

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

July 21, 2015  
Tuesday, 5:30 p.m.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING  
Public Hearing-Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, met in special session at 5:48 p.m., Tuesday, July 21, 2015, in the Board Room of the Kathleen C. Wright Administrative Center, 600 Southeast Third Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Present were: Donna P. Korn, Chair (absent); Dr. Rosalind Osgood, Vice Chair; Members Robin Bartleman, Heather P. Brinkworth, Abby M. Freedman (absent), Patricia Good, Laurie Rich Levinson, Ann Murray (absent), Nora Rupert (via teleconference); Robert W. Runcie, Superintendent; and J. Paul Carland, II, Esq.

**Call to Order** The call to order was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**Close Agenda** Upon motion by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, the Agenda was approved and declared closed. Mrs. Freedman, Ms. Korn, and Ms. Murray were absent. (6-0 vote)

**Purpose Of Meeting** For The School Board of Broward County, Florida to Discuss and Approve the Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan for the Five Years beginning July 1, 2015, and any other items the Board deems necessary.

1. Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan for the Five Years Beginning July 1, 2015 (Postponed)

Motion was made by acclamation of the Board to approve the Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan (TDEFP) for the Five Years beginning July 1, 2015. **This item was postponed until the August 18, 2015 Public Hearing.** Mrs. Freedman, Ms. Korn, and Ms. Murray were absent. (6-0 vote)

**Announcement by Vice Chair**

Welcoming the audience to the first public hearing for the 2015-2016 Tentative District Educational Facilities Plan (TDEFP), Dr. Osgood stated that the District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP) was to keep the public and the School Board fully informed as to whether the District was using sound policies and practices that met the needs of students and warranted public confidence in the District's operations.

Explaining the legal procedure required for this hearing, Dr. Osgood announced this was the first of two hearings for the DEFP. Individuals wishing to address the agenda item were required to sign in as a speaker. At the end of the presentation and before the Board votes, each listed speaker would be called to the floor and given three (3) minutes to address the Board. She thanked the audience for their support and attendance at this hearing. Dr. Osgood introduced the Superintendent and asked him to give a brief overview of the DEFP.

### **Statement by Superintendent**

Mr. Runcie began a brief overview of the TDEFP by stating last year the District went through an extensive process to complete a needs assessment that identified approximately \$3 billion worth of need in this District. Much of that was due to a significant reduction in the millage rate, as well as state funding. He explained the process and method focused on equity in addressing the most critical needs of all schools across this system in a very clear and transparent way. There was public discussion on the allocation of how the funds would be disbursed at each school and how the work would be prioritized. Those commitments have not changed. Continuing, Mr. Runcie said last year the District took a historic step when 74% of the voters in Broward County overwhelmingly approved an \$800 million General Obligation Bond (GOB). The bond would provide this District with funds necessary to meet the needs of its schools and the most critical life, safety, technology, and facility needs. In addition, Mr. Runcie stated the bond would offer needed investments in music, art, and athletic programs. The bond is an investment in the students' future, in the community, and in the vitality of Broward County.

Mr. Runcie further stated that two months ago, the Board approved the Amended Adopted District Educational Facilities Plan (AADEFP), which included all the GOB projects. This new DEFP does not change the funding, commitments, or prioritization of the projects. Last January, the District refinanced some existing debt and anticipated a savings of \$14 million as a result of that refinancing. Mr. Runcie informed the Board through the great work of the finance department, Benjamin Leong, Chief Financial Officer, and his staff and financial underwriters, the actual savings achieved was \$56 million. Property value increases and additional rebates the District received due to refinancing, increased the capital outlay program to \$150 million over the next five (5) years. This will refresh the maintenance vehicle fleet and student transportation buses as well. In closing, Mr. Runcie said the finance staff would give a brief presentation and then take questions from the Board.

### **Staff Presentation**

Omar Shim, Director, Capital Budget, presented a PowerPoint presentation. He informed the Board that they are required to approve the TDEFP each year prior to adopting the budget. On May 19, 2015, the Board approved a major amendment to last year's facility plan, which included the Safety, Music, Art, Athletics, Renovations, & Technology (SMART) and bond funds. The facility plan proposed today would not change the funding for the SMART program that was approved in May. For convenience, all items with a green header essentially stayed the same. A blue header was used to highlight the changes presented today.

Mr. Shim explained this plan had updates to revenue projections and savings providing approximately \$30 million per year in resources or about \$150 million over a five-year period. This new funding became available through property values higher than previously projected; federal e-Rate reimbursements for approved technology purchases; and debt refinancing. Mr. Shim stated recommendations from the Superintendent and Cabinet included projects that had a higher impact on the District's Strategic Plan that focused on safety / security, capital improvements, buses, and other high-impact capital projects. Mr. Shim reviewed a year-by-year cost summary on page five of the recommended projects and initiatives. Details for those amounts were discussed from pages 7-13 and broken down by category (Safety & Security, Academic/ Athletic Equipment, Capital Improvements, Facilities/ Capital Salaries; Portable Transition Plan, Technology Equipment, and Transportation, Vehicles & Buses).

In addition to those items, Mr. Shim referred to Addendum #4 page 275 that showed an additional 24 classrooms the City of Parkland had agreed to fund. In closing, Mr. Shim identified Appendices on page 277, in which Appendices A, B, and C were required to be in the TDEFP.

