
Arkansas Division of Public School



Academic Facilities & Transportation

**COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL ACADEMIC FACILITIES
AND TRANSPORTATION**

Dr. Ken James, Chair

MEETING AGENDA

May 1, 2006

9:30 a.m.

Arkansas Department of Education Auditorium

Call to Order/Roll Call

1. Approval of March 8, 2006 Meeting Minutes
2. Rules Governing the Academic Facilities Partnership Program
Request for Approval to Post Changes for Public Comment
3. Request for Approval of Tentative Partnership Projects
4. Custodial Maintenance Handbook
Request for Approval for Posting and Public Comment
5. Request for Approval for Extension of Division Contracts
6. Marmaduke Tornado Damage Update

MINUTES OF
COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL ACADEMIC
FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION

Date: May 1, 2006

Place: ADE Auditorium, Little Rock, AR

Attendees: Dr. Ken James, Director, Arkansas Department of Education
Richard Weiss, Director, Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration
Mac Dodson, President, Arkansas Development Authority

Call to Order/Roll Call. Dr. Ken James called the eleventh meeting of the Commission for Public School Academic Facilities and Transportation to order. All Commission members were present.

1. Approval of March 8, 2006 Commission Meeting Minutes. Dr. James stated that the minutes were received in time for review and asked for questions or a motion. **Mr. Weiss moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion and with no further discussion the motion was approved unanimously.**
2. Rules Governing the Academic Facilities Partnership Program – Request for Approval to Post Changes for Public Comment. Dr. James turned the meeting over to Doug Eaton who stated that the changes to be made to the rules dealing with the Partnership Program: 1) came out of the Extraordinary Session, pages 2, 3 and 6; and 2) that some Partnership projects went a lot further in breath and scope than the Transitional Program projects, resulting in the need to change the reasons for and the basis of analysis. The first document is the Emergency Amendment and the second is the Rules that are to be put out for public comment, and the Commission will be asked to vote on each one.

The emergency amendment will allow the rules to be put in place immediately and the changes are highlighted in red. On page 6 the change clarifies that the information provided to the Commission today regarding the partnership projects is tentative and that the school districts will be notified of the final decision on the applications and the estimated amounts of state financial participation no later than July 1, 2006.

The next change has to do with the basis for the cost estimates and is the same paragraph the Commission approved in the Transitional Program rules. But in the Partnership Program the square footage cost does not apply to many of the projects. It can be applied to new buildings and new additions, but cannot be applied to a roof, sidewalk, etc.

On page 8 the appeals process (identical to the one that was put in the Transitional Program rules) is added, since it was not in place in the original rules. The way the legislation was written up the appeals process was at the end and the intent was that it would apply to everything in the legislation. The appeals process is being added here to stabilize the rules and policies for the Partnership Program because this is the extended program.

On page 9 the standard emergency clause is added. On page 10 the effective date is immediately upon approval by the Commission. These rules are already on the <http://www.arkansasfacilities.com/> web site and once approved by the Commission, a link will be established and the hearing for public comment advertised. Once the hearing is advertised the 30-day period for written comments will begin.

Mr. Weiss moved that the rules be approved on an emergency basis. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously. Dr. James stated that rules were approved for emergency purposes and now a motion was needed to put them out for public comment. **Mr. Dodson moved to put the rules out for public comment. Mr. Weiss seconded the motion and with no further discussion the motion was approved.** Dr. James stated that the rules had been approved for emergency and public comment.

3. Request for Approval of Tentative Partnership Projects. Mr. Eaton stated that this tab includes: 1) a recommended Tentative List of Approved Projects and 2) a recommended Tentative List of Disapproved Projects and these lists are in the same format as the Transitional Program projects, with the exception that a "remarks" column has been added. Originally, legislation required that Partnership Program projects were to be submitted at the same time Master Plans were submitted, but that was changed as follows: 1) February 1, 2006 the Master Plans for the first three years were submitted and 2) March 1, 2006 Partnership Program projects were submitted. The Master Plan and Partnership Program project tie directly in two ways. 1) Each project requested for the Partnership Program must be listed on the Master Plan and 2) each Partnership Program project had to tie in to the Master Plan in some way. The legislation established May 1, 2006 as the date the district would be notified that a Partnership Program project had been tentatively approved and July 1, 2006 as the date for final approval. The Legislature also set up September 1, 2006 as the date for Master Plan approval. So in order to

approve the Partnership projects, the Division has not been able to completely review or approve all the Master Plans; therefore, the projects listed lack the last tie with the Master Plan.

