

APPROVED
26-2007

Rockville, Maryland
November 8, 2007

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Thursday, November 8, 2007, at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Ms. Nancy Navarro, President
in the Chair
Mr. Steve Abrams
Mr. Christopher Barclay
Ms. Shirley Brandman
Ms. Sharon Cox
Dr. Judy Docca
Mr. Ben Moskowitz
Mrs. Patricia O'Neill
Dr. Jerry Weast, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: None

Re: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Re: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

By consensus, the agenda was approved.

**Re: OVERVIEW OF THE SUPERINTENDENT'S
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Ms. Navarro stated that this time each year, the Board begins to consider those issues that are related to boundary changes and the Capital Improvements Plan. Prior to this evening, the superintendent provided to the Board his recommended FY 2009 Capital budget and the FY 2009-2014 six-year Capital Improvements Program. As the meeting proceeds, Ms. Navarro will ask Board members to pose questions, request additional data, or introduce alternatives at the end of the presentations by Dr. Weast and staff.

Any significant modification to the superintendent's recommendation requires an alternative. If there is a second, a vote would be taken after a brief discussion of the alternative. An alternative will require four votes (not counting the student Board member) to place them before the public for comment, along with the superintendent's

recommendations. In this regard, public hearings have been scheduled for November 14 and 15 at 7:00 p.m. Please keep in mind that a vote to place an alternative before the Board does not commit Board members to support the alternative when final action is taken. The Board will take final action on these matters on November 27, 2007, at 6:00 p.m.

Dr. Weast invited the following staff to the table: Mr. Joseph Lavorgna, acting director of the Department of Facilities Management, Mr. Bruce Crispell, director of the Division of Long-range Planning, and Mr. James Song, director of the Division of Construction.

There was a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following topics:

1. Official enrollment and updated projections by grade and systemwide
2. Revenue assumptions for the FY 2009–2014 CIP
3. Spending Affordability Guidelines
4. Allocation of County GO Bonds
5. CIP funding sources (GO bonds, current revenue, impact tax, recordation tax, and state aid)
6. FY 2009 State CIP request (construction, renovations, relocatables, and planning)
7. Superintendent's recommended FY 2009–14 CIP
 - ◆ \$257.9 million in expenditures
 - ◆ \$1.490 billion six-year expenditure plan
 - ▶ Nine new elementary schools
 - ▶ Reopening one elementary school in the downcounty
 - ▶ Maintains completion dates for individual school project
 - ▶ Maintains completion dates except for a one-year delay for Paint Branch High School
 - ▶ Reduces the scope of improvements for Redland and Ridgeview middle schools
 - ▶ Systemic countywide projects for HVAC, roof replacement, and PLAR
 - ▶ Countywide project initiatives such as school security, technology, and building improvements
8. Boundary studies for Churchill and Clarksburg clusters

**Re: BOARD OF EDUCATION DIALOGUE AND
QUESTIONS**

Mrs. O'Neill commented that there is a lot more desire to do more than the funding will allow. On the Redland/Ridgeview issue, the intention was to improve instructional spaces with a modernization. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the scope of the project grows when staff is assessing what needs to be done. When a project costs nearly \$30 million and it is not a modernization, what is it? Therefore, staff looked at the underlying issue that had to be

addressed, which was the open plan school, and there were no walls; ceilings and duct work needs to be rerouted for better air circulation.

Mrs. O'Neill pointed out the need for a device for staff to monitor the entrance for visitors. Staff agreed that administration was embedded in the building. There will be a security system to allow for access control.

Ms. Cox inquired about the installation of walls where possible. Mr. Song replied that there will be four types of walls in the existing building – drywall, segmented walls, cinder block, and furniture. The non-load bearing walls will be removed to build a wall to the roof deck, and the floor plan will remain the same.

