

**GUILFORD COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JOINT CAPITAL AND FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE
301 W. MARKET ST. OLD COUNTY COURTHOUSE, GREENSBORO, NC
BLUE ROOM,
OCTOBER 11, 2018
8:00 A.M.**

Present: Chairman Alan Branson, Commissioners Jeff Phillips, Carolyn Coleman, Guilford County Schools Attorney Jill Wilson, Guilford County Attorney Mark Payne, County Manager Marty Lawing, Guilford County Attorney Mark Payne, Guilford County Schools Superintendent Dr. Sharon Contreras School Board Members Deena Hayes, Anita Sharpe, Angie Henry, Wes Cashwell, and H. Winston McGregor.

Absent: Alan Duncan

Also Present: Guilford County Schools Facilities Director Julius Monk, Guilford County Schools Chief Operations Officer Scott McCully, Guilford County Facilities Director Dan Durham, Deputy County Clerk to the Board Scott Baillargeon.

I. UPDATE ON STATUS OF FACILITIES STUDY

Chairman Branson called the meeting to order at 8:19 A.M. and turned the floor over to Scott McCully, Chief Operations Officer for Guilford County Schools.

McCully reviewed the process toward the master process. McCully turned the floor over to MGT Consultants Dr. Ed Humble and Joe Clark.

Clark provided a Power Point Presentation (PPP) and elaborated the details of the presentation.

Dr. Ed Humble reviewed the assessment on the project and explained the preliminary facility assessment data; review of demographic data and enrollment projections; FCA Scores; Sustainability Scores; Technology Infrastructure Scores; Site Scores; Combined Score-Cut Prices and Utilization threshold models. He noted that the purpose of the work session is to receive input from the committee to best utilize the available spaces. Humble reviewed the parameters of the Capital Re-Investment plan.

Clark spoke to the collaboration on the project and noted that work has been moving along quickly and efficiently. He discussed the culmination of the data into a matrix, which will then be utilized to compile a readable report; however, stated that the present moment the bulk of the data was in raw form and mostly unreadable. Clark provided an historical and projected enrollment throughout the Guilford County School District. He stated that the data continues to show growth over the next ten

years. He provided breakouts of the building assessments and how the buildings were rated to compile overall scores (based on utility and capacity) in relation to upcoming projected enrollment data. He spoke to how the software compiles evidence for the most effective data to be used succinctly throughout the district. He emphasized class sizing reductions; how data was weighted to incorporate those future projections; the number of under/over-utilized schools identified in the study that could be alleviated, and presented the building assessments score ranges and what MGT is striving to achieve overall utility.

H. Winston McGregor asked if portable buildings were taken into consideration.

Clark stated that the emphasis of the assessment was on the brick and mortar building; however, noted that the portable buildings would be deemed unacceptable to the future growth.

Discussion ensued among the committee concerning portable buildings.

Clark spoke to the buildings that received lower scores overall and emphasized the buildings according to frequency models that exhibit excellent level scores. It was noted that 40% of the County buildings scored good or better.

Dr. Contreras asked if the assessment included IT capacity and sustainable power utility. She asked if the Technology infrastructure score is a measure bandwidth.

Clark stated the challenges of using many of the power supply lines of the older buildings as they were out of date and limited. He noted that many of the buildings do not contain the level of technological support needed to upgrade to the current technology standards. He provided a number of pathways to consider; however, he emphasized that at current the buildings could not be brought up to the standard.

Commissioner Phillips inquired about the data and if the overall findings were comparable to the rest of the nation.

Clark shared that the County does contain many older buildings unsuitable for tomorrow's technological needs, however noted, anecdotally, that the County is comparable with the rest of the nation. He stated the challenge going forward will be how to assess how much of the buildings that could be salvaged and what needs to be retired.

Dr. Humble highlighted the fact that the data does indicate that Guilford County was not an outlier in the national scope; however, noted that the County does have a good number of unsatisfactory buildings which are going to provide a deal of challenges ahead.

Clark delineated the facility assessments and the scoring cut-points that illustrated how the buildings will be selected for improved infrastructural needs. He noted that they intend to identify more issues than the County could address financially all at once.

Dr. Contreras clarified that the buildings in question are under renovation, yet stated that the issue is concerning the priority of which buildings are completed over the next ten years.

Dr. Humble gave details about the expenses associated with the costs of a project as large as this one. He noted that apart from other challenges they had to find a balance to identify which buildings were a priority.

Commissioner Phillips asked about how priority buildings will be identified. He emphasized the committee to provide timely and thorough updates to ensure that information was being disseminated accordingly.

Dr. Humble clarified that the process is based on many factors of assessment and the details of determining suitability among the buildings.

Commissioner Coleman asked if the noted Jefferson Parrish, Louisiana school buildings data were collected either post-, or pre-Hurricane Katrina, and the extent of aid provided to them by FEMA to rebuild the buildings.

Dr. Humble stated that the numbers collected and presented today reflected assessments of buildings taken both before and after the Hurricane Katrina event. As for the FEMA information, Humble did not have answer currently. He spoke to the utilization thresholds in relation to other schools across the nation and clarified that there was a desirable grading among buildings to emphasize where flexibility in construction and other factors could be obtained and more efficiently utilized.

