

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

May 18, 2016

SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Supervisors in Attendance:

Mr. Stephen A. Elswick, Chairman
Ms. Dorothy A. Jaeckle, Vice Chair
Mr. Christopher M. Winslow
Mr. James Holland
Ms. Leslie Haley

School Board Members in Attendance:

Ms. Dianne H. Smith, Chairman
Ms. Carrie E. Coyner, Vice Chair
Mr. John M. Erbach
Mr. Rob W. Thompson
Dr. Javaid E. Siddiqi

Committee Members in Attendance:

Mr. Steve Elswick
Ms. Leslie Haley
Ms. Carrie Coyner
Mr. Rob Thompson
Dr. Edgar Wallin
Mr. Allan Carmody
Mr. John Hilliard
Mr. Randy Holmes
Ms. Barbara Mait
Mr. Andy Scherzer
Mr. Chris Sorensen
Ms. Nita Mensia-Joseph

A. OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Elswick called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. on behalf of the committee. He stated the Board of Supervisors and School Board will not convene until just prior to the Closed Session.

Ms. Coyner expressed concerns relative to the number of people at the table at the previous meeting, which was a joint meeting between the committee, the Board of Supervisors and the School Board. She stated the committee is structured to provide citizen participation, and it is important that they have a voice at the meeting. She apologized for the length of the previous meeting and stated hopefully today's meeting structure will work better.

B. CERTIFICATION OF APRIL 20, 2016 CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Blakley (Clerk to Board of Supervisors and Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee) read the following statement:

At the April 20 Joint Meeting of the Board of Supervisors, School Board and Capital Construction Committee, a Closed Session was held in accordance with Section (§) 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under the following subsections 29 and 3: discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, including interviews of bidders or offerors, and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; and discussion or consideration of

acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

Several of the committee members left the meeting prior to the end of the closed session and were not present to vote on the motion of Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Carmody, for the committee to adopt the resolution certifying the closed session. I will now read that resolution and request that the committee members who were not present to certify the closed session do so when I call their name.

I would also note that Mr. Gib Sloan, who participated in the meeting as the Planning Commission representative in Dr. Wallen's absence, is out of town and unable to be here today to certify the closed session, but plans to do so at the June 15 committee meeting.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i-one) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii-two) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the committee.

Ms. Coyner: Aye.

Mr. Hilliard: Aye.

Mr. Holmes: Aye.

Ms. Mait: Aye.

Mr. Scherzer: Aye.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On motion of Mr. Carmody, seconded by Mr. Thompson, the agenda was approved by the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee.

Ayes: Holland, Jaeckle, Coyner, Thompson, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

D. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES/ACTION ITEMS

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Mr. Carmody, the minutes and action items from the April 20, 2016 meeting were approved by the committee.

Ayes: Elswick, Haley, Coyner, Thompson, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

E. BUSINESS ITEMS

1. PROJECT UPDATES

i. **MANCHESTER, BEULAH, ENON, MONACAN**

Ms. Joseph stated nothing has changed with the project schedules from the previous meeting. She further stated the A&E activity has been stopped on the Providence and Manchester projects until the parity issue is resolved, as a result of discussion at the last School Board meeting. She stated the construction management RFP bids have closed, negotiations are taking place, and it is anticipated that a memo will be presented to the School Board for approval by June 16th. She provided copies of a comparison summary of middle school classrooms and other spaces at existing Elizabeth Davis and Tomahawk Creek and proposed Providence and Manchester middle schools, as well as portions of the Comprehensive Plan related to the Public Facilities Plan and revitalization. She read the definition of revitalization from the Comprehensive Plan, which states the goal of facility revitalization is to make an existing facility comparable to a new building. She also provided a copy of a portion of a July 2013 presentation from the Chesterfield Chamber of Commerce, which stated revitalization is assumed to be the replacement and/or renovation of the same items listed in the Comprehensive Plan. She stated, going forward with presentations, she wanted to make sure everyone had what was approved by the Board of Supervisors and how the Schools actually shaped the proposed renovations. She provided photos depicting a parity comparison between Elizabeth Davis and Tomahawk middle schools. She referenced the data sheet for the middle school comparison study and stated the biggest concern was for collaborative spacing and fitness rooms. She stated, at the School Board's request, she confirmed with the principals of both Tomahawk and Elizabeth Davis that collaborative space is critical to meet the current educational programs at the schools, such as student project work space, ESOL instruction space and tutoring space for students who may need additional support for the current Standards of Learning. She further stated, in talking with the architects, the collaborative space basically exists and eliminating it would not have a significant impact on cost. She stated both Elizabeth Davis and Tomahawk have used health education space for fitness rooms, and both of those principals, as well as the principal at Providence Middle, have stated that that is critical as part of their Health and PE program.