The review proceeded as follows:

- 1) Double-checked that each submitted Partnership Program project was on the Master Plan. Projects not on the Master Plan were moved off.
- 2) Made sure that each Partnership Program project met the general requirements of the new standards. If the project was an addition, a new facility, or a significant portion of a building to be upgraded, such as a HVAC system, it was checked to determine if the new standards established in the facility manual were met.
- 3) Doubled-checked to make sure each Partnership Program project was at an academic facility. If it was an athletic or administrative facility, the project was not approved.

If a Partnership Program project did not meet all of the above criteria, it became a recommended disapproved project.

Most of the Partnership Program projects on the second list were identified as "Repair by replacement". Some projects were "Funded under Transitional" and the district reapplied, or in some cases the district put them on both lists to see which would be approved. Working with districts to get them to make the leap of faith from repairing something to actually improving it to get it on the Partnership Program list has been an educational process. Hopefully, the next projects submitted will be actual enhancements to projects, which right now are not being seen. A number of projects listed here are simply pulling something out and putting something back in (not an enhancement, does not add to the building or to the life) and are disapproved. The disapproved list will expand by July, because there are projects on the approved list that do not quite tie into the Master Plan. Right now the quantity and type cannot be identified.

If a Partnership Program project was on the Master Plan, met the standards, and was an academic facility, it was initially classified as being an approved project, and then the estimated cost was determined by a number of different ways. 1,202 projects are on the recommended tentative approval list and 226 projects are on the recommended tentative disapproval list. Of the 1,202 projects, about 250 were visited by architect/engineer teams. These are the five teams brought on board with a meeting and training sessions. The teams were told exactly what was to be done because their scope was to 1) verify the scope of the project, and 2) verify the facility index of the building to which the project applied to see if had changed. It was an opportunity to go back and verify that the condition indexes done in 2004 are still valid (there could have been deterioration or improvements could have been made to the facility, etc.) 250 projects were visited and the remaining projects were done in concert with the districts as we looked at scopes of work, talked with the district, applied the square footage amount, and applied the building amounts to R. S. Means to come up with the estimated cost. If the scope was not clear or our estimated cost was way above or way below what the district had, that was noted in the "remarks" column. The focus of the comments is related to the scope being tied to the Master Plan and needs to show what the district intends to do over the next three years. This is the basic criterion for project approval, not money. The estimated cost was also determined at the site visit. Then objective data was reviewed (i.e., the growth figures on how the district is projected to increase/decrease in population, the wealth index that has already been calculated for this year, and the number of students). These three pieces of objective data were then fed into the formula that provided the scoring numbers seen on the lists (as was also done in the Transitional Program). Remember there was a discussion about how the Commission wanted the numbers represented and the Commission requested scoring order. The lists are presented in scoring order here but have also been alphabetized for ease of use. An evaluation was also done of the FCI using a) the building or b) the district to calculate the score of those projects.

Next will be the review on how the Partnership Program project addresses the issue of short falls and supports the Master Plan. In the legislation the Division had two charges: 1) develop a mechanism by which the projects would be analyzed on context alone, and 2) develop a mechanism by which the projects would be analyzed on how they did or did not support the district's Master Plan. The first part was math and was easy. Now a subjective evaluation will be done to look at what the district intends to do for the next three years and how this project supports that. For example, if there is projected growth throughout the district, and in the first three years of the Master Plan no additions, buildings or renovations are shown that would support that growth, the district has a disconnect between the project and the Master Plan - and that is something that will be looked at. Projects will be reviewed more closely with regard to whether or not the project addresses issues on the Master Plan relating to 1) growth, 2) the assessment done in 2004, and 3) district priorities which will be difficult because a lot of the district's priorities do not jump out at you. Some Master Plans were prepared by architect/engineer firms, some prepared by the district were quite good and some prepared by the district were bad and require that a lot of work be done with the district to try and analyze exactly what the district is trying to accomplish. The districts cannot be faulted for doing a bad job; it is just that many of the districts have never done a Master Plan before and are being asked to look forward three years, then seven years. The Division will work closely with the districts for the first three years and hope that will make the second part of the Master Plan process a lot more palatable and easier to understand. But right now it is very difficult to tie projects to the Master Plans.

