

**Camden County Board of Commissioners
Camden County Board of Education
Closed Session - Joint Meeting
July 27, 2022 – 6:00 PM
Camden County Public Library**

Welcome & Call to Order

A joint meeting of the Camden County Board of Commissioners and Camden County Board of Education was held in the boardroom of the new Camden Public Library at 6:00 PM on July 27, 2022. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the site and construction of the new high school. The meeting was called to order by Board of Commissioner Chair Ross Munro and Board of Education Chair Christian Overton.

Board Members Present

Board of Commissioners: Chairman Ross Munro, Vice Chair Tiffney White, Commissioner Clayton Riggs. Absent: Commissioner Tom White and Commissioner Randy Krainiak.

Camden County Board of Education: Chairman Christian Overton, Vice Chair Jason Banks, Board Members Kevin Heath, Sissy Aydlett and Chris Purcell.

Others Present

Camden County – County Manager Erin Burke, County Attorney John Morrison, Clerk to the Board Karen Davis

Camden County Schools – School Superintendent Dr. Joe Ferrell, Attorneys John Leidy and Johny Hallow, Administrative Assistant Anita Cuthrell

Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Ross Munro gave the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Consideration of the Agenda

Board of Commissioners - Motion to approve the agenda as presented.

RESULT:	PASSED [3-0]
MOVER:	Tiffney White
AYES:	Ross Munro, Clayton Riggs, Tiffney White
ABSENT:	Tom White, Randy Krainiak

Board of Education – Motion to approve the agenda as presented.

RESULT:	PASSED [5-0]
MOVER:	Chris Purcell
SECOND:	Jason Banks
AYES:	Christian Overton, Jason Banks, Sissy Aydlett, Kevin Heath, Chris Purcell

Presentation

M.B. Kahn – Bill Cram, Project Executive; Maggie Dittmar, Estimator
Moseley Architects – Ashley Dennis, Principal Architect
Timmons Group – Kim Hamby, Civil Engineer

The presentation by M.B. Kahn & Moseley Architecture representatives included the following:

- Market Update (Bill Cram)
 - Steel Mill Products prices are up over 100% in 2021. (Source: Construction Analytics)
 - Engineering News Record (ENR)BCI inputs index for 2021 is up 10.0%. The BCI is up 5.3% year-to-date for the first four months of 2022. (Source: Engineering News Record)

- Produce Price Index tables published by AGC show input costs to nonresidential buildings up about 18% for 2021. (Source: Associated General Contractors)
- Deflation is not likely. Only twice in 50 years have we experienced construction cost deflation, the recession years of 2009 and 2010. That was at a time when business volume dropped 33% and jobs fell 30%. (Source: Construction Analytics)
- The construction industry is in the midst of a period of exceptionally steep and fast-rising costs for a variety of materials, compounded by major supply-chain disruptions and a shortage of available workers. (Source: AGC)

Material	Price	Inventories	Deliveries
Copper	Stabilizing	Contracting	Delayed
Drywall	Increasing	Contracting	Delayed
Electrical Equipment	Increasing	Contracting	Delayed
Glass	Stabilizing	Contracting	Delayed
HVAC Equipment	Increasing	Contracting	Delayed
Plumbing Fixtures	Increasing	Stabilizing	Delayed
PVC	Increasing	Contracting	Delayed
Steel	Stabilizing	Contracting	Delayed
Stainless Steel Pipe & Fittings	Stabilizing	Contracting	Delayed
Transportation/Shipping/Freight	Increasing	Contracting	Delayed

SOURCE: Manufacturing & Services PMI Institute for Supply Management Gilbane Supplier Network

Material	Lead Time (Months)
Major Electrical Equipment	10-18+
Curtainwall	9-12
Major Mechanical Equipment	8-10
Generators	8-12
Roofing	6-9
International Fabricated Millwork	6+
Small Electrical Equipment	5-7
Small Mechanical Equipment	4-7
Food Service Equipment	4-7
Elevators	4-6
Fire Pumps	4-6
Entertainment/Recreation Equipment	3-5
Steel	3-5
Metal Panels	3-4
Specialty Door Hardware	3-4
Lockers	3-4
Plumbing Specialties	3-4
Imported Tile and Stone	3
Ceiling Baffles	3

