MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board and Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Fairfax County Government Center, Rooms 9 and 10

Work Session No. 26/**Infrastructure Financing Committee (IFC)**
October 2, 2013

1.01 Call to Order and Announcements

Fairfax County Board Supervisor John Cook convened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. with the following Fairfax County School Board members and Fairfax County Board of Supervisors present:

Sandy Evans (Mason)	Supervisor John Cook (Braddock)
Patty Reed (Providence)	Supervisor John Foust (Dranesville)
Kathy Smith (Sully)	Supervisor Jeff McKay (Lee)

County Personnel Present:

Fairfax County Executive, Edward Long, Jr.; Fairfax County Chief Financial Officer, Susan Datta; Deputy County Executive, Dave Molchany; Deputy County Executive, Rob Stalzer; Deputy County Executive, Dave Rohrer; County Deputy Director Department of Management and Budget, Joe Mondoro; County Capital Program Coordinator, Martha Reed; County Debt Manager, Joe LaHait; Park Authority Acting Director, Cindy Messinger; Director of Planning and Development Division Park Authority, David Bowden; Park Authority, Mike Baird; Director DPZ, Fred Seldon; Director of Planning Division DPZ, Marianne Gardner; DPZ, Chris Caperton; Deputy Director DPWES, Ron Kirkpatrick; Director of Building Design and Construction DPWES, Carey Needham; DPWES, Tom Williamson; DPWES, Teresa Lepe; DPWES, Bill Hicks; County Attorney, David Bobzien; County Attorney's Office, Cynthia Tianti; Director Office of Public Affairs, Merni Fitzgerald; Chief of Staff to Supervisor Cook, Kiel Stone; Aide to Supervisor McKay, Linda Waller; Aide to Supervisor Foust, Jane Edmondson; Aide to Chairman Bulova, Clayton Medford; Aide to Chairman Bulova, Mark Thomas; Director Facilities Management Department, Jose Comayagua; Director Department of Transportation, Tom Biesiadny; Human Rights and Equity Program, Ken Saunders; Office of the Board's Auditor, Christina Manning; Barbara Byron, Office of Community Revitalization

Work Session No. 26/**Infrastructure Financing Committee (IFC)**
October 2, 2013

Fairfax County Public Schools Personnel:
Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Transportation Services, Jeffrey Platenberg; Director of Design and Construction, Kevin Sneed; School Board Facilities Planning Advisory Council member, Karen Hogan; Director of Facilities Planning, Lee Ann Pender; Assistant Director of Facilities Management, Brian Crawford; Deputy Clerk of the Board, Lizette Torres-Barthel

Others Present:
Tim Thompson, FCCPTA; Phyllis Payne, SLEEP; Lisa May, NVAR; Jeff Anderson, Trails and Sidewalks Committee (Hunter Mill)

DISCUSSION

1.02 Administrative Items

- The committee approved the minutes from the September 11, 2013 meeting with no changes.

1.03 County Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requirements

- The committee listened to a presentation on the county's ADA requirements, which included the following:
  - A discussion of ADA capital requirements. The county has an $11 million unfunded requirement which represents only those projects identified by self-assessments. Additional self-assessments are underway and will result in additional capital requirements.
  - The committee asked for a recommendation for an expedited timeframe for completing ADA self-assessments and the identified required improvements.

1.04 Summary of County Requirements

- The committee listened to a summary recap of county requirements including:
  - Capital renewal requirement of approximately $48 million annually, bond program requirements of $110 million over the 5-year CIP period, and $187 million in the next CIP period.
  - The committee discussed the possibility of recommending a more formalized process to review and take a more creative look at all future projects for possible shared uses.

1.05 County Capital Project Cost Saving Measures

- The committee listened to a presentation on cost cutting measures employed by the county's Building Design Branch including value engineering and energy- saving measures.

- The committee discussed the possibility of reallocating project savings, as a result of a favorable construction bid climate, to contingency after value engineering or after construction bid award.

1.06 School Infrastructure Maintenance Requirements

- The committee heard about the schools' requirements for maintenance, which included a discussion of the following:
  - With regard to school maintenance, the committee asked staff to provide the total annual requirement in dollars (2% of replacement value).
  - The committee discussed the sources of financing major maintenance for both county and schools.
  - The committee asked that schools' staff provide some examples of how classrooms might look different in the future.
  - The committee also requested that county and school staff provide a high level summary of needs in the format of a memo that can eventually be shared with both Boards. Staff was asked to provide this memo to the committee at the November meeting for their review.