These two lists will change. Some projects are on here that the districts would really like to have; but if a project does not support the Master Plan and can't be tied to it in any way, it will probably be recommended for disapproval. The district will be asked to redefine the project and between now and July the scope will be discussed. Priorities have been set up within the Division as to how these projects will be reviewed. The Division feels comfortable with the projects on this list that do not have a comment, which means the project is on the Master Plan and there is nothing specific that must be addressed. A lot of projects have remarks and many are predicated on the two things being tied together. The goal right now is to complete a much closer analysis on the projects versus the Master Plan, which possibly will cause projects to be taken off the recommended approved list and put on the recommended disapproved list.

1,202 projects were on the recommended approved list and 226 on the recommended disapproved list. Approximately \$250 million is expected to be the state's share on these projects over a three-year period. This is probably a little less than originally anticipated and how that detail out to cash flow is not known at this time. This, along with the final list of projects, will be part of the recommendation that will be brought to the Commission in June. Verification of the cash flow for the first year will allow the Division to proceed. In October the Division has a report due that is a moving forecast of what will be spent for the next three years and that is going to be very difficult to hit. Right now disbursement of funds is a lot slower than anticipated. Wednesday a report will be presented to Senator Broadway and the Oversight Committee that we have only expended about 25% of the Immediate Repair Program funds and 30% of the Transitional Program funds which means there is a lot of money in the bank. This has resulted from districts not being able to gear up fast enough and waiting too late in the year to get contractors on board, and this was expected. Districts that have done projects over the years have a very fine forecasting staff and know how to get projects accomplished. But many districts that have not had the opportunity or the need to go out and get a contractor or architect are finding that it may take five, six or seven months. Many projects that need to be done this summer will have to be put off until spring simply because the industry is not ready.

After final approval by the Commission, the intent is to post these two lists on the www.arkansasfacilities.com web site this afternoon and this will be the official notification to the districts. A Commissioner's Memo will be sent out and any district that has a project listed on the Tentative List of Disapproved Projects has until May 15, 2006 to submit to the Division any further justification the district would like considered for that project. Otherwise, the Division will immediately begin reviewing the approved projects over \$20,000. \$20,000 was selected because that was a logical breaking point. 640 of the 1,202 projects are below \$20,000 with the lowest project \$26 and the highest project \$9.4 million, and the effort has to be proportional between the size of the project. \$20,000 is the breaking point in contractual law in Arkansas as to what has to be bid, what has to be bonded, etc. So Division emphasis will be placed on all projects over \$20,000. All projects that fit a regimen and meet procurement laws in this state will be awarded. The Division will establish steps to track projects and allow the Division to develop this list a lot more thoroughly and hopefully a lot quicker.

Mr. Dodson asked if the approval at this time would include the amounts less than \$20,000. Below \$20,000, what happens? Mr. Eaton responded that the list includes every project that has been approved. Because of the sheer numbers, the Division went back and determined that there were 200 Immediate Repair Program projects and 300 Transitional Program projects. Now there are 1,202 Partnership Program projects, as well as the 500 to 600 the Division is still dealing with. The Division is not capable of handling 2,000 projects so \$20,000 was arbitrarily selected as the review point. If a district submits a scope (that the Division agrees to) and qualified bids for a project below \$20,000, more than likely the Division will take that information, deal with it and match their share. Projects above \$20,000 will be reviewed. The breaking point at \$20,000 is exactly at about a 1,000, with 600 projects that go up and then keep going up to \$22,000, \$23,000, \$80,000, \$100,000, all the way up to \$9 million. But \$20,000 is the breaking point under procurement law as to what documentation is needed to advertise and award the project. Below \$20,000 you are allowed to procure services and products with local board policies and, in most cases, telephonic quotes; above that state procurement laws are to be followed.

The recommended Tentative List of Approved Projects presented today is every project from every district. Nothing has been taken off except projects that were recommended as disapproved. The Commission is requested to approve the tentative lists, which will be put out on the web site for districts to see. Districts are really bound by not proceeding with the planning until the final amount is known. Some may look at the list and say the district has a good shot at getting this and will start going through the process. Some have already started the process and this makes it very awkward because there is other documentation that is going to flow between the Division and the districts as far as mutual agreement. Legislation requires that a Partnership Program Agreement has to be entered into by both parties and there are certain stipulations in the Partnership Program Agreement as to how the project is to be monitored and reviewed. So the districts that have asked about proceeding before then have been told that the Division can only guide and tell what is going to happen from this point forward. If a district wants to start the project, the district must be prepared to change the design

contract into the process, etc. Most will wait to see what that amount is and July 1, 2006 is the notification date. Mr. Eaton asked for any question.