Mrs. Brinkworth indicated an apology was owed to Stranahan High School and herself as the representative for that community. A meeting was held at the school in which she was never contacted. She thanked Dr. Osgood for attending after being told no other Board Member was available. Mrs. Brinkworth felt it was disrespectful to her and the community, who were told she was on vacation and not available, when no one from the District called to see if she was available. During that meeting, things were said in relation to the ADEFP that were incorrect. Mrs. Brinkworth emphasized when staff or the Superintendent go out to meet with the community, that the facts are correct before they are presented. She questioned the Superintendent why, when asked what happened to the past ADEFP monies allocated to projects, he stated that no money was budgeted through the ADEFP. It was her understanding that it was a projection for five years but in the first year, dollars were being allocated and money was budgeted. She also felt it was disrespectful when the community asked about past promises and the Superintendent had replied there was nothing in writing, when those community members had sat through hours of meetings and looked at design plans that were drafted. Stating there was nothing in writing causes the community to lose faith and think there was loophole because nothing was in writing.

Mrs. Brinkworth expressed her frustration and wanted to ensure as the DEFP was discussed at this meeting, it was made very clear to whom the money was being given to and when it would be spent. In previous boards, it was voted on to allocate money to certain schools, including Stranahan, to fix things that were very badly broken at those schools. Those communities needed those repairs. Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know why those things did not happen and how could she know they would now be taken care of by staff. She asked for some type of reassurance when a plan is voted and presented to the state, it will be followed through.

Mr. Runcie apologized to Mrs. Brinkworth and the community if the meeting was arranged in a way where she was not informed. He was out of town on vacation with family when the meeting was set up. Although his office did not set up the meeting, he would take responsibility for it. It was his understanding notification had been sent to all the Board Members regarding the meeting. He said the process should have been handled better and he would ensure it would be going forward. Regarding the capital plan, Mr. Runcie said the DEFP is a five-year projection where funding could be at risk, as it was when the millage rates were cut. The bond is very different and that money would not be going to the state or somewhere else. The District knows it positively has those dollars and the commitments made that were memorialized in this document, would stand going forward over a number of years.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated her question was regards to commitments made in year one in past DEFPs where the projects were not delivered. The community wanted to know what happened to those projects. Mrs. Brinkworth said she would look up the specific projects while the audience is speaking to discuss later in the meeting.

Mrs. Bartleman remarked she was also contacted as to what plans were done for that school. Although the community was told plans were not drawn up, she stated they were in which a contractor was involved and she was present when it happened. Stranahan was supposed to be the first green school. Mrs. Bartleman wanted to know why that information was not relayed to the public. She said the reason they did not get the green school was because the District did not receive a bond at the time. She asked how staff gave incorrect information and where the breakdown was from the facilities end, which has now made the public distrust the District.

Mr. Runcie replied that his response was based on what he knew since coming into the District and working with the Board. There were plans and commitments made prior to him arriving to the District. He has had to look at where the District was currently with the DEFP and move forward.

Mrs. Bartleman said Stranahan was on the DEFP from last year and the year before where they had a roofing project. In addition, there was a condemned portable that was on the list previously that had been left off the current list that should be discussed later in the meeting. She asked the Superintendent to speak after the audience has spoken to rebuild that trust.

Mrs. Good was eager to hear from the audience and understood her colleague's frustration. Moving forward, there has to be better communication, especially for community meetings. In addressing what was before the Board, Mrs. Good stated there were lengthy discussions about numerous plans that were placed on a shelf that never happened. She mentioned every Board Member was in attendance when discussing the bond and which projects would be completed. There was a large amount of projects that never started and there were concerns from many Board Members about what would happen to the projects for the entire county, not just Stranahan. Some of the projects never materialized for a variety of reasons even though plans were drafted and designs were created.

Mrs. Good said there was a consensus from the Board this would be their pallet to ensure things would be completed moving forward. She understood the need for Stranahan to receive the necessary improvements and it deserves it as much as any other school in the District. She also understood and appreciated the frustration from many that felt they may have been mislead in the past, but she could only deal with what could be accomplished moving forward. She supported the need to have projects completed.

Mrs. Good said discussing what happened in the past was important so that history would not be forgotten and lessons would be learned in what to do better or differently to ensure promises made were kept. She told the Superintendent she knew he was not with the District in years past when some of the promises were made. As a group, she said to ensure what was being discussed today that they would do a better job in communicating what was trying to be accomplished with all of the schools. Her hope at the conclusion of the meeting was that everyone would have a clear understanding as to what would take place moving forward. This Board could not go back in time on what was promised. Mrs. Good spoke of her appreciation of her colleague's desire to have an explanation, reiterating that the Superintendent may not have been with the District at the time in question, and that she deserved an explanation as to why certain things did not occur, where the District was today, and where it would be moving forward.

