



*Stafford County
1300 Courthouse Road
P.O. Box 339
Stafford, Virginia 22555-0339*

*Stafford County Public Schools
31 Stafford Avenue
Stafford, Virginia 22554*



**BOS/SB Joint Working Committee
Tuesday, August 27, 2018
6:00 p.m. – A/B/C Conference Room
George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center
1300 Courthouse Road Stafford, VA 22554**

1. Call to Order
2. Appointment of New Co-Chairs
3. Approval of the Meeting Agenda
4. Approval of the 6/25/18 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)
5. Discussion of the JWC Charge (Attachment 2)
6. Discussion of VPSA Financing
7. Review of Proposed Revisions to the Joint CIP Process (Attachment 3)
8. Review of the Annual Budget Calendar (Attachment 4)
9. Shared Services Update
10. Other Business
11. Adjournment



Stafford County
1300 Courthouse Road
P.O. Box 339
Stafford, Virginia 22555-0339

Stafford County Public Schools
31 Stafford Avenue
Stafford, Virginia 22554



DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

Attachment 1

Joint Schools Working Committee (JSWC)

June 25, 2018 // 6:00 p.m.
Executive Session Room
Alvin York Bandy Administrative Complex
Stafford County Public Schools

I. Call to Order

Committee co-chair (School Board member) Jamie Decatur called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Committee members Dr. Sarah Chase and Jamie Decatur were present to represent the School Board, and committee members Tom Coen and Mark Dudenhefer were present to represent the Board of Supervisors (BOS). Absent were committee member Irene Egan (School Board) and committee co-chair Cindy Shelton (BOS).

Also present were BOS member Meg Bohmke and the following staff from the school division ("School") and county government ("County"):

School Division

- Chris Fulmer, Chief Financial Officer;
- Melissa Hall, Clerk of the School Board;
- Scott Horan, Assistant Superintendent of Operations;
- Pamela Kahle, Acting Superintendent; and
- Wendy Martin-Johnson, Executive Director of Student Services.

County

- Tom Foley, County Administrator;
- Fred Presley, Deputy County Administrator; and
- Mike Smith, Deputy County Administrator.

Ms. Bohmke requested that the agenda be revised to include a discussion regarding a new JSWC process. The agenda was adjusted accordingly.

II. Approval of May 29, 2018 Meeting Minutes (EXHIBIT A)

Mr. Coen moved, and Mr. Dudenhefer second, that the committee approve the May 29 meeting minutes without revisions. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Member Comments/Reports

There were no member comments or reports.

IV. Old Business

A. Joint Capital Improvement Planning (CIP) Process (*EXHIBIT B*)

Mr. Foley reported that County staff has been conducting an after-action review of the FY19 joint CIP process to determine what improvements are needed.

Mr. Presley reminded the committee members that the first year of the joint CIP process (FY19) included only large-scale, bond-funded projects. It created a platform for discussion and was a thorough review by both boards of the needs and solutions. It was also meant to serve as a launching point for the next joint CIP process (FY20), which has just begun.

Mr. Presley provided a brief slide presentation (Exhibit B) and stated that the after-action review was conducted by the BOS Finance, Audit, and Budget Committee (FABC). The review included meetings with all of the key stakeholders, including School staff. The joint CIP policy will now be revised and improved based on the findings of the after-action review.

One of the recommended improvements is that staff be provided additional training on the joint CIP process so that they will know what is expected of them and when it is expected. Also, the joint CIP policy will be revised to:

- Clarify the charge and responsibilities of the Joint CIP Technical Review Committee and the Joint CIP Oversight Committee;
- Require that the School Board provide its approved CIP priorities list at the beginning of the review process;
- Request updated school enrollment numbers earlier in the process;
- Include a reporting mechanism to provide project status updates to the BOS; and
- Place emphasis on maintaining existing capital assets.

Mr. Presley reported that the FY20 joint CIP will include the "3R" projects (repair/replacement/rehabilitation projects). County and School staff are working together to define and provide scoring criteria for these projects. The criteria will be applied to both School and County projects and will ensure an efficient presentation of the projects and scoring. Staff will continue to work on the funding mechanisms during the summer as they gather input from the BOS and the JSWC.

Mr. Presley briefly described the proposed 3R scoring criteria (see *page 6 of EXHIBIT B*). Mr. Foley welcomed input from the JSWC members on the proposed criteria.

Mr. Foley stated that in the FY20 joint CIP process, the School Board will need to present its approved CIP priorities list at the beginning of the process. This means the School Board should begin working on the list now. Mr. Presley will send the calendar of important dates to Ms. Decatur.

Mr. Foley explained that this is a true "joint" process because the Technical Review Committee is made up of County and School staff and administrators, and the Oversight Committee is made up of the two FABCs and one citizen from the private sector.

Ms. Decatur stated that she still has faith in the joint process, but acknowledged that a great deal of dialogue with her fellow School Board members will be needed.

Mr. Foley stated that the School Board's initial submittal due date is in August. The School Board will then be able to submit late changes in September if necessary.

Dr. Chase requested more detail about the inclusion of the 3R projects. Mr. Presley explained that it has always been the intent to include them in the second year of the process. (The "full" joint CIP process has always been intended to include the major, bond-funded projects as well as the 3R projects.) This will help the County and Schools to achieve greater efficiency.

