Meeting Agenda Topics

H. Closed Session

I. Adjournment to Next Meeting Date – April 20th, 12:30 School Admin.
School CIP Update
CCGAAC Meeting
March 15, 2016

Topics for Discussion

- Schedule Updates
- Peripheral Activity
  - Prototype Selection
Providence Middle School Renovation

1. Site location - N/A
2. Land acquisition - N/A
3. Site Approval - N/A
4. Selection of A&E - Complete
5. Stakeholder engagement - Complete
6. Schematics - Complete
7. Stakeholder engagement - Complete
8. Design Development - Complete
9. Construction documents - Complete
10. Site plan approval – In Progress
11. Construction document approval – In Progress
12. Bid solicitation
13. Award of Contract
14. Contractor submittals
15. Modified stakeholder engagement
16. Construction updates
17. Substantial and final completion reports
18. Final close out report

**Major Milestone Completion Dates**

- Pre-Design: March 2014
- Design: February 2016
- Bid: April 2016
- Construction: Final Completion - January 2019; Final Close-Out - April 2019

**Move in January 2019 (FY19)**

- Teachers move-in July 2018

**Kitchen Phase complete Jan. 2019, Teachers move-in July 2018**

Providence Middle School Renovation

Recommendations Requested:
April 2016 – Review bid results

Update:
1. Bid advertised February 28th
2. Pre-Bid Meeting: March 15th at Providence Middle School
3. Amendments posted by: March 15th
4. Bid close date: March 29th
5. Award made by April 15th (originally March)
Manchester Middle School Renovation

**No Change**

**Recommendations Requested:**
July or August 2016 – Review of bid results (based on bid close date)

**Update:**
- **Bid Update**
  - Approval and review of all documents by April 30th
  - Bid – May 15th through June 15th
  - Award of contract July 1st
Beulah Elementary School Replacement

Recommendations Requested:
March 2016 – Closed session CCGAAC discussion regarding site selection update

Updates:
1. Note: Positive impact to schedule likely with prototype
Enon Elementary School Replacement

Recommendations Requested:
March 2016 - Closed session CCGAAC discussion regarding site selection

Updates:
1. Note: Positive impact to schedule likely with prototype
Matoaca Elementary Replacement

Recommendations Requested:
March 2016 - Update on Matoaca strategy

Updates:
1. Update on site in closed session
2. Study from 2015
   - New school is needed
   - Site inadequate
New Midlothian Elementary

Recommendations Requested:
April: Update CCGAAC on status of School Board site selection

Updates:
1. Update to School Board end of March or early April in closed session on site
# Remaining CIP Schedules

**No Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Pre-Design</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Bid</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Move-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Pending review of ESCO projects with School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Building Strategy: Utilize CIP funds ($2.0M) in conjunction with ESCO project.

---

## Prototype Options
3 – Options

1. Traditional A&E RFP for original prototype design
2. Traditional A&E RFP with two tracks
   ◦ Original prototype design
   ◦ Architect provides design from the A&E’s previous construction portfolio for customization and site adapt in Chesterfield
3. PPEA – Public Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act

#1: Pros and Cons of RFP w/ Original Prototype Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‣ Greater control of the design</td>
<td>‣ Longer initial design period (8 – 12 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Can own the design</td>
<td>‣ Multiple bid periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Repeat use of the design may mean fewer change orders in subsequent projects</td>
<td>‣ One-time A&amp;E (120 to 180 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Greater opportunities for stakeholder input and citizen engagement</td>
<td>‣ Multiple construction bid periods (60 to 90 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Greater opportunity for multiple construction companies to perform the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#2: Pros and Cons of RFP w/ Two Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same as “Original Prototype Design”</td>
<td>Potentially longer period for selecting the A&amp;E firm – review of the construction design submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter design time – (3 to 5 months)</td>
<td>Multiple bid periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May have fewer change orders if prior construction project design used (“As–builds”)</td>
<td>• One–time A&amp;E (120 to 180 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multiple construction bid periods (60 to 90 days)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#3: Pros and Cons of PPEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces bid periods to 1 for both construction and A&amp;E combined</td>
<td>Develop PPEA procedures and have adopted by the Board before PPEA can be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially control design and own design upon completion</td>
<td>Longer bid review time for initial selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially faster time to start construction</td>
<td>Debt capacity of smaller construction company to take on 4 new school construction projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Requirements in RFP and Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prototype from the bidders construction portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language that requires citizen engagement for specific design requirements during the interim negotiations phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approval of construction documents, without site adapt, as a part of the final negotiations phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prototype Selection

Option 2 was chosen – RFP with two (2) tracts

- **Tract 1**
  - Original Prototype Design
  - "From Scratch"

- **Tract 2**
  - Construction Portfolio Design
  - "As-Built"

**Key Selection Criteria**
- Functionality of design
- Construction design quality
- Design flexibility
- Ability to Customize (allows for citizen engagement)
- Time frame to get construction documents ready for bid
- Ownership of design
- Cost of design and applicable discounts
- Ability of A&E firm to manage multiple concurrent projects

**Time line for RFP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec. RFP Request</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue RFP (30 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with RFP Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Number of Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview and Final Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award and Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent upon number of proposals received
Q&A
Public Entity Drafts and adopts PPEA Guidelines BEFORE accepting any proposals

**Solicited**
- Solicitation issued
- Conceptual proposals received and reviewed
- Information subject to FOIA is determined
- Accepted conceptual proposal(s) identified

**Unsolicited**
- Private entity submits proposal with payment of review fee
- Proposal received and determination made to accept the proposal for review
- Post notice for 45 days to encourage competition + 1 copy available for public review
- Conceptual proposals received and reviewed
- Accepted conceptual proposal(s) identified
- Review of one or more proposals + other professionals as deemed appropriate
- Optional review by an advisory committee
- Approved by the School Board
- Interim Agreement with additional options for negotiations
- Comprehensive Agreement / Final Contract

Stop
Return proposal and fee to private entity
Required Information

Conceptual Phase Requirements

1. Qualifications and experience (detailed list of requirements)
2. Project characteristics (detailed list of requirements)
3. Project Financing (detailed list of requirements)
4. Anticipated public support or opposition, or both
5. Project benefit and compatibility (detailed list of requirements)
6. Any additional information as the Schools may reasonably request to comply with the requirements of the PPEA
7. Suggestions for formatting the information

Detailed Phase Requirements

1. Topographical map
2. List of affected public utility facilities
3. Plan for securing all necessary property
4. - if required
5. Listing of all firms that will provide any services, e.g. design, construction, warranties, plus a description of guarantees and warranties
6. Life-cycle cost with methodology and assumptions
7. Detailed discussion of all assumptions
8. Identification of any known support or opposition
9. Demonstrate consistency with local government plans
10. Identify any officers and executives of the firm(s) submitting the proposal and any disqualifications based on conflict of interest
# School Cash Proffers - Sources and Planned Uses, FY2017-FY2021

by: Budget & Management, March 15, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Proffers - on hand¹</td>
<td>$3,208,400</td>
<td>$3,835,192</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Proffers - forecast²</td>
<td>791,600</td>
<td>2,164,808</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enon</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matoaca</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlo ES</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Acquisitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ as of Dec 31 2015
² Forecasted receipts between Jan 2016 through June 30, 2018

Proposed modification to CCPS approved CIP