Dr. Osgood stated she apologized at the Stranahan meeting. She knew there had been things that happened prior to the Superintendent and some of the Board Members' arrival to the District that various communities were expecting that never occurred. What was previously promised to communities did not have enough funds to deliver in a manner to be sufficient. She said it was important to admit that there were promises in the past that were not delivered. This Board was concerned about all children across the District and they would make a commitment with funds the District knew it had that were not based on the legislature. Dr. Osgood relayed she did not know how the notification process from staff worked, but because she knew several of her colleagues were out of town at this time, she made it a point to be present at the Stranahan meeting to ensure there was some representation from the Board. She was aware of the mistrust from the community but said communication had been a problem within the District before those on the dais had arrived. Dr. Osgood believed the communication had improved but still had issues with certain communities that needed to be addressed. She felt the Board was committed to ensure every school received what it needed and said it was disheartening to hear that the Board had disrespected a certain community.

Dr. Osgood commented she and her colleagues were committed to ensure all communities, populations, and ethnic groups were treated equally and each child in every school received what they deserved. The public will hold the Board accountable and the way to build public trust is to act on what was promised moving forward and recognize what happened in the past cannot be changed. In closing, Dr. Osgood stated after the discussions take place, the Board needed to come up with a plan that had dates, times, and specific actions that everyone would be able to measure moving forward and asked the audience for that opportunity.

The Vice Chair received input from the audience.

Mr. Runcie stated Stranahan and Northeast High were the two schools that motivated him to work day and night to get support from the county to get the bond because he knew the District did not have the money to do the critical work needed. He said he was familiar with the condition the schools were in. He had a stronger appreciation of the history given, promises and commitments made, projects that were put place, and plans that were developed. If he could, he would replace Stranahan with a brand new school. Unfortunately, Mr. Runcie said he and the Board could only accomplish projects with resources the District had and could only move as fast as the processes would allow. Over \$18 million was allocated from the bond funds to start the work at Stranahan. He assured everyone that he would work hard, along with the Board and his staff, to get this work started. In speaking with Derek, Messier, Chief Facilities Officer, they concluded there were some items that could be completed to improve the conditions in the school until some the major projects are started. This was a priority for him. He apologized that it got to this point and for what the community has had to go through. Mr. Runcie stated he would take a personal interest in Stranahan's work and thanked those in the audience for attending.

The Vice Chair received additional input from the audience.

Jeff Moquin, Chief of Staff assumed the seat of the Superintendent on the dais.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired how staff chose to spend the additional money and that this was the first she had heard of it.

Mr. Shim replied it was brought to the Superintendent and his Cabinet and they gave their recommendations.

Mrs. Bartleman asked if the Board had the ability to amend/modify it. She did not remember recommendations to be voted on without reviewing with the Board. Usually there were preliminary meetings and in the past have had staff meet with each district representative to discuss the capital needs. She wanted to know what happened to that process, how long before the second reading, and was staff planning to have the one-on-one meetings with each Board Member before September.

Mr. Shim responded that the plan was amended May 19, 2015, and due to the limited time between that meeting and this one, they were unable to accomplish it. The second reading would be in September and Mr. Shim stated they would meet with Board Members individually.

Mrs. Bartleman questioned why the money was moved from the facilities plan to the SMART plan, and what happened to the money that was allocated for the roofs. In addition, she asked why other projects from last year's DEFP were moved to the SMART plan.

Mr. Shim replied the SMART program was larger than the bond program; the SMART program was \$984 million and the bond was \$800 million. He stated approximately \$184 million were projects previously in the DEFP and brought into the SMART program due to their relationship with other projects in the SMART program.

Mrs. Bartleman asked why the money was not left in the DEFP and gave the example of Stranahan having an earmark of \$3.3 million before the bond that would have been additional if it were kept at Stranahan. The SMART money should have been in addition to what was promised in the DEFP.

Mr. Shim clarified from a funding perspective that the funding was not taken away. The funding was still there, it was just moved down into the SMART program. The \$184 million is beyond what the bond entails.

Mrs. Bartleman referred to Stranahan on page 224, specifically, the Building Envelope for \$5,557,000. She said if that money was there last year in DEFP, she assumed that the \$5,557,000 was in the bank. If this was true, why was it moved to the bottom in SMART money.

Mr. Shim stated it was part of the \$184 million that is in addition to the \$800 million for the bond, which equates to the \$984 million in the SMART program. Funding from the ADEFP was moved into SMART, approximately \$90+ million. The \$5.6 million from the ADEFP was underlined in blue under the SMART program.

Mr. Leong elaborated further to state the Facilities department wanted to bundle the \$5.6 million on other projects, which included fire sprinklers, fire alarms, and the roof and loggias replacement, and were underlined in blue. The money was not lost, just bundled to make the projects easier to execute.

Mrs. Bartleman asked staff to somehow explain that in the book to the public. The way it appears in the book gives the illusion that SMART program is the SMART bond.

Mr. Shim remarked that there should be clarification to indicate the bond has been bundled with some of the DEFP projects to create some of the SMART programs, which was clearly larger than the bond.

Mr. Moquin reminded Mrs. Bartleman when the process was started last year, the District did not know at the time if it would receive the bond. The Board asked staff to reflect in the DEFP the projects that would get done based on existing millage and not assuming the bond money would be available. Subsequently, they went out to the community and said if the bond was passed and infused an additional \$800 million revenue into the capital program, they indicated what work would be done. The attempt in May, when the DEFP was brought to the Board, was to recognize that people were going to look at the smaller book that was passed, and to try to show those projects were incorporated into the SMART program. As stated earlier, the SMART program included the \$800 million bond and the revenue that was available before the bond, which equals \$984 million.

