

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on August 9, 2005, at 4:00 p.m., in Meeting Room 235, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from August 3, 2005.

PRESENT: Mr. David P. Bowerman, Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Ms. Sally H. Thomas and Mr. David C. Wyant.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr.; Assistant County Executive, Roxanne W. White; Assistant County Executive, Thomas C. Foley; Director of Office of Management and Budget, Melvin A. Breeden; County Attorney, Larry W. Davis; and Clerk, Ella Carey.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Sue Bell Friedman, Mr. Stephen Koleszar, Ms. Diantha McKeel, Ms. Barbara Massie Mouly, Mr. Gordon Walker, and Mr. Brian Wheeler.

ABSENT: Ms. Pamela Moynihan

SCHOOL BOARD OFFICERS PRESENT: Superintendent, Kevin Castner; Executive Director of Fiscal Services, Jackson Zimmerman; Director of Building Services, Al Reaser; and School Board Clerk, Jennifer Johnston.

Agenda Item No. 1. The Supervisors' meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker. The School Board meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by its Vice-Chairman, Ms. Friedman.

Agenda Item No. 2. Discussion: School Division Capital Improvement Funding Process.

Ms. White presented a slide presentation and summarized the executive summary which was forwarded to Board members. As Albemarle County becomes more urbanized, increasing demands are placed on the County's finances to fund infrastructure improvements for the growing urban population. Since more than 50 percent of County residents now live in the growth areas, rather than in the rural areas, the County faces the financial challenge of paying for new roads, sidewalks, stormwater facilities, fire stations, recreational space, libraries, etc. for the increasing urban population. These urban demands were not as visible ten to twenty years ago, when more of the County's capital financing was directed at building new schools and expanding existing schools for the growing student enrollment. The struggle to secure revenues for the growing infrastructure needs became more apparent during last year's capital improvement budgeting process, when both the school division and local government submitted capital requests in excess of available resources.

With the County facing continued pressure to finance urban capital needs, while the need for school capital projects has leveled off due to a fairly level enrollment growth, the Board of Supervisors recognized the need to revisit the way we allocate resources, particularly debt service, in the CIP between the school division and local government needs. The Board of Supervisors requested that we hold a joint meeting with the School Board to discuss the issue of competing demands for capital improvement resources and agree upon a process for allocating capital funds between the school division and local government.

This executive summary identifies the problem with the current debt service allocation and proposes a funding method for debt service and a proposal to improve the capital improvement decision making process. Both school division and local government staff worked together to develop this proposal and support the recommendations outlined throughout this executive summary.

For background information, Attachment D provides a summary of the approved School Division CIP projects for FY06 – FY10, as well as the planned school projects for planning years FY11-FY15.

Issue/Problem

There are two identified problems or issues to be resolved: (1) the great majority of CIP outstanding debt and debt service is currently allocated to school projects and does not, therefore, allow for increased local government debt for growing infrastructure needs; (2) the current process between the School Division, the CIP Technical Committee and the Board of Supervisors does not work well and can create an adversarial relationship between the Board of Supervisors and School Board over the reduction or "cutting" of the School Capital Improvement Plan.

School Debt and Debt Service

The School Division has incurred the majority of County debt over the past 20 years, mostly due to an aggressive building and renovation program and the ease of debt issuance through Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) bonds. Based on the currently approved CIP, total outstanding debt at June 30, 2006 will be \$90.5 million for the School Division and \$24.7 million for Local Government. The attached chart (A) shows the County's total obligated debt and each division's share of that total. In FY06, the School Division's share of the total debt is 72 percent; Local Government's share is only 28 percent.

In looking at annual debt service, Chart B shows that in FY06, the Schools have 85 percent of the debt service, while Local Government has only a 15 percent share. With an established financial policy of debt service to revenues ratio of 10 percent and a goal of aligning the County's ratio with other Triple AAA bond localities at 7 percent, school debt cannot be maintained at the same share of debt capacity and still allow for the growing debt service for the County's infrastructure needs without increasing the available revenues or setting a specific target/limit for the School Division CIP.

