### Project Title: SPLOST IV Program Management

### Location: Sam Moss Service Ctr

### Meeting Date: 02/25/2016

### Subject: 2.25.2016 E-SPLOST Advisory Committee Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DID ATTEND</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Anthony Sanger</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BRJ</td>
<td>Billy R Jones</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Cathy Blakeney</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Charlie Rogers</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Chris Avers</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>CIP Team</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Daniel Minich</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>DWB</td>
<td>Delilah Wynn-Brown</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Dr. R. Stephen Green</td>
<td>DeKalb County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Herman Lorenz</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>JDW</td>
<td>John Wright</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>JLW</td>
<td>Joshua L. Williams</td>
<td>DeKalb County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Justine Miller</td>
<td>DeKalb County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Kimberly Mitchell</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>Narwanna El-Shabazz</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Richard Boyd</td>
<td>DeKalb County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Wyvern Budram</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YF</td>
<td>Yvonne Fowlkes</td>
<td>SPLOST Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 00001: Call to Order, Roll and Welcome Visitors

Call to order at 6:01pm by CR. (CR) We are going out of order to respect the Superintendent's schedule. We are jumping to Item 00005 on our meeting agenda and start with our exchange with the Superintendent. You will find a letter in your packet to Dr. Green with some topics for discussion with him. Please let me recognize you if you have a question to best utilize the time we have with him. Visitors: Anthony Sanger, Vice President and Business Unit Leader (PMCM) for AECOM; entire Capital Improvement Program Team

### Item 00002: Review and Approval of Meeting Agenda

(CR) Does anyone have comments on the agenda? (CB) We need to reflect that we went to Item 5 first. Otherwise, I motion to approve agenda. (CA) 2nd.

### Item 00003: Review and Approval of Minutes from January 28 Meeting

(CR) This was handled and approved via email. (CA) Motion to officially approve minutes. (NES) 2nd.

### Item 00004: Discuss Follow-Up Matters from Prior Meeting

NEW
REPORT ON SPLOST ITEMS AT FEBRUARY BOE MEETING: (CR) Everyone here has seen Herman's email regarding the meeting. (CB) Does anyone have any discussion? (CR) The only item up for discussion is concerning the auditorium at DeKalb Elementary School of the Arts. The Board rejected the recommendation because clarification is needed on the voter-approved referendum of a comprehensive school of arts versus keeping the schools separate. I have heard that the actual referendum says "art school at Avondale Middle". (JW) This is true. However, some documents have it listed as a "comprehensive" art school. Others interpret "comprehensive" as a K-12 school. My argument is that the design itself will not change whether or not the school is K-12 or K-7. However, this is the Board's decision and it has been tabled. It may not make the April Board meeting but may return in May. We are working with the Superintendent to address this item as soon as possible. (JDW) The money is already in the budget. We are just waiting for the Board's approval.

00004B STATUS OF DCSD APPROVAL OF RECENT BYLAW CHANGES: (CR) I signed off on this before the meeting. The Superintendent now has the ability to appoint members. I am going to encourage him to do that for at least two members. (JW) We met with him and talked about this. He has asked us to start the selection process similar to the process utilized to select our existing Committee members. (CR) Is there a timeline? (JW) We are publishing our call for candidates on the DCSD website on March 11th and will be accepting applications until April 8th. The Superintendent should make appointments by April and the new Committee members should be here for May's Committee meeting. This does not circumvent that the Superintendent can decide to appoint members during this process as he sees fit. (CA) Can we nominate a recommendation for appointment? (JW) You are welcome to do that if you have interested people; however, it is up to the Superintendent to appoint. (CR) If you have someone who is interested and you yourself know and recommend the person, direct the person to the website to submit an online application and provide me with the person's information.

CELL PHONE SIGNAL BOOSTERS: (CR) Any update? (JDW) CGLS is finalizing their decision on the type of signal booster that is needed. I should have an actual equipment brand during the next meeting.

