

<p>Question 1</p>	<p>Answer</p>
<p>What is the current time line for construction and financing of the proposed new high school? NOTES:</p>	<p>The School Board has included the Eastern Area High School (“EAHS”) in the Capital Improvement Plan (“CIP”) for funding beginning July 2011. With a two (2) year estimated construction time, that would make the estimated opening in Fall 2013. <u>There is no identified funding source for this project, however, which means that there is no timeline.</u> The planning and engineer drawings are in the initial phase and are being paid for with Federal Stimulus Funds. Construction money for the school will only come when the County Manager and Board of Supervisors decide to move forward with a bond financing referendum.</p>
<p>Question 2</p>	<p>Answer</p>
<p>According to Henrico County, the bond process allows the County 8 years to use the allotted GO Bond monies. The Henrico County School Board determines the scheduling of these projects and in what year money will be spent on what projects. Mr. Montgomery – what guarantee can you give us that the new high school will be a Year 1 priority in the next bond referendum? NOTES:</p>	<p>The order (as opposed to schedule) of bond projects is set when the bond goes to the voters. In the 2005 Bond Package (“2005 Bonds”), the EAHS planning money (\$2.5M) was set as one of the last projects. I cannot guarantee that EAHS will be in the first year or that it will even be in the bond package. It will take our community working together to (1) ensure that the EAHS (and other important projects) are in the next bond referendum, and (2) that the EAHS is one of the earliest projects in the bond package. EAHS will be competing with other worthy projects from other parts of the County.</p>
<p>Question 3</p>	<p>Answer</p>
<p>Has Henrico County acquired all the land necessary to build the new high school? If not, what is the status of this acquisition?</p>	<p>If the EAHS is located adjacent to Elko Middle School, we need approximately 40 additional acres due to wetlands and site requirements. (The total land needed for a high school complex is approximately 60 USABLE acres.) We are in contact with the land owners, who have granted permission to have access to</p>

NOTES:	property for evaluation purposes.
--------	-----------------------------------

Question 4	Answer
<p>Mr. Montgomery and Mr. Donati – Henrico County manger Virgil Hazelett wants to delay any bond referendums to Henrico County until November 2012 per his letter to the Superintendent of Henrico County Schools, Dr. Pat Russo dated November 17, 2009 due to the current economic conditions and the discontinuation of Federal Stimulus dollars. However, municipal bond interest rates are at an all time low of 3.8% and the interest rates have the potential to increase by 2013. Can you clarify why Henrico County would not want to take advantage of the low interest rates and low construction costs of today’s market?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>I think that it is fair to say that everyone wishes to take as must advantage as possible of the favorable bond rates and construction costs. In fact, HCPS has realized some savings in its recent renovation and construction projects, and those savings have allowed us to accomplish some additional work. Also, the lower bond rates have allowed the County to “re-sell” some of its bonds at the more favorable rate. The savings from these lower rates has helped fund fully some of the renovation projects (Varina High School for example) and close the nearly \$12M operational funding gap that is projected for 2010-11.</p> <p>NOTES:</p>

Question 5	Answer
<p>Mr. Montgomery – can you please update us on the status of the \$21.5 million renovation to Varina High School that was included in the 2005 Bond Referendum?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>The total project costs for the VHS renovation is \$32,704,943. The School Board has included a request for this amount in its current CIP request to the Board of Supervisors. (The same request was in last year’s CIP, but there was no funding provided.) Of the \$32,704,943, \$21,225,548, is 2005 bond financing, and \$11,479,395 is unfunded at this time. If the funding is provided by the Board of Supervisors, the project will begin this summer and should be completed in August, 2013. The drawing and plans are complete.</p>

Question 6	Answer
<p>Beginning in 2005-06, the Henrico County Board of Supervisors approved the following Henrico County budgets:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2005-06 \$836,298,230.00</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2006-07 \$905,675,130.00</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2007-08 \$964,105,629.00</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2008-09 \$1,039,397,534.00</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2009-10 \$1,058,614,701.00</p> <p>Henrico County has exceeded these budget numbers in some years. Mr. Donati – can you explain how a decline in Henrico County revenues allows for an approved increase in the Henrico County budgets, but will not allow Henrico County to move forward with a GO Bond referendum prior to 2012?</p>	<p>NOTES:</p>