Mr. Weiss asked Mr. Eaton to restate the provisions. This is a provisional approval of a tentative list and what might cause a project to fall off this list. Is it within the comments here? Mr. Eaton said the Division has to go back and verify the scopes. If something was missed in the scope (for example, a non-academic building) then yes the project would come off the list. The biggest one is that if a project does not support the Master Plan. This took up a page and a half of the legislation of how a project had to track with the Master Plan. If a district presents a Master Plan with all maintenance and repair projects except for one project at the bottom, the District will go back to the Master Plan to see if the project can be tied to the condition of the building, growth, etc. If the project cannot be tied to anything, then the Division will go back and ask the district why this is the first priority, and there has to be a correlation.

Dr. James asked if the lists were already on the web site with a link to be established once the Commission approved the lists. Mr. Eaton responded yes. Dr. James asked if Mr. Eaton and the Division were confident with the lists and if the comments were going to be a part of the lists also. Mr. Eaton replied yes. The Division wants the districts to see the comments because the Division doesn't want a district to start designing a building and all of a sudden see a comment that says the Division has a concern about the scope. Hopefully, the districts will respond right away and clarify the comments. All projects over \$20,000 with a comment need clarification. Once the scope is defined, the Division can read the estimate and come together with the districts on the cost, which will make our cost estimates for July a lot more accurate. Dr. James suggested that an asterisk be used with a caveat saying if there is a comment there are still questions, so make sure you call the Division. Mr. Eaton said that could be done. The Commissioner's Memo will be changed to reflect that a response to the comments is requested by May 15. Hopefully, districts will see this and respond.

Mr. Eaton stated that, as mentioned to the Commission in the January meeting, he is trying to turn the focus to the projects and scopes submitted by the districts. Money is a good gauge, but it is not an accurate gauge of what is being done. An accurate gauge is simply a listing of what a district is actually doing. There has to be a meeting of the minds on a scope that will enhance the buildings and the suitability, as well as make it more equitable to the district. Dr. James asked if there were any more questions.

Mr. Weiss said with that explanation he moved that the Commission approve the tentative Partnership Program lists as submitted by the Division and for posting. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion and with no further discussion or clarification the motion was approved.

4. Custodial and Maintenance Manual – Request for Approval for Posting and Public Comment. Mr. Eaton stated that Act 1426 authorized a number of manuals the Division was required to put together. The Facility Manual was presented to the Commission in September 2005 and subsequently approved and put in place. To accelerate the process two other manuals were incorporated within that manual. One manual had to do with custodial maintenance and the other had to do with detached equipment. Detached equipment is being held in abeyance right now. The Custodial and Maintenance Manual that was included followed the guidelines in the legislation by detailing two things. 1) a custodial and maintenance procedure was to be established by the district and reported in the February 2007 or a subsequent Master Plan, and 2) the various elements that had to be included in the custodial and maintenance plan. The intent was to make sure that once school buildings were at a certain level there was a plan to keep them clean, maintained, and equitable across the state. A lot of questions were found because there was a disparity in what the districts have in place right now. Some, especially the larger districts, have very involved plans and some simply have no plan at all; but the requirements to submit a plan are the same. Over the last month or so the original plan has been added to and is what you see here (a sort of a how-to manual). From this manual, a district that has to put together a custodial plan can find out how to calculate the staff, how to set up a schedule, how to establish a daily timeline for custodians, etc. The same has been done for maintenance and a district can find out what is recommended for inspection, what is the recommended schedule for the inspection, etc. The intent was for the district to use this manual as a guide when the district's custodial and maintenance plan is prepared. This can be used in any format. It is a guideline and a manual. A district can do a custodial guideline, a custodial maintenance schedule or whatever the superintendent feels comfortable with. Hopefully, a district will be able to develop a plan from this as it covers basic custodial items, how new hires are handled and acquainted with procedures, recommended training lists of what custodians and maintenance people should be trained to do, etc. It is very difficult to set a standard for the area of custodial and maintenance, even though the intent of 1426 says that the manual shall set a standard. A guideline can be set and recommended procedures and methods given on how to keep a facility clean and maintain it, but when you set a standard actually a qualifier is being set. A superintendent does not need to be told how many times to clean a toilet; but toilets should be put on a cleaning schedule. (For example, daily is recommended. But it may be scheduled once a month in the custodial plan. Then as required in legislation, custodial and maintenance spot visits/inspections will be done to determine how successful the plan is. After a day is spent inspecting the facility and