Dr. Wallin inquired, from an instructional standpoint, what the fitness room space would be utilized for at a middle school level and what it would look like. He also inquired what type of equipment would be included in a fitness room that would not be included in Health and PE classrooms.

Ms. Mait inquired whether the fitness space would be used for Health and PE instruction or for after-school activities.

Ms. Joseph stated in looking at parity and equity, the two middle schools currently in existence have already converted space into fitness. She further stated the principals took classrooms and converted them into fitness rooms, noting that she is not sure whether this is a construction issue or an instruction issue.

Dr. Wallin stated, before determining the construction, we need to determine what the instructional issue is and the curriculum issue.

Ms. Donna Dalton stated Health and PE is no longer required in the 8th grade, so more creative classes have been designed to engage those students in PE activities. She further stated the fitness rooms are being used to engage students in classes that are not typical PE classes.

Ms. Coyner noted the programs are driven towards healthy lifestyle and activities.

In response to Dr. Wallin's inquiries, Ms. Dalton stated she would provide the instructional aspects of the fitness rooms, as well as the number of 8th grade students enrolled in the programs.

Mr. Scherzer inquired about the disproportionate amount of instructional spaces between Manchester and Providence Middle Schools, considering the number of students at each of the schools.

Ms. Joseph stated she would get the answer to that question from Instruction and provide it to the committee.

Dr. Wallin clarified his requests for information related to fitness room space: 1) how many students are involved in and required in this specialized facility for their instruction; and 2) does the School Board want to go down that road with expenditures for an elective, rather than an instructional requirement.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's question, Ms. Joseph stated the construction management RFP is following the county's procurement process, with both county and school representatives on the RFP team that will evaluate the bids. She then reviewed changes approved by the School Board for the Providence bid. She stated Ms. Coyner has requested that the committee discuss options if the bid results come back over budget, including the use of remaining bond funds and the CIP Reserve, as well as the long-term impact of funding options if additional projects are over budget.

Mr. Sorensen stated there is currently about \$5 million in the CIP reserve, which is used for both referendum and major maintenance projects. He further stated, looking at Schools' results of operations for 2016, approximately \$6 million is proposed to be placed in the CIP reserve at year-end, contingent upon approval by the Board of Supervisors, bringing the CIP reserve up to \$11 million.

Ms. Joseph stated if the projects do come in over budget, the expectation is to still provide new furniture within the schools, and staff will be looking at the CIP reserve to provide that funding.

Mr. Elswick inquired whether the recommendation to maintain the kitchen renovation includes the additional serving line.

Ms. Joseph stated several pieces of new equipment were just purchased for the kitchen. She further stated the current kitchen layout only provides the capacity for two serving lines, and the third line was more of an a la carte line. She stated in order to achieve parity an additional full-service line is needed. She noted that the new equipment would be taken out and repurposed at other schools.

Mr. Elswick stated the third serving line should be based on necessity, not just because two other middle schools have three lines.

Ms. Joseph stated currently the two lines are sufficient as long as participation remains at 55 to 60 percent; however, if at any time student participation in the lunch program increased, there would not be enough capacity to serve the students in two lines in the time allotted.

Discussion ensued relative to having additional lunch periods, the cost of the additional line, and the community's desire for the kitchen renovation.

Ms. Haley stated there has been a lot of discussion regarding this issue. She stated there are some drainage problems in the kitchen and flooring issues related to it that need to be addressed, and it makes sense to properly size the kitchen while addressing these issues. She further stated there is standardization not just in facilities, but in the middle schools as far as instructional time and balance, noting that they all work on a similar bell schedule and it would not be practical to add a fourth lunch period.