Question 7	Answer
<p>Mr. Montgomery – can you please tell us what is the scheduled date of the next Budget Hearing for the Henrico County School Board? What is to be discussed at the School Board meeting tomorrow night, Tuesday 02-09-10?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>HCPS has two (2) budget processes. First, the CIP, which generally begins in July and is submitted as a request to the County not later than December, addresses funding for capital projects (bricks and mortar). The other process is the operating budget. We are currently in the operating budget process, which must be submitted by February. The meeting on 2/9 at the Henrico Theatre will address the operating budget and specific how to close an estimated \$16 million shortfall from last year’s budget. I have provided a separate handout that outlines areas that we are looking to for savings.</p>

Question 8	Answer
<p>According to information provided by the Henrico County Department of Planning and Research, trailer data indicates that the Brookland District has 20 trailers at their elementary schools, which is the most of any district in Henrico County. This translates to one trailer for each 279.76 elementary students in the Brookland District, which is the highest in Henrico County. The data also indicates that the Varina District has 23 trailers at their high schools, which is the most in Henrico County. This translates into one trailer for each 168.09 high school students in the Varina District. Mr. Montgomery – based upon this information, can you explain how the Henrico County School Board came to the decision to put a \$59 million new high school (Glen Allen High School scheduled to open in fall 2010 which went \$14 million over budget) and a \$4.6 renovation the Varina Elementary School and a \$4.6 renovation to Mehfoud Elementary School in the 2005 GO Bond referendum?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>As an initial matter, I was not part of the planning for the 2005 GO Bond referendum (which planning would have started not later than 2003), so I cannot speak first hand as to the thought process. Such planning was based on projections made in 2003, about where needs would be in 2011-12. Obviously, projecting 8 plus years out can get tricky.</p> <p>I agree that trailers are a good “check” on whether we are doing a good job of providing for our students. It is hard to say that a school is at or below capacity when it has trailers sitting in the parking lot.</p> <p>As to the 20 trailers at elementary schools in Brookland, that number should be reduced by half with the redistricting that will take effect Fall 2010 and the completion of some classroom additions (Lakeside, Dumbarton, and Tuckahoe ES) in 2011.</p> <p>The high school trailer question is unfortunately more difficult. A high school requires a minimum of 1,450 students to maintain an effective instructional program. Without this critical membership level, the school will not be able to offer the variety of courses and activities required and expected by our students. Any new high school will have to have this critical mass, or its students will not receive the same opportunities as currently provided.</p> <p>As stated above, the planning for the 2005 bond projects would have begun in 2003. At that time, the economy was strong, new homes were under construction across the county, and a large developer was planning for a mixed use development (The Wilton) in Varina along the river after build-out of a project in the west end. We know from past experience that new development attracts families with younger children, so it was important to provide for anticipated elementary growth (thus Varina and Mehfoud ES expansions). Needs were anticipated based upon information available in 2003. Since that time, the</p>

	<p>economy has impacted jobs and housing demand and new development is only occurring in small pockets around the county, and the Varina project that justified these projects is not yet underway.</p> <p>Regarding high school needs, at the time of bond planning (2003-04), Hermitage, Godwin, and Henrico High Schools were approaching or over capacity and significant growth was anticipated in the Deep Run zone from Twin Hickory. The need for an east area high school was identified based upon the pending development of the Wilton, which was timed to begin after completion of Twin Hickory. That is why the high schools were sequenced like they were.</p>
--	--

Question 9	Answer
<p>According to the same trailer data, there are 112 total trailers in Henrico County in all elementary, middle and high schools combined. Of these 112 total trailers, 60 of these trailers are located in the Fairfield and Varina Districts. Mr. Montgomery – can you please comment on the disparity of total trailers in Henrico County, in particular in the Varina and Fairfield Districts? Why are the Varina and Fairfield Districts getting trailers, when what they really need is additional schools?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>Trailers are placed at schools for either capacity or renovations. (There are also Title 1 trailers that add capacity for Title 1 preschool programs.) Currently, there are 92 capacity trailers and 14 construction/renovation trailers. (There are 7 Title 1 trailers, for a total of 113 trailers.) Of the 92 capacity trailers, 49 (53%) are at schools that serve students from the Varina and Fairfield districts. Beginning in the Fall of 2010, HCPS anticipates having 62 trailers for capacity, of which 26 (42%) will be at schools that serve students from the Varina and Fairfield districts.</p> <p>With the attendance boundary changes that will occur in fall 2010, and anticipating phased renovation work next year, trailers are in place this year that may or may not be removed by next year. For example, Henrico High School has retained its trailers (placed to support renovations and an addition) for current scheduling needs and to minimize the number of teachers that float. Next year, Henrico High School will lose eight trailers (only four will remain for capacity).</p> <p>It is possible to have membership at or above capacity, have trailers in place, but</p>