Regarding the enrollment projections, Mr. Horan stated that School staff are attempting to compress the process so that they can get the numbers solidified earlier than in the past. He does not anticipate that the enrollment numbers will vary greatly between the first

estimates and the final, actual numbers. Mr. Horan advised, however, that it is simply impossible for those final numbers to be provided any earlier than the end of October. Mr. Foley stated that the joint CIP policy will be revised accordingly.

Dr. Chase noted that "safety and health risk" is scored at only 20% on the 3R scoring criteria. She stated that if a safety or health risk is severe enough, the project should be of a higher priority than the other projects. Ms. Decatur asked if the scoring criteria would be submitted to the CIP Oversight Committee for input. Mr. Foley stated that he will ensure this is done. He explained that timing is a challenge, however, since the FY20 joint process has already begun. Mr. Horan and Mr. Presley stated that School staff are also currently preparing input on the scoring criteria and will submit that to the County once finalized.

Ms. Bohmke asked if School staff have begun working on the School FY20 CIP yet. Mr. Horan explained that staff are, indeed, obtaining input from all building administrators and putting together the list. The goal is to have the list approved by the School Board in August.

Mr. Foley stated that County and School staff will soon meet jointly to finalize a revised draft of the joint CIP policy, which will then be presented to both FABCs.

B. Shared Services Update (EXHIBIT C)

Mr. Presley provided a brief update on shared services (EXHIBIT C). He reported that County and School staff currently has several shared services underway, including:

- FLSA audit;
- General audit;
- Leadership Institute;
- Other training;
- Benefits administration (employee and retiree health insurances; and a benchmarking and best practices study);
- Radio system;
- Central purchasing division administrator position;

Ms. Decatur stated that she really wants to see increased and improved communication between the two boards and between staff from both organizations.

Mr. Foley strongly recommended that shared services be a standing discussion item on every JSWC meeting agenda.

C. Central Purchasing Position Update

Mr. Presley updated the committee on the current central purchasing division administrator vacancy (see *page 2 of EXHIBIT C*). Mr. Fulmer stated that the School Board's FABC received the same update last week.

D. School Security

Ms. Bohmke reported that the sheriff will be briefing the School Board on school security protocols in closed session tomorrow.

V. New Business

A. Roof Contractor at Colonial Forge High School

Ms. Bohmke stated that she's heard many rumors about roof leaks at Colonial Forge High School. Mr. Horan explained that there are leaks in the addition, but they are actually not roof leaks. Some are caused by issues with the siding, which is covered by the warranty. The contractor is currently investigating the exact source of the water. Additionally, there are roof drain issues which are being corrected this summer. And, finally, the wind storm in March caused significant shingle damage on the roof which is also being repaired this summer.

Ms. Bohmke requested that the school administrators disseminate this information to school staff and parents. Mr. Coen suggested that it be done in writing.

B. Timing of, and Outstanding Issues Related to, Fredericksburg Christian School (FCS) Property

Ms. Bohmke reported that funding of the VPSA bonds is on the BOS agenda for July 10.

C. Redistricting Efforts

Mr. Coen asked for a status update on the county-wide redistricting effort. Dr. Chase stated that the School Board has not met since the property was approved by the BOS as part of the 10-year CIP. Now that it has been approved, the School Board needs to start discussing how to proceed with redistricting.

Ms. Decatur stated that she and Dr. Chase will keep the JSWC updated as things progress on this issue.

D. Review of Heather Empfield Day School and Stafford High School Day School Programs (EXHIBITS D, E, F)

Dr. Chase reported that the current public day school memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the two boards will expire on June 30 (see *EXHIBIT D*). To her knowledge, no efforts have yet been made to renew the agreement. Additionally, the MOA calls for a mid-year review, which has not been prepared. Dr. Chase provided a breakdown of expenses (EXHIBITS E, F).

Ms. Bohmke stated that she had shown Exhibits E and F to a Finance Department representative at the County. That individual reported that the numbers in the exhibits do not quite match what her records show. Also, the same staff member reported that she has been receiving the mid-year reports regularly over the years.

Dr. Chase explained that Exhibits E and F show what the School's actual costs are for running the programs. She stated that more positions are needed to run the programs appropriately than are funded under the MOA. She also reported that Drew Middle School may have to expand in the near future, so the Heather Empfield Day School might have to be moved at some point. The two boards need to be aware of this.

Mr. Foley stated that the public day school program has very much been a work in progress. He stated that the BOS did approve \$285,000 to expand the program, but there has been no available school space. The preference is to keep these children in the public schools rather than private facilities.

Ms. Decatur stated that this matter could be delegated to the new superintendent once he/she comes on duty.

Mr. Foley stated that timing is critical, with both boards about to begin deliberations on their FY20 budgets.

Ms. Bohmke asked why the Private Day School Committee has not met recently.

Ms. Decatur stated that she does not know but will look into it.

E. Schedule of Future JSWC Meetings

Ms. Decatur asked that the committee decide on a meeting schedule for going forward. She wants to ensure the meetings are productive and timely. It used to meet quarterly until the new joint CIP process began, which required more frequent JSWC meetings.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the committee should figure out what its purpose is and what its objectives are. Also, the agendas should be prepared further in advance. This is probably the most important committee for both boards, and the school division is the largest partner agency for the BOS.