CIP Decision Process

Currently the process for submitting and approving a School CIP Request often leads to a conflict between the School Board's approved request and what the BOS is able to fund. The Long Range Planning Committee develops a CIP request based on projected enrollment demands and other factors, which is then submitted to the School Board for approval. The approved CIP request is then submitted to OMB to be reviewed by the CIP Technical Review Committee, comprised of County and School Division staff, BOS and School Board members and citizens. The majority of committee members do not have the knowledge to judge the validity, the timing or the increased cost estimates for the school projects, nor the authority to feel that they can reject or rearrange school projects that have already been approved by the School Board. Therefore, each year the School's CIP projects are either approved as submitted, or if they significantly exceed revenues, the proposed changes would go back to the School Board for approval before a recommended CIP is submitted to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Often, as was the case this year, the short budget review time frame does not allow time for the School Board to revise their requests prior to budget work sessions. This process, therefore, results in the perception that OMB and/or the Technical Committee cut the School Board's approved CIP budget.

Proposed Solution

School Debt and School Debt Service

If the County intends to keep its annual debt service close to the ratio of debt service to revenues set by other Triple AAA localities (7 percent) and if the debt capacity of Local Government must grow to meet increasing infrastructure demands, then the share of school debt service must level off over the next ten years or additional revenues must be added to the CIP.

The attached Chart A of total obligated debt shows school debt going from 72 percent of the total to 58 percent in FY10 and 52 percent in FY15, while local government total debt goes from 28 percent to 48 percent bringing local government obligated debt and school obligated debt to a more equitable level.

The attached Chart B shows total county annual debt service rising from approximately \$13 million in FY06 to \$27 million in FY15. The School Division share of this debt goes from the current 85 percent to 62 percent in FY10 and 54 percent in FY15, while local government debt increases from its current 15 percent of the total to 38 percent in FY10 and 46 percent in FY15, again a more equal balance between schools and local government debt service.

Attachment Chart C shows that if these debt service targets are adhered to, the County's overall debt service to revenue ratio will be in line with other Triple AAA localities.

These debt service targets, which will begin to equalize the debt service between the Schools and Local Government, will form the basis of the Capital Improvement Program projects funded by debt. If these intended targets can be agreed upon by both Boards, then School Division projects will be requested within these debt parameters. This change will require school staff to perform more up front analysis on the impact of requested project costs on their debt service capacity and the impact of staging or sequencing projects to meet these targets. School staff and the School Board will be able to add or delete projects or move projects into different years, as long as they stay within these approved debt targets. It is important to understand that these targets do not reduce the level of school debt service, which in the approved CIP goes from approximately \$11 million in FY06 to \$15 million in FY15, but only the share of total debt service. Even keeping to these targets, the School Division will still be able to issue \$52.3 million additional debt for project costs over the next 5 years.

Everyone recognizes that a ten-year plan will change, so unexpected changes caused by emergency situations or unplanned enrollment growth may occur. However, these should be rare exceptions to keeping requested projects within the debt service targets. Most changes will be accommodated by the School Division by adjusting their projects within the approved debt parameters. However, if a new high school is to be considered necessary within the next 15 to 20 years, the joint boards must carefully consider the funding of debt, since a project of this proportion may not be able to be funded within the current debt service targets.

CIP Request, Recommendation and Approval Process

To alleviate the problems cited above and become more efficient with our time and more effective in our results, both School and Local Government staff is recommending that the request, review and approval process be revised in the following way:

The Long Range Planning Committee can still fulfill its role for the School Board in looking at long-term school needs and making recommendations for future projects. However, the committee will need to understand the approved debt service parameters and, with guidance from School Division staff, will need to request projects that stay within the planned debt service targets. Their recommendation would still be forwarded to the School Board for review.

CIP Staff Review Team: The function of this small staff team will be to review the technical details and cost information on requested local government CIP projects and then to rank projects based on our established CIP criteria. The team would not rank or change school projects if they were within the allowable debt service limits. If school projects did exceed available revenues, the team would resolve the discrepancy using team members from the School Division and OMB to work out the details. This staff team will balance general government projects to revenues using OMB's estimates of available revenues and debt service.

CIP Oversight Committee: This larger CIP committee would be broader based and comprised of staff members, representatives of the Board of Supervisors, the School Board and the Planning

Commission, and community representatives. This committee would focus more on the broader policy issues and priorities in the Capital Improvement Program and would review the recommendations of the CIP Staff Review Team and provide input on priorities, timing and costs. This committee, would not need to review the technical aspects of each project, i.e. whether the square footage is correct, whether the costs have been estimated correctly, whether all costs have been accounted for, whether all revenues are there to support the project, etc. This review and analysis should already have been done by the staff team before it is presented to them.