STATUS OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND AVAILABILITY FOR USE AS SWING SPACES TO RELIEVE OVERCROWDING (BRIARCLIFF, INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL, AMS): (CR) We discussed this during our discussion with Dr. Green. (CB) What is
going on with buildings A and B on North Decatur Road? 
(JW) We are looking at the buildings to consider additional 
use for them. Our feasibility analysis for surplus facilities 
will help us make this decision. (YF) Are they in use now? 
(JW) No.

00004E UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATION SPREADSHEET MATTERS: NEW

00004EI RETURN OF AMOUNT BUDGETED FOR COST CODE VERSUS THE AMOUNT AWARDED ON CONTRACT AWARD LIST: (JW) We have provided this. The revised spreadsheet has the cost code budget not the total project budgets as requested. (CR) Agreed. We would like to see the cost code budget versus the amount of the contract awarded going forward. For example, the design budget should show alongside the amount awarded to the architect of the project.

00005 DISCUSSION WITH SUPERINTENDENT GREEN: (SG) NEW
Thank you for inviting me. It is a pleasure to be here. I am still learning the efforts of this Committee. We are now sitting on full accreditation status and are ready to climb other heights. Some of these topics listed on your correspondence are topics we (DeKalb County Schools) have recently discussed. I think it is my responsibility to share what I see for this Committee not only because of the E-SPLOST V effort in May 2016. We, also, have some significant overcrowding issues in Cross Keys that can cascade into other areas and can have a ripple effect in our demographic area due to a growing population. Enrollment is increasing in certain areas. How do we catch up with that? Right now, the major bubble is in our elementary schools but it will eventually roll into our middle and high schools. This issue along with others is why I don't see this Committee as an "oversight" but an "advisory" committee. I understand that many of you bring a level of expertise to the table that can advise on our work going forward. You (the Committee) help us (DCSD) see what we cannot see. You can provide a better understanding from the community's viewpoint. I see this Committee as an advisory role to advise on the work done by Joshua and his team. You have a corner of the community that you network with and speak with and I think there is a role of advocacy entailed with being a Committee member. The E-SPLOST effort coming this May is different. It is coming early - May instead of November. We won't know what the details are until the Facilities Conditional Assessment (FCA) and Educational Adequacy Assessment (EAA) studies are done and an extensive amount of community input is provided. We are asking for a vote beforehand and having the community entrust our proposal. I am counting on this Committee to help explain why this E-SPLOST effort is different. Why don't we have a specific project list before the vote? The reason is not to short change
the stakeholder process, but rather enhance it. We have
categories and areas that we know we are going to need to
devote $500 million dollars towards; however, due to the
now compressed time line, a thoughtful and transparent
stakeholder engagement process has been established to give
our community an opportunity to weigh in on the
development of a specific project list based upon our facility
and enrollment data. It is an important role of the
Committee's to reach out to corners of the community that I
cannot reach to express these efforts. I think the Committee
plays a vital role and I look forward to working with you.
(CR) I, for one, will offer that the title of the Committee has
given us some challenges. A lot of us have experienced
community members demanding actions from us because we
are the "oversight" committee. An official name change
would be helpful. (CA) "Advisory" is certainly different
from "oversight". (CR) That is why the name change should
be advertised.