Ms. Bohmke recommended that the committee meet quarterly. She also recommended that the agendas be put together by the two committee co-chairs in collaboration with the county administrator and school superintendent. She also suggested that staff only attend a meeting if they are actually needed.

Mr. Foley added that the committee should have a clear purpose, and that purpose should be what drives the agenda.

Dr. Chase asked what the deadline would be if the meetings are quarterly. Ms. Bohmke suggested allowing the committee co-chairs, county administrator, and superintendent figure that out together. Shared services must be on the agenda regularly. She noted that County and School staff seems to have a great working relationship and strong communication. It seems to be the elected officials who need to improve in this area. Ms. Decatur echoed those sentiments and stated that she will talk about this soon with the acting superintendent, and Ms. Shelton can speak with the county administrator, to decide on the next meeting date and agenda.

Ms. Bohmke recommended putting these changes in writing to foster better understanding on the part of both boards. She recommended that the document be presented to both boards for approval.

The committee agreed to cancel the July 23 meeting.

F. New JSWC Process

This subject was discussed under item "E" above.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

FOR DISCUSSION

BOS/SB Joint Working Committee

Committee Charge:

The Board of Supervisors/School Board Joint Working Committee (JWC) will serve as the primary means of interaction and communication on all matters between the two Boards, outside of full joint meetings between the two bodies. The Committee will focus on policy and budget matters requiring joint consideration and will have the following responsibilities:

- Review and consider joint policy and budget matters and make recommendations to the two Boards when appropriate*;
- Serve as members of the Joint CIP Oversight Committee**;
- Review and consider 'Shared Services' opportunities and make recommendation to the two Board's when appropriate;
- Provide regular updates to the two Boards on the work of the Committee

Committee Composition:

Current Chair of the Board of Supervisors

Current Chair of the School Board

Two Board of Supervisor Members Appointed by the Board of Supervisors

Two School Board Members Appointed by the School Board

Alternates?

Staff Resources:

County Administrator

School Superintendent

Other staff as needed

Meeting Schedule/Procedures:

1. Monthly meetings will be held on the 4th Monday of each month or at other times determined by the Committee
2. The agenda for the Committee will be established through the Joint Chair/Vice-Chair monthly meeting, with input from Committee members
3. Minutes will be kept for each meeting and shared with both Boards each month. The Clerks to the two Boards will rotate attending the meetings to take minutes.

**For Discussion: The Board of Supervisors is considering a change to its committees overall and specifically with regards to the schools to avoid confusion and improve clarity, consistency and communication. This 'draft' charge for the Committee proposes that the JWC become the one committee between the two Boards.*

*** For Discussion: If the JWC becomes the one committee between the two Boards, it would require a change to the Joint CIP Process to designate its members to serve on the CIP Oversight Committee*

STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

31 Stafford Avenue
Stafford, Virginia 22554-7246
Phone: 540-658-6000
<http://www.staffordschools.net>

RANDY BRIDGES, Ed.D.
Superintendent

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

STEPHANIE JOHNSON
Chair

MEG BOHMKE
Vice-Chair

HOLLY HAZARD
PATRICIA HEALY
NANETTE KIDBY
DEWAYNE McOSKER, JR.
DANA REINBOLDT



Stafford County School Board /Board of Supervisors Joint Working Committee Meetings (Effective 2/2013)

- **Co-Chair:** Dana Reinboldt
Members: Patricia Healy/Stephanie Johnson
Alternates: Meg Bohmke, Nanette Kidby, Holly Hazard
- Meeting will be announced in advance. Board members will submit items to Co-Chair/superintendent for discussion by the committee. Agendas will be developed by Co-Chairs.
- Appointed committee members will be involved with all discussions. Other School Board members may attend the meeting, but will not engage in the discussion unless invited to do so by Co-Chairs. Staff members, if needed, will attend when invited, and engage in conversations if requested.
- School Board and Board of Supervisors Clerks will rotate attending the meetings to take minutes.
- Co-Chair will share information from the joint meetings with the full Board at the next scheduled meeting. Minutes from the meeting will be reviewed by Co-Chairs and submitted to both Boards.
- The two joint meetings of both Boards will continue, and additional meetings can be recommended by Co-Chairs of the Joint Working Committee.

Joint Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Process

1. Joint CIP Process Flow Chart
2. CIP Budget Calendar
3. Review Process for Joint County/School CIP
4. CIP Project Evaluation
5. Project Scoring Guide
6. Proposed Reporting
7. Proposed Next Steps
8. Appendix A

DRAFT

CIP Budget Calendar

April – June

- Development, review and revision to standards, metrics, studies, and methodologies for justifying capital improvement requests

July

- Post CIP Instructions and Forms
- CIP Process Overview/Q & A (Attendance Optional)

August

- All requests for Department, Agency, and School Project Justifications & Cost Data Due with the School Board's **formally adopted capital priorities.**
- Department of Finance and Budget (DFB) begin review with assistance from the Public Works Department (PW), the Department of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities (PRCF) and appropriate school division (SD).

