

MUSCOGEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2001, 6:30 P.M.

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Board of Education of the Muscogee County School District was held on Monday, September 17, 2001, 6:30 p.m. in the conference room at the Bradley Library.

The following members were present: Mary Sue Polleys, Chairman, James Walker, Vice Chairman, David E. Ebron, Philip T. Schley, Linda Parker, Fife Whiteside, John Wells, Brenda Storey, and Owen Ditchfield.

Others present: Guy W. Sims, Superintendent of Education, James E. Humes, II, Legal Counsel, Fred M. Jones, Treasurer, Brenda Dozier, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, Shirley Jaegar, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Myles Caggins, Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs, Billy Kendall, Administrative Assistant, Bill Hortman, Association Superintendent, Gordon Stallings, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, and representatives from the media.

Dr. Polleys called the meeting to order with an invocation and pledge of allegiance to the flag led by students from Fox Elementary School. The Shaw High School Chorus with Debbie McElrath directing performed the National Anthem. Dr. Polleys recognized visitors in the audience, Mr. and Mrs. Halouska from Friends of the Libraries and League of Women Voters, Helen Kleiber a teacher at Columbus High School along with teacher cadets, and Mrs. Askew representing PTA's. Dr. Polleys called on Laura Sartin representing Very Special Arts contest winners, Terrion Thomas formerly of MLK Elementary and Tasha Bryant at Dawson Elementary. Dr. Polleys recognized Mr. Willie Hill on the public forum. Mr. Hill did not show up.

Upon motion of Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Ebron, the Board unanimously approved official actions taken at the regular Board of Education meeting held on August 20, 2001 as amended.

Upon motion of Mrs. Parker, seconded by Mr. Wells, the Board unanimously approved the appointment of Judy Whitt for the position of Assistant Principal at Columbus High School.

Upon motion of Mrs. Parker, seconded by Mr. Ditchfield the Board approved the continuation of broadcasting monthly school board meetings at the cost of \$400.00 per meeting not to exceed \$500.00. Mr. Walker commented that the numbers from the survey presented do not support an extensive audience and he would not vote to continue the broadcast. The vote was (7) affirming and (2) opposing, Dr. Schley and Mr. Walker.

Upon motion of Mrs. Parker, seconded by Mr. Wells, the Board unanimously approved the use of Kinnett Stadium by the Arthritis Foundation on November 10, 2001 with a rain date of November 17th for a recreational walk.

Upon motion of Mrs. Storey, seconded by Mr. Wells, the Board unanimously approved a change to grade configurations at Northside High School because of construction concerns. The proposal for the opening of school in the 2002-2003 school year will be for the 9th and 10th grades only with 11th grade being added in the 2003-2004 school year and 12th grade being added in the 2004-2005 school year.

Upon motion of Mrs. Storey, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board unanimously approved the implementation of academy programs in five high schools with the intent of offering programs of excellence that will better serve the students assigned to those schools.

Upon motion of Mrs. Storey, seconded by Mr. Ebron, the Board unanimously approved funding from the Georgia Council for the Arts Touring Program in the total grant amount of \$4,354.00.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board unanimously approved financial statements for twelve months ending June 30, 2001.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board unanimously approved the appointment of A.G. Edwards and Sons, Inc., as Financial Advisor and King & Spalding as Bond Counsel to advise the school district regarding QZAB financing of the construction academy at Jordan High.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Storey, the Board unanimously approved the renewal of the system maintenance service agreement for the payroll and personnel package software provided by Integral Systems, Inc.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Ebron, the Board unanimously approved change order no. 10 in the amount of \$658,524.14 for rock excavation at the North Site Project; change order no. 11 in the amount of \$30,925.20 for mass rock excavation at the North Site Project and change order no. 12 in the amount of \$274,667.70 for rock excavation at the North Site Project. Mr. Whiteside asked how close is the completion of the rock excavation on the site. Mr. Caggins commented that less than \$400,000 for the three sites is left.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board unanimously approved change order no. 1 in the amount of \$158,351.97 for construction at Northside High School.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Storey, the Board approved change order no. 1 in the amount of \$4,841.02 for stage lighting at Columbus High. The vote was (7) affirming and (1) abstaining, Mr. Ebron.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Parker, the Board approved the following action items as one motion:

