



**Facilities Workshop Minutes
Monday, May 8, 2006 – 9:00 a.m.
School Board Meeting Room
Stuart, FL 34994**

Members Present

Lorie Shekailo-Chair
Dr. David Anderson
Susan Hershey
Nancy Kline
Dr. Sara A. Wilcox, Superintendent

Members Absent

Kristin Conrad, Student Representative (JBHS)
Laurie Gaylord-Vice-Chair

Staff Present

Ruth Pietruszewski, Darla Miloszewski, Cathleen Brennan, Rodger Osborne, Deana Newson, Linda King, Marshall Skinner, J. Lisle Bozeman, Garrett Grabowski, Wilma Schuler, Sabra Avery

Public

Kevin Powers, Kim Delaney, Allan Fish

Press

PBPost – Mike Bender

Stuart News – Kelly Tyko

MCEA – No representation

AFSCME – No representation

Call to order by the Chairman and Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States

Dr. Sara A. Wilcox explained to Board members that Laurie Gaylord had clients and could not make the workshop today. Dr. Sara A. Wilcox requested to change the order of the agenda. The number 2 item was changed to number 4, the number 3 item was changed to number 2, the number 4 item was changed to number 5, and the number 5 item was changed to number 3. Lorie Shekailo stated that items would be re-scheduled if time did not permit the presentation. Dr. Sara A. Wilcox made an addition to the agenda. Deana Newson was requested to update the Board on the search for a School Board Attorney.

1. Update on SB360 Implementation (COPY ATTACHED)

Kim Delaney, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, explained the process to assess school impacts in the various DRIs in the region. Kim placed a map on the screen to illustrate the 20 DRIs currently being reviewed. These DRIs represent 110,000 residential units, 20 million square feet of retail/office space, and 25 million square feet of industrial space. The majority of the activity is in St. Lucie County. The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council's responsibility was to coordinate the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review process. In reviewing DRIs, the council is responsible for assessing all the various impacts that occur from the development and a DRI, by its definition, is assumed to have a multi-jurisdictional impact. Kim stated that SB360 is "a pay as you go plan for Florida's future". The council is working with the City of Stuart, County, and district staff to update the Interlocal Agreement, which will be presented at a joint meeting. The Interlocal Agreement was being updated with regards to school siting, establishing school concurrency, specifically the level of service for schools, and proportionate share mitigation. Proportionate share is really what a pay as you go plan means. If an individual entity does not have the funding set aside in their capital budget, then the developer can simply pay for that developer's proportionate share of costs and go forward. Development is not held up. The same methodology applies to transportation. The bill requires that local governments adopt and maintain specific capital improvement elements, so that everything is tied in. She explained that there's a funding source that comes in, and there's a plan for the long term improvements. She reviewed the Callery Judge Grove DRI in Palm Beach County and the Western Grove DRI in St Lucie County. When the council reviews a project, they try to figure out how to determine the proportionate share of impacts generated by this project. She gave examples and showed how the math was done to figure the developer's costs. Kim Delaney has not reviewed the DRIs in Indiantown yet. Lorie Shekailo asked if this methodology could be applied to evaluate the impacts of PUDs. Kim answered yes. She explained that DRIs are the only type of projects that come to the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council for review. All local governments have policies in their Comp

1. Update on SB360 Implementation (Con't)

plans that require that development can not move forward until infrastructure costs are funded and needs scheduled to be completed within a certain time frame. She thought the time frame stated was three years from initial construction. She stated that this methodology could be applied to any project, and it spelled out what the true costs were for schools with new development. Other districts have told the council that this methodology is consistent with the impact fee methodology. There is no additional discount built in. The schools have to be put on line before the development can move forward, and this is the only way the districts are able to do that. She informed Board members that this is the same methodology that Broward and Dade counties are picking up. Nancy Kline asked how many units were in DRIs. Kim answered a 1,000 dwelling units in Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River Counties, and in larger counties like Palm Beach it's 3,000 units. It's 1,000 units and above. Lorie Shekailo asked if Kim had any calculations on the proportionate share for the Owens Grove Development in Indiantown. Kim said she would need some time to make an assessment. Kim offered to make a spreadsheet while the next item was being discussed, and then she would come back and show it on the screen and go over it. She said it was straight forward math. Dr. Wilcox said that would be great and thanked Kim. Kim sat down to create the spreadsheet.