OPEN TABLE DISCUSSION WITH SUPERINTENDENT: NEW

(NES) Welcome to DeKalb County. I have been here a long
time. I, personally, would like to see money spent throughout
more schools. We do work repeatedly on the same schools.
We have tremendous needs in other schools; however, we
are performing more renovations on the same schools we
already worked on. We really need to work on maintaining
work done on the schools instead of rebuilding the same
things. (SG) I agree with you and we need to spin out of that
cycle. First, let me say that the SPLOST initiative period is a
blessing. I have been Superintendent in two other states and
SPLOST does not exist in either of them. When needs
exceed choices, informative decisions have to be made.
Some decisions in previous SPLOST efforts were not
finalized with data. Decisions were made based on politics.
When multiple SPLOST referendums are finalized in this
fashion and needs are repeatedly unmet, we end up with the
issue you speak of. For SPLOST V, we are using real data to
identify where funds need to be allocated for work. But
because of previous practices, we are in a deficit. There will
be times that we will have to do patch work where we really
need to tear down and rebuild. I will fight off the politics
involved with the allocation of SPLOST funds. However, in
a situation where more money is going out than coming in,
decisions have to be made. I can promise you that politics
will not play a part in where the money goes. (CA) Scope
changing is an issue where it's not what the community
wanted in the beginning but now the scope is changing.
Another issue is renovations we spend good money on today
that are not maintained properly. We don't have a regular
way with doing business for maintenance initiatives.
AECOM is doing a great job and is doing what they are
asked to do; however, the community and stakeholders are
asking for different things and no one is stopping the
approval of changes in scope for political reasons. (SG)
That's the deficit. (CA) In the past, we had county employees
who managed maintenance. Maybe we should have a contractor manage the maintenance of our properties. As for the scope changing, I think part of the scope creep issue is that the community is not part of the decision making process in the first place nor throughout. (SG) If you have seen the schedule posted for May 2016’s vote, it is going to be a very detailed stakeholder engagement calendar. Stakeholders will have ample opportunity to engage in the process. There is, still, a big difference between having your say and having your way. It is a consensus building process. What comes out of the process may not necessarily be what you put in. Everyone has their own perspective. (BJ) We are talking about improving the relationship between stakeholders and those who make the effort to do the right thing with the CIP budget. I see this as a challenge because we say "stakeholders" but who are the stakeholders? We had a pretty sizeable capital improvement project at the school that my son was at. I served on the school's council. Within the community, there was disagreement on how money should be spent. But it's not like we had a decision to make because it was already decided. Why not get together to make sure what is delivered is what we need based on what is being provided per this budget? How do we get ahead of the back and forth in a structured format instead of saying "hey, we communicated, we invited" and we end up not having the right outcome? (SG) I invite you all to take a look at our communication plan. We have been working with an outside group who will develop a communication plan that has a structure to it. It does not exclude anyone and will not allow one particular group to take over the outcome. We are going to invite the public to weigh in on how do we use the data - not politics - to shape the issue. We will get into redistricting, maybe even reclustering.