- M-Change order no. 2 in the amount of \$25,897.92 for construction at Marshall Middle School.
- N-Change order no. 1 in the amount of \$23,115.89 for construction at South Columbus Elementary.
- O-Change order no. 1 in the amount of \$88,469.60 for construction at Wesley Heights Elementary.
- P-Change order no. 3 in the amount of \$51,825.52 for construction at Britt David Elementary.
- Q-Change order no. 4 in the amount of \$15,965.72 for construction at Waddell Elementary.
- R-Confirmation purchase order to Alexander Contracting in the amount of \$80,100.00 for replacing sanitary sewer line at Hardaway High School.
- S-Confirmation purchase order to Grant Environmental Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$31,700.00 for erosion control at East Columbus Magnet Academy.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Storey, the Board unanimously approved the execution of a quitclaim deed for a driveway easement on the property of Downtown Elementary School.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Storey, the Board unanimously approved an amended contract between Muscogee County School District and the National Center on Education and the Economy who will work with (9) low performing schools. The school district will be given an additional \$37,800.00 from NCEE for Brewer Elementary School.

Dr. Polleys directed the Board to the addendum item relating to the preliminary budget for the new main library. Mr. Whiteside commented, "this item was on the construction committee agenda for Monday and the purpose was to address the fact that when we were presented with the schematic plan for the new library at the last board meeting. The cost estimates that went with the schematic were about 1.3 million dollars over budget. There was also some absence of detail in the site preparation section which was to be cured. A revised budget and a change in the schematic diagram for the library was generated by the architects but not presented to the committee on Monday night because it's still about \$900,000 out of budget even though it now has considerable detail. I don't think it's a good idea to leave that hanging and I'm not a 100% sure that the action that we took on the schematic design for the library at the last board meeting was really consistent with contract and I'd like to call on legal counsel for a comment." Mr. Humes said, "A condition in the engineer architects contract 2.2.4 which if the architect or engineer comes in with a statement of probable construction costs that exceeds the amount of your budget which happens to be established at the time then the contract under which you employ the architect engineer provides that the owner or in this case the owner's representative which is the school district shall at that time authorize the architect engineer to either (1) reduce the scope of the project or (2) inform him of any increase in the budget sufficient to cover such increased probable construction costs. In the addendum there is a letter that Mr. Caggins sent to New York to the architect engineers, Mr. Lamis of Robert A.M. Stern. In essence the intent of this is to suggest the architect engineer ways in which to get the project back within budget which was the direction the Board gave at the last Board meeting. In Mr. Caggins letter to Mr. Lamis on the second page basically concludes, by providing authorization to proceed in a manner appropriate to the budget. The instructions given to the architect and engineer in the letter was to come back to the Board which would keep the plan so as to be within budget." Mr. Whiteside commented, "I read Mr. Caggins letter and he did direct the architect to reduce the scope of the project. In other words to do something to cut down on the cost of the project so as to bring it in within budget. But still the architect has come back with the second estimate of \$870,000 something dollars over budget. Somebody has to provide some direction to the architect about how to close that gap. If we don't address this issue now, it's going to get