September

- School system submits confirmation/adjustments based on any final review by School Board. **Any modifications from the School Board's formally adopted capital priorities should be formally adopted and reflected in the adjustments to projects.**
- PW/PRCF/SD Sends Updates, Revisions, and Comments to DFB for Department and Agency Project Requests
- In one or more sessions, CIP Representatives from all Departments, Agencies, and Schools will meet with DFB to review submittals

October

- CIP Project Requests Sent to the CIP Technical Review Committee (TRC)
- TRC Meetings – Review and begin ranking of project requests
- Departments, Agencies, and Schools Respond to TRC Questions and Comments
- TRC Meeting – Review project ranking, available revenues, and finalize recommendation

November

- **School provides updated enrollment projections to TRC to evaluate modifications to projections.**
- **School Board approves the program capacity methodology.**
- **The TRC provides their recommendation to both Boards and the Oversight Committee.**
- Meeting #1 - CIP Oversight Committee Meeting (CIP Projects Overview and Project Review and **review of School Board approved program capacity**)
- Meeting #2 - CIP Oversight Committee Meeting (CIP Revenues Overview, Project Review and Finalize Recommendations)

December

- Meeting #3 - CIP Oversight Committee Meeting finalize the recommendations
- Joint Meeting of Board of Supervisors and School Board to Review CIP Recommendations of the CIP Oversight Committee
- Final Recommended CIP Document Prepared and send to County Administrator for consideration in the recommended budget

January

- In consultation with the Superintendent, County Administrator review of recommended CIP based on final review of revenues and finance policies

March

- County Administrator's Recommended Budget & CIP presented to Board of Supervisors
- Board CIP Work Session
- Annual reporting on the status of School and County projects to the Board of Supervisors.

April

- Public Hearing on the Proposed Operating and Capital Budgets and CIP
- BOS Adopts Operating and Capital Budgets & CIP

Review Process for Joint County/Schools CIP

Capital expenditures, within the context of the CIP, are defined as new or upgrades to facilities, equipment and vehicles with a unit cost greater than \$50,000. Capital Improvement Projects are generally broken into two main categories: large projects such as new infrastructure or major renovations, and small projects that include repair, replacement and rehabilitation (3R).

Large capital projects and 3R projects will be balanced against revenues in the first five years. The final five years of the plan will provide a view of projected needs. The 3R projects in the final five years are expected to include cyclical replacement items.

Large capital projects and 3R projects will be scored independently due to the number of 3R projects submitted each year. The 3R projects are primarily small scale projects that include repair, replacement and rehabilitation of existing physical assets. The need to maintain existing assets is fundamental to the continuation of providing services to the community. Emphasis throughout the process and scoring will reflect this foundational ideal. Cyclical maintenance of existing capital assets in order to prevent major breakdowns or deterioration of assets with the goal of extending the life of facilities and assets are considered routine maintenance. Generally, routine maintenance will be considered an operating expense.

The 3R projects include:

- Repair, replacement and rehabilitation projects; and/or,
- Projects that are new infrastructure but are minor enhancements to existing infrastructure (i.e. new playground, new storage facility, new walking path, etc.)
- Projects that will increase the useful life of an existing asset but not fundamentally change the structure or purpose (i.e. roof replacement); and/or,
- Repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of major mechanical systems such as heating and cooling systems; and/or,
- Upgrades to technology infrastructure that provide for major overhauls and improvements to the system, such as fiber projects.

The 3R projects do not include:

- Major overhauls to assets that change the structure or purpose; and,
- New buildings or new infrastructure that provide significant enhancements to existing infrastructure; and,
- Large scale enterprise resource management systems, such as a Financial System.

The 3R projects will be funded in accordance with the Board's Principles of High Performance Management. Additional funding for school projects is possible through debt funding from the Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA).

Basis and Justification for Capital Project and 3R Submissions

Capital project submissions **whether 3R or large projects** should be based on standards, comparisons, metrics, methodologies and objective study to the greatest extent possible to justify the need and timing for capital improvements. Examples of this justification include:

- Comprehensive Plan – Public Facilities Plan
- School capacity projections
- Vehicle and apparatus replacement criteria
- Facility maintenance and replacement needs assessments
- Standards/metrics for maintenance & replacement (infrastructure) need and timing
- Long range space studies, facility master planning, etc.
- Strategic plans, special studies and service plans

Initial Staff Review

DFB staff compiles the submitted project requests and verifies the accuracy of the anticipated project costs and operating impact. The requests are extensively reviewed by the County Public Works Department (PW), Department of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities (PRCF) and appropriate school divisions (SD) to verify the accuracy, adequacy and completeness of project descriptions, project cost, and funding requests. The CIP review schedule provides for a four week review period for any project in the CIP requiring construction. However, departments and agencies are encouraged to consult with PW, PRCF and SD as early as possible in the capital planning cycle regarding the engineering requirements for new projects under consideration or being proposed for the capital plan, and for any revisions to existing projects. Consultation should continue throughout the CIP preparation and review process.

Technical Review Committee (TRC)

The TRC ranks the projects based on established criteria. The ranking process allows projects to be added in a systematic, objective manner. Available revenues, the Board's Guiding Principles and Priorities, and financial policies guide project inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program. The Technical Review Committee reports its recommendations to the Oversight Committee.