This committee will not spend its valuable time trying to balance the projects against projected revenues or debt service, which is a complicated and detailed task, but will instead provide input on a funding and sequencing scenario(s) developed by the staff team. Taking the details out from under the purview of this larger committee will free up their time to look at the big picture and countywide impacts, not the details of each individual project.

The final decision on the proposed Capital Improvement Program rests as always with the County Executive based on the recommendation of the Staff Review Team and the CIP Oversight Committee.

Staff recommends approval for the following:

- Agree to the outstanding debt and debt service targets for school projects as shown on Chart A and Chart B;
- Agree that the long term planning for funding a new high school in 15 to 20 years needs to begin no later than 2010;
- Direct the Long Range Planning Committee to build their CIP project request within the agreed upon debt service targets;
- Direct County Executive to form a CIP Staff Review Team to analyze the technical and cost details for requested CIP projects and make funding recommendations. School projects will be reviewed by this team, but not changed if they are within the approved debt service targets. Any funding discrepancies between school projects and debt service targets will be resolved by OMB and school staff representatives on this team;
- Direct the County Executive to form a CIP Oversight Committee to include representatives of the Board of Supervisors and the School Board, staff and community members to review the recommendations of the Staff Review Team and provide input on priorities, costs and county wide CIP impacts.

Mr. Rooker commented that everyone in the room is here because they want to do what's best for the county as a whole, not just schools or government. He said that there have been discussions of forming a committee comprised of both School and Supervisor Board members, and people from both staffs to review the capital projects. Mr. Rooker added that the other option discussed was having a budget where each part would make their own decisions within that budget.

Ms. Thomas asked if inflation had been factored into the figures presented.

Ms. White responded that some of the projects have been adjusted as they go along, but it's not a true reflection of what might be seen at the end of the 10-year period. Ms. White explained that if the county were to undertake a big project, the ratios would change accordingly.

Mr. Walker said that a different way to address that obligation would be to stay within the policy but still increase the amount of revenue committed to CIP.

Mr. Rooker responded that the problem with that is increasing the ratio to exceed the AAA bond rating, which leads to higher interest rates.

Mr. Koleszar asked if the numbers reflected the current CIP.

Mr. Breeden answered that everything is based on the existing CIP except for one list of projects.

Mr. Koleszar commented that in essence what has happened is general government has for a long time gotten by without much CIP money, and now the need is there to double that amount. He said that in order for local government to fund the increase, the strategy here is for schools not to increase their CIP monies.

Mr. Boyd said that the school's enrollment numbers are not increasing.

Mr. Koleszar replied that the way he likes to look at the percentages is how much each has grown, noting that the county government's debt service will triple, with schools' increasing only 15 percent.

Mr. Rooker noted that it's important to look at the base numbers.

Mr. Koleszar stated that the school CIP tends to be enrollment-driven, and if the school populations were to grow by 300 or 400, the theory presented here could run into some trouble. He emphasized that there is no way to know what enrollment might do in the future, as it fluctuates

dramatically with economic conditions. Mr. Koleszar said that current housing prices tend to preclude families from moving here, but that might change if the prices level off.

Ms. White pointed out that there is a mechanism in the plan to bring the CIP formula back under review in the event of unusual or unanticipated situations.

Mr. Rooker commented that they are trying to arrive at a process where both the county government and school needs can be weighed and met, regardless of where they are. He noted that often there is no choice as to whether certain facilities need to be built, such as courthouses.

Mr. Koleszar acknowledged that the changing demographics are affecting the capital and operating budgets of the county.

Dr. Castner commented that he agrees with this proposal, noting that the schools have been very fortunate to have capital programs funded within the existing debt service. He stated that enrollment is remaining steady, so the new formula makes a lot of sense, adding that it is because of what they have been able to do in the past that they feel that they can make this work.

Ms. White continued with her report, noting that the county is way under the 10 percent maximum, and right in line with AAA guidelines of 7 percent. She explained that the proposal would require more work with OMB and school staff to include more analysis, adding that it does allow for growth in the schools' new debt service of \$52.3 million over the next 5 years.