worse. Starting out with almost \$1,000,000 over budget we're not going to end up less than a million dollars over budget. I left it on the committee agenda even though the administration was not ready with a definitive report. That's why I asked that it be carried forth to this agenda." Mr. Wells commented, "I agree with Mr. Whiteside. We discussed this long and strong but during the meantime, I have talked to the chairman of the Library Project Development Committee, Mr. Pete Robinson. Mr. Robinson has issued an e-mail which went to the members of the Library Project Development Committee which I am on that committee. He asked that I read this into the minutes and actually I would like to read this as a resolution: "Subject to your consent, I would like to give the project superintendent Mr. Myles Caggins and the architect, Stern Company the following instructions: 1) revise the plans so that all budget categories meet our initial budget allocations, with the understanding that all savings go into the book and equipment allocations. 2) work on the revisions with an emphasis on getting the cost savings from the gross square footage (total space) and not the net usable square footage (program, service and work space) to the extent possible. 3) find cost efficiencies and savings in non permanent areas (things that can be done later or with savings such as specialized gardens). 4) be prepared to reduce the gross and net square footage, if it is necessary to comply with the overall mandate to be within budget in all categories, but concentrate on protecting the programs and ability to deliver services. It goes on to say we all know that the project must be within budget and we have no leeway in this matter." Mr. Wells commented that "the Project Development Committee and its Chairman are well aware of the fact that things have been out of budget and not in budget and so he wants to make it very clear on instructions to the architect and to our administration that we should work to get this within budget and we cannot be out of budget. This letter adopted by a resolution today would affirm our intention of making this a completely in-budget program. I so move." Mr. Wells motion was seconded by Mr. Ebron. Dr. Polleys asked if anyone would like to speak to the motion. Mrs. Storey commented, "I realize that some of this can be subjective but we said all along we were going to build a library at a 100,000 square feet. The initial drawings were at 107, they came down to 105 and my understanding is that if they're in there they cost more, if they come out we get less money. It's not an even-stein thing. So we know that it would come in right at 100,000 square feet. Why don't we just say that? Why don't we just reduce it to 100,000 square feet and say this is it." Mr. Whiteside commented, "When we commissioned or rather got the original Cohen Report that is May 30, 2000 edition. The gross square footage of the library grew from 100,000 square feet which is what we put in the campaign literature to basically a 103,000 square feet. I did go check the campaign literature. I went upstairs to the microfilm and read the coverage in the Ledger which I believe to be accurate since I was on the scene at the time it was printed and I found nothing wrong with it. So it grew from 100,000 square feet to 103,000. In the second part of the Cohen Report it grew to 104,000 square feet and changed and then it stayed there that was the version of the report that we voted on until the June validation by the architect. With the validation that the architect did of the Cohen Report, it then grew to a 105,000 square feet. Now it grew with the architect's report to 107,000 square feet. So it's gone up in 2,000 square foot increments from the start. I always thought that we were going to be campaigning for and voting for 100,000 square foot library. But now here's the problem. We actually did. Myles pointed this out and I went back and checked. I listened to the tapes and read the minutes. We actually did when we approved the validation of the Cohen Report back in June. We really did approve a 105,000 square foot project. Now that's part of the problem. I don't know. Ms. Mueller you came to the Committee meetings on Monday and I believe what you told us is that you thought the same programs could be done with the building of a 100,000 square feet and that you would not have a problem with that. (Ms. Mueller comments) Exactly. So we could do that. That's an option. I think the Project Development Committee should have input as to how this is done. But I'm a little bit troubled all due candor with the use of the term in the e-mail, instructions. It says here, I would like to give the project superintendent, Myles Caggins and the Architect, Stern and Company the following instructions. That's really the school board's job. I think we're suppose to do that." Mrs. Storey commented, "I think that's semantics. At no process have we not said that it did not have to come in budget?" Mr. Whiteside commented, "That's an interesting question. I wondered about that. I listened to the tapes today again and we voted last month to approve the schematic design with a cost estimate that said a million-two out of budget. At a minimum we ought to do something to clarify tonight that we really didn't give them the go-ahead to go a million-two over budget. At a minimum, we ought to do that. What to do beyond that, I don't know. One thing that I'm absolutely certain of. If you all will remember, I had a conference call with Myles Caggins and the Architect a couple of months ago. I think I sent you all a summary of it and the architect makes it very clear that the time to address issues such as how much is it going to cost and what we're going to put into it is now. If we don't address it now, if we get into January we may be able to scale it back. If we do the bid "specs" and the bid "specs" come in high, we may be able to scale it back but it's going to cost us money and it's going to cost us delays in the project." Mr. Ebron commented, "I speak in favor of the motion. I think the four items mentioned by the Project Development Team would give us exactly what we need to stay within budget. What we approved last month, I thought was the design. We gave instructions which I felt were followed that we needed and quality over quantity was preferred and that we did not want to reduce things like the copper roof. We