equipment, etc., it may be determined that the custodial plan needs to be tweaked. Then the district must correct or develop a better schedule, etc. Then in six months the facilities and equipment will be inspected again.)

Requirements for the seven-year Master Plan are massive. Districts are required to have a custodial plan and a maintenance plan in addition to a seven-year forecast for their goals and projects - and this is a monumental task. This Custodial and Maintenance Manual should make it a lot easier to meet the requirements and a big step forward in putting that plan together. Included are methods for staff calculations, recommended schedules, services and inspections, and a format. This is being sent out electronically, can be downloaded, changed and used in whatever way the district wants to use it. Also included is a recommended method on how to establish the amount of staffing needed. For the larger districts the procedure is very detailed (teacher stations, square footage, type of space, etc. are counted), and worked out mathematically to determine a number. Or one custodian per 19,000 square feet can be used. Hopefully, this manual will raise the visibility of the custodial and maintenance program because many districts don't have dedicated custodial and maintenance sections. In some districts the custodian may also be a bus driver or something else and may be keeping the building clean to the satisfaction of the principal, teachers and superintendent, but may not keeping it maintained to a status that allows that building to go on longer than maybe 20 years. Again, the Commission approved the basic tenants of this in 2005; all that has been done here is an expansion.

Mr. Weiss said "excellent". Dr. James said this manual would go a long way in terms of helping school districts go forward. Mr. Eaton said that with the Commission's approval today the manual would go out for public comment. Because the original Facility Manual has already gone out for public comment, this is a monumental change. This manual will be posted on the web site, a public hearing will be advertised and held, and after the advertisement there will be a 30-day period for written comments. Members of the original Task Force who served on the Custodial and Maintenance Committee reviewed this manual and one or two things were suggested. Otherwise, the committee members were absolutely ecstatic and thought that being able to fill in the blanks would be much easier for the districts. Dr. James responded that this would be greatly appreciated by the districts. **Mr. Weiss made a motion to put the Custodial and Maintenance out for posting and public comment. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously**

5. Request for Approval for Extension of Division Contracts. Mr. Eaton said this is the time of year to review contracts. Mr. Kunkel has provided the dates for the contract renewals and the necessary forms to go forward. To accelerate the process all eight contracts are listed by company, the extension period requested and what the company's services will be used for with this extension. The companies have not been contacted nor has price been determined, but this will all be worked out. Commission approval is requested to proceed. Dr. James asked if there were any questions from Commission members.

Mr. Dodson asked if all were doing a good job. Mr. Eaton replied yes, although some have to be pushed a little. The information from the last five regarding the scopes was good and a tremendous help to us. If these contracts are extended, the intent is to start immediately on the next round of scopes for the 2007-08 projects and have those done by the time the Master Plans come in. These contracts are needed right now. This has to be compressed. At the present rate if the Division doesn't get back on a logical schedule, the staff will not be able to take a deep breath until the middle of 2008 if we can make it that far.

Summit Consulting Services (one of the original three hired by the legislation and has been with Division the longest) will work with the Division on putting a lot of information out to the districts as a how-to manual. Having come from a large school district with assets and a large staff and then visiting school districts in the last couple of months to talk about three issues and the superintendent is the only one there that gives you an idea of the level of staff. Plans are to put together a how-to manual. Then when a district calls and says the district wants to purchase land, the information can be found in Tab A (here is what needs to be done to purchase property, here is everything needed); or hire architectural services, the information can be found in Tab B. This will be a desk-side reference and will assist districts with a lot of facility issues. It will go beyond simply submitting projects for the Partnership Program. The Commission is requested to approve the extension of the contracts. The contracts will then be negotiated, a price and scope determined, and the necessary documentation presented to finance and procurement and then to the Commission at the meeting in June so the contracts can go into effect in July. **Mr. Dodson made a motion to extend the contracts and Mr. Weiss seconded the motion. Dr. James made a clarification that this would be a one-year extension, 2006-07, and asked for any further questions or clarifications. Mr. Weiss asked that after this one-year extension other competitors be looked at. Mr. Eaton said that would certainly be done especially the last five and the top three were part of the original process. Mr. Weiss said he understood what Mr. Eaton was saying. With no further questions or clarification, the motion was passed unanimously.**

