



21. Laura Siegel, Churchill Cluster
22. Larry Center
23. Wendy Williams
24. Daniel Shannon
25. Shirley Brandman
26. William Smeltzer
27. Jerri Reger
28. Chris Tucker
29. Chris Burch
30. Carolyn Rabunsky
31. Kristina Williams
32. Dr. Daniel Perlin

Board of Education members asked the following questions and made comments:

1. Mrs. King asked Mr. Lavorgna to explain the process for changing boundaries in relationship to the request from the Town of Kensington. Mr. Lavorgna stated that a boundary study would be done, committee formed, boundary review process with the committee, committee report filed, Superintendent would make a recommendation, and the Board would take action, which could occur in March.
2. With respect to the testimony of the Richard Montgomery Cluster, Ms. Signer asked (1) what is the impact on the CIP of accelerating the modernization as suggested to 2003, (2) what is the impact in terms of state aid request of a replacement school versus a modernization, and (3) where is the location of all the utilities (water, gas, sewer) on the Richard Montgomery High School (RMHS) property in order to ascertain whether or not a replacement school is feasible given the right-of-way for public utilities.
3. Mrs. O'Neill asked about 401 Fleet Street. Who owns the property? Mr. Lavorgna stated the property was owned by the Board of Education and is leased to the County Government. Mrs. O'Neill asked what their intent was for the future use of the property.
4. Mr. Abrams asked about the modernization of RMHS. As to the capacity issue, it was his assumption that the King Farm was counted as future RMHS enrollment. However, that development is currently divided between two clusters. He would like comments from the City of Gaithersburg, City of Rockville, and the clusters involved regarding the efficacy of that unification.
5. With the capacity issues proposed for RMHS, Mr. Abrams' second issue is the middle school capacity. There is a middle school site as part of the King Farm. He

asked for the timeframe within CIP consideration.

6. Mr. Abrams wanted staff to comment on both proposals of the RMHS community. In one proposal of the reuse of the site for a new RMHS, the only facility that would remain would be the auditorium. The early feasibility work looked at a new structure built to the east of the current auditorium on the parking area. He wanted to know staff's view of the feasibility of using that layout.
7. Mr. Abrams wanted the comments from the City of Rockville regarding the RMHS proposal since part of the land that is sought is city-owned property. Is a swap envisioned? Is there interest on the part of the city? What would be the constraints?
8. Regarding the Carver site, Mr. Abrams asked how employees would be housed during the construction of a new school?
9. Mr. Felton asked if the RMHS community had considered renaming the school to Carver with the exchange of property.
10. Mr. Abrams thought it would be helpful if there was clarification as to the relationship between the county budget and the availability of state funds for construction. Mr. Lavorgna reported that the eligibility for state aid MCPS requested is based on projects that were approved by the County Council in May. Therefore, the school system knows what projects were eligible for submission, which is \$30 million based on the current funding formulas. The budget is built on \$40 million in state aid, and MCPS had received \$50 million in the past. There is a state aid problem unless the percentage is increased in the state formulas or projects are added. The change in those formulas can be made by the Board of Public Works or the legislature. Mr. Abrams pointed out that in both cases that change would occur in Annapolis. He wanted people to understand what the process is and where the pressure points are for change in the formula. He thought it would be useful for state and county elected officials not to plea ignorance on this funding issue. He encouraged the press to write about this issue and what MCPS can do under the current state of law and regulations.
11. Mrs. O'Neill asked about the list of elementary gyms and the construction cycle of phasing them in with two schools per year. Greenwood Elementary School is on that list in FY 2002. Is that correct? Mr. Lavorgna stated that there was no request for a gym for Greenwood. The only request is for FY 01 for Dr. Sally Ride and Northwest #6 elementary schools. Mrs. O'Neill asked if it would be best to plan the gym with the addition.

12. Ms. Signer wanted to know the cost of a gym at Greenwood done earlier versus later, using inflated construction costs.
13. Ms. Signer asked for the accuracy of the enrollment forecast at Greenwood, and a rationale for moving a third special education class into the school if it is, indeed, overcrowded. Could that be delayed? What would be the consequences?
14. Mrs. O'Neill asked for the costs (school by school) to add an elementary gym for every school in the six-year CIP that will be modernized and/or have an addition. How could all others on the list be slotted in with a request for gym equity, and what would be the cost?
15. Mr. Felton wanted clarification on the ADA compliance issue raised by the Paint Branch Cluster. Mr. Lavorgna stated that the improvements in the feasibility study will correct the ADA compliance issues.
16. Ms. Signer stated that Ms. Askin raised an issue about a safety review that had been conducted at Coldspring Elementary School. Would staff please summarize the review and the intent of MCPS to address the concerns raised in the report.
17. Regarding the Churchill Cluster, Ms. Signer asked about the portable structures at Tilden which was originally six rooms to Cabin John and eight rooms to Frost. Does MCPS have other plans for the eight rooms that were suppose to go to Frost. If not, is it feasible to place it at Cabin John given the surrounding elevation.
18. Mrs. Siegel stated that Hoover was over capacity, and Ms. Signer noted that even under an accelerated schedule to modernize in 2009, how would overenrollment be addressed in the interim and where would portable classrooms be placed in light of the addition.
19. Ms. Signer asked about Potomac Elementary School and the suggestion for an eight-room rather than a six-room addition. Is that necessary? Can it be sited on the property?
20. Mrs. O'Neill noted that in both the Rockville and Wootton clusters' testimony, there are issues of leaking roofs at Coldspring and Twinbrook elementary schools. She asked for the status of those repairs.
21. Mrs. King asked about RMHS, and when it was last modernized. What was done in 1976?
22. Mr. Felton asked how MCPS accommodates students when there is an increase of

classrooms and students How are the issues of the cafeteria and other facilities issues addressed?

23. Mrs. O'Neill asked about Glen Haven/Stephen Knolls. She asked for background material on how the decision was made with the pros and cons of the movement of Stephen Knolls.
24. Mrs. O'Neill asked if Stephen Knolls did not go to Glen Haven, would there be impact on the woods with the modernization of Glen Haven?
25. Ms. Signer asked what efforts were made to involve the community (homeowners) in the Glen Haven and Stephen Knolls combination.
26. Mr. Burnett wanted to know the cost savings of two modernizations on separate sites versus one modernization at Glen Haven.

The hearing ended at 9:30 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

JDW:gr