Mrs. Bartleman reiterated Stranahan was promised a new school and green plans were developed but were shelved. She inquired why the projects were delayed and not started last year when funding was available.

Derek Messier, Chief Facilities Officer, responded since he joined the District, they have been trying to build a system to execute this program using limited resources effectively and efficiently. He said Stranahan was not the only school and apologized. Rushing out and spending money would only hurt schools later in the program. Mr. Messier agreed that this program had not been executed as soon as it should have been, but they were doing everything possible to move this forward the right way and would hold to the commitments that were made.

Mrs. Bartleman asked why no one had been out to fix some of the issues at Stranahan, such as the cameras, pool, and tent, and inquired if the delay was with Facilities or Physical Plant Operations (PPO). For the record, Mrs. Bartleman wanted to state that the teachers, students, and staff were amazing, and in spite of everything going on, they do amazing things at that school. In addition, she wanted to recognize that staff took care of providing the instruments for the students. Mrs. Bartleman inquired what the process was and why was it failing.

Mr. Messier replied to say the process was failing has to take into account the overall picture of their portfolio. There was \$3 billion in deferred capital maintenance. The PPO department cannot make up for that deficit. They go out every day, work very hard, and complete more than 80,000 work orders a year, but there is only so much they can do to maintain things that need to be replaced. He wanted the Board to understand they were trying to respond. In emergencies, they respond very well; however, they do not do as well with routine because there are so many emergencies to deal with everyday. Mr. Messier said that was not an excuse but the facts of where they stood. Any time a school contacts him, he personally visits the school to figure out how to resolve their issues.

Mrs. Bartleman wanted to know where staff was with the ADA ramp.

Mr. Messier responded all the projects for Stranahan were altogether. They were working to contact an Owner's representative and Stranahan is their first assignment. Another Owner's representative would be assigned to Northeast.

Mrs. Bartleman stated in December 2014, demolition of portables were approved but Stranahan portables were not included and she wanted to know why.

Mr. Messier replied he would have to research that, but he knew there were over 600 portables to be demolished that were no longer needed for class size reduction (CSR).

Mrs. Bartleman requested staff to follow-up to determine why Stranahan portables did not rise to the top to have their portables demolished and what the process was to determine which schools were placed on the list.

Mr. Messier stated it was not a process that he chose to select which portables were placed on the list to be demolished. That list was ongoing when he took over last year and they have tried to accelerate that process. There had been more portables demolished in the past 12 months than had been demolished several years before.



Mrs. Bartleman said on page 263, the City of Parkland had a deficit of \$33,439 and she wanted to know where the money was coming from to complete the playgrounds.

Mr. Messier said the school has raised money for new playgrounds. He indicated they would be partnering with them to help support the playgrounds with PPO labor.

Leslie Brown, Chief Portfolio Officer, added when they worked on the agreement with Parkland, funding was set aside to move the eight portables at Riverglades Elementary. The \$33,439 on page 263 was not a deficit but rather a recognition that the money had already been set aside for the demolition.

Mrs. Bartleman asked staff to explain that in a footnote at the bottom of the page. She also mentioned she would like to discuss their options on how to spend the additional money. Except for the sound systems, the New Projects Detail had large amounts but did not show which schools that money was for, with the exception of a few. Every school should be listed for each project to ensure every Board Member is aware which of their schools would have the work completed for that project. Mrs. Bartleman said the technical schools did not indicate if the funds were coming from Workforce or capital money. Referring to page 21, she asked why the money did not come from Workforce.

Mr. Shim replied there were some funds coming from Workforce, but he would have to verify which ones.

Mrs. Bartleman requested staff to provide what was being funded through Workforce. She did not believe the District should be using capital dollars when Workforce capital dollars could be used instead. Mrs. Bartleman referred to Coconut Creek High on page 41, and asked staff to put in writing that the air conditioning in the hallways would be included. In regards to Collins Elementary, she wanted to know why the single-point of entry was not included.

Mr. Messier said he would visit Collins to ensure the single-point of entry had been completed.

Mrs. Bartleman asked staff to verify whether the \$115,000 for Blanche Ely High's scoreboard had been paid or if those funds were available to use somewhere else. Referring to Hallandale Adult & Community Center on page 101, Mrs. Bartleman said it was supposed to be turned into a K-8 school and questioned why funds would be used in year one for a center if it was being converted to a K-8 school. There was no reflection of it in the capital budget.

Mrs. Brown replied that at the Boundary Hearing, staff was requested to continue this study. They have been working with the City of Hallandale and put a project team together with a representative from each of the departments. The decision to change any of the facilities into something new had not been approved through the Board. It would have gone through the boundary process and come back to the Board in February and March 2016, in which a decision would be made at that time.

Mr. Messier said the only overlap would be the media center and the remainder of the work is infrastructure, which was required for those facilities.

Mrs. Bartleman requested an explanation in writing as to how the two departments (Facilities and Boundary) would work together on any overlaps. She then discussed Markham Elementary (page 131) and said she did not see the roof as part of the work. She asked staff to confirm if it was part of the Replacement of Building 1. Referring to page 152 for Northeast High, Mrs. Bartleman inquired about the drainage for flooding.