6. Marmaduke Tornado Damage Update. Mr. Eaton gave an update on the tornado damage at Marmaduke and stated that the enclosed pictures were not very clear. Marmaduke suffered a tornado, along with a couple of other towns in northern

Arkansas and southern Missouri. Marmaduke is a very small district, located on one campus with all three buildings (elementary, middle and high schools) connected to make one big school. The tornado struck the town, did extensive damages to homes, one major employer in the area, and caught one side of the school building. Two days after the tornado Mr. Eaton walked through the building with the superintendent and the insurance company representative and viewed all the necessary things that had to be done.

The school is up and running. It opened on Wednesday. Portable buildings were brought in and a security fence was installed. The superintendent is working very diligently on an evacuation plan for the portables. Superintendent Smith has done an unbelievable job. She is up there by herself and the only administrative assistance she has is the principal and a general bookkeeper. The insurance representative has been a tremendous asset to her. The insurance company has essentially agreed to almost everything asked for. The insurance company has audited the entire bill and there are a few items insurance will not cover. Superintendent Smith has been directed by me to go to FEEMA and fill out the forms, as these are public buildings.

The most significant damage was to the elementary school that lost most of the roof. The insurance company is going to replace the roof on the whole complex, with the exception of one roof that will be repaired. Much of the building had a metal roof and the wind pulled it loose everywhere and ripped up quite a bit of the sections. One section of the elementary school sustained wind force so bad the walls collapsed. All of that is going to be repaired and/or replaced.

The target is to have this building ready for school next year. The portables may not be out but everyone is confident the elementary students can be back in the building. The elementary students are the only ones in portables. One wing of the elementary school is open and being used as the Pre-K area. The middle and high schools are up and running. The bus barn shed and maintenance office were lost and damage was done to the agri building. The insurance company is going to handle all of this.

Superintendent Smith reported this morning that the campus was clean, all of the insulation was gone (which was something to behold, it looked like pink snow everywhere), the play area is open and things are in good shape. Quite a bit of help was received from the Greene County School District who had extra buses that were dispatched from Paragould so Superintendent Smith was able get buses moving again. DPSAFT mechanics were sent because all the Marmaduke buses were damaged as they were caught in the shed. Greene County mechanics put the repairs high on their list; and by using parts from one bus all of the buses were repaired

This report was sent to Dr. James earlier and this information is given to the Commission as an update. Superintendent Smith will not have to apply for Catastrophic Program relief because 1) there will be some FEEMA assistance and 2) the insurance only had a \$1,000 deductible and FEEMA may pick that up. The items the insurance company will not cover are batting cages and things like that, and apparently the district will be OK. Mr. Weiss said thank you for the report.

Senator Broadway said Catastrophic Program funds would be available, if needed, as a line item had been put back in to provide access to the funds. Mr. Eaton responded that this is an appropriation that all hope will never have to be used. Mr. James said this whole exercise is one that could be used as a case study for the State Board, ADE and superintendents in terms of what happened and what has to be done in this type situation; this was a phenomenal happening and something that needs to be considered. Mr. Weiss asked the enrollment for the Marmaduke School District. Mr. Eaton replied approximately 670-680. Dr. James said Ms. Smith is a relatively new superintendent having been "proven by fire" and one day was up on a roof when he called. Mr. Eaton said Superintendent Smith had stated in conversation that "superintendent training teaches you how to do schedules but it doesn't tell you what to do when you drive up one day and your building is gone". This needs to be discussed with superintendents and included as a section in the training (if you have a disaster, this is what you do). As mentioned, what made this situation bad was that a lot of homes were hit and there was no place to rally because the school and the one factory were hit. When we arrived there the staff was trying to get the school up and running and the Red Cross, Salvation Army, the State and everyone who would normally set up at the school had no place to go. It was a double whammy. Dr. James said it was amazing that no lives were lost as this same storm hit Tennessee and nine people were killed.

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Weiss made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.