TRC Charge:

The Capital Program Technical Review Committee will assist the County in the Capital Program process by assuring that the technical aspects and costs of each of the requested projects have been well researched and documented. The team will also review, evaluate and document the need for each project and make recommendations for priority funding based on the established Capital Project Evaluation Criteria. The Capital Program Technical Review Committee will report their recommendations to the County Administrator and the Capital Program "Oversight Committee."

1) Technical Review Committee Member Responsibilities:

- Review all project requests for clarity, accuracy and appropriate timing;
- Meet with project submitters to clarify requests and propose revisions, if needed;
- Rank requested projects based on established evaluation criteria;
- Review available revenues and debt service requirements for project requests based on approved County financial policies;
- Prioritize projects based on their ranking and available revenues;
- Determine if projects should be considered a 3R project;
- Together with the DFB develop a recommended CIP based on revenue projections provided by DFB;
- Review updated school enrollment projections to determine if variances in the recommendation need to be made;
- Forward the joint recommendation to the Capital Program Oversight Committee for its review;
- Reconvene to evaluate any projects introduced to the process by the Oversight Committee.

2) Technical Review Committee Members:

- County Budget Director, Department of Finance and Budget (Committee Co-Chair)
- Title - Deputy Director, Department of Public Works (Committee Co-Chair)
- Title - Senior Planning staff, Department of Planning & Zoning
- Title - Senior Project Management staff, Stafford County Schools
- Title – Planning/Budget/Finance staff, Stafford County Schools

*Support staff: Senior Budget and Management Analyst, Department of Finance and Budget

Board of Supervisors/School Board Initial Policy Review

Just prior to the Oversight Committee's Review, the two Boards (the Board of Supervisors and the School Board) review the project requests and initial financial forecast provided by the TRC. This initial review provides the Boards an opportunity to provide feedback to its respective members serving on the Oversight Committee.

Oversight Committee Review

The Oversight Committee reviews the Technical Review Committee's ranking and Capital Program recommendation adjusting the projects as necessary. The Oversight Committee provides a recommended CIP to the County Administrator and reviews the recommendation with the Board of Supervisors and School Board at a joint meeting in December of each year.

1) Oversight Committee Charge:

“The Capital Improvement Program (Capital Program) is the planning guide for County expenditures for major capital facilities and equipment and includes a ten-year approved Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) balanced to revenues. The Capital Program Oversight Committee will assist the County in the Capital Program process by reviewing and evaluating the recommended Capital Improvement Program brought forward by the Technical Review Committee. The Committee will assure that the proposed Capital projects are aligned with County policies, established priorities, guiding principles and long term vision. The Committee will also assure that the recommended ten-year CIP is aligned with approved financial policies and that the County’s financial stability is maintained through the prudent use of its revenues. The Capital Program Oversight Committee will report its recommendations directly to the County Administrator as a part of preparation for the annual budget recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

2) Oversight Committee Member Responsibilities:

- Review the recommended Capital Improvement Program presented by the Technical Review Committee;
- Ensure that the proposed project ranking is properly and consistently applied;
- Propose modifications/improvements to the project ranking system;
- Ensure that all Capital projects carry out the County’s long-range goals and objectives;
- Ensure that the recommended ten-year CIP addresses County needs through the proper timing, prioritization and balance of local government and school division projects;
- Ensure that County revenues are used wisely to address the County’s capital needs and that the recommended CIP conforms to approved financial policies, including the use of on-going revenues and borrowed funds;
- Propose revisions or adjustments to the ten-year CIP proposed by the Capital Program Technical Review Committee, if needed;
- Submit a recommended CIP to the County Administrator with any documented revisions to the plan submitted by the Technical Review Committee.

3) Oversight Committee Members:

- Members of the Board of Supervisors’ Finance, Audit and Budget Committee (FAB)
- Members of the School Board Finance, Audit and Budget Committee (FAB)
- 1 Citizen Representative. Selected by Superintendent and County Administrator with business and construction experience
- County/School Staff Support includes: Deputy County Administrators, Deputy Superintendents, the Budget Division Director (Co-Facilitator), and the Deputy Director of Public Works (Co-Facilitator)

Final Recommendation and Approval of the Capital Improvement Program

The County Administrator will consider the recommendation of the Oversight Committee as part of the overall consideration in recommending a proposed budget to the Board of Supervisors which considers available revenues and adherence to County financial policies, parameters and goals. The County Administrator's Recommended Capital Improvement Program is reviewed and considered by the Board of Supervisors and subsequently approved, along with the annual Capital Budget for projects to be funded in the upcoming fiscal year.

Capital Improvement Program Project Evaluation

Project evaluation criteria have been established and are used by the committees to review and evaluate all capital projects and their cost estimates. All CIP projects are evaluated against various factors which the submitting department/agency is asked to address on each of the applicable CIP Forms, such as the Project Request Form, the basis of cost estimates provided on the Project Cost Summary Form, and the several project cost detail forms, all of which are fully described in the instructions.