SOURCE: Gilbane

- Design Update (Ashley Dennis)

- Site Plan
- Floor Plan
- Front entrance
- Interior Courtyard
- CTE Lab
- Media Center
- Gymnasium
- Cafeteria Commons
- Extended Learning Area

- Prepared Questions

1. What is the actual usable (being area available for roads, parking, fields and buildings) acreage on the 343 site?

Kim Hamby - The usable acreage on the 343 site is about 44 acres. There are 55 acres of high ground, but much of that is tucked up into the wetlands.

2. What will now not fit on the 343 site that was previously on the board-approved site plan?

Kim Hamby - The multipurpose field is the only thing that will not fit on the site. This change happened in late 2021 and shortly before the project went on hold. This area was used for drainage and was required by a comment from the 3rd party reviewer. Everything else the District has requested fits, but is “shoehorned” into the site.

3. How much additional acreage would we need from the northern adjoining landowner on the 343 site to have a comparable site “acreage-wise” to the new site as far as offering facilities and future expansion?

Kim Hamby - We believe 20 additional acres would work, depending on the shape of the acreage acquired from the adjacent property. It is our understanding the small property on the road frontage is not available,

which would not provide another access point to 343 unless they purchased a larger piece of land. The additional access point would be highly recommended for improved site access and circulation.

4. What is the actual usable (same criteria as above) acreage on the 158 site?

Kim Hamby - We do not have enough information to provide an accurate answer. We have heard 70 acres, but also the proposal from the purchase agreement has only 57.3 acres of the 70 cut out for the school. The transmission line across the front, combined with the future widening of highway 158, eliminates all the frontage of the tract which is also a significant amount. It would be helpful if we had access to the map that is being referenced.

5. Estimate of costs for grading work at each site?

The current site development estimate on the 343 site is approximately \$5.2M. We would need more extensive site investigation completed before a reasonable/comparable estimate could be prepared for the 158 site.

6. How much overburden could be stored in berms etc. on each site to potentially save some money (343 site as is and if additional land could be acquired)?

Kim Hamby - There is no room on the 343 site and even if we could “find” places for them, they are not an ideal solution. They create additional drainage issues for which would need to be accounted. However, berms and stormwater against the road or under the power easement on the 158 site are possible.

7. It was mentioned the soils are similar on both sites and that the main advantage of the new site was it had been better maintained and drained, so could compression techniques (like compression plating) be used on the current site to reduce the amount of cut and fill needed?

Maggie Dittmar - No. This would have been in the Geotechnical report if it was a recommended solution.

8. Can we get a copy of the DOT study completed (as referenced by Rick Ott at some point) on the 343 property?

Maggie Dittmar & Kim Hamby - We do not have final permits from NCDOT. We did take the site through review for driveway, stacking, and turn lane configuration and had informal approval of the final layout. It was confirmed no Traffic Impact Analysis would be required. The MSTA review document can be provided if needed.

Chairman Ross Munro and Commissioner Clayton Riggs expressed particular concern in regard to the amount of traffic created by the schools currently situated on Route 343.

After a discussion in regard to traffic, David Otts with NCDOT stated that based on the concerns referenced a Traffic Impact Analysis could be requested for both sites.

County Attorney John Morrison clarified that once a determination is made on the final design of the school, the tract desired for purchase can be identified in the contract, when the contract enters negotiation. There is no contract at this point.

School Board Member Sissy Aydlett asked how the property would be paid for. Chairman Munro responded funds from the County Fund Balance would be used.

9. Will potential land purchase be explored adjacent to the 343 property?

It was decided to come back to this question later in the meeting.

10. Does the Board of Education have a choice or determination of the school site on any portion of the 158 site?

It was decided to come back to this question later in the meeting.