3. 2. Cost of Student Stations (COPY ATTACHED)

Marshall Skinner, MCSD Director of Adult and Vocational Education, had provided current information to the Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC) in Indiantown to get the information out allowing the community to be aware of the numbers. Marshall stated that the information on current population, current housing units, and the persons per household comes from the County. He presented the numbers on PowerPoint slides. He identified developments in Indiantown. He informed Board members that the student generation rate established was .64 students per household. This generation rate came from different sources; Indiantown DRI application, an economic plan done for Indiantown area, and a study by Land Research Management, Inc. Marshall quoted that the Martin County percentage rates were 45% are elementary students, 23% are middle school students, and 31% are high school students. Dr. Wilcox explained that those percentages have a direct relationship to the number of grades in the schools. Marshall felt it was important to make the best projection, identify the needs, and acquire land and school sites now. The additional school facilities expected to meet the 20 year growth in Indiantown are 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school, in addition to the middle and elementary school already out there, plus a support service building. Marshall explained that the most immediate need would be a new elementary school.

J. Lisle Bozeman, MCSD Capital Projects Planner, talked about the cost of student stations. She provided handouts with tables from the impact fee study. The tables described how the student station costs were derived. The latest costs of school construction are divided by the number of student stations to calculate the cost per student station. The figures are weighted and portables were added in. Land area and costs were figured. Last year the county-wide cost per acre average was \$70,000. This figure was obtained through working with the property appraiser's office and The impact fee study the County just completed. In certain parts of the county this number is extremely low, but the western part of the county was being balanced with the eastern coastal areas of the county. The total cost of a student station arrived at by this method was \$34,069. This figure is a reliable figure, since actual cost data, replacement value on property insurance records were used. J. Lisle stated that good figures support this number. Lorie Shekailo stated that the state puts out numbers, but they don't include entire costs. J. Lisle said the state's number is depressed. Dr. Wilcox thought the cost per acre should be updated. J. Lisle said she would work with the property appraiser's office to do that, because these numbers were from a year and a half ago.

Lorie Shekailo asked Kim Delaney if she was ready with the spreadsheet, so that the Board could switch back to agenda item #1.

1. Update on SB360 Implementation (Con't) (COPY ATTACHED)

Kim explained that the Treasure Coast Regional Council had convened a task force for the last two years to deal with these types of issues, particularly school impacts and the ability of the region to accommodate those impacts. Dr. Sara A. Wilcox asked Kim what the timeline was on the Interlocal Agreement. Kim said the council hoped to have a draft ready for the Board's review by mid June. At this point she said that the council has a consensus on how the three entities view the issues on level of service and the application of concurrency. A great deal of time has been spent working on definitions. Dr. Wilcox asked Kim if September was the deadline for the agreement. Kim answered yes; September was the deadline for the adoption of the agreement by the three entities. She told Board members that DCA has posted model documents last week. The models have language that accomplishes what the statute intends to accomplish. Kim proceeded with the spreadsheet she had just created. She used the spreadsheet that was used for the other projects and plugged in Martin County's local numbers. She applied it to the Owens Grove development and explained the math involved to compute the numbers. Using a potential estimated impact fee of \$4,700 per unit, the formula suggested a net cost of \$7.5 million. This is the potential cost without land. Lorie Shekailo asked Marshall what the District had asked out of Owens Grove. Marshall replied they would like a 15 acre elementary school site and the 10 acre support services site, for a total of 25 acres. Marshall said the formula had not been applied yet to this development. Marshall said that the only issue discussed at this point in time was the 25 acres. Dr. Sara A. Wilcox explained that Kim's calculations were in addition to the donated land. Dr. Wilcox said that the assistance from the Treasure Coast Regional Council had been invaluable. Lorie Shekailo asked how many units and acres Tusawilla and Tres Belle comprised. J. Lisle said she would get that information.