Mr. Rooker asked what the interest rate presumption is on debt. Mr. Breeden responded that it is 5 percent throughout the time period.

Mr. Boyd asked what the projected revenues are to keep the number at 7 percent.

Ms. White and Mr. Breeden replied that growth is projected at 7 percent to keep pace with the CIP, adding that the amount going into the fund can change based on revenue.

Mr. Bowerman commented that if the county knows up front what dollars would be allocated for borrowing from both local government and schools that allows them to make those decisions up front before plans for building move forward.

Mr. Boyd agreed, adding that there is flexibility built in if there are needs such as new schools or mandated programs that need to be implemented.

Ms. White reported that there are six entities that review and make recommendations for capital needs – a Long Range Planning Committee that makes recommendations to the School Board; the school board then approves the CIP requests that get submitted to the CIP technical review committee, who in turn work to develop a recommendation that goes to the County Executive, who then sends it to the Planning Commission for their input, and then onto the Board of Supervisors for approval. She noted that one of the problems with the process right now is there are no guidelines for the Long Range Planning Commission, and they have no context as to what available revenues might be or what kind of fiscal constraints there may be on projects.

Ms. White added that the Technical Review Committee members also review the School Board budget, but many of the members do not have the expertise to look at the projects and say what the school really needs and are hesitant to make recommendations about already-approved projects. She added that the budget review timeframe doesn't always allow decisions to be made about what fits into revenues to come back to the School Board and say here's what the revenues are for project prioritization.

Ms. White then summarized the recommendations.

Mr. Rooker stated that since the cost of a new high school would be \$80 million, they would need to be frugal to anticipate that.

Board members commented that the enrollment is projected to be level even five years out.

Ms. Thomas cautioned that beyond the five-year period there may be projects such as the high school, possibly, that would significantly impact the total CIP budget.

Mr. Rooker noted that the school would double outstanding debt, and that cannot be forgotten.

Ms. McKeel said that the discussions of the new high school would take place in 2010, but not actual groundbreaking.

Mr. Wheeler stated that it would be wise to start looking at land and a site for the new school.

Mr. Rooker asked if a school site would be 50 acres or so. Mr. Reaser said that because it would be a site for a middle and high school, 100 acres would be needed.

Mr. Rooker commented that it is unlikely to have a development that is going to proffer an entire school site, so it would be wise to look at that possible location now.

Ms. Thomas said that proffers are not free, and usually take the place of something else such as roads, contributions to affordable housing, etc.

Ms. Mouly suggested using language that states "would need to begin planning."

Mr. Rooker asked if there were any comments about the recommendations presented.

Mr. Boyd stated that he was surprised because he thought this meeting would be discussing the 60/40 split.

Mr. Rooker responded that that meeting would take place at a later time, as both Boards have agreed to meet jointly on both issues.

Mr. Wyant emphasized the importance of getting the right people on the committees involved in the process.

Ms. McKeel noted that this doesn't mention the composition of the committees, and it would be important to her to have balanced representation on the committees.

Mr. Boyd stated that he wants to make sure that there is enough time for the Board to review recommendations from the committees.

Mr. Rooker said that Mr. Tucker and Dr. Castner need to discuss the makeup of the committees and bring it back to the Boards at some point.

Ms. McKeel commented that the report presented only alludes to the shift from rural to urban, and the public may not realize how the county got to where it is now. She described this as a "missed opportunity," and suggested that there be some type of explanation or companion document for the report presented here.

Mr. Rooker noted that there is some detail included in the long-range plan, but agreed that perhaps some "exhibits" from the CIP discussion could be included as attachments.

Ms. McKeel added that just a paragraph of rationale would have made a big difference, because this is what's on the web and what they pick up.

Mr. Tucker commented that the media is usually in attendance, as they are today. He said that staff is aware of it for so long, that they assume others are aware of it also.

Mr. Wyant said that there was a Board discussion about public relations for the county's efforts.

Ms. White said that there has been discussion of doing this as the county becomes more organized.

Mr. Foley noted that there are several work sessions scheduled for the next few months.

Ms. Friedman added that it would be helpful to have the public understand that this is not so much a school spending issue, but a countywide issue.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that there has been a leveling off of enrollment in Albemarle at a time when the county is facing increasing state and federal mandates for the things that local government has to pick up, such as court building expansion and stormwater management. She added that other high-growth communities such as Loudoun are having to build new schools each year in addition to other demands.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that there must be a way to present the rationale of why the county makes spending decisions – both on the school and the local government sides.