didn't want value engineering. If we can obtain within budget, stay within budget for that 104,000 square feet then fine. Those are the instructions that I thought we gave. The Project Development period lasts until December and by January the design should be complete and we should approve that and then we will have specifically more numbers. I think the direction that we are giving now is to stay within budget. I don't think anyone has ever said I haven't had any thoughts that we need to be over budget realizing that 2-million dollar contingency still might not be enough." Dr. Polleys commented, "just for a point of clarity, we all agree that we've always agreed that it has to stay within budget. The issue is whether our vote last month might have raised a question about exactly what the budget limit is." Mr. Whiteside commented, "It's like what we did last month is like you go down to the car dealership and you say, I want the Monte Carlo. I want the sunroof. I want the deluxe radio with the cd in it and then we say, oh but, we don't like the fact that it's out of budget. What you order in the car dictates what the price is. Last month, what we voted on was a building that costs out a million-two over." Dr. Polleys, "the issue is sending mixed signals about the limitation of the budget." Mr. Ditchfield, "I basically agree with Mr. Ebron. I was coming prepared tonight to vote against the motion to put a flat limit on it. I feel it's very important that we not only give the development committee a chance to give us the input but to accept the fact that we appointed them to do just that and not to make decisions before they have input but now that I have this e-mail here, I agree that these four points seem to me to cover the issues at hand. They do not mention anything about a limit on square feet and I also agree that I think we're kind of hung up on that 100,000 square feet. When you design something it's not going to come out exactly as the ballpark figure that was thrown out when the issue was being pursued. As long as we can keep under budget if we get some more square footage out of it, I have no problem with that. So I support the motion." Mrs. Storey commented, "I think that it's time we put a limit on it. I thoroughly believe that it's time because what's happening is that, like we're going up by two's, we're only coming down by two's. As we come down going up cost us, make sure I'm right on this figure \$250 per square foot. When we come down we get 125. At some point we're losing out on this. So we might as well cut our losses and say. I realize it can't be 100,000 square feet and maybe not 12 or 7 inches something or somewhere. I don't care about that but I think that it's time that we quit sending all these mixed signals that we quit being ambiguous in our statements and trying to walk the narrow way. We only got a certain amount of money, we can only spend that amount of money and it's time for us to cut to the chase and I'd like to make an amendment to John's motion and limit it to 100,000 square feet and in budget and have the things that are necessary to have a quality building and if by some chance. We have never done a project, never done a project in our construction history during a SPLOST that we didn't have a change order and that the change order didn't up something." Mr. Ebron commented, "That's what the \$2,000,000 in contingencies is for." Mrs. Storey continued, "But if we keep building and we don't limit it we're going to use our 2,000,000 in contingency real quick. But if we by some small miracle have some money left over. I bet we could use it to buy books and stuff for the library that could be used within the programs of the library and therefore strengthen not only the quality building but the quality program that's going to be in that building so I'd like to move a motion to amend John's motion to limit it." Dr. Polleys asked for a second on the amendment to limit the library building to 100,000 square feet. Mr. Whiteside seconded the amendment. Dr. Polleys asked for discussion on the amendment. Mr. Walker commented, "I'm at a loss to understand why we are usurping the Library Project Development Committee's authority or whatever it is that we've given them. We have an e-mail here that addresses all the things that we are concerned about so why are we wanting to do something now that will negate what they are trying to do. I'm at a loss. Can somebody explain that to me?" Dr. Polleys commented, "Can I just answer and see if this clarifies. This would not necessarily negate what they want to do with it in terms of figuring out how to use that 100,000. You would simply be putting a limit on it to clarify and not send mixed signals." Mr. Whiteside commented, "I just want to make two points in connection with that. We really need to try to keep in perspective what the function of the Project Development Committee is. The function of the Project Development Committee is to make recommendations but it's the School Board, we're the owner's agent. Somebody here tell me that that's wrong. We are in affect the owner of the project under the terms of the contract. If we put limits or we make decisions about what should be in the building, we're not taking over the Project Development Committee's responsibilities, we're exercising our own responsibilities. The other thing is what we're really talking about here is who is it that has to make the decision and at what point the decision has to be made. I for one, I'm concerned about the fact that the budget that was generated by the Stern Company included a very small amount of money for books only about 340,000 and some odd thousand dollars. I believe Ms. Mueller said she would rather have going into the building a \$1,000,000 to buy books with, that's not in there. We have a number that's just about a third of that. I would hate for us to be put in a position where we move into the new library with no new books. What's the point of having a library. We take a collection out of a 50,000 square foot library then move it verbatim exactly as it is into a 100,000 square foot library what have we really gained. Now, that's an issue that could be dealt with at any