00005B  OPEN TABLE DISCUSSION WITH SUPERINTENDENT  NEW CONTINUED: (SG) So this Committee can play a significant role in this process as a "third eye". But the results still will not be influenced by special interest groups. (CR) That is an issue that we continually struggle with. In the perfect world, you match dollars with the need. But in the situations where you have to choose because there's not enough money, one of the things we frequently come into contact with is ensuring the list and priority of the items on that list do reflect the most relevant stakeholder interest. Some of the schools have active school councils and that's a great thing. However, about 50% of the schools do not have that. I understand that you cannot make people respond. We just want to make sure that the schools who do not have as responsive a community/staff as others are still made aware of information as those that have proactive school councils. (SG) The question is after you decide this money goes to this school, then the debate comes in about what priorities are first, second, third etc. It is not necessarily about how much money is going to a school. The data will provide the demographic need for monies. Cross Keys should never have...
happened. There is a moral and ethical problem with Cross Keys. People were taken advantage of because they are not necessarily documented. About 60% of the money is expected to go to Cross Keys. (CB) I attended the session at Stone Mountain High School in regard to stakeholders expressing what they wanted. When we went on break, I made an effort to educate people on what SPLOST is for - capital improvement, not renovations. I think the first thing we need to do is after identifying stakeholders we need to educate the stakeholders. (SG) You did just that. (CB) Yes, but the issue is I went to the meeting as a community member not a Committee member. (SG) One thing I noticed is after SPLOST is voted, people want to go back and make changes. I have witnessed Joshua constantly expressing to people that referendums cannot be changed. It is a legal document. (CB) Again, I think it all goes back to education. From what I saw, it's imperative that the communication plan you have has an education piece for stakeholders. (SG) I understand where you are coming from. To me, it sometimes looks like a "Christmas wish list" where people compete to get there wants heard and executed and the loudest voice wins. (CB) I think that has been the history of DeKalb County. Once you educate the stakeholders on their wants and needs, they need to understand that needs must and will come before the wants. And those who do not understand afterward evidently do not have DeKalb County's best interest. (WB) One of the challenges I see is timeline. From the time a project is identified to the time the project starts, there are a lot of changes. The folks you start out with to educate are no longer there when the project starts. This is where the gate opens because new people decide they want something different. Maybe we should develop short term plans, mid term plans and long term plans to identify the need at the time when the project was identified. (CA) How will the language differ in May on the referendum? (JW) We developed a five paragraph joint resolution which is posted on our E-SPLOST website. The language allows us the opportunity to incorporate the FCA and FEAA reports as well as the capacity and enrollment data through 2025. This data will be used to determine where we will need new facilities, additions, renovations, and other capital improvements.
done. What will come before the Board in December 2016 is a specific list that has gone through vetting. The list will be routed from the data. (CR) When the referendum is drafted, will it say that the Board will vote on a list that will be developed after the vote? (JW) No. It does not say that a specific list will be developed. (YF) When will it be released? (JW) The referendum has been published. It is on the website. What I think would be helpful would be to provide you with a copy of the paragraph language as posted via our website. (YF) We continuously talk about increasing communication. Not everyone looks onto the website. Newspapers usually have it. (JW) I will email a link to you. (KM) Redistricting has come up in the past. Once you look at the data, what is your plan for redistricting? (SG) It is already happening. You will see part of the outcome this summer. Particularly within the elementary level. Long term discussions are going on now. Right now, we are getting ready for two 900-seat elementary schools. The secondary feasibility study will help us decide if we need new middle and high schools or if reshaping the cluster will shift demographics to other schools. (NES) When we did the school tours, I have to acknowledge that Joshua's team has been the best I've seen. (SG) In a tough situation, he is doing a great job. There is a lot more need than resources and discretion is truly needed when making decisions. (YF) Pretend that I am a community member not on the Committee. It is like you are asking me to sign a blank check. Why should I trust you? (SG) In the calendar we have, it shows that you have your say. So this time, you play a part in the outcome. You will have the opportunity to witness and hold me accountable on the outcome. We are making the effort to be as transparent as possible. The study is not done until June; however, once the study is completed, you will have the opportunity to hold me accountable. (BJ) When seeing the FCAs, you can see that the issues are real. (JW) All FCA reports will be published on March 12th. Beforehand, you never saw any data. The reason you can trust is because we are responding to the lack of transparency in previous referendums. The information is at your fingertips. (SG) We are giving you as much information as we can when we get it. When we go to meetings with other counties, they hold us up as the model at being transparent. (WB) The elephant in the room is that we are creatures of the past. There is a current distrust of DeKalb County government. Unfortunately, we are dragged into that. Unless we make the effort to educate stakeholders and let them know they are not signing blank checks, there will be a distrust. (SG) That is what the data on the referendum is providing. There is enough detail to show that it is not a blank check. It just does not have specific projects or specific lists annotated. Anyone asking for this I cannot help but question that person's agenda. (NES) My concern, like most, is Cross Keys has changed three times. There has been no true resolution that fixes the problem for a substantial period of time. The community wants to know and wants to be able
OPEN TABLE DISCUSSION WITH SUPERINTENDENT CONTINUED: (CR) In the context of the emergency measures to relieve overcrowding, do you see funds in SPLOST IV made available to add swing space with the facilities we have now? (SG) We haven't seen viable facilities yet. (JW) We brought additional anticipated revenue to the Board to have dollars go toward International Student Center to relieve overcrowding in schools and possibly build two elementary schools. Funds were not allocated to Briarcliff but it is up for discussion. (CR) We have been asked to have an attendee at meetings. What is your preference? Should we attend the work session, the board meeting or both? (SG) You are welcome to attend but I do not see if that is essential. (CA) We get notification of approved items during the meeting. (CR) The assigned Committee attendee attends the meeting. (SG) The meetings are video-taped; however, it is your call. There may be specific items where the Committee may want to be there like the December 2016 meeting. (KM) I think it means a lot and increases our moral that you have taken the time to attend. To actually be able to speak to you means a lot to us. (SG) This is the first of many. I have no problem attending meetings. It is a pleasure. JW introduces the CIP team to Dr. Green.

