CIP Committee Report **Submitted by: Melissa McKenna, Chair**
September 1, 2015 **mckennaforeverpta@gmail.com**

Recent & Ongoing Activities

- Annual CIP "Cluster Comments" were submitted to the MCPS Department of Long-Range Planning (DLRP) in July. These have been compiled by Julie Morris and will be considered for the upcoming CIP budget.
- June-August: DLRP held meetings with every area to review their cluster comments and hear any additional concerns regarding capacity, rev/ex, and boundary studies.
- The Next Steps Reps subgroup of this Committee met with Councilmember Berliner, BOE, Glenn Orlin and Bruce Crispell, and Parks and Planning to continue discussions started at the Keeping Pace forum in March. (Separate summary of those meetings follows)

Relevant County Council Actions

- July 21st: County Council approved $27M to the Department of General Services to begin the relocation of the Shady Grove bus depot.
- July 28th: County Council approved placeholder projects for Walter Johnson HS and Northwood Cluster MS solutions.
- July 28th: Release of the Office of Legislative Oversight Report: A review of the MCPS Revitalization/Expansion Program

Relevant Rockville City Action

- August 3rd: Rockville City agreed to fund a $400k expansion of the gym at RMES#5 in exchange for free use of MCPS facilities for 2 years.

Relevant BOE Action

- August 20th: Awarded contract for construction of BCC MS#2.

Future Activities

- September CIP planning meetings with MCPS staff.
- Plan monthly CIP meetings and a testimony workshop in preparation for BOE public hearings in November.
- Monitor and inform conversation (as appropriate) regarding OLO report. We would like all schools evaluated and a responsible rev/ex schedule created.

Work for all

Over the summer our #1 priority out of the area meetings was to address school capacity. We ourselves don't prioritize capacity projects over rev/ex, but have advocated for rev/ex to continue and not be left behind to address only capacity. As an organization we need to determine if we feel other measures should be included in FACT scores, and why or why not, and understand the ramifications of those factors. We will need to gather the views of our PTAs and communicate with MCPS/BOE/CC accordingly.

Important CIP Dates

- *October 15th:* Superintendent releases recommendations on boundary and/or planning studies conducted in Spring 2015.
- *October 28th:* Superintendent publishes recommendations for the FY 2017–2022 CIP.
- *October 29th:* MCPS/MCCPTS CIP forum, 7 pm at 45 W. Gude Drive cafeteria.
- *November 9th and 12th:* BOE public hearings on the CIP

Notes on the OLO report:

There is a lot of misinformation and misinterpretation going on. This could be very distressing to our school communities, and I want them to have the right information.

MCPS is **NOT** going to reorder the rev/ex list for October!

MCPS agreed to go back and look at mathematical errors in computing FACT scores, acknowledged that the scores were only ever a snapshot in time and not computed over time. They acknowledge that facilities will deteriorate at different rates based on age and use. And yes, snapshots should not inform a 20 year process, and they will look at ways to reassess and assess more frequently.

From where we are in the CIP process for next year's recommendation, there will likely be a supplemental recommendation in Mid October addressing FACT scores and "the queue" but, I repeat, NO REORDERING WILL OCCUR THIS CIP CYCLE. Not all schools even have FACT scores and it takes about 9 months to evaluate schools.

I can't promise that all programmed schools will continue on their "original" (original-several-times-revised?) schedules but those slated to go into holding schools this winter will do so, those that have been designed will likely remain unaffected. It's a matter of what money has been spent so far. Schools with just feasibility studies completed is a little murkier.

The study came about to look into why so much of the CIP budget (total $) goes to rev/ex projects.

The focus was on reconstructions, replacing the entire structure, not modernizations. (see report for definitions). The report noted FACT scores should be revisited but not for the reasons we've said. They (OLO and CC) want system "upgrades" (their term: to us it's band aids) to prompt FACT score lowering thus relieving the urgency of that rev/ex and freeing up money to build more capacity.