1.07 Proposed Meeting Schedule

- November 6 (Rooms 2 & 3), and December 4 (Room 9 &10).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Work Session No. 26/**Infrastructure Financing Committee (IFC)**

October 2, 2013

Q and As:

1. Why is maintenance being paid for out of school general obligation bonds? - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
2. Provide a chart that includes actual ratio of debt to disbursements for neighboring jurisdictions (include their bond rating). – ***Provided on August 7, 2013***
3. Present a chart showing forecasted bond sales and capacity.– ***Provided on August 7, 2013***
4. Present the pros and cons of short vs. long term bond maturities (20 years vs. 30 years). – ***Provided on August 7, 2013***
5. Provide information on the history of the 10% debt ratio, showing how capacity can disappear when expenditures are reduced. – ***Provided on August 7, 2013***
6. What can be done to reduce the cost of construction to help close the gap of unfunded school capital requirements? What would the $25 million requested in increased bond sales provide and what would not be provided? - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
7. Are there changes in code or other practices that could reduce the cost of renovating/building schools? - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
8. What is the impact of scheduling school renovations at 30, 35 or 40 years, rather than 25 years? - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
9. Please provide a list of all schools, their age, when they were last renovated, and the cost of that renovation. Please include examples of the schools renovated in the last 6 years. - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
10. Please provide details regarding space allocation policies for particular kinds of instructional programs. For example, what size space is required for music, for art, for gifted and talented programs, for classrooms for children with special needs, etc… compared to those for ordinary classrooms. - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
11. Please provide statistics and back up data for the chart on page 17 of the Schools' CIP presentation. - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
12. For all schools please provide capacity levels, including current enrollment numbers over or under capacity. - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
13. Analyze a program of conducting a "mini-renovation" at the 20-25 year mark that would update essential systems only, followed by a more complete renovation at the 40-year mark. Outline what such a program would look like, assess the impact on students, and analyze the cost impact on the CIP program. - ***Provided on September 11, 2013***
14. Provide a slightly different slide in the FMD Capital Renewal Presentation for Slide #3; showing ranges (not cumulative numbers). – ***Provided on October 2, 2013***
15. Please provide the best estimate of where the orphan service drives are located throughout the county. In addition, please provide information regarding how much VDOT spends annually on trial maintenance. – ***Provided on October 2, 2013***
16. Provide additional information regarding the Silver Line landscaping requirements as compared to other metro stations. – ***Provided on October 2, 2013***
17. Please provide the total occupied square footage of county facilities.
18. How many daily users are there in county buildings?
19. What is the average construction square foot cost for new county facilities?
20. Please provide the year in which each county facility was constructed and the year it was last renovated.
21. How many new facilities will the county be constructing over the next ten years?

22. If the school board's request for an additional $25M is approved, what would it do to the projected debt ratio limits each year, for the next 10 years?
23. Please provide a recommendation for an expedited timeframe for completing ADA self-assessments and the identified required improvements.
24. Please provide the total annual requirement in dollars for school maintenance (2% of replacement value).
25. Please provide some examples of how classrooms might look different in the future.

Follow- up Actions:

1. Refer the concept of PPEAs (opportunities and challenges) to a joint Board of Supervisors/School Board meeting - ***Scheduled for November meeting***
2. Refer the discussion of the 10 Principles of Financial Management to a Joint School Board/County Board meeting
3. At August 7, 2013 meeting, include a summary of paydown expenditures over the last several years and some general comments about paydown funding and limitations ***– Provided on August 7, 2013***
4. At future meeting, discuss the Comprehensive Plan (how it works, how it is changed) - ***Scheduled for November meeting***
5. At a future meeting discuss the Joint Use resolution and how we can better work together on use of facility space - ***Scheduled for November meeting***
6. Explore ways that the county's public transit could supplement the school bus fleet and add to the agenda of a future meeting.
7. Request for Schools' to provide a similar presentation on Infrastructure requirements at October meeting. - ***Scheduled for October meeting***
8. County and school staff should provide a high level summary of needs in the format of a memo that can eventually be shared with both Boards. Staff was asked to provide this memo to the committee at the November meeting for their review.

Parking Lot:

1. How are programming changes, such as additional requirements for AAP schools, prioritized against what is already in the CIP?