Mr. Messier responded they have been addressing site drainage as part of their working projects. He stated they have mitigated some of the issues at Northeast, but the remaining issues would be addressed with the roof project.

Referring to page 186 for Plantation High, Mrs. Bartleman questioned what was happening with the canopy.

Mr. Messier said the canopy was being redesigned to meet the capacity needs of the school.

Mrs. Bartleman remarked when the Board has their discussion on the additional money, she would like to discuss Plantation High, as well as the projects at Stranahan. In closing, she wanted to ensure the track resurfacing at Stranahan would be completed and requested staff to provide a rationale as to how they prioritized the list of portables to be demolished.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to page five and asked why \$30 million was not available in year one. She believed the 2015-2016/ year one was short-changed.

Mr. Shim responded that 2014-15, along with year one, totaled \$34 million for 2015-16.

Mr. Leon added that only \$14 million was new money realized for 2015-2016. Due to the refinancing, approximately \$30 million in new funding had been projected for years two through five.

Mrs. Brinkworth mentioned she received a list of projects from staff showing where the \$20 million came from for the carryover and asked staff to forward that information to all Board Members as well. Mrs. Brinkworth questioned the \$3.4 million carryover dollars for Technology Equipment on page five, and to her colleague's point, did not show which schools it was being used for or the priority. She did not feel comfortable setting money aside when no one knew where those commitments were being made at the schools. The Board worked very hard to be fair and equitable in those decisions and it should have been made very clear by staff where those dollars would be spent. She opined it was disrespectful not to have given the Board the opportunity to review how or where to spend the new additional money prior to this meeting.

Referring to page nine, Mrs. Brinkworth inquired how the \$8 million carryover allocated to Capital Improvements performed by PPO would be prioritized and whether the intention of those dollars would be used for emergency work.

Mr. Messier replied yes, the money would be used in response from work order requests and was not a priority for schools. The funds were for emergency replacements or work orders that came up.

Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know how those emergencies receive a priority over other schools with the same issues and what was the length of time to respond to the work.

Mr. Messier responded that because they have more emergencies than people to take care of them, they prioritize based on the amount of space impacted. He said the length of time depends on how quickly they were able to obtain parts to make the appropriate repairs. It was not a lack of being responsive, but rather getting the appropriate parts to make the changes. In some cases, they had to put a bandage on the work to keep it running when an entire system could not be replaced. In years past, money was budgeted for PPO to either purchase the equipment and perform the work, or it was for materials from a vendor to install.

Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to ensure the schools with the highest priority need would receive the attention they need and deserve. Continuing on page nine, she asked if the Stadium Sound Systems had lightning alarms included in the funding.

Mr. Messier stated he would have to defer to Damian Huttenhoff, Director, Athletics & Student Activities, on that scope of work as it was requested from his department.

Mrs. Brown added she would ensure the Board received a list of schools that have a stadium with a lightning alarm system.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired about the priority for the Turf Resurfacing-High Schools.

Mrs. Brown replied the turf resurfacing has been done by doing an inspection at the schools, which they have been trying to get back on a cycle. When the District had a decrease in capital funding, that process was eliminated. She stated their intent is to get the schools back on a cycle to ensure the turfs are safe and the inspections are done on an annual basis. The schools identified with needs would be put on the priority list.

Mrs. Brinkworth said part of the conversation at the community meeting for Stranahan, was the turf replacement and track resurfacing and whether the two could be completed at the same time in an effort to give their facility something for the students.

Mr. Messier responded the field at Stranahan was prioritized with the first group of two schools a year and will try to package the two schools. Typically PPO staff is used to cut the turf projects and they will coordinate PPO staff with outside vendor that provides the track resurfacing.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated she had many questions as to how the decisions were made in regards to the additional new money. Referring to page 261, she asked if the items underlined in blue were additional dollars that were not approved by the Board.

Mr. Shim replied no, the Board approved those on May 19, 2015.

Referring to page 280 regarding the portables, Mrs. Brinkworth cited there were portables that were condemned sitting on properties that pose a health hazard. She asked that staff look at the portables at Stranahan and their proximity to where students eat their lunch. She believed there were portables on the list that were not as high a priority as other schools. In addition, the uninhabitable portables were a health risk and she wanted to know how staff would ensure they were on the list as unsatisfactory.

Mr. Messier said they would go back and examine the portables and would be happy to demolish the condemned portables as soon as possible.

Mrs. Brown added that they work with the building inspector, receive the data from them, and run it through their class size office to align the data. If something was missed at Stranahan, someone would be sent to the school tomorrow.

Mrs. Brinkworth shared her dissatisfaction that there were portables that were missed in the process. She wanted to know if the building department was recommended to visit the portables at Stranahan by whoever the outside consultant was at that time of the assessment.

Pertaining to Level of Service (LOS), Mrs. Brinkworth asked why the asterisk only existed in some schools listed on page 289. Monarch High, listed at the bottom, was highlighted with 2s across the page but there is no asterisk until 2019-20, while Bayview Elementary had 2s as well, but they had an asterisk starting in 2017-18.

