

**CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION GOALS AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
JOINT MEETING WITH THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AND SCHOOL BOARD**

**August 17, 2016
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 502**

Committee Members in Attendance:

Mr. Steve Elswick	Mr. Allan Carmody
Ms. Dorothy Jaeckle (for Ms. Haley)	Mr. John Hilliard
Ms. Carrie Coyner	Ms. Barbara Mait
Ms. Dianne Smith (for Mr. Thompson)	Ms. Nita Mensia-Joseph
Dr. Edgar Wallin	Mr. Andy Scherzer
	Mr. Chris Sorensen

Others in Attendance:

Dr. Joe Casey
Dr. James Lane

A. OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Coyner called the committee meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

Committee members and staff persons introduced themselves to Dr. Casey and Dr. Lane.

Dr. Casey thanked Dr. Lane for inviting him to attend the Schools' leadership meeting this morning. He stated he and Dr. Lane are committed to working together and have their staffs work together for the sake of both the county and the School Board. He further stated capital projects and infrastructure are very important, and he looks forward to working with Dr. Lane in defining ways to get the projects done in an engaged and transparent manner.

Dr. Lane expressed appreciation to Dr. Casey for attending the School Board's leadership meeting. He stated he is looking forward to working with the citizens on the committee as processes are developed that may create more opportunities for transparency and feedback. He further stated he hopes to set the example that he and Ms. Dickson set in Goochland with how the schools and county could work together.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On motion of Mr. Carmody, seconded by Dr. Wallin, the agenda was approved by the committee.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaeckle, Coyner, Smith, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait,
Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.
Nays: None.

C. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES/ACTION ITEMS

On motion of Dr. Wallin, seconded by Mr. Holmes, the minutes and action items from the May 18, 2016 meeting were approved by the committee.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaeckle, Coyner, Smith, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

D. BUSINESS ITEMS

1. PROJECT UPDATES

i. PROVIDENCE, MANCHESTER, BEULAH, ENON, MONACAN

Ms. Joseph reviewed major organizational changes in School Administration, including Todd Marshall, Director of Maintenance and Construction, Agur Davis, Construction Project Manager, and Lloyd Schieldge, CIP Contract Administrator. She then provided an update on the Monacan High School renovations and addition project, including a financial and schedule update. She stated the construction contract administrator, MBP, began overseeing the project on July 1, as a result of the reorganization, and provided a sample of a weekly progress report that Schools receives from MBP, which provides for transparency on what is happening with the project. She provided an out-year renovation update, noting that the schedule pretty much remains unchanged, and staff will be going back to the School Board between now and the end of this year to finalize the scope of work for the remaining projects and to answer questions regarding community space. She stated staff would then work with Purchasing to solicit an RFP for design firms for the remaining projects between January and February 2017. She then provided details of the Chesterfield Prototype for the four new elementary schools, which will be constructed two at a time, beginning with Beulah and Enon, and then Matoaca and Midlothian.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's question, Ms. Joseph stated the prototype is designed to accommodate 750 students.

Ms. Joseph stated stakeholder engagement meetings have begun for the participants to provide input on entrance designs and exterior finishes and color schemes.

In response to Mr. Hilliard's question, Ms. Joseph stated the prototype will fit on the current Enon Elementary site, and it will be modified to have two primary academic wings. She further stated the proposed 750-student capacity is sufficient for Enon Elementary. She noted that the voting for exterior finishes for Enon and Beulah Elementary will continue through September 2. She provided photos of four options for entrance designs and three options for exterior finishes and color schemes. She stated the community will be voting on the options.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's question, Ms. Joseph stated more than 50 people attended the Enon Elementary community engagement meeting. She further stated parents can vote for the options on the Schools' website, as well as Enon Elementary School's website. She stated the voting will continue for all four schools, so if two schools choose the same entrance design, that is what will be used for all of the schools.

In response to Mr. Carmody's question, Ms. Joseph stated the fee for all four design options is within the budgeted amount for design, and the cost of construction is still to be determined.

Ms. Joseph then provided details for the Beulah and Enon Elementary replacement schedules, noting that the move-in date for both of the projects is September 2018.

Mr. Sorensen stated the Planning Commission will consider substantial accord for Enon Elementary at its September meeting, and the county is currently negotiating with the adjacent church to acquire approximately 2 acres for the replacement project.

In response to Mr. Holmes' question, Mr. Sorensen stated the two-wing design would be built with the existing school still in-tact, tearing down the gym and a couple of classrooms during the latter stages of construction.

Ms. Joseph reviewed the preliminary replacement schedules for Matoaca and Midlothian Elementary, noting that more detailed schedules will be available later this year.

Mr. Sorensen clarified that the Planning Commission's substantial accord hearing of the Matoaca Elementary replacement has been moved from September 20th to October 18 due to negotiations with property owners.

Ms. Joseph stated a Natural Resource Study must be completed for the Midlothian Elementary site prior to substantial accord.

Mr. Sorensen stated the county's Right-of-Way Department has been in contact with the property owner of the Midlothian Elementary site, who has been very cooperative in granting access to the site. He further stated staff has requested an appraisal of the entire property, which is approximately 82 acres, but has chosen a smaller 23-acre site. He stated staff is proceeding on both acreages until a final decision is made.