	<p>not have enough students in the system to fill a new school and maintain the minimum membership needed at the existing school(s). This dynamic is impacting the Varina district right now—especially in the absence of The Wilton development. (See the following chart.)</p>
--	---

High School	Capacity	90% Capacity*	Fall 2009 Membership	Difference (Membership-90% Capacity)	2009-10 Trailers	Fall 2010 Projected Membership	Difference (Projected Membership-90% Capacity)	2010 Projected Trailers	Trailers for Capacity	Trailers for Construction
Highland Sp.	1788	1609	1725	116	9	1637	28	5**	5**	0
Varina	2022	1820	1990	170	14	1936	116	14	6	8

*This is the point where we often place trailers so schools maintain scheduling flexibility.
 **Trailers at Highland Springs HS will be shared by the comprehensive school and the technical center.

Question 10	Response
<p>In our research, we have identified the total number of K-12 students in each magisterial district by both traffic zone and by individual school population. The Varina District has the third highest total of K-12 students by traffic zone (10,029) and the second highest total of K-12 students by school population (9,991). The Varina District also has the highest total of high school students (3,866) in Henrico County. The Brookland District has the lowest total of K-12 students by both traffic zone (9,052) and second lowest total of K-12 students by student population (8,804). The Brookland District also has the lowest amount of high school students of any district in Henrico County (2,102) and they</p>	<p>Again, the 2005 bond referendum was based on planning done during the 2003-04 time frame. As such, it was before “my time,” but I am certain that it was based on the best available data and analysis. Additionally, the magisterial district lines move every 10 years, as a result of census data and to ensure one-person-one-vote. Thus, in 2011 the magisterial lines will be adjusted to “even out” the population, which will have an effect on your figures and analysis.</p> <p>HCPS planning for school facilities is based upon school aged population, not total population, and our attendance boundaries do not follow magisterial district lines. Our schools at each level have varying capacities and our schools may be located in one magisterial district and serve many students in other magisterial districts.</p> <p>Based upon growth patterns and needs identified during planning for the 2003 Bond Referendum, there was a need for a high school to bring relief to as many existing high schools as possible in areas where membership growth was</p>

<p>also have the lowest percentage of K-12 students as a percentage of their total population (14.14% - traffic zone and 13.57% student population). Mr. Montgomery – based on these numbers, can you explain how the Henrico County School Board came to the determination to fund a high school in the Brookland District before funding a new high school in the Varina District?</p>	<p>underway and expected to continue. This was the first time that non-contiguous zones needed to be addressed simultaneously. The site of the Glen Allen High School was selected because redistricting would allow the district to shift students at most high schools to more effectively utilize existing space and accommodate growth from Henrico High School and west. The east area high school need was anticipated to follow based upon the timing of the development of the Wilton.</p> <p>I am providing a separate chart that shows projected populations by school before and after the redistricting that will take effect beginning in the fall of 2010.</p>
--	--

<p>Question 11</p>	<p>Answer</p>								
<p>In December 2009, Henrico County took advantage of stimulus recovery zone bonds to the tune of \$9.8 million. These bonds were used to help fund sewer system projects in the Lakeside, Highland Springs and Monument Avenue areas. By using these federally subsidized bonds, Henrico County was able to receive a 45% rebate on the interest cost from the U.S. Treasury. Mr. Montgomery – has Henrico County looked into this kind of financing for a new school project?</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>There are four (4) sources of funds for capital projects: (1) General Obligation bonds (like the 2005 bond referendum); (2) Virginia Public School Authority Bonds; (3) Virginia Lottery Funds; and (4) County general funds. To date, there have been no federal bond programs for schools similar to the stimulus recovery zone bonds that you mention. To be clear, we did receive \$14M in stimulus funding which we did put toward projects. Those capital projects (and the amounts) are:</p> <table data-bbox="890 1019 1808 1247"> <tr> <td>Lakeside ES (6) Classroom Addition</td> <td>\$3,839,126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tuckahoe ES (6) Classroom Addition</td> <td>\$4,119,081</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dumbarton ES (6) Classroom Addition</td> <td>\$3,616,397</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High School #2 Planning</td> <td>\$2,500,000</td> </tr> </table>	Lakeside ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$3,839,126	Tuckahoe ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$4,119,081	Dumbarton ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$3,616,397	High School #2 Planning	\$2,500,000
Lakeside ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$3,839,126								
Tuckahoe ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$4,119,081								
Dumbarton ES (6) Classroom Addition	\$3,616,397								
High School #2 Planning	\$2,500,000								