Mrs. Brown replied the reason Monarch did not have an asterisk until 2019-20 was because relocatables could be used on their campus until the last year out. Bayview did not have relocatables and was over its permanent capacity, thus the reason why their numbers would have to be reviewed in 2017-18.

In closing, Mrs. Brinkworth requested staff to provide the Board amounts for the Magnet programs listed on page 295.

Mrs. Rich Levinson addressed the \$154 million on page five. She asked if the Taxable Property Value was projected for the other years and how was it projected.

Mr. Leong responded yes they adjust it with millage. They also stay on the conservative side when projecting.

Mr. Shim added that they rely on the property appraiser information as it comes in June and July. The information the District had was accurate to what the appraiser had. In outer years, they utilized the state's data for the District. Mr. Shim said they go a step further in making a comparison with Miami-Dade and Palm Beach to come up with a tri-county average.

Mrs. Rich Levinson expressed her concern that the additional money was never brought to a workshop to be discussed with the Board and felt one was necessary. She agreed with her colleague that it was disrespectful to not bring it to the Board first and did not feel this was the forum to discuss it.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated the Board had spent hours and hours discussing the SMART program. Mostly everyone on the Board was new since 2010, so this Board can only look at what is currently before them and not what was promised in the past. The money for the bond will not be shifted and each school will receive its designated amount. Mrs. Rich Levinson asked staff if the timing scheduled could be tightened around the bundling of what needs to be completed at Stranahan.

Mr. Messier replied he knew the schedule presented was not satisfactory to anyone, including himself, however, it was a realistic schedule that could be achieved. In the year he had been with the District, he tried to set reasonable expectations and live up to them. He would love to tell everyone the work would be completed by next summer, but it was not going to happen that fast. The work would be started next summer in 2016. It is a major project and would not be completed until the following year. Mr. Messier said what he presented last week in terms of a timeline, was that they would hold a project charter meeting in August. That would be the first step where they meet with the stakeholders of the school and project, to identify the scopes and set clear expectations as to what the project would achieve. From August to November they would create the schematic design and develop design build Request for Proposal (RFP) and then procure it throughout the bid, which was a three-month process. The next step would be to award the contract in February of 2016 and go through design and permitting February through June. The construction would then begin. It was a very aggressive schedule and would not create any slack.

In light of that information, Mrs. Rich Levinson inquired if there were other things, such as the track, that could be pulled from the bundling and taken care of sooner and would not affect the integrity of the total project.

Mr. Messier responded that taking pieces out would end up taking more time because he would need more people to manage those smaller pieces. Putting everything together would be the most time-effective way to ensure the work was completed. He said they would be performing work on the condition of the schools before the major work is started.

Mrs. Rich Levinson emphasized that the air conditioning was a major problem that needed to be addressed beforehand; it was not something that could wait two years.

Mr. Messier stated the system needed major replacements and could not be completed immediately; however, for schools with serious air conditioning problems, he had people tasked to keep a close watch on them daily. They were trying to use their resources as effectively as possible and still keep the schools operating in a safe manner. He said he would look into the \$25,000 for heat and if it was only for a boilerplate, it could be handled by a purchase order.

Mrs. Rich Levinson mentioned there were a lot of minor things that she thought could be addressed sooner such as the seating for football games, and should consider shifting several of the work orders to complete some of the minor items. She asked staff to look into it to see if that was something that could be accomplished.

Regarding the condemned portable at Stranahan, Mrs. Rich Levinson said the cost to remove/ demolish it was only \$6,000 and it should be done right away. She concurred with her colleague to receive a breakdown of the dollars for Magnet schools. To address a statement from the audience, Mrs. Rich Levinson responded that Bayview Elementary was not the only elementary school that would not be meeting LOS; there would be other elementary schools not meeting LOS and she wanted to ensure that was clarified. Mrs. Rich Levinson emphasized that any mold issues could not wait two years and needed to be taken care of immediately. She asked staff what the status was regarding the mold.

Mr. Messier responded whenever they have an Indoor Quality Complaint (IAQ) it is not taken lightly. An independent consultant comes to the school to do the testing. Any remediation required is then performed. In the plan before the Board, there was money allocated for that service. There was an environmental team that managed it. Currently, they do not have any complaints but they have a team that goes into the schools pro-actively to assess every building in the school.

Mrs. Brinkworth requested staff to find out the last time when someone was at Stranahan to inspect it.

On page 280, pertaining to the Portable Transition Plan, Mrs. Rich Levinson questioned why there was a carryover of \$532,984 from 2013-2015 and what was being done in the demolition for portables that were approved in the last two years. In addition, she asked why the 2013-14 portables had not been demolished.

Mrs. Brown replied when the items come to the Board there were several steps that had to be taken to get relocatables approved by the state for demolition and is an annual process. The portables for 2013-14 were in the queue to be demolished by PPO. She works with Facilities to ensure all the relocatables are demolished at that one school.

Mr. Messier stated there was only one crew that handled nothing but demolition. If there were additional funding they could hire outside contractors, but it would increase the cost per unit.

Mrs. Rich Levinson suggested hiring another crew, whether it was from the outside or within, which ever was more cost efficient, but the portables needed to be removed. In closing, she reiterated there needed to be a discussion regarding the new money and it should have been discussed with the Board first.