Mr. Wheeler added that growth does not pay for itself, adding that fiscal impact studies show that every residential development shows the county losing money.

Mr. Boyd disagreed, stating that most of those projects pay for themselves and then some. He acknowledged that residential developments are costly, but added that the Neighborhood Model – which blends commercial and residential – helps with that fiscal impact.

Mr. Rooker stated that most fiscal models indicate that some commercial must be built to offset the cost of residential.

Mr. Wheeler asked for comments on transportation issues in the county.

Mr. Rooker replied that there are community funding options working through the MPO to make specific funding recommendations to city and county governments, but the state has cut back its funding for transportation to localities, losing \$1 million over four years while project costs have almost doubled. He added that transportation projects are prioritized similarly to CIP projects based upon what funding is expected from the state. Mr. Rooker noted that the inflation factor alone for the Meadow Creek Parkway project is close to two-thirds of the area's secondary road fund allocations. There's an incentive to get it going rather than sit there and watch inflation move and put [costs] out of sight.

Mr. Rooker added that the county is now allocating funds for the first time in the CIP for transportation, and the state's revenue-sharing is now \$1 million as they are trying to encourage localities to fund local projects. We're all going to have to live within the budgets that we have and make prioritization choices based upon what we deem as being most important to the county. He said that the existing committees have performed an important function, but their involvement will be even more important as the new CIP structure moves forward.

Mr. Boyd commented that the CIP oversight committee is going to be very important.

Mr. Koleszar said that this is an improvement in the process, but both Boards should provide a common front to present the joint needs to constituents in the county. He added that the fluctuation in capital projects is huge based on what's happening in construction, noting that if there is a recession we can save a lot of money because companies will need the work. Mr. Koleszar stated that the county should perhaps take advantage of those times and have CIP projects done during recession.

Ms. McKeel responded that the University of Virginia kind of hurts us there, because they are always having construction.

Mr. Koleszar cited Monticello High School as an example of a project that cost more than it should have because it was done during a building boom.

Mr. Bowerman said that there are priorities that have to be met, regardless of the timing.

Mr. Rooker stated that if there are people on the CIP committee that have that kind of business acumen, they can bring forward those recommendations.

Mr. Koleszar said that that should be one of the criteria in the CIP process, to look at market conditions.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Board of Supervisors and School Board would determine who would be on the committee.

Mr. Rooker said that recommendations would be made, and the Boards would agree as to the makeup of that committee.

Motion was offered by Mr. Boyd, **seconded** by Mr. Wyant, to approve the following recommendations as requested by staff: (1) agreed to the debt targets as presented; (2) agreed that long term planning for a new high school would need to begin no later than 2010; (3) directed the Long Range Planning Committee to build their project request within the debt targets; (4) directed the County Executive to form a CIP Staff Review Team; (5) and directed the County Executive to form a CIP Oversight Committee. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant and Mr. Bowerman.
NAYS: None.

Mr. Walker asked about including a paragraph as to why the change is occurring for inclusion on the county's website. Staff agreed to do so.

Ms. McKeel then offered **motion, seconded** by Mr. Wheeler, to approve the recommendations with a change to "request" the County Executive. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Friedman, Mr. Koleszar, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Mouly, Mr. Walker and Mr. Wheeler.
ABSENT: Ms. Moynihan.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 3. Update on Lane Auditorium Renovations.

Mr. Tucker summarized the executive summary which was forwarded to Board members. Staff received guidance from the Board of Supervisors in the fall of 2004 to proceed with a design that retains the large venue capacity, is sensitive to the original character, and provides a means of conversion into a Board Room capable of supporting smaller audience sizes in an appropriate atmosphere. A design team was assembled to work with Moseley Architects in this effort: Lee Catlin (Community Relations Manager), Ella Carey (Clerk, Board of Supervisors), Jennifer Johnston (Clerk, School Board), Sharon Taylor (Clerk, Planning Commission), Ana Kilmer (Clerk, BZA), Mike Brown (Information Technology) and Ron Lilley (Project Manager). Their progress to date has resulted in the product that is included in this package.