number of points. I mean we could deal with it in January but it gets to be costly after tonight. It gets to be also something that delays the project. I think that at some point we're going to have to decide who makes the decision." Mr. Ebron commented, "I agree that we certainly have to demonstrate leadership and I think that's what we're trying to do. I feel like we have continuously said that the library must be within budget. I don't see any mixed signals with that. I think the public may get a mixed signal from our going back and forth. That concerns me. The instructions are to go back and get the design within budget whether that is reducing gross square footage or whatever but getting it within budget and if it comes back and it's over-budget then we will give them the same instructions but I don't think that it will. I know that there are figures that we don't have regarding demolition. We all agree that with any savings whether it's through contingencies or through reduction in gross square footage we want that money to go for books. I think that's pretty clear. I would like to give the public the image that we all are saying the same thing, that we want the library within budget and that we want to be able to purchase as many books as we can. I think the four points that the Project Development Team has made would bring us in line with what all of us want to do." Mrs. Storey said, "I agree and I do think we're all saying the same thing basically. I think the problem has arise from, I have never voted on any budget that I didn't say, this is the amount of money we have, we cannot go over it. Not one time when we got the estimates has it been within budget and even when we write and say it's got to be in budget we get 2,000 square feet either added or taken off and we're still not there. While I don't think we're sending mixed signals among ourselves. Apparently there are mixed signals with the design and I think if we can limit the mixed signals by saying this is where we are, this is what we're going to do, we may actually get one design that's going to be within our budget and I don't think we're saying anything different than the committee. I think we're just being more specific." Mr. Wells commented, "I'm in favor of a 100,000 square foot library but I think the Project Development Committee is trying to get as many square feet or the best serviceable square feet out of the dollar that they can. I think they have charged Myles and the architect with that and I think they are reiterating that through these instructions. Mr. Caggins, did you plan to bring us a final figure that was going to be over-budget?" Mr. Caggins said, "I cannot do that." Mr. Wells went on, "Do you think the Project Development Committee would ever ask us to approve a final figure that's over budget?" Mr. Caggins replied, "I don't think they will." Mr. Wells, "When do you think you can get us a budget figure on this that's within budget that we can finally approve?" Mr. Caggins said, "Our intent is to look closer at the 8th of October. We're hoping that we can bring something, a more defined and in-budget by the 8th of October." Mr. Wells, "Are there any mixed signals to you that you're going to give us a final document that is over-budget?" Mr. Caggins, "No sir." Mr. Wells continued, "I too have been very concerned and I've raised my doubts about it a lot. I think what has happened is and everybody is concerned about it. The chairman of the committee says in the e-mail, due to news media reports and things like that, everybody is talking about it being over budget and I think he wanted to allay all of fears that the Library Project Development Committee was not going to come back with one that was over budget. As a matter of fact he wanted to give new instructions to not go over budget. If we adopt this as a resolution today understanding that he says you've got permission to reduce all areas in this to get it in budget, be prepared to do it, we can't go over budget, we have no leeway in that, to me that means that the Library Project Development Committee hears us loud and clear. I hope this can allay some fears not only here but also in the public. I've got to trust the Library Project Development Committee to do this." Dr. Polleys commented, "I am going to exercise the privilege that the chair has to speak to the motion which I very rarely do while I am presiding but I am going to speak to this motion and make two points. The first with all due respect, the idea of project that is well within budget we have learned from experience does not stay that way. Blasting rock in north Columbus was well within budget when we began it. We know from our experience that change orders take projects directly out of the budgeted scope that we voted on and approved and that there are always necessary change orders that must be done. The second point that I want to make is that, I am extremely concerned about the wording that says, "I would like to give the project superintendent Myles Caggins and the architect in New York, Stern and Company the following instructions." This communication went to not the Board of Education members but it went to the Library Planning Committee members. It is not the Library Planning Committee's authority to direct Mr. Caggins or the superintendent. We've never given them that authority. The authority rests with these nine elected people. I do not want to set a precedent where the Library Planning Committee directs the superintendent and Mr. Caggins." Mr. Whiteside, "I'm not going to make this as a motion but I'm going to offer this as a suggestion. Suppose that we gave the Project Development Committee. By the way I just want to say I share your concerns here about establishing a protocol here that removes authority away from accountability. Now that is a prescription for disaster. Every time you do that, you set somebody up to fail. Anytime that you say that one person is going to have the authority to make the decision and at the same time you say others those who are accountable at the ballot box have the accountability that sets up both sides to fail. That's a very bad plan. One thing that I'd like to get clear here is whatever happens here tonight we end up with a clear direction that it's the School Board who makes the final