11. Does a new referendum have to be on the ballot?

Maggie Dittmar - No. See additional information below.

12. Did the language of the currently passed referendum limit the total project to \$45 million?

Maggie Dittmar - No. The ballot question referenced “authorizing not exceeding \$33,000,000 school bonds”.

13. Sitework guesstimate on the 158 and 343 site?

Maggie Dittmar - The current site development estimate on the 343 site is approximately \$5.2M. We would need more extensive site investigation completed before a reasonable/comparable estimate could be prepared for the 158 site.

14. Interest estimates with associated loan cost by delaying land purchase 3, 6, and 9 months?
Guesstimate is fine.

Bill Cram presented the following as his best estimate:

Camden County High School							
Delay Impact on Interest Expense							
Baseline = \$33,000,000 Loan - 30 Years @ 3.25% Base Rate							
Delay Duration	Quarterly Increase	Cumulative Increase	Permanent Loan Interest	Deduct Baseline Interest	Permanent Loan Increase	Construction Loan Increase	Total Loan Interest Increase
Baseline Interest			\$ 19,163,100.00	\$ (19,163,100.00)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3 months	0.50%	0.50%	\$ 22,529,100.00	\$ (19,163,100.00)	\$ 3,366,000.00	\$ 121,875.00	\$ 3,487,875.00
6 months	0.25%	0.75%	\$ 24,261,600.00	\$ (19,163,100.00)	\$ 5,098,500.00	\$ 243,750.00	\$ 5,342,250.00
9 months	0.25%	1.00%	\$ 26,004,000.00	\$ (19,163,100.00)	\$ 6,840,900.00	\$ 365,625.00	\$ 7,206,525.00

15. How much does the building cost eliminating all site costs? (Question added during the July Board of Education meeting.)

Maggie Dittmar - The current building construction cost estimate on the 343 site is approximately \$43.75M. This does not include site development, exterior athletic facilities, or potential add alternates, such as an auxiliary gymnasium, additional classrooms, auditorium, etc.

Commissioner Clayton Riggs asked what had been cut from the original construction plans for the new high school.

Ashley Dennis – Some programmatic adjustments were made based on meetings with staff, teachers, etc. However, it was not made smaller. Spaces cut were in relation to the auxiliary gymnasium and auditorium. Nothing was truly given up programmatic related to academics. The current plan is designed for 600 students. The core (gymnasium, cafeteria, kitchen) is designed for 800 students.

Commissioner Riggs questioned in regard to the number of high school students currently enrolled. Dr. Ferrell responded that there are 600 students.

Board of Education member Kevin Health stated that classrooms will be added back to the plan as a result of additional grant funds that have been awarded.

County Attorney John Morrison requested clarification in that the current high schools house 600 students and the current plan would also house 600 students. Mr. Morrison questioned if more students would be able to fit on this site as a result of growth in the county.

Ashley Dennis replied that it could hold 800 students.

Mr. Morrison asked Ms. Dennis if, in her professional opinion, this building could never hold more than 800 students. Ms. Dennis stated she would not feel comfortable answering wholeheartedly in this public setting but she would say there would be limitations if the school is built on the existing 343 site.

Board of Education Kevin Heath stated if there was an ability to purchase 40 more acres, the site would not be limited to 800 students.

Commissioner Riggs stated that it would be easier and smarter to build the new school in the middle of a large field with additional acreage available, which would allow for additional expansion as needed, instead of trying to “shoehorn” it onto a piece of land that is too small and forced upon us.

Board of Education member Chris Purcell stated that there is a willing seller of an additional 40 acres of land at a much lower price than \$1.75 million, who is more than happy to negotiate and sell the land contiguous to the site on 343.

Chairman Munro requested the information concerning the property Mr. Heath referenced to be provided to the County for further investigation.

- Next Steps – Maggie Dittmar
 - Confirm the site location for the new Camden County High School and Early College.
 - Confirm the total project budget, including the additional \$10M in grant funds, for the new Camden County High School and Early College.
 - Confirm the final scope and release our team to proceed with Construction Documents development.