A plan, elevations, and an Audio/Visual (A/V) System Description are attached to this executive summary for your review. The plan and elevations show the dais configuration, A/V components (such as cameras and podium positions), and support spaces. Highlights include:

Dais: The modular dais as will rest on a platform that is approximately the same height as currently exists. Ramps will allow for handicapped access. The dais will be moveable for storage against the stage when desired. Each position on the dais will have a flat screen monitor and a fixed microphone. Monitors will show the presentation that is projected on to the large overhead screen, so that those seated at the dais will not have to turn their heads.

A/V features: The audience will view material projected from the rear on a large overhead screen. The screen will be approximately the same size as the existing screen. The A/V equipment will allow for a conventional presentation. In addition, cameras will be positioned to capture large format drawings or scale models and put them on the screen as well. The A/V systems will allow for the presentation to be carried on the overhead screen, dais monitors, associated conference room monitor, and meeting room 235 monitor. There will be three presentation points: the main podium in front of the dais (adjustable so that it can face the dais or the audience), a point to the left of the dais where a podium can be set, and a similar point to the right.

Support spaces: An associated conference room is shown (off stage left) in conjunction with a small restroom and kitchenette.

Staff presents this information for discussion and seeks guidance in moving forward to a final design as quickly as is practical.

Mr. Jay Mohr, representing Mosely Architects, addressed the Board. He reported that they had looked at a concept of eliminating the center entrance to the auditorium and continue use of the side entrances, partitioning off the seats in the rear to create a cross-aisle. Mr. Mohr said that the seats under the balcony would be sectioned off with folding partitions, so that just the seats in the front of the auditorium would be available for the routine Board meetings. He added that there would be a platform and desks for the Board, and the stage would remain free for other functions. Mr. Mohr said that the balcony would remain, and the folding partitions would open to allow for up to 500 seats for performances, lectures, etc.

Mr. Mohr presented three-dimensional sketches of what it would look like to close the balcony off with a curtain. He explained that there are 510 seats in the entire room, with 200 of those always available, and 120 under the balcony with 190 in the balcony.

Mr. Boyd asked how many seats are in the current room. Mr. Tucker replied that there are 60, with an additional 25 available.

Mr. Mohr noted that staff, including Board clerks and Lee Catlin, have provided input on the new plan. He mentioned that the Board seats would be in a semi-circle design with lecterns positioned for speakers, adding that there would be a conference room for 12 for executive sessions. Mr. Mohr said that there would be a room for AV equipment to manage the sound system, adding that there will be rough-in spots for video cameras should the county decide to televise or simulcast meetings.

Mr. Mohr said that there are 13 positions at the meeting table, with flat screen monitors at each seat and a screen behind the table as well to function by rear projection. He pointed out where speakers would stand, and noted that there would be a document camera to show materials being presented.

Mr. Wheeler said that the seating arrangement still seems like a huge chasm down the middle with 20 feet across. Mr. Mohr stated that there is a compromise between the type of configuration wanted and not making the horseshoe deeper in one direction.

Mr. Thomas said that if there were fewer seats, it would be tighter, and asked if there needed to be 13 seats. She added that the quality of deliberation depends on being able to look at the person you're speaking to.

Mr. Mohr responded that this is a much wider room than the current meeting room, and if it is tightened up it will turn the backs of Board members to the audience.

Mr. Walker asked what the plan is for the current space. Mr. Mohr replied that the room would remain a conference room or "green room" for people who are presenting in the large room later.

Mr. Ron Liley, Project Manager, Community Development said that there are needs in the Finance Department, and they may move in the coming years into the existing boardroom.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that there had been a long debate leading up to redoing the auditorium, recognizing that it is in disrepair. He said that it seemed to make sense to redo the boardrooms at the same time and provide options to make the room smaller and more intimate.

(Note: Mr. Boyd left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.)

Ms. McKeel commented that this is the first time the School Board has seen this.

Mr. Mohr noted that this plan evolved from a broader master plan for the building, and every space in the building is badly needed.

Mr. Bowerman said that he liked Ms. Thomas' idea of having the horseshoe arrangement, even though some backs might be to the audience, as there is something missing in the larger oval.

Mr. Rooker stated that the people who are deliberative on the Board would be in the center positions.

Ms. Thomas asked how mobile the seats are, and wondered if a tighter horseshoe could be made for smaller meetings.