In response to Mr. Holmes' question, Ms. Joseph stated the architect anticipates that the project will still be \$2.5 million over budget, after making the proposed changes to the bid.

Dr. Wallin stated you will never achieve complete parity in all of the middle schools because student populations change. He further stated when looking at costs, decisions must be made based on information and data. He stated part of the committee's responsibility is to oversee, ask questions and provide comments about the expenditure of funds, but decisions must be made using good data and he does not believe that information has been provided.

Ms. Joseph stated the School Board requested that the committee discuss funding options if the Providence project still comes in over budget, as well as the long-term impact of funding options if other projects come in over budget.

Discussion ensued relative to the anticipated impact of the proposed bid changes.

In response to Mr. Hilliard's question, Mr. Sorensen stated the referendum authorizes the expenditure of \$304 million in debt, and we have budgeted approximately \$277 million, so there is the capacity for additional bond funding.

Dr. Wallin stated every indicator we have seen for the last three months is that the projects are going to cost more than anticipated to begin with based on the information that we had at that time.

Mr. Thompson stated we should really be able to have an indicator of costs once the first two new elementary school bids are in.

Mr. Elswick stated project scopes have been modified and changed, which is impacting costs. He expressed concerns that what was envisioned when the bond referendum was approved and what we have today do not match.

Ms. Joseph stated that is the reason she provided the Comprehensive Plan documentation, which indicates that renovating will be providing like-new buildings.

Ms. Coyner stated the School Board wants both boards to discuss how to collectively fund and move forward on the Providence and Manchester projects if they come in over budget.

Mr. Elswick noted that every decision made to spend more money on these two projects will impact services or expenditures on other capital projects. He stated you cannot hide behind the parity issue and close down the rest of government, indicating that somehow this needs to be balanced.

Mr. Carmody stated there are some things working in our favor – refinancing existing debt with lower interest rates will provide some relief for budgetary pressures, and in a five-year time horizon, there may be some stabilization in construction pricing. He further stated there needs to be a focus on balancing what is good for the community today versus the longer term, but not necessarily committing to everything we want.

Mr. Thompson stated he would prefer to use the term ‘benchmarking’ rather than ‘parity.’ He noted that Providence is not going to be another Tomahawk because we are not re-doing the façade.

Dr. Wallin stated there is no answer of parity between two schools if you really serve the demographics of each of the schools. He further stated schools should be a reflection of the communities they serve, and the goal should be to provide the instructional programs needed for the demographics served.

Mr. Thompson stated all of the benchmarking should have been done on the front end, and this has been addressed through the process moving forward.

Ms. Coyner stated the School Board has directed staff to benchmark the new elementary school designs off of the county’s two newest elementary schools.

Mr. Elswick suggested that Mr. Carmody and Mr. Sorensen be working behind the scenes to determine options for additional funding and provide a menu of options for the boards to choose from.

Further discussion ensued relative to use of the CIP Reserve for funding projects that come in over bid.

In response to Mr. Hilliard’s question, Ms. Joseph stated the architect will be providing a schedule as to when the Providence project will go back out for bid now that there is a clear definition of the proposed changes to the bid.

In response to Dr. Wallin’s question, Ms. Joseph stated the asbestos will be removed from Providence this summer, but the remainder of the construction will be delayed. She further stated additional mobile units have been added to clear out more students.

Ms. Joseph then provided construction and financial updates on the Monacan High School renovation and addition project. She stated the change orders remain unchanged from the last meeting, the gym and office construction have been delayed until September, and ongoing meetings with the contractor are occurring.

Discussion ensued relative to the language within contracts providing impetus for contractors to be more familiar with sites and identify extraordinary situations during the bidding process.