Project Ranking Criteria for Large Projects

All submitted or proposed Capital Improvement Projects will be subject to ranking in accordance with the criteria and scoring system below. Areas of emphasis will include the following 8 categories:

- Health and Safety (15%)
- Education (15%)
- Impact on Operational Budget (15%)
- Special Considerations/Regulatory Compliance/Timing/Location (15%)
- Economic/Community Development (15%)
- Quality of Life (10%)
- Infrastructure (10%)
- Sustainability/Energy Efficiency (5%)

Each project will be evaluated against each area of emphasis and scored on a scale of **zero** through **four** based on the degree to which the project addresses the attributes of the particular area of emphasis. **A score of zero will denote that the project does not meet the condition, and a score of four will denote that the project materially meets the condition.**

Descriptions of each area of emphasis and the attributes or considerations that will determine the score are as follows:

1) Health and Safety (15%)

Health and safety typically involves such things as fire service, police service, emergency response and communications, safe roads, public health, and flood control, as examples. A health clinic, fire station or police station would directly impact the health and safety of citizens, thus scoring high in this category. Similarly, safety improvements in a school or public building might score points in this category while

adding concession stands to an existing facility would probably not. Considerations would include the following:

- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by County sponsored service plans, master plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
- Does the project directly reduce risks to people or property (i.e. flood control)?
- Does the project directly promote improved health or safety?
- Does the project mitigate an immediate risk?

2) Education (15%)

This category relates to education and learning. New facilities, renovations or technologies that create or enhance educational opportunities are included in this category. Items addressed would also include major renovations or facility maintenance improvements to preserve assets or upgrade school or other educational facilities. Finally, this category would also include technological upgrades or improvements and facility improvements designed to improve or enhance the learning environment. A project to add a classroom wing to replace temporary trailer facilities at a public school would score high in this category. Considerations in establishing the score include:

- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by School Board sponsored service plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Is the project supported by special surveys or community input?
- Does the project address an immediate and necessary space need?
- Does the project accommodate an essential program, or is it a program enhancement?
- Is the project mandated?
- Is the project intended to bring parity and consistency among similar facilities?

3) Impact on Operational Budget (15%)

Some projects may affect the operating budget for the next few years or for the life of the facility. A fire station or library must be staffed and supplied; therefore these projects have an impact on the operational budgets for the life of the facility. Replacing a storm water line will not require any additional resources from the operational budget. The score will be based on considerations such as:

- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by County sponsored service plans, master plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
- Will the facility require additional personnel to operate
- Will the project lead to a reduction in personnel or maintenance costs or increased productivity?
- Will the facility require significant annual maintenance?
- Will the new facility require additional equipment not included in the project budget?
- Will the new facility reduce time and resources of County or School staff maintaining current outdated systems?
- Will the efficiency of the project save money?
- Is there a revenue generating opportunity (e.g. user fees)?
- Does the project minimize life-cycle costs?

4) Special Considerations/Regulatory Compliance/Timing/Location (15%)

This criterion includes projects that because of special circumstances or emergencies must be undertaken immediately or in the very near future, regulatory mandates, or connection with other projects which have been selected for completion. The score will be based on considerations such as:

- Does the project address a legislative, regulatory or court-ordered mandate (0 – 5 years)?
- Will the future project impact foreseeable regulatory issues (5 – 10 years)?
- Does the project promote long-term regulatory compliance (>10 yrs.)?
- Will there be serious negative impact on the County if compliance is not achieved?
- Are there other ways to mitigate the regulatory concern?
- Is the project required to protect against an immediate and significant health, safety or general welfare hazard/threat to the County
- Is there a significant external funding source that can only be used for this project and/or which will be lost if not used immediately (e.g. proffers, grants through various federal or state initiatives, and private donations)?
- Do other projects require this one to be finished first?
- Does the project require others to be completed first? If so, what is the magnitude of potential delays?
- Can this project be done in conjunction with other projects?
- Will it be more economical to multiple projects together?
- Will it help in reducing repeated neighborhood disruptions?
- Will there be a negative impact of the construction and if so, can this be mitigated?
- Are there inter-jurisdictional considerations?
- Does the project use an existing County-owned or controlled site or facility?

- Will delay of the project result in significantly higher construction costs in the future?
- Does the project involve external funding or partnership where funds will be lost if not constructed?

5) Economic/Community Development (15%)

Economic/community development considerations relate to projects that foster the development, re- development or expansion of a diversified business/industrial base or designated growth area. Projects that will help create jobs and generate a positive financial contribution to the County would be included in this category, as would a new park or streetscape project in a targeted growth area. Providing the needed infrastructure to encourage redevelopment of a shopping center would score high in this category. Reconstructing a storm drain line through a residential neighborhood would likely score low in the economic development category. The score will be based on the following attributes or considerations:

- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by County sponsored service plans, master plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
- Does the project have the potential to promote economic/community development in areas where growth is desired?
- Will the project continue to promote or enhance economic/community development in an already developed area?
- Is the net impact of the project positive (total projected tax revenues of economic/community development less costs of providing services)?
- Will the project produce desirable jobs in the County?
- Will the project rejuvenate an area that needs assistance?

6) Quality of Life (10%)

Quality of Life is a characteristic that makes the County a desirable place to live and work. For example, public parks, libraries, schools, multi-use trails, open space, and preservation of community character enhance the quality of life for citizens. A County maintenance building is an example of a project that may not directly affect the citizen's quality of life. The score will be based on the following attributes or considerations:

- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by County sponsored service plans, master plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?

