

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL FACILITIES AND CAPITAL PROGRAMS
MEETING MINUTES

January 13, 2020 – 7:00 pm

Dr. Charles R. Drew Elementary School – Library

In Attendance: John Chadwick, Jeff Chambers, Rosa Cheney, Michael DePalma, Mike Freda, John Giambalvo, Charles “Chip” Goyette, Sarah Johnson, Steven Leutner, Miles Mason, James Meikle, Scott Milam, Colleen Pickford, Shellie Ramirez, Adam Rasmussen, Heather Sauve, Stacy Snyder, Cecilia Ciepiela, Laura Edwards

1. Minutes for December approved.

2. Liaison Reports
 - a. ACTC: No update.
 - b. ACI: Communications discussed, between parents and students and schools. Bullying discussed. Concern for field space for intramural sports.
 - c. ACC BLPC: Presentation was given from design team that showed the major design ideas that they had heard from our committee, and taking into account major programmatic constraints and organizing the program on the site. One of the items the design team solved was making room for a future pool on the site by creating a large entrance courtyard that would be an outdoor gathering space, but could be filled in with a pool in the future. Next meeting is Wednesday, Jan 15 where "three" initial concept design options will be presented.
 - d. ASEAC: No update.
 - e. SEPTA: No meeting on Dec 24. Summer activities fair on Jan 25 specifically focused toward special ed students/parents. Program-based, not facilities-based discussions, but those can turn into facilities items longterm.
 - f. BAC: Transportation options discussed – more data collected regarding complexity and efficiency of the bus system including impact from new buses, changing boundaries, and improved parent interface (pilot should be ready for start of school year). Compensation studies discussed.
 - g. CCPTA: Conflict exists because the CCPTA meets at the same time as FAC. Elementary school planning process and equity policy will be discussed tonight.
 - h. JFAC: Review meeting where public facilities plans were reviewed and feedback given. Draft purpose statement was reviewed. Letter has been sent out for review, but the JFAC committee meeting to provide input and review has not yet occurred. Map presented with County and APS sites shown, dated November 18, 2019. Both letter and map are on the APSAC website. Due diligence needs to be performed to look at covenants, easements, and site constraints that might prevent sites from being readily used. The goal is to include "next steps" as part of next CIP, so that a planning document can be ready from APS in 2021.
 - i. SHAB: Wellness pit. Safety and security working group that includes discussions of lock-down drills and concussions.

j. Superintendent's Sustainability Advisory Committee: Not discussed

3. Minor Construction/Major Maintenance Update:

Committee with APS staff and FAC Liaison that reviews the MCMM budget requests. MCMM budget and funding has stayed consistent year to year.

Fulfilled all relocatable needs from owned stock. APS has been measuring the return on investment compared to leasing them, and they have \$4Million return so far.

Four buildings will be empty during summer since no summer school use, so MCMM is looking at savings by using alternative means to condition the schools for the 1 or 2 people occupying the schools.

Typical projects include internal room conversions, relocatables, and HVAC upgrades. System wide projects include third-party gym/bleacher and theater safety inspections, lead/mold/radon testing, storm water management, water isolation valves (so don't have to shut off entire water supply to work on plumbing), and switchgear servicing and upgrades. Cameras used for work in progress.

Previously, in 2008, maintenance requests came in from individual sites (principals submitted needs and wish lists) and then MCMM budgeted what they could. Most requests now are coming from MCMM staff resulting from onsite inspections.

Major roofing and HVAC projects are included in bond funding, now called as 'infrastructure' bond funds. These get 70 to 80% approval by County residents.

Lessons learned – Need to include budget for updates to fire and storm water codes and infrastructure for relocatables. Need to submit for permit and then order equipment well in advance (2 years ahead) to allow for long County review process and long equipment lead times.

Bike racks stock is replenished. Two year HVAC plan completed on Gunston and Randolph. Small synthetic play fields have been successful, except for non-sanctioned uses with cleats.

4. Update on Elementary School Move/Boundary Process:

Option 1: Move McKinley to Reed. Arlington Traditional moves to McKinley. Key Immersion moves to Arlington Traditional building. Key would open up as a neighborhood school.

Option 1 is being recommended to School Board for a vote on Feb 6. Option 1 and the other proposals and scenarios have been posted on the website. If vote No, then boundary changes will occur but without change in programs at the schools.

Why can't the proposals include changed boundaries with the changed programs. What would the boundaries look like with Option 1? What are cost impacts?

FAC is upset that the process appears to have had approval or signoff by FAC, but this is not the case. "...meetings with representatives of." APS staff said that proposals were discussed with FAC and that the intent was not to say FAC approved the proposal. But should FAC be more involved in the process? Not if all we do is 'rubber stamp' a decision that is already made. Suggestion made to not approve any option, but rather to provide broad recommendations regarding the criteria for ranking or approving the options. FAC's strengths are intimate knowledge on projections and facilities issues like transportation, walk zones, etc. Suggestion regarding FAC's role is to review what data is being used to analyze options. Suggestion that FAC play a larger role in the next step of the process (using lessons learned from the past boundary change process). Suggestion that a subcommittee be immediately developed to review.

Review of high school boundaries will begin in the fall.

5. JFAC Update on County Manager's Letter Regarding County Sites: Not discussed

6. Projections and CIP Update:

County has debt ratio of 10% and APS has separate ratio of 10%. Sharing of debt between County and APS does not occur, but jointly funded projects do occur. It is unlikely that County would support costs of parking at Career Center.

Two new years coming in, with finishing an elementary and middle school. Things that are in there – all expense estimates from 2 years ago.

Financing for FY 29-30 is not included. Expenses from 2 years ago are included, but cost overruns for current ongoing projects are not included.

MCMM funding is included.

Potential savings at parking garage for Career Center.

Not much change in middle school and high school projections, but there is a lowering of the elementary school projections. Need to correlate CIP and planned projects with projections. Options for handling growth – relocatables, add seats where future growth is

expected. APS is conducting design studies to determine ballpark costs of potential projects.

Presentation for CIP meeting previewed by APS staff. Visuals for that meeting include maps of where seats are needed within the County.

CIP is a planning document that must stay under the debt ratio requirements, but that also allows for future growth.

Suggestion to make recommendations regarding the CIP in terms of actual projects, such as:

- Raze Montessori and place Career Center parking there as a surface lot, and use the \$30 Million saved by not building the Career Center garage toward a new elementary school.
- Put Montessori at Campbell.
- Return Hoffman Boston to middle school use.
- Turn Ed Center to a middle school use.
- Build option school on Columbia Pike.