Commissioner Riggs expressed concern in regard to the extensive required site preparation at the site on 343.

Mr. Cram clarified that the \$5.2 million includes storm drainage, paving, road access, utility connections; far more than just the overburden – a complete site development package.

Commissioner Riggs asked Ms. Hamby how much better the Williams tract is versus the site on 343.

Ms. Hamby answered that from a drainage standpoint it is not really any better. The soils are very similar in that they both have the same drainage classification which indicates a lack of permeable soils, heavy clays. There are two different soil types but the Roanoke soils, which are on the eastern half of the 158 site and the entire 343 site, tend to have a higher chance for shrink swell than the clay soils which can cause more that would have to be removed. The western half of the Williams tract is Perquimans soil; still a bad drainage class.

School Board Member Jason Banks questioned Ms. Hamby if additional property purchased at the 343 site that has been farmed and drains as the property on 158 does, one could expect a similar cost to remove overburden and the cost of the site work?

Ms. Hamby stated that it is most likely but nothing is certain until borings are done. She confirmed that the soil types at both sites are very similar.

Upon a question from Board of Education Chairman Christian Overton in regard to whether land could be purchased on the 158 site in the middle of the property and then land on either side could be purchased by the County, Mr. Morrison clarified that the County has not yet made that proposal but it is possible that the proposal could be made.

Going back to question #10, Mr. Banks questioned as to where the burden falls in regard to the selection of the site for the school.

Mr. Morrison responded that it is his opinion that the decision is the County’s to make.

Mr. Banks referenced a Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Education and the Board of Commissioners from 2020 that references the site on 343 as the site for the new school and questioned if it would need to be amended between the two boards in that it is a contractual agreement.

Mr. Morrison responded that he would need to review the agreement.

School Attorney John Leidy stated that the Memorandum of Understanding would need to be amended between the two boards to change the site. As it stands right now, the MOU is limited to the 343 site specifically.

Commissioner Riggs stated that the state mandates that the Board of Commissioners provide facilities and land for schools. He stated that the Commissioners are trying to work cooperatively with the school to get the best spot for the school and the students. The priority should be what is best for the students of Camden County; not the adults who are complaining.

Mr. Banks presented the results of a survey conducted by the schools in regard to the selection of property for the site of the new school. 75% of respondents (almost 700 respondents) chose the site on 343. The respondents were comprised of parents/guardians (518), staff (88) and others (87). 519 chose the site on 343, 138 chose the site on Highway 158 and 36 had no preference.

Commissioner Riggs confirmed that only those that were in the school system's database received the survey.

Mr. Heath added that the survey was also posted on Facebook.

Public Comments

Deborah Penwell addressed the boards in opposition to the site located on Highway 158. Key concerns included:

- Potential economic development on adjacent properties.
- Safety in regard to potential businesses surrounding the school campus and access of the general public to school property.
- School buses that serve multiple schools; bus schedules.
- Traffic/safety concerns on Highway 158.

Mr. Banks questioned Mr. Otts in regard to a potential traffic plan for the site on Rt. 343, should additional acreage be purchased.

Mr. Otts explained that school traffic in general is of great concern statewide in that currently less students are riding school buses. He added that there is potentially a favorable plan that could be put into place for the 343 site with the additional acreage. Mr. Purcell confirmed that a preliminary plan had already been approved for the current plan on 343.

Adjourn

There being no further matters for discussion Chairman Munro called for a motion to adjourn.

Board of Commissioners – Motion to adjourn.

RESULT:	PASSED [3-0]
MOVER:	Ross Munro
AYES:	Ross Munro, Clayton Riggs, Tiffney White
ABSENT:	Tom White, Randy Krainiak

Board of Education – Motion to adjourn.

RESULT:	PASSED [5-0]
MOVER:	Jason Banks
SECOND:	Chris Purcell
AYES:	Christian Overton, Jason Banks, Sissy Aydlett, Kevin Heath, Chris Purcell

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.