NEW CONTRACT AWARD LIST UPDATE: (JW) Warren Tech's contract award from last month needs explaining. The construction budget of $391,000 is accurate because the original project was slated for a roof repair. Upon review, it's been deemed that the roof requires replacement which is why the contract award is substantially higher than the budget. We missed the budget reallocation approval during the Board meeting and will submit it in April. (WB) Was it determined through a value engineering projection? (JW) Yes. We are hoping to address the roof issues with replacement rather than extensive repair. (JDW) The bidding process has brought the cost to replace roofs at a lower than the average price to replace a roof. (JW) It will, also, allow us to replace roofs even faster. (CB) I'm getting a lot of negative feedback about Hallford Stadium. I heard the turf was supposed to be replaced this football season and I don't see that happened. (JW) We have asked for additional money to fix the field because this was not part of the original project. The Board has approved it. I do not have a timeline for when this will be done. (JDW) Part of the issue with this whole project was that we have to coordinate with athletics to have all sporting events scheduled at Hallford moved to another venue. We are on track when it comes to the schedule. (AS) Is artificial turf being put in? (JDW) Yes. (AS) This will help immensely with maintenance. (CR) Any more comments? No response. (CR) What is the standard
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- Ratio between attendees and proposals received? (RB) That is difficult to determine. A lot of firms bring multiple representatives and/or their subcontractors. Also, principals and multiple DCSD staff attend.

00007  
**COLLECTION OF MEMBER FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY:** (CR) Does anyone have any? No response.

00008  
**NEW BUSINESS:**

00008A  
**NOTIFICATION OF UPCOMING COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND OTHER EVENTS:** (CR) Richard has provided a list of upcoming community meetings between now and the next Advisory meeting. Fernbank's ribbon cutting and the secondary school facilities study are pending. (CB) Can we get the ribbon cutting date in time so we can adjust our schedules? (RB) I will make a note to do that.

00008B  
**CHANGES/POSITIONING/PRIORITIZING OF SPLOST IV PROJECTS - RESPONSE TO BOE DISCUSSION FROM FEBRUARY MEETING:** (CR) We already discussed this with Dr. Green and with Herman's email. This is in regards to a clarification needed on the District's and the community's understanding of a "comprehensive" art school.

00008C  
**ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR FOR 2016 TERM:** (CR) I am going to nominate Ms. Blakeney to continue as Vice Chair. (NES) I motion the nomination. (CA) Second. Cathy Blakeney will continue to service as Vice-Chair for the E-SPLOST Advisory Committee 2016 term.

00009  
**COLLECT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MEETING AND FOLLOW-UP MATTERS FOR NEXT MEETING:** (CR) We don't have any recommendations this meeting. (JW) Just need to clarify if the Committee does semi-annual or annual reports? (CR) We generate annual reports. One is due now. Does anyone want to attempt this one? No response.

00010  
**NEXT MEETING DATE:** March 24, 2016

00011  
**ADJOURNMENT:** (NES) Motions to adjourn. (BJ) Second. NEW Meeting adjourned at 7:31pm.
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