5. 3. Cost of Construction (COPY ATTACHED)

Julie Sessa, Sabra Avery, and Garret Grabowski had worked on this item as a team. Julie began with the CMR delivery method and discussed the areas of the GMP where negotiation can take place for possible savings opportunities. Sabra Avery discussed negotiation tools and shared what the district did to ensure cost savings. Julie reviewed the general conditions and how dollars could be saved.

Lorie Shekailo interrupted the presentation and moved to “Open to the Public.” She requested to do this portion of the agenda while Kim Delaney was still in the audience.

6. Open to the Public

- Kevin Powers stated that the student generation rate was a reflection of the population today. Indiantown residents feel that will change. He stated residents were grateful for the good schools. He explained that Indiantown residents four years ago created a community development plan. He described Indiantown’s plan as one of the community, for the community, and by the community. He informed the Board and public that Indiantown laid in the Western 1 taxing district, which is the largest taxing district. He stated it contributed 48% of Martin County’s ad valorem taxes. He reflected on the history of how Martin County’s western taxing district was formed and why.
- Alan Fish, President and CEO of Western Martin County Chamber of Commerce, reported that Marshall Skinner attended the Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC) in Indiantown and answered a lot of questions. He brought a message from the Chamber. He informed the Board and Public that the Indiantown Board supported where the developer was in this project in this point in time. He believed that the .64 student generation rate was a flawed number, maybe not for today, but for the future. He requested that the Board look at this number. He felt things were going to change in western Martin County.
- Sue Hershey explained that the Board did not create the number.

Lorie Shekailo closed “Open to the Board,” and she thanked everyone for allowing the agenda to be rearranged. She moved back to the cost of construction presentation.

5. 3. Cost of Construction (COPY ATTACHED) (Con’t)

Julie said the construction costs would be discussed using the CMR delivery method. She discussed how the Facilities Department tried to save money in the GMP. Nancy Kline praised Julie and her department for the costs that had been sliced off the general conditions of past projects. Julie explained that Sabra checks that what is listed in the approved GMP is in the pay applications for general conditions. Sabra informed the Board that the staffing burden rate had become a negotiation tool, and the bidding process has continued to be monitored. Bid openings are attended and reviewed. She stated that the contractor’s relationship with the subs made a big difference in the owner’s cost of the work. Julie said most of the contractor’s would not accept payment on the District’s P-Card. She stated that the CMR buys and holds the insurance bond with the current GMPs. It is possible that the District could buy the insurance and have the CMR continue to hold the bond. The District could also participate in an Owner Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP). There are savings opportunities participating in an OCIP. Julie discussed the possible savings opportunities and the disadvantages of OCIP. Julie spoke next on overhead and profit. The district is currently accepting 5% contractor’s profit and overhead. Sabra stated that some of the numbers were coming in lower, and she contributed that to good negotiating. Julie discussed value engineering. Julie reminded Board members that the design development should reap the most benefit, and sometimes it is used toward the end of the project to reduce construction costs when necessary due to budgetary constraints. Julie stated that contractor participation is paramount to create competition. Julie told Board members that facilities would be prepared to consider going to the next contractor if the price was not right. Dr. David Anderson stated that we need to plan for some lead time when building schools. Nancy Kline stated that competitive bidding will push the prices down. Julie talked about insurance costs and losses. She reported that it will be very difficult to get property insurance this year.