- Does the project increase or enhance educational opportunities for County citizens **outside of those provided by Stafford County Public Schools?**
- Does the project increase or enhance recreational opportunities and/or green space?
- Does the project target the quality of life of all citizens or does it target one demographic? Is one population affected positively and another negatively?
- Does the project preserve or improve the historical or natural heritage of the County?
- Does the project affect traffic positively or negatively?
- Does the project improve, mitigate and or prevent degradation of environmental quality (e.g. water quality, improve or reduce pollution including noise and/or light pollution)?

7) Infrastructure (10%)

This element relates to basic or core infrastructure needs of the County. Typical projects in this category would include utility/service infrastructure such as storm water systems, underground utilities, sidewalks, streets/transportation facilities, broadband or wireless communication systems, streetscapes, and County service facilities. Buildings would also be included to the extent they address a basic functional need of the County. Constructing a facility in excess of facility or service standards would score low in this category. The score will be based on the following attributes or considerations:

- Is there a facility being replaced that has exceeded its useful life and to what extent?
- Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, objectives and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the project supported by County sponsored service plans, master plans, strategic plans or special studies?
- Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
- Is there a facility being replaced that has exceeded its useful life and to what extent?
- Do resources spent on maintenance of an existing facility justify replacement?
- Does this replace an outdated system?
- Does the facility/system represent new technology that will provide enhance service?
- Does the project extend service for desired growth?

8) Sustainability/Energy Efficiency (5%)

This criterion relates to the Board's objective to build in a sustainable and energy efficient manner. Projects in this category will be those that directly involve energy savings, LEED certification or reduced carbon emissions. A project that directly reduces energy would score high in this category; a project that involves negative impacts to the environment or an increase in the carbon footprint will score low. Consideration in this area of emphasis would include:

- Will the project result in a reduction or increase in energy use?
- Does the project involve specific energy reduction strategies or features?

- Will the project achieve LEED certification?
- Will the project have a long-term positive impact on the environment?
- Will the project negatively impact the environment?
- Is there a reasonable payback period for the project's investment?
- Is the project designed to promote or encourage sustainable development?
- Is special consideration be given to energy conservation including total life-cycle costs?

Review of 3R Projects

As defined by the process, projects that are considered to be 3R will have different scoring criteria. Emphasis in the CIP will be given to maintaining current assets. The first five years of the CIP will have scored projects that are balanced with offsetting revenues. Consideration for the following will be included:

- Does the project increase infrastructure capacity to meet existing deficiencies to service the existing population? (10%)
- Does the project increase effectiveness and/or efficiency of operations (10%)
- Does the project eliminate a risk or hazard to public health and/or safety that endangers that population area? (30%)
- Does the project preserve or extend the life of an existing asset? (20%)
- Will failure to do the project or delaying the project have major impacts on other projects or programs? (15%)
- Is the need for the project supported through studies? (15%)

Annual Capital Projects Reporting

The status of capital projects will be reported annually to the Board of Supervisors. The reporting will be done in the March time frame to coincide with the Budget Work Session for the Capital Improvements Program. Both School and County projects will be reported.

Proposed Next Steps

- **June** - Development of 'Working Draft' by County and School staff based on Joint Schools Working Committee (JWSC) feedback (completed)
- **June** - JWSC consideration of "Working Draft" (completed)
- **July** – Feedback of JSWC incorporated in "Final Draft" (completed)
- **August** – BOS considers "Final Draft" CIP Policy (completed)
- **August – September** – JSWC review 'Final Draft' CIP Policy
- **September** – BOS considers adoption of CIP Policy

- **Appendix A**

During the FY2019-29 Joint CIP Process, the Oversight Committee established guiding principles for the Technical Review Committee. These principles will be incorporated into the scoring and evaluations of projects.

- Generally, priority will be given to capacity over the rehabilitation of existing schools.
- New high schools will be proposed at 2,150 seats.
- Projects approved in previous CIP's that will begin in the next fiscal year will not be part of the Technical Review Committee's review. The Oversight Committee may recommend that in-process projects are amended or removed to meet the needs of the community. att

DRAFT

Joint CIP Policy, Summary of Changes

Joint Schools Working Group

August 27, 2018

PG#	Proposed Change to Joint CIP Policy and Staff's Recommendation	School Board's Finance Audit and Budget Committee Recommendations (7/23/18 Meeting)
2	Schools will provide an updated enrollment projection to the TRC at the beginning of November. The TRC will consider changes in projections and the timing of new schools. This may delay reporting to both Boards and the OSC.	Originally proposed to have enrollment projections completed by the last week of October. The School FAB supports an update in early November.
2	The School Board will formally adopt CIP priorities.	No comment made.
2	The proposed policy includes an annual report to the Board of Supervisors in March. County staff has begun working on a reporting method and will include School staff to develop a shared reporting structure. Staff envisions the report will provide summary information of projects that include: budget versus actual spending and projected spending by major construction categories (i.e. land acquisition, design, construction, etc.); change orders to the projects; and completion timelines.	Supports reporting to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board.
2	The School Board approved the program capacity methodology. (Update made from the County's Finance, Audit and Budget Committee 8/21/2018).	
4	The proposed CIP policy includes 3R projects that are scored against a common set of criteria. The funding of these will be independent, but will be presented to the OSC to provide for a comprehensive view of all projects included in the CIP.	The School FAB is concerned that the introduction of the 3R projects into the Joint CIP is premature and do not support the inclusion within this next CIP cycle. They would like to see the Joint CIP process for large CIP projects through another year before introduction of the 3R's to the policy.
4	The proposed CIP policy states that large capital projects and 3R will be balanced against revenues in the first five years. The remaining five years are a projection of needs.	
6	The proposed policy includes two facilitators, the Budget Division Director and the Deputy Director of Public Works for Engineering and Construction. The purpose of the facilitator is to help the OSC move through the process with the goal of recommending a CIP to both Boards. Equal representation of both County and School projects can be achieved without facilitators from both staffs. Staff recommends amending the policy as noted above.	Supports having two co-facilitators with one from the Schools and one from the County.