While there is a geographic disparity in the location projects, there is no bias. They tend to follow the original construction timing pattern.

In the briefest of nutshells, the CC is trying to find a way to do fewer rev/ex by shoring up the old buildings. Thereby releasing money towards capacity projects, because it's very costly to do rev/ex as a proportion of the total CIP. Mr. Song noted these projects also tend to double school capacity....

MCPS was given ample opportunity to comment. And did so well. Acknowledging that FACT scores were a snapshot. As part of the MCPS feasibility process, they compare the cost of building renovation vs the cost of building replacement thoroughly. There was also someone from the state that backed up MCPSs cost efficiencies, opening new buildings on time, and getting the best bang for their buck.

Important factoid: state must approve any project tearing down 50% of existing structure to receive state funding. In all cases the state has approved all MCPS feasibility studies showing the necessity of "reconstruction."

Please contact me if you have any questions. If you are unsure of questions being directed to you by your schools, I will be happy to answer them.

CIP subcommittee report Next Steps Reps Top 5 Topics Findings

1. More realistic job of predicting population growth.

BC: Can't predict/account for housing turnover. Do school enrollment census and monitor trends.

2. Eliminate cluster averaging. Change the APFO. Moratoria.

Berliner: MAYBE. May look at individual schools. SSP policy review up next year. Supports school test except where boundary change would resolve overcrowding.

GO: NO. Placeholders allow residential development to continue while MCPS does feasibility study. Only put in placeholder if MCPS doing study. Fund project within 6-year CIP.

BC: NO. Too many schools for individual basis. Cluster averaging allows building elsewhere and boundary changes. Placeholder project is minimum needed to stay below 120% moratorium threshold. If tighten APFO threshold, rev/ex will be pushed back to address only capacity–has already happened.

P&P: NO. Believes capacity issues could be addressed with additions and boundary changes.

3. First provide space in schools, then add development. [Related to moratorium]

Berliner: where development important, shouldn't be driven by capacity.

BC: MCPS facility planning NOT driven by SSP. Continually doing capacity work.

4. Require developers to contribute more money/pay for the actual cost of a seat in the classroom (including costs of land). Proportional payment.

Berliner: YES DO! developers should pay proportionally.

P&P: YES. Cost of seat should include contribution or cost of land. Is capital cost assumption accurate? Willing to swap land between parks and schools.

5. Have county and municipal planning departments use the same length planning cycles (through end of projects) with consistent generation rates.

BOE: DLRP thinks long term.

BC: Can only include development in enrollment projections once project approved.

GO: Timing of development from plan approval to full build out hard to predict.

P&P: YES. Will look at generation rates in new SSP. However, feels generation rates aren't the issue.

Collocation:

Berliner: YES DO! His key takeaway. Kind of conversation he wants.

BOE: OK with collocation concept, but what about now. Already doing with parks, pools, wellness centers, Linkages, schools.

P&P: YES. <u>This is a basic thing we should be accepting.</u> Already with parks. Open to other kinds of community facility collocations. Favors as a means for acquiring land from development plans.

Alternative design/schools in office buildings:

BOE: OK. No problem with different design, but wouldn't save money. Not sure parents/community ready for out-of-the-box thinking.

P&P: MAYBE. Office buildings for offices; school buildings for schools. Could retrofit an office building, but consider other options first. New, urban public facilities may have to be bigger, higher and will cost more. People don't want urban schools in suburbs.

Reclaiming schools/county sites:

BOE: MAYBE. Not off the table. Expensive to renovate, often cheaper to build additions.

P&P: NOT LIKELY. Moving/repurposing County building/park met with strong school and community pushback.

Key: BC: Bruce Crispell; APFO: adequate public facilities ordinance; SSP: Subdivision Staging Policy; GO: Glenn Orlin; P&P: Parks and Planning; DLRP: Division of Long-Range Planning.