2. 4. Elementary “A” Construction Schedule (COPY ATTACHED)

Julie discussed the problems with construction. She stated that the Chinese were buying all the steel and concrete, and all the transformers were in Louisiana. She reviewed the timeline for construction. She stated the district was in the pre-design planning phase now. The next step would begin in July 2006, schematic design, and that is the first step looking at alternative designs. She reviewed the steps and scheduling of each step; design development, construction documents/GMP, construction administration, and occupancy. The occupancy expected date was July 2008. Sue Hershey asked about the roads, since the roads were not included in the County’s capital plan. Julie said the County had sent their engineers to our Facilities Department to work on it. Nancy Kline suggested that item be on the agenda for the next joint meeting. Facilities had delivered a letter to the County of everything that would be needed to fit into the construction schedule. Julie gave an overview of the meetings she has had with the County and their engineers.

4- 5. New Schools Post Occupancy Survey (COPY ATTACHED)

Julie told Board members the district had developed a Post Occupancy Survey (POE). They structured it like one from Palm Beach County. It was sent out April 19th and evaluations were due back May 1st. She described the survey as voluminous, and said they were currently working on the analysis. The response rate on the survey was 100%. At the request of the Board three questions were sent to the following departments; maintenance, transportation, food service, educational technology, records retention, safety officer, operations manager, and school resource. The three questions asked were:

- 1) Operationally what do you like about the facility?
- 2) Operationally what do you dislike?
- 3) Operationally is there anything else you can list that would be helpful for reuse?

Julie reported that overall each of the site responses were positive for a re-use.

+ 7. Update on Search for School Board Attorney-Deana Newson

Deana Newson, Director of HRMD and Staff Development, reported to the Board that there was only one qualified applicant. A total of three candidates applied for the position, but two did not have law degrees. They both had just applied for every position in the district. The old system allowed individuals to apply for every position, even before the job was posted. The software has been updated so that this can not happen again. The attorney's position is posted on the internet with the other open positions. At the request of the Superintendent, Deana went through the Martin County Bar Association and placed an ad in their newsletter. In addition, she contacted the bar's Board of Directors and asked if they could get the word out to all the membership. Sue Hershey asked if a block of time could be set-up for interviews. Dr. Sara A. Wilcox was looking at next Monday, May 15th, to set-up interviews. Dr. Wilcox asked board members if they felt it was too soon. Dr David said the Board needed to move on it. Board members came to a consensus to start interviews Monday. Lorie Shekailo told Board members that Russell Petersen offered to speak with any of the board members on qualifications of candidates.

~~7- 8. Open to the Board~~

Nancy Kline

Stated she would be attending the legislative session update at the end of the week. She will attend the PTA Banquet after her Education Foundation meeting tonight.

Sue Hershey

Hoped the Centex issues would be resolved and beneficence to the community would be achieved.

Lorie Shekailo

Agreed with Sue and hoped for the best for Indiantown and the kids.

Dr. Sara A. Wilcox

Asked if the Board members would entertain telephone interviews for out-of-town candidates.

Sue Hershey

Asked if the District had the technology to do the interviews by computer.

Dr. David Anderson

Felt the phone system worked well with the Internal Auditor interviews. He said the conversations were very clear.

Dr. Sara A. Wilcox

Established a consensus with the Board for telephone interviews.

Nancy Kline

Asked if Board members would receive the resumes prior to Monday. The Superintendent responded positively to her question.

Dr. Sara A. Wilcox

Asked Deana if she had developed the interview guide the last time. Deana responded positively. Sara suggested Deana work with Lorie Shekailo to develop an interview guide.

Dr. David Anderson

Stated that he liked the interview guide, but said that canned is only good to a certain point and sometimes the questions need to be expanded. He was aware that every candidate had to be asked the same questions.

Deana Newson

Explained how important it was to give each candidate an equal opportunity. She said there was no problem if the interviewers ask additional questions. They can always go back and ask the previous candidate the same question.

There being no further business to bring before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

CHAIR (Lorie Shekailo)

SECRETARY (Sara A. Wilcox, Ph.D.)