Mrs. Good recalled Mr. Messier stating that should the bond pass, the schedule would need to be revisited and he never mislead the Board. She did not want anyone else to be mislead in thinking that changes would not occur when it was clearly stated otherwise. Moving forward, if there were additional dollars available, the Board needs to know what the priorities are and how to allocate those dollars. She concurred with her colleagues that those discussions should have taken place prior at a workshop and one should take place as soon as possible. While Stranahan is a priority school, there are other schools in the District that are a priority as well.

Mrs. Good felt the portable issue needed to be handled on a more priority-need basis. Safety, air quality, and the proximity to students should be a key component in the decision on how those portables are being handled. Mrs. Good questioned whether or not the Operation Specialist III on page 10 was funded out of capital.

Mrs. Brown replied all positions in Facilities Management & Real Estate were funded out of capital. That particular position was a technical position, but not a charted position.

Mrs. Good referred to the Revised Comprehensive Music Equipment on pages 266-274, and inquired how the years were selected for music equipment at the various schools.

Daryl Diamond, Director, Innovative Learning & Arts, responded it was a five-year plan that was reduced to three years and all of the schools were moved up; no schools were pushed back. There would be three phases the instruments would be delivered.

Mrs. Good remarked she did not see that in the book. Funding was being allocated for five years. Although all schools deserved to have had their music equipment yesterday, there were schools, such as high schools that are competitive, that were viewed to receive their equipment in the later years. She requested a rationale as to how the dollars were being allocated and how the priorities were determined.

Daniel Gohl, Chief Academics Officer, added the priority decisions were: equity of access, condition of current equipment, and whether or not there was sufficient equipment to allow schools to participate in a rich music construction program.

Mrs. Good shared that Miramar High had an amazing band program, which had been a reason why students have chosen to go to Miramar, however, their band equipment was falling apart. She did not understand having a school with a program so vital, listed in the outer years. There needs to be an understanding some of the programs that are trying to function in some of the schools already, have not had musical replacement in years and are in dire need of it. The way it was displayed, she had concerns and needed to understand it to be able to support it moving forward, but as of now she was not supporting it.

Mrs. Rich Levinson requested staff to include in their rationale, the music repairs on page eight as to what it would be used for and how it was projected.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated the TDEFP book they were reviewing was for 2015-16 and the music equipment replacement chart started with 2014-15. She wanted to know if the dots in 2014-15 would be moved to the 2015-16 year since that has not yet occurred. The book should be updated to reflect everything accurately.

Mr. Leong clarified the 2014-15 year was over; however, they showed it in the book so the Board knew what the prior funding was for any category. Since the year is already over, the carryover would be brought forward into this year.

Mrs. Good concurred regarding the portables. Referring to pages 7-13, Mrs. Good concurred with what her colleague stated and felt it was critical that they receive additional information to understand how those dollars were being utilized. In closing, she reiterated the importance of having the workshop to discuss how the additional dollars would be utilized.

Mrs. Levinson referred to page 13 on transportation and stated she had an issue with over 47% of the new money being allotted for that category. When the workshop is scheduled, it would need to be discussed as a Board. She would like to know what the return on investment would be for this category, based on the listed items being completed.

Dr. Osgood asked where Plantation High (page 186) stood in regards to the canopy and when staff anticipated the project to be completed.

Mr. Messier replied they were working under the assumption of a specific location and size for the canopy within that budget number. As they met with the school staff to determine what the school needed, they realized what they thought they needed was insufficient and the school would need a larger canopy to accommodate their student population. Due to this change, the canopy would be able to go in the location originally planned and still have the space underneath that was required. A budget increase had been made and they were following through to design it to meet the school's needs. Mr. Messier will get back to the Board on a specific time schedule.

Dr. Osgood concurred with comments regarding the music instruments. Those issues are important to students as well. In reference to page 280, she did not see Bair Middle on the list and knew there was a portable issue at that school. She would like follow-up on Bair and where it stood on the priority list. She would also like to know where all the other portables, regardless if they made the list or not. Dr. Osgood agreed with her colleagues to receive the dollar amounts for the Magnet programs. Referring to Stranahan, she wanted to ensure students were included in the discussions and meeting. At the community meeting, the pool was discussed and the timeframe for completion was given as November 2015. Dr. Osgood wanted to ensure the Public Information Office (PIO) did a great job in celebrating and communicating that delivery. She would like to plan other deliverables with a date of completion, and engage the community to show the District is delivering on those projects. The issue of bathrooms came up at the meeting in which staff said would be an easy fix, so she would like to have before and after pictures taken, report it to the community, and post it online. Dr. Osgood inquired what the solution was for the small cafeteria and the tent with holes in it.

Mr. Messier responded there would not be any new cafeterias in the SMART program currently, but they were working with schools to ensure whatever they had was functional. For Stranahan specifically, the tent was not worth patching and would be more cost-effective to replace. They received a quote on the replacement and should have it completed before the start of school.



Dr. Osgood questioned the process regarding the mold. She understood there were no open complaints for the mold, but she would like it rechecked. In addition, she would like to see something in writing that states Stranahan would be safe to open for school for students, teachers, and staff. She told Mr. Messier if there were situations where he needed additional help, to bring it to the attention of the Superintendent and Board so decisions could be made to change get the human resources in place that were needed. Finally, she agreed with her colleagues and would like the opportunity to prioritize what projects should be completed with the new money.