decision about what the project should be. I wonder if what we could do is to take this e-mail which is really just sort of a statement of desires and goals and say that we approve the directions that the Project Development Committee chairman has given to its' committee and ask them to make us a recommendation and then we can act on it. I have one other concern and I share Mrs. Storey's concerns about the square footage because it has grown. But I would also like to see whatever comes out to have at least a million bucks built in it for books. The way I read this memorandum where the cost for the books would come from would be on whatever is left over when the reserve is not used. We know what that's going to be. Can I offer a substitute motion." Dr. Polleys said the original motion along with an amended motion is already on the table. Mr. Humes said, "once a motion is amended that really needs to be voted on. Then you can come through with a substitute motion." Mr. Whiteside commented, "my thought would be that we could ask the Project Development Committee, approving in concept the recommendations that the chairman has made to that committee, ask the committee to render a report to us remembering that a number of us would like to see the square footage cut back to 100,000 square foot and have at least a million dollar reserve in it." Mr. Wells, "I'll withdraw my original motion." Mrs. Storey, "I'll withdraw my amended motion." Mr. Whiteside, "I'll make that as a motion." Mr. Walker, "I think Fife and I are on the same page here except he added a little something that I wasn't prepared to do in my motion. I was going to say the same thing that we would ask the Project Development Committee to make this as a recommendation to us and also clean the language up here that we are stuck on about them directing the superintendent and Myles to do things. Personally, I don't think Pete meant that in the true sense of the word." Mr. Whiteside, "I want to add one thing to that to make it clear here that to the extent that we may have inadvertently approved the project last month a million two over budget that that approval is modified." Mr. Wells seconded Mr. Whiteside's motion. Mr. Ditchfield, "I think we're getting a little hung up on this one word. This e-mail reflects the thinking of the Project Development Committee. No matter what the terminology is here I don't see why we can't say looks like good recommendations we make the decision, let's make it tonight the same recommendations that they have there and it's our decision and that's quite clear rather than asking them to go back and come back to us. Yes, poor choice of words but I still think we can act on it." Mr. Whiteside commented, "No, there's big trouble in Dodge City if you do that. Because the problem about that is , if you just say this is the deal then if they come back with a recommendation that's two million dollars over budget which is not at all impossible given the fact we don't know what the demolition is going to be yet then we're hung on that. What has to be absolutely clear here is that we end up making the final decision on it before it goes to bid specifications. I want it to be absolutely crystal clear that they make a recommendation and it comes back to us and we get to approve it or disapprove it." Mr. Ebron commented, "I think it's clear in the public eye that we appointed the Project Development Team and they report to us. I don't think it's any question about that. We are the elected officials, we make the final decision." Dr. Polleys called for a vote on the motion, that the Board approve in concept the recommendations being made in the e-mail to the Project Development Committee and ask that the members of the Project Development Committee provide the Board with a report of how to do the project within budget so that the School Board may vote on it. Mrs. Parker commented, "I don't want to see them put a price in there. I want to see do they understand what we mean and based on these four comments in the e-mail it looks like they understand what we say and what we mean. I want to see if they understand what we mean by the square footage, the books and everything else. I want them to do that. I don't want to tell them." Mr. Wells, "I want it to be made as perfectly clear as we can that I have not approved any library project to be built over budget. I have approved a plan as we go forward which will be within budget whenever the final approval is made by this Board." Mr. Ditchfield commented, "I'm uncomfortable with the motion. We're saying to the Development Committee you get in there as an architect would and figure out exactly how we're going to cut everything rather than saying architect's you're your job to bring it back under budget. We're asking a volunteer committee to do the kind of work of exactly how to modify the building. I don't think that's within the privy of what they are doing. That's the architect's job." Mr. Ebron commented, "The four directions that the committee is giving us is enough to send to the architect and the architect can get specific. I'd like to offer a substitute motion to instruct the Superintendent to send the e-mail from the Project Development Committee in the form of recommendations to the architect." Mr. Ditchfield seconded the substitute motion. Mr. Ebron commented, "under the contract it requires that it must come back to the Board within budget for approval." Dr. Polleys called for a vote on the substitute motion. The vote was (5) affirming and (4) opposing, (Polleys, Storey, Whiteside, and Schley). The substitute motion passed.