PROPOSED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF STAFFORD
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

RESOLUTION

At a regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors (the Board) held in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, Stafford, Virginia, on the 4th day of September, 2018:

MEMBERS:

- Meg Bohmke, Chairman
- Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman
- Jack R. Cavalier
- Thomas C. Coen
- L. Mark Dudenhefer
- Wendy E. Maurer
- Cindy C. Shelton

VOTE:

On motion of , seconded by , which carried by a vote of , the following was adopted:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY2020 BUDGET CALENDAR

WHEREAS, the Budget Calendar includes new processes for the Board and County staff; and

WHEREAS, the Board and the School Board have adopted a Joint Capital Improvement Program (CIP); and

WHEREAS, staff is preparing a Long Term Financial Projection to be presented to the Board in November, and is scheduling follow up work sessions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 4th day of September, 2018, that it be and hereby does adopt the FY2020 Budget Calendar as follows:

August

- Monday, August 20, 2018 CIP-All requests for County and School CIP projects due
- Tuesday, August 21, 2018 CIP-Present CIP policy/procedure changes to the FAB
- Monday, August 27, 2018 CIP-Joint Working Group review Joint CIP Policy

September

Wednesday, September 05, 2018 CIP-Present Joint CIP Policy for Board approval

Tuesday, September 11, 2018 CIP-School Board Meeting - adopts the CIP priorities

Tuesday, September 18, 2018 **Present FY2018 year-end summary financial results**

October

Monday, October 01, 2018 CIP- Technical Review Committee (TRC) receives projects

Monday, October 08, 2018 CIP - TRC meeting - Review all Schools Projects

Tuesday, October 09, 2018 CIP - TRC meeting - Review all Public Works Projects

Friday, October 12, 2018 CIP - TRC meeting - Review all Public Safety Projects

Monday, October 15, 2018 CIP – TRC meeting - Review all Parks Projects

Tuesday, October 16, 2018 CIP - TRC meeting - Review all Transportation Projects

Tuesday, October 16, 2018 1st Quarter Review - current fiscal year and preliminary upcoming fiscal year overview

November

Wednesday, November 07, 2018 Present Five Year Financial Plan to Board of Supervisors

Wednesday, November 07, 2018 CIP-School submits updated enrollment projections to TRC for review

Friday, November 09, 2018 CIP-TRC committee forward CIP to both Boards for information and the OSC committee

Thursday, November 15, 2018 CIP-Tentative Date: CIP Oversight Committee (OSC), Meeting #1 - project overviews/review

Tuesday, November 27, 2018 CIP-Tentative Date: Present affordability to Board of Supervisors

Tuesday, November 27, 2018 Five Year Financial Plan Work Session Transportation, Utilities, CIP and debt capacity

Thursday, November 29, 2018

CIP-Tentative Date: CIP OSC Meeting #2 - revenues, debt capacity, and final recommendations

December

Tuesday, December 4, 2018

Five Year Financial Plan Work Session to confirm Board's priorities

Thursday, December 6, 2018

CIP-Tentative Date: CIP OSC Meeting #3 – finalize the recommended CIP

Tuesday, December 18, 2018

Presentation of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Audit to the Board of Supervisors

Tuesday, December 18, 2018

CIP-Tentative Date: Joint Meeting of Board of Supervisors and School Board to present OSC recommended CIP

Tuesday, December 18, 2018

Final recommendations on the Five Year Financial Plan

Friday, December 28, 2018

CIP-Final recommended CIP document prepared for County Administrator

January

Friday, January 18, 2019

CIP-County Administrator/Superintendent final review of CIP

Tuesday, January 22, 2019

Board meeting – mid-year review

March

Tuesday, March 05, 2019

Presentation of Proposed Budget and CIP to Board of Supervisors

Tuesday, March 05, 2019

Board of Supervisors authorize Public Hearings for the FY2020 Budget, the CY2019 tax rates, and the CIP

Tuesday, March 12, 2019

Budget Work Session: General Fund revenue and expenditure

Tuesday, March 19, 2019

Joint Budget Work session with School Board presenting their Approved Budget to the Board of Supervisors

R18-211
Page 3

Tuesday, March 26, 2019

Budget Work session Debt, Financial Policy limitations (debt capacity) CIP

April

Tuesday, April 02, 2019

Budget Work Session as needed

Tuesday, April 02, 2019

Budget, tax rate and CIP Public Hearings

Tuesday, April 09, 2019

Budget Work Session as needed

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

3rd Quarter Financial Review

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

Budget Work Session and adopt the FY2020 Budget, CIP, CY2019 Tax Rates

DRAFT