Mrs. Good spoke about the outside canopies, stating some schools do not have them and others have the canopy but are in disarray, and inquired if there was a true assessment by school site.

Mr. Messier replied he did not have an assessment of the temporary canopies, but did have an assessment on the permanent canopies.

Mrs. Good remarked if the Board had an idea how many temporary canopies needed to be replaced and the costs involved, it might be possible to have all replaced at one time. She thought it should be a conversation to take place at some point.

Mr. Messier stated they are not always able to buy or add new items, but they do try to fix what can be fixed.

Mrs. Rupert commended her colleagues for their comments. She concurred regarding the additional funding and looked forward to having that discussion with her colleagues. She also stated she would like to see a plan come forward with the Superintendent that provided funding for Mr. Messier to hire additional workers to the organizational chart or outsource, which ever the Superintendent thought would be best to get the job done. In addition, Mrs. Rupert remarked that many projects were behind schedule in the URS plan and would like further discussion on that as well.

Mrs. Brinkworth acknowledged staff would provide the Board with information on the \$20 million in carryover and wanted to ensure she understood correctly that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recovered funds that were placed in long-term reserves were included in that amount. She felt it was a conversation that needed to take place once the Board Members received that information.

Mr. Moquin said the Superintendent expressed the sense of urgency with Stranahan. The conversations from the community meeting started about expediting whatever work there was that could be done, while maintaining the integrity of the program and the commitments made. He did not want to prolong, nor felt there was a need for him to reinforce the wisdom of not amending the work that was part of the SMART program. Mr. Moquin agreed it was a thoughtful request of the Board to have a conversation about new monies. There were numerous people that asked about the "M" and the "A." Staff committed that they would use a lot of the existing or new millage revenue streams as an opportunity to make investments in those areas where it was not appropriate to use bond money and amortize those investments over an extended period of time.

Mr. Moquin stated if the Board looked at the recommendation before them, they would see it tried to uphold some of that, such as the surveillance cameras, the music, and athletics. The recommendation tries to make investments in other non-facility capital areas, where they have gone for years without the appropriate capital funds for those needs. To the extent that the Board requested a conversation on re-prioritizing some of that back into facility needs, he felt it was appropriate. He would encourage the Board to use the same discipline with the criteria of a base-model used to prioritize all and not try to go through to dedicate that money to certain projects. Having been in the District for many years, this was not an unfamiliar meeting for him. He has sat in many meetings in various capacities and he knew the community did not want to hear the reason they were there today was because of mistakes of the past, but unfortunately it was true.

Mr. Moquin had seen the organization make commitments to address short-term problems that only led to bigger problems. He did not want to see the District make those same mistakes. He stated when Mr. Runcie started with the District and began discussing the capital process and capital budget with the Board, it was a function of previous Boards' priorities that were not necessarily criteria-based. There were \$1.8 billion worth of cuts that were not done very thoughtfully. What was left were projects that did not make any sense. As a result of that, a very thoughtful criteria-based model was developed to try to prioritize \$3 billion worth of need and with the bond, \$1 million worth of revenue.

Mr. Moquin spoke on the conversation to re-prioritize some of the new money to further adjust facility needs and he suggested doing it in the same fashion it had been done in the past. To move the District forward, he respectfully requested a ten-minute recess to allow him an opportunity to meet with Mr. Carland, Mr. Leong, Mr. Shim and their team, along with Mr. Messier, to discuss how to accomplish three things: 1) how to move forward with the item before the Board today, 2) how to provide the opportunity to have more dialog on this new money through a workshop process or otherwise, and 3) how to accomplish both of those by honoring their commitment to have an approved budget and meeting statutory requirements.

A brief recess was taken.

Following the recess, Mr. Moquin thanked everyone for giving him the opportunity to meet with staff. He said the outside deadline to approve the District's final budget was September 16, 2015. Currently there was a hearing scheduled on September 8, 2015 to approve the final DEFP. After speaking with staff, they believed they could hold those dates without issue and asked the Board to defer the item before them to schedule another tentative hearing on August 18, 2015, following the Regular School Board Meeting. In the interim, recognizing the deadlines for posting, the week of August 4, 2015, they would schedule a workshop. A Regular School Board Meeting was scheduled on August 4<sup>th</sup>, so they were suggesting the workshop be held on either on August 5<sup>th</sup> or August 6<sup>th</sup> a workshop to discuss the DEFP and would bring the additional information requested this evening as part of that discussion.

After discussion from the Board on possible dates for the workshop, Mr. Moquin said he would poll the Board Members to determine which day would be the best day for everyone, including the Superintendent, to attend the workshop. During the discussion, Mr. Moquin was advised the Superintendent would not be available on August 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> and he then suggested the possible dates of July 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup>.

The Vice Chair asked for a motion to Postpone this item.

Motion to Postpone (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to postpone the District Educational Facilities Plan to an August 18, 2015 Public Hearing, immediately following the Regular School Board Meeting. Mrs. Freedman, Ms. Korn, and Ms. Murray were absent. (6-0 vote)

Adjournment This meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

/dvn