Mr. Whiteside commented, "This is an off the agenda item and I'm not asking for any Board action. I'd like to know if the Superintendent is ready for Board members to review the resumes' from perspective library members?" Mr. Sims said, yes. Mr. Whiteside said, "Every Board member gets to review every resume', is that right?" Mr. Sims said yes and it was never intended for there to be any kind of a sub committee. Mr. Sims said there is close to about sixty applicants.

Mr. Wells commented, "on the dedication of the north site property project, there is a majestic grand view. A panorama view and the Superintendent made the comment that it would be a beautiful site in the spring and fall and summer and other times where people could come and look over. I would like to offer a resolution that we preserve that site where the dedication was from the property line up to that panoramic vista and that we dedicate that area to the citizens of Columbus in recognition of their observance of excellence in education for the children of Muscogee County." It was the consensus of the Board that this be done at next months Board meeting.

Mr. Humes said, "Last month we changed to the 21-person board and we wanted to do 7, 7 and 7, 3 years, 2 years and 1 year staggered terms and I didn't catch it then. I got a call from Ms. Mueller and that just won't work." Dr. Polleys, "No, my understanding was that after the initial appointment all subsequent appointments would be for 3 years." Mr. Humes agreed with this understanding.

Mr. Whiteside asked regarding the status of the Board policy manual revision? Mrs. Dozier commented that, it is being reviewed by the staff departments and will be brought to the Board next month for final approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Ebron, the Board unanimously approved the following consent agenda items:

- Personnel Report (Appendix A).
- New budget for FY02 Grant \$4,354.00 Georgia Council for the Arts Touring Program.
- New budget Local Assistance Funds \$10,000.00 for Kendrick High from Georgia General Assembly.
- New budget grant \$297,757.80; Reading Options Program for after-school enhancement in grades 4-8.
- New budget grant \$462,240.70; Reading Options Program in (33) elementary schools grades K-3.
- New budget grant \$15,417.00; Technology/Career Education for Agriculture Education.
- New budget Federal; \$437,805.00 and State; \$158,251.00 for Technology/Career Education.
- New budget GLRS FY02.
- New budget middle school magnet program for Arnold Middle (\$75,000) and East Columbus (\$75,000).
- Budget adjustment for School Nutrition Program; \$176,000.00.
- Budget adjustment for JTPA Summer Youth additional funds, \$9,769.00.
- Procedures for expending Georgia Lottery Funds FY02.
- Purchase order Bill Heard Chevrolet, \$13,860.00 Malibu for Central Office.
- Purchase order Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium, \$17,438.00 FY02 membership.
- Financial Assistance for a total of \$904.98.

Upon motion of Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Wells, the Board unanimously voted to go into executive session to hear a student discipline appeal and a personnel matter.

Upon motion of Mr. Ebron, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board unanimously voted to adjourn the regular September meeting of the Board.



James E. Humes, II
Legal Counsel