Ms. Joseph then provided an update on the Providence Middle School renovation project. She stated the contract was awarded for Providence on August 8, noting that the bid was \$2.07 million over budget versus \$5.6 million over with the first bid. She further stated the School Board approved funding the budget shortfall with the CIP fund balance. She provided details of actions taken to reduce costs. She then provided an update on the Manchester Middle School renovation project. She stated the Manchester Middle bid closes on September 7, and the School Board will receive the results on September 13 and award a contract on September 27. She further stated the delays are due to standardization of finishes to match existing schools. She stated the same actions as the Providence project were taken, including reduced phasing, to reduce costs; however, staff still anticipates the Manchester bid will be at least \$3 to \$4 million over budget after the changes were made.

In response to Mr. Holmes' question, Mr. Sorensen stated one option for funding the overage would be issuing additional bonds, indicating that the county is allowed to issue up to \$304 million. He stated another option would be the CIP fund balance.

In response to Mr. Carmody's question, Mr. Sorensen stated there was a savings in design fees for the four prototype schools that would be another option for funding the overage.

Discussion ensued relative to delivering a new school as opposed to renovating Manchester Middle School, if the cost of renovation is close to the cost of a new school.

Mr. Sorensen stated construction of a new school would have to go back to the School Board, but not to the citizens, for approval.

Ms. Coyner stated lessons have been learned through this process, noting there needs to be a more consistent way of analyzing existing buildings than what was done in the past to obtain the information needed for making the best decisions possible.

Ms. Joseph stated after meeting with the new construction staff, it was determined that an engineering firm should completely evaluate all schools scheduled for renovation and determine the full scope of the work and whether renovation is reasonable, as opposed to new construction. She further stated we do not want to get in a similar situation as the Manchester project, so we will spend some money up front on evaluation of the proposed renovations. She stated, looking at what has been spent in design work with the Manchester project, one-third of that could have been spent in evaluating the building.

Discussion ensued relative to the necessity of evaluating the buildings up front and having the necessary information to make decisions.

Mr. Holmes stated more information can be valuable, but it comes back to what is in the best interest of the county and the students at the school. He cautioned staff about asking for detailed information that is just not available. He stressed the importance of acquiring enough general information in the early phase to get a sense and try to commit to a path and move forward. He stated down the road, it may be determined that \$1 million could have been saved, but it would have cost \$1 million to determine that in advance.

Mr. Scherzer concurred that making a decision is the best thing to do.

Ms. Jaeckle expressed concerns about what happens with the students when renovating in place and stated there should be a policy of how to handle that situation. She stated by the time these bond projects are complete, we will be starting on more schools.

Dr. Wallin stated it appears we have enough information now to know that the Manchester Middle project will be \$3 to \$5 million above budget. He expressed concerns that it may not be wise to spend more money to get additional information to confirm what we already know. He stated time is money, and when you delay a project six months to a year, the bids are going to come in higher. He stated decisions need to be made that are in the best interest of the school system and the citizens.

Dr. Lane stated we do have some information, but not all that we need, to make the decision. He further stated September 7 is not that far away, and no more money will be spent between now and September 7. He stated knowing exactly where the bids come in is very important, and the bid amount is significant in terms of what he would recommend to the School Board. He further stated knowing that number is essential to having a conversation around what a new school would cost. He further stated he would like to see more analytics before making a recommendation.

Mr. Holmes stated he is not arguing about analytics, but finding a balance.

Ms. Mait stated she attended the meeting at Manchester Middle last year and saw the excitement about revitalization opportunities. She expressed concerns relative to the length of time citizens will be disrupted on the Hull Street Corridor due to revitalization efforts on one side of the street versus the other.

Mr. Dupler stated the Manchester YMCA is in an ongoing fundraising effort to fund capital improvements across the street. He further stated, under either scenario being discussed, the timing of the school would be the same as the YMCA, and he does not anticipate an impact on the Hull Street Corridor.

Mr. Scherzer inquired whether there has been any additional discussion relating to resurrecting or studying the PPEA policy that is necessary to enable the PPEA process.

Ms. Joseph stated since the county now handles all of the procurement, the PPEA process would be a county decision.

Dr. Casey stated the PPEA is sometimes used for projects that need to be rushed, and they are not necessarily thought through and discerned as well. He further stated he would like to think that the county and schools will have plans that have been thought through, and there would be a number of bidders with the most competitive pricing. He stated, as far as his experience, the PPEA process would be worth considering if a major road or major economic development project is needed within record time. He further stated he would like to think it is a combined county and school effort to make logical projections for school enrollment and capacity.

Further discussion ensued relative to using the PPEA process for schools that may be needed quickly due to major subdivision build-outs.

E. NEXT MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

Mr. Elswick requested that Dr. Casey and Dr. Lane take a look at the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee, have a dialog with staff and the committee members, and report back to the committee at its next meeting with recommendations to improve the committee and its processes. He stated the committee could be more effective, and with new leadership and new ideas, it is appropriate to reevaluate it.

F. CLOSED SESSION (if needed)

A Closed Session was not needed at this time.

G. ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms Mait, the committee adjourned at 1:17 p.m. until September 21, 2016, at 12:30 p.m. for its next regularly scheduled meeting at the School Administration Building.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaekle, Coyner, Smith, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.