2. REPORT ON COUNTY PROJECTS

Mr. Dupler stated staff has completed neighborhood inspections around Providence Middle School, and most of the cases identified have been resolved. He further stated parks improvements will be completed in two phases, with the turf and path improvements internal to the park done by Parks and Recreation this summer. He stated the parking improvements and shared use path is currently in site plan review for the adjacent parking facility, and is anticipated to be under construction this summer and completed in late May 2017. He further stated the sidewalk project is funded, with construction beginning in June and anticipated to be completed this summer. He stated the neighborhood inspections around Manchester Middle School will begin in May, and parks improvements are currently being looked at, including walkways, field and turf improvements on the facility site, and a number of shared use pathways to connect with the sidewalk on Hull Street.

F. NEXT MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

Mr. Carmody stated there was a prior request for a real estate tax revitalization update, and he will check with Mr. Dupler on the timeframe for that to be on the agenda.

Mr. Elswick stated he and Ms. Coyner will meet next week to set the agenda for the committee's June 15 meeting.

G. CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Hilliard, seconded by Ms. Haley, the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee entered into a Closed Session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under the following subsection 3: discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

Ayes: Elswick, Haley, Coyner, Thompson, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

Mr. Elswick called the meeting to order, on behalf of the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order, on behalf of the School Board.

On motion of Ms. Haley, seconded by Mr. Winslow, the Board of Supervisors entered into a Closed Session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under the following subsection 3: discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaeckle, Winslow, Holland and Haley.

Nays: None.

On motion of Mr. Erbach, seconded by Mr. Thompson, the School Board entered into a Closed Session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under the following subsection 3: discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

Ayes: Smith, Coyner, Erbach, Thompson and Siddiqi.

Nays: None.

NOTE:

Ms. Coyner recused herself from participating in the discussion regarding the Enon Elementary and Midlothian Elementary School sites. She entered the closed session following the discussion on those two topics.

Reconvening:

On motion of Mr. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Coyner, the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee reconvened into open session.

Ayes: Holland, Jaeckle, Coyner, Thompson, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

On motion of Ms. Haley, seconded by Mr. Winslow, the Board of Supervisors reconvened into open session.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaeckle, Winslow, Holland and Haley.

Nays: None.

On motion of Mr. Erbach, seconded by Dr. Siddiqi , the School Board reconvened into open session.

Ayes: Smith, Coyner, Erbach, Thompson and Siddiqi.

Nays: None.

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Mr. Carmody, the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee adopted the following resolution:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and ii) only such business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the committee.

Mr. Elswick: Aye.
Ms. Haley: Aye.
Ms. Coyner: Aye.
Mr. Thompson: Aye.
Dr. Wallin: Aye.
Mr. Carmody: Aye.
Mr. Hilliard: Aye.
Mr. Holmes: Aye.
Ms. Mait: Aye.
Mr. Scherzer: Aye.
Mr. Sorensen: Aye.
Ms. Joseph: Aye.

On motion of Mr. Winslow, seconded by Ms. Haley, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following resolution:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and ii) only such business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Elswick: Aye.
Ms. Jaeckle: Aye.
Mr. Winslow: Aye.
Mr. Holland: Aye.
Ms. Haley: Aye.

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Dr. Siddiqi, the School Board adopted the following resolution:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the School Board hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and ii) only such business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the School Board.

Ms. Smith: Aye.
Ms. Coyner: Aye.
Dr. Siddiqi: Aye.
Mr. Erbach: Aye.
Mr. Thompson: Aye.

H. ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Ms. Haley, the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee adjourned at 2:10 p.m. until June 15, 2016, at 12:30 p.m. for its next regularly scheduled meeting at the School Administration Building.

Ayes: Holland, Jaeckle, Coyner, Thompson, Wallin, Carmody, Hilliard, Holmes, Mait, Scherzer, Sorensen and Joseph.

Nays: None.

On motion of Mr. Winslow, seconded by Mr. Holland, the Board of Supervisors adjourned until May 25, 2016, at 3:00 p.m. for its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Ayes: Elswick, Jaeckle, Winslow, Holland and Haley.

Nays: None.

On motion of Dr. Siddiqi, seconded by Mr. Erbach, the School Board unanimously adjourned until May 24, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. for its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Ayes: Smith, Coyner, Erbach, Thompson and Siddiqi.

Nays: None.