Mr. Mohr said that looking at a more linear plan, such as a wide "V" with the chairman at the head parallel to the stage, there might be some flexibility.

Ms. McKeel commented that seating for 200 would make the room seem cavernous.

Mr. Mohr said that they could develop a plan to address that issue, and asked if the 13-seat arrangement should be reconsidered.

Mr. Rooker noted that the Board members would be occupying the center and would be closer together, so anything that could be done to tighten that would be helpful.

Mr. Tucker asked about the V shape mentioned.

Mr. Mohr said that if they wanted to do a narrower V, there would likely not be room for 13 seats, and perhaps not even 11.

Mr. Foley suggested looking at how other localities have configured their meeting space and bring that back to the Boards, but today he would like to get input today on what is presented.

Mr. Walker said that with the School Board meetings related to disciplinary issues, 12 or 14 seats would not be enough.

Staff assured him that the current boardroom would continue to be available for larger meetings.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that Lane is a community auditorium and that is the reason the room has remained large.

Mr. Wyant noted that the AV room location seems far from the auditorium if there are technical difficulties. Mr. Mohr replied that initially the AV system is not so complex that there will be the need for a separate control room, adding that there could be a space carved out for equipment that would be more accessible to the auditorium.

Mr. Wheeler asked about space for the news media. Mr. Mohr responded that a lot of localities are moving towards cablecast, but if that is not done then there is space under the current design for cameras to be set up.

Ms. Mouly asked if the audio provisions would enable audience members in the back row to hear speakers. Mr. Mohr replied that there would be a much more sophisticated sound system, with delay to eliminate reverberation.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the room would accommodate all county employees. Mr. Mohr responded that he knows it will hold 510 people.

Ms. Friedman asked how many seats would be taken out. Mr. Mohr responded, very few, maybe 20 to 40. Mr. Liley added that you gain some under the balcony.

Ms. Friedman asked if it had been considered to use the space under the balcony. Mr. Mohr replied that it would give the Boards about the same space they have now.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that one option considered was redoing the existing boardroom, but it was more economically beneficial in the long-term to have the auditorium room used instead.

Ms. Thomas asked if speakers would still be eye-level with the Board under the new configuration. Mr. Mohr replied that they would.

Mr. Koleszar said that the auditorium is often used when the School Board is having their meetings, and wondered if having meetings in the auditorium might actually restrict its use.

Mr. Rooker said that one option considered was having a Board building, and the county is trying to preserve as much community use as possible while keeping it within budget.

Mr. Mohr presented renderings of the future appearance of the room under the present plan, including where the Board would sit, where the partitions would be, where the screen would project, etc.

Mr. Rooker asked if the moveable wall could be moved forward. Mr. Mohr responded that that would probably not work, unless it was just moved to the lip of the balcony. If it were moved out farther, it would look improvised. Mr. Mohr emphasized that there will be work involved in reconfiguring the room, so it would not be recommended to be done constantly.

Mr. Tucker said that once the Board signs off on the general concept, Mr. Mohr and his firm will begin to work on construction drawings.

(Note: Mr. Wyant left the meeting at 5:45 p.m.)

Mr. Mohr added that they need 60 days to get bids out, and the work will take seven or eight months beyond that time.

Mr. Rooker said that it would be helpful to have the Planning Commission and School Board see the plans when they come back.

Ms. Thomas noted that the ARB uses it also. She wondered how the plan projector would work.

Mr. Rooker asked what the budget is on this right now. Mr. Foley responded that there is \$1.4 million total allocated now, including AV costs.

Ms. McKeel asked what the cost would be for additional options. Mr. Mohr said that the options discussed today would not likely affect the cost at all, as it is more of a question of configuration.

Mr. Foley stated that he will allow the Planning Commission to review the drawings presented and provide input, adding that clerks have been involved as well.

(Note: Mr. Bowerman left the meeting at 5:51 p.m.)

Mr. Walker asked if there is software available that might be used to show how people could move around in the room, to give people a higher level of comfort. Mr. Mohr replied that it is complex, but his firm does use it. It's a pretty expensive prospect to do that the way you're talking about; the cost would be about several thousand dollars.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the Board of Supervisors/School Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn. Due to the lack of a quorum the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 11/9/2005
Initials: DM