

School Construction Roundtable Work Group
3rd Floor Hearing Room, Winchester Hall
January 17, 2017
Approved Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Mike Marschner.

Attendees present were: Mike Marschner, Dick Pryor, Jeremy Holder, Roger Fritz, Kyle Bostian, Tom King, Dusty Rood, and Jason Wiley

Attendees absent were: Joe Dattoli, Ray Barnes, Darrell Guyton, and Chuck Nipe

Guests: Bret Fouche and Janice Spiegel

Approval of the Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the November meeting will be approved at the next meeting.

Review Draft Selections for Final Report

Mr. Marschner provided a preliminary draft document (Attachment 1) and a draft Executive Summary list (Attachment 2) to use as a guide as the committee discussed the final report. The committee spent the meeting time discussing these two documents. In general:

- The committee would like to see action steps recommended, if possible.
- The committee would also like a section that describes the process the committee used to discuss the charge included in the final report.
- The committee members would like to be updated regularly about progress on the recommendations once they are accepted by the County Executive.

Using the Executive Summary as a guide, the committee:

- I. **Site Work & Storm Water Management –**
 - a. The committee feels that it would be most helpful if, prior to design, county staff, FCPS staff, and the civil engineers worked together during “conceptual design” to look for efficiencies. This could potentially maximize savings. A suggestion was made that perhaps the best time for this to occur would be at the feasibility study.
 - b. Regarding recommendation that site and storm water regulations be evaluated and clarified, the committee further discussed schools are designed to meet the regulations or exceed the regulations.
- II. **School Site Acquisition Process –**
 - a. Another idea is to form a group to evaluate sites as they are proffered for cost savings.
 - b. A program of incentives could be developed to encourage developers to assist in site development and cost efficiencies.
 - c. Options, such as fee in lieu in cases where a school site cannot be proffered that will meet the criteria, should be explored and/or incentives for developers that go beyond the minimums should be encouraged.
- III. **High Performance Buildings –** This topic was primarily addressed in the interim report. Mr. Fritz confirmed that the Jonathan Hager Elementary School in Washington County did achieve LEED Silver Certification.
- IV. **Prevailing Wage –** This topic was covered in the interim report
- V. **School Construction Technologies and Potential Cost Savings –**
 - a. **ACTION ITEM: Mr. King will provide Mr. Marschner with some general wording for VRF systems and evolving technologies.**
 - b. Mr. King suggested the committee review the list of efficiencies that Dr. Lever provided to the committee to make sure we have incorporated the concepts in that report into our

discussions. **ACTION ITEM: Staff will make this comparison and update the committee at the next meeting.**

- c. The committee had a lengthy discussion about added construction and maintenance costs for design features, such as the FHS atrium, that are added in response to the community. A suggestion was made to look at cost per cubic foot versus cost per square foot to get a truer sense of useable space within the school building. As the committee discussed previously, a way to reduce costs is to decrease the overall volume of the building.
- d. Another suggestion is to ask the school system to look at their architect selection metrics to make sure they are utilizing selection criteria with an eye for keeping costs contained. The committee recommends that FCPS instruct the architect/designer to design to a specific budget.

VI. **State Legislative Changes** – This topic was covered in the interim report.

VII. **Cooperative Review** –

- a. Action Items: **Mr. Marschner will clarify with the County attorneys whether or not a cooperative review process could be adopted via policy or would require legislation.**

VIII. **Delivery Methods** –

- a. While the committee cannot support one delivery method over another for cost savings, the committee wants to be clear that delivery methods should be evaluated for each project. There should be an emphasis on budget costs and meeting the educational program. The design method should be chosen based on design efficiencies and operational efficiencies.

IX. **Fees** – A suggestion was made to move the fees under the cooperative review section of the report.

Mr. Marschner will work on incorporating all of the suggestions and clarifications into the draft report. The committee will continue to look at the draft final report at their next meeting and discuss the outstanding topic areas.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 31, 2017 at 3:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.