Clark spoke to the combined weighted scores of the sample schools used to contrast the state of Guilford County Schools. He presented a split data sheet that broke the school buildings up between those utilized for elementary schools and those for K-12 the data was then mined for a combined total value of all buildings and listed the scores by individual school. He emphasized that implemented programs could be a factor in over-utilization of certain buildings. He shared that to combat this issue, programs need to be relocated to other buildings where more space can be utilized.

Discussion ensued among the committee concerning program-based schools as drivers of higher populations.

Dr. Contreras emphasized to the committee that the assessment was preliminary and that they must remain cognizant that the potential for things to evolve over the next ten years was high. She noted that a score needed to be included for proper accommodations for all students.

Dr. Humble agreed with Dr. Contreras and emphasized that MGT will investigate adding extra rubrics to mine the data to ensure a total score of all building conditions.

Commissioner Phillips asked if there was a correlation or disparity between higher-performing and lower-performing buildings.

Clark spoke to Phillips' point and noted that his assessment was accurate, and MGT could provide a data chart that would reflect the school's under-utilization of schools to identify facilities where improvement could be achieved readily. Clark stated that the data broken out currently, the scores are diverse and difficult to assess on a correlation value. Clark reviewed the data collected among Guilford County High Schools. He provided a ranking based on utilization. Grimsley, Southern, Smith, Northeast, and Western fall in the lowest ranks of FCA Scores and stated that the County has many complex challenges to address the conditions of schools.

McGregor asked Clark to return to a previous slide that elaborated the historical and projected enrollment, and noted the scores reflected that there was minimal disparity across the County.

Clark spoke to the buildings that were supporting specific programs and increased fluidity among student populations based on over-utilization of programs. He noted that among the poorly graded schools, the next question should be to seek out the specific programs offered at those schools and make determinations to move programs to other schools to foster increased utilization. He emphasized the many complexities in the minutiae of the reporting that need to be addressed in the final assessment.

Anita Sharpe asked about the final assessment and what the committee could expect.

Discussion ensued among the committee concerning the expectations of the final assessment; the assessment of under/over-utilization of building capacity; the issues facing the County currently concerning capacity.

Clark provided GIS Data that offered several pragmatic options and recommendations across the County. He emphasized that MGT was considering every possible measure concerning to obtain the most feasible assessment.

McGregor asked if the numbers reflected in the PPP were post-tornado event where students were moved to other schools.

Clark stated that data was before the tornado event, and he spoke to the overcrowding in schools, yet emphasized that not all of schools were overcrowded at present and that offered several additional options to be entertained.

Anita Sharpe asked about prioritization of capital in converse to utilizing space as best practice.

McCully shared that other research could be provided to best answer that type of question. He stated that there were still mountains of data to parse.

Cashwell asked if the bond money was spent on HVAC, and how close was their assessment to the target.

McCully stated that he did not know at present.

Discussion ensued concerning the meaning of the data on the slide.

Dr. Humble offered the facility master plan strategies, program strategies, non-capital strategies, and capital outlay strategies. He noted that there will be options to foster collaborative efforts to build these schools, and emphasized that there were myriad strategies to be identified to ensure best practices. He shared that all the scores presented today could be shifted into a cost assessment but noted that equitability among all buildings was paramount.

Clark shared that MGT was confident that they were at a level that provided multiple context to the scale of the project.

Anita Sharpe asked if there had been any recommendation on the optimal size of pre-k-12 school.

Dr. Humble shared that there were lots of data that could provide an answer, and shared a story from a previous project where the question was submitted, “how big was too big?” He stated that circumstances dictate size and optimum capacity.

Dr. Contreras noted that efficiency will be considered to satisfy the needs of the schools. She emphasized that while buildings were of major concern, it was the programs offered that mattered most as that would be the major attraction to the buildings regardless of where they are located across the County.

Discussion ensued concerning the size, efficiency, and potential programs each building could potential house.

Commissioner Phillips spoke to sharing information across the committee, and stated that it was critically important to share this information with the County staff and Board of Commissioners to ensure that continued exposure for discussions so that a master plan number can be identified and achieved. He shared that the expectation to achieve the desired result in a year is unrealistic and a more reasonable goal would be to allow the committee and others to view the data, in either its raw or complete form, at each step of the assessment as it would set the pace of the project. He emphasized that all parties involved need to have access to the data as it comes in for assessment.

Clark noted the pacing and the scope should be on the committee's timeline and will be distributed and shared in the future.

Commissioner Phillips stressed the need for a reasonable timeline be agreed upon by the committee.

Commissioner Coleman asked that she could be given a hard copy of the power point presentation.

Chairman Branson thanked MGT and Guilford County Schools and looked forward to future conversations. He echoed Phillips statement that the BOCC be shared among the Board of Commissioners. He expressed concern for the data concerning boundary optimization where information can be readily accessible to residents so that they understand what to expect in the coming future concerning where their kids will attend school. He underscored that students will need to be moved to other schools to ensure that the full capacity of buildings, programs, utilization be achieved.

Commissioner Coleman noted that every parent needs to feel that their child is receiving the same education as everyone else, and she stressed equitable access across the County as being paramount.

II. OTHER NEW BUSINESS
None

III. ADJOURN
Adjourned by unanimous consent at 10:45 A.M.