Question 12	Answer
Through our research, we have determined that it is within Henrico County's authority to buy back previously issued bonds. Mr. Donati – has Henrico County explored the option of buying back bonds that were issued as part of the 2005 GO Bond Referendum and reselling them as part of a new bond referendum at the lower interest rate?	NOTES:

Question 13	Answer
We have been told that the proposed new high school for the east end was to be modeled after the current Glen Allen High School. Mr. Montgomery, if this is true, what was the need for an additional \$2 million to be spent on the planning and design of the proposed new east end high school?	<p>You are correct that the EAHS is being “site adapted” from the Glen Allen structure. (This is similar to what was done with Elko MS and other middle schools across the County.) This process will result in a savings in time and money. If it were not a site adapt the cost would be roughly double. One reason that the Elko site is costly is that there are significant changes and improvements that must be engineered for the roads leading into the site.</p> <p>NOTES:</p>

Question 14	Answer
Currently, there are federal grants in place from the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries that could help offset the cost of a new high school. The grants could range from as little as \$5000 to over \$1 million. Has Henrico County looked into these grants? Has there been any consideration	<p>There are no federal grants administered by DGIF that would apply to construction of a new school of any sort. There are possible grants (state and federal) that could augment the course of instruction, for example, in environmental science. I have discussed the environmental science approach with a number of groups and agencies (VCU, DGIF, Car Max Foundation, etc.) There is genuine interest in establishing such a program, but there is no funding</p>

given to making this proposed new high school an environmental science magnet school?	for construction of facilities. NOTES:
---	---

Community Question 1	Answer
How will the geographical boundaries be determined for the new high school?	The boundaries will be set in a manner similar to what occurred with the recent redistricting undertaken in conjunction with the Glen Allen HS. We will establish a citizen committee that will propose boundaries that consider community, proximity, feeder patterns and similar matters.
Community Question 2	Answer
What is the status of the additional land that needs to be purchased for the new high school?	HCPS is in discussions with the owners of the land adjacent to Elko Middle School.
Community Question 3	Answer
Has any thought been given to a name for the new school? Perhaps being named after an educator that has left a mark on the east end?	HCPS has a process to select school names that solicits input from the community. Your suggestion is a good one, and should be made once the school construction is underway.
Community Question 4	Answer
Is there a limit on the number of classroom trailers that can be placed at high schools?	The only limit is what the community will tolerate. Without funding available to build a new high school, students will attend class in trailers at VHS, HSHS and Henrico High School for the indefinite future. Also, keep in mind that when the renovations begin at VHS, as much as 1/3rd of the student body will be in trailers at any given time until the work is done.
Community Question 5	Answer
Currently, there are no fees charged to	It is certainly possible to charge fees if the board wants to go in that direction.

<p>elementary school students at the beginning of the school year. Is it possible to add a small general fee to the elementary schools to be paid at the beginning of the school year to help offset either budget shortfalls or to be placed into the funds for the construction of the new high school?</p>	<p>However, these fees would go toward the operational budget to support the instructional goals.</p>								
<p>Community Question 6</p>	<p>Answer</p>								
<p>Where does the money go that is accumulated from the Virginia Lottery?</p>	<p>Traditionally, Henrico County has utilized State Lottery funds for capital projects. In the current budget, the lottery funds have been withheld by the state to help fund education instructional requirements. In the past, the amount of funding from the lottery has been about \$4M to \$6M. In FY 2008-09, the lottery funding was used as follows:</p> <table data-bbox="793 732 1478 865"> <tr> <td>Fairfield MS Renovations</td> <td>\$3,088,564</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Henrico HS Art Additions</td> <td>\$ 925,177</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ES Office Renovations (4)</td> <td>\$1,437,787</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ES Office Renovations (3)</td> <td>\$1,077,508</td> </tr> </table> <p>The lottery augmented other funding to complete the Fairfield MS and Henrico HS projects.</p>	Fairfield MS Renovations	\$3,088,564	Henrico HS Art Additions	\$ 925,177	ES Office Renovations (4)	\$1,437,787	ES Office Renovations (3)	\$1,077,508
Fairfield MS Renovations	\$3,088,564								
Henrico HS Art Additions	\$ 925,177								
ES Office Renovations (4)	\$1,437,787								
ES Office Renovations (3)	\$1,077,508								