



MEETING SUMMARY

Ad Hoc Joint City-Schools Facility Investment Task Force

Capital Planning & Implementation Subcommittee

Tuesday, August 29, 2017 | 7:00 – 8:30 pm

City Hall – Chet & Sabra Avery Conference Room

1 Task Force Members Present

- Elliott Branch, Chair
- Marshall Cook
- Eric Wagner

2 COA and ACPS Project Staff

- Jeremy McPike, Director, Department of General Services
- Morgan Routt, Director, Office of Management and Budget
- Dr. Lois Berlin, Superintendent, Alexandria City Public Schools
- Richard Jackson, COO, Alexandria City Public Schools
- Carrie Beach, Division Chief, Neighborhood Planning and Community Development
- Katherine Carraway, Urban Planner, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Arthur Wicks, Budget/Management Analyst, Office of Management and Budget
- Mike Herbstman, Chief Financial Officer, Alexandria City Public Schools
- Erika Gulick, Facilities Planner / GIS Specialist, Alexandria City Public Schools
- Jack Browand, Division Chief, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

3 Consultants

- Beth Penfield, Brailsford and Dunlavey
- Kayla Anthony, Brailsford and Dunlavey

4 Community Comment Period

- One community member submitted written comments to the subcommittee. No verbal comments were given.

5 Review of Meeting Agenda and Objectives

- Elliott Branch, Chair, welcomed subcommittee members and made introductory remarks. Mr. Branch restated that the goal of the entire Joint Task Force is to prioritize the identified CIP projects and ensure that a process is defined to execute the funds as efficiently and effectively as possible.

6 Discuss and Confirm Subcommittee Objectives

- Subcommittee members defined their vision of success at the end of the process.
 - Mr. Wagner defined success as recommending a process for the City and ACPS that provides consistency and coherence in capital planning. and that provides a better framework for future decision making. He also would like to ensure there is more discipline in determining how projects get onto the CIP list for consideration and for their the execution.
 - Mr. Cook defined success as establishing a capital improvement process that works for all stakeholders with long-term thinking beyond 3-5 year segments.
 - Mr. Branch defined success as outlining a coherent process for the City that is traceable from planning to design to execution and all stages in between. Projects need to be delivered on schedule within budget, and scope, while also providing the proper level of benefits to residents. Additionally, he flexibility should be built-in so that City officials and project staff have the ability to change course when projects are not providing the intended benefits. Mr. Branch stated that he believes the Subcommittee has an obligation to follow priorities set by City Council and elected bodies.
- Subcommittee members agreed that decisions should be made with regard to the long-term, defined as 30-50 years.
 - Mr. Branch requested that analysis of project operations be considered as part of the CIP process and that the Subcommittee may be able to evolve the operations analysis tool currently used by the Office of Budget and Management.

7 Capital Project Planning & Implementation Best Practices

- Ms. Penfield, facilitated discussion on best practices in capital project planning and aligned vernacular within the field.
- City and ACPS staff clarified their respective CIP processes including interaction between the School Board and City
- Mr. Routt, explained the roles of the City's Peer Technical Review Committee and the CIP Steering Committee. Mr. Routt answered specific questions about their roles and process as raised by Subcommittee members.
- Subcommittee members indicated that they will define stakeholders in the CIP process from the resource allocation phase through project identification. These stakeholders may include, but are not limited to, citizens, community stakeholders, City Council, ACPS, and the City Manager.
- Mr. McPike, explained how projects are executed within the City.
- Dr. Berlin and ACPS staff described their CIP review process including how determinations are made as to whether facilities/equipment should be repaired or replaced. Ms. Gulick described some alternatives ACPS is pursuing to alleviate capacity issues.
- Subcommittee members indicated a desire to see more rigorous analysis of alternatives within the process, rather than performed on an ad hoc basis.

- Subcommittee members indicated they would like to see master plans reconciled with the projects funded in the CIP.

8 Discussion / Observations to Date on City and School Practices and Processes

- Subcommittee members discussed themes and observations regarding City and ACPS processes.
- Mr. Branch defined the project model as identification of need through the fielding of a capability by a City entity.
 - Based on discussion, the Subcommittee intends to consider the following issues during this process:
 - Identify stakeholders across the project model, as outlined above;
 - Define the role and responsibilities for the legislative and executive branches of the City;
 - Define the level of oversight necessary for prioritizing capital projects of various complexity;
 - Determine if there are ways to structure waypoints in the process;
 - Define knowledge/decision points within project lifecycle;
 - Define prioritization process across entire portfolio of projects that is rigorous;
 - Determine operating implications for CIP;
 - Determine how regional solutions to needs are approached (for example, shared facilities with other jurisdictions)
 - Identify process for evaluating scope, schedule, cost, and benefit;
 - Outline best practices for communicating with stakeholders when project funding/timing/scope has changed;
 - Understand the portfolio of projects and how to revise (expand or shrink) scope during implementation, how best to stop a project, and how to repurpose funds in those cases.
- During discussions, the Subcommittee requested the following additional information:
 - Deliverables on Peer Technical Review and CIP Steering Committees
 - Clarification on ownership of school buildings

9 Next Steps

- The Subcommittee determined it will meet bi-weekly on from 7:00 – 9:00pm at City Hall. Mr. Branch concluded the meeting.