Mr. Abrams asked about Redland/Ridgeview and the size of the improvements because of the issue of an ultimate modernization. Of the improvements, how many would be lost in a subsequent renovation? Mr. Song said that was difficult to define in the scope of the work. At Ridgeview, the issue is student circulation. Mr. Abrams thought the changes in the administrative area would survive and be incorporated in a renovation. He was curious on how this new plan would stand up to a cost benefit analysis. Mr. Song stated that the plan was to construct areas that could stand alone.

Ms. Brandman noted that the original scope of the Redland project was total replacement of the HVAC and electrical systems. In the \$6 million, could some of the HVAC work be done under the countywide projects? Mr. Song stated that the mechanical system at Redland and the existing boilers and chillers are in good condition, but duct work needs modification. At Ridgeview, there are five air handling units that need replacement.

Ms. Brandman asked about the science area and whether that separate issue could be considered at this time. Mr. Song thought that could be included in routine maintenance.

Dr. Docca was concerned about students walking through one classroom to get to another classroom. Mr. Song thought that Redland had two to three classrooms that share space. Hopefully, there is a way to give those classes a separate entrance, but they will have to create detailed plans that meet code.

Mr. Moskowitz pointed out that it is important to keep the current upgrades for security. He asked what the impact would be of keeping the scope of Redland the same, but delay the project. Dr. Weast explained that it would take a long time to get to the project, and the same problem of funding will be bigger.

Mr. Barclay heard that the school system was committed to the modernization of Paint Branch High School in 2010. Furthermore, security is important. He asked about the advantages of the system going digital, life expectance, and maintenance. Staff replied that the promethean boards have a life cycle of 8–12 years and maintenance will be done by school staff.

Mr. Barclay asked about the life expectancy of the student response wands. Staff stated that there are extra wands in case they need to be replaced. The wands are assigned to students, and they are responsible for care. It is expected that the wands' life expectancy is four to five years.

Mr. Abrams asked if this equipment is funded through the capital or overhead budgets. Staff explained that it is a capital expenditure.

Ms. Brandman asked what the new technology initiatives cost. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the past two years of Tech Mod has cost \$18.7 million, and it goes to \$19.6 million with the new initiative of promethean boards, wireless, and routers and switches.

Ms. Navarro inquired about just including site work for Paint Branch for \$2 million. Mr. Lavorgna thought the project is under way with the design and mandatory referral, but there could be authority to sign a contract for site work with less being spent than the full request.

Mr. Abrams inquired about the risk associated with less than full funding. Mr. Lavorgna replied that a decision would have to be made in February/March when the update is done.

Ms. Cox thought that if money was added to the request would it be funds that would not be needed in the next years, such as promethean boards. She asked what \$2 million would buy. Ms. Cox inquired about air conditioning for Rock Terrace School's gymnasium with installation in the summer of 2009. Further, Ms. Cox stated that there was a transportation issue to Neelsville Middle School for students living in Montgomery Village. She asked if it was possible to increase the feasibility study to include an addition at Montgomery Village Middle School. Staff replied that there would be a \$35,000 increase to add 10 rooms to the school.

Ms. Cox noted that the site size for an elementary school is 12 usable acres. What is the preferred school site for a combined school? Mr. Lavorgna said there is a preferred size, but there are many schools on sites that are smaller. Dr. Weast said there is no magic number because a site depends on the type of school, topography, enrollment, and expected enrollment.

Mrs. O'Neill asked about site work at Paint Branch. Would anything have to be redone? Mr. Song replied that the site work is slated for adjacent property where the replacement building will be located.

Mrs. O'Neill asked if there was immediate need in health and safety costing \$2 million. Dr. Weast stated that he would not recommend \$2 million to fund anything else but site work at Paint Branch.

Ms. Brandman inquired about the security system initiative. Staff replied that the new

camera system is digital, rewire the buildings, multiple pixel cameras, and network all systems. Further, there will be a network-based visitor management system and a central download. The total cost is \$9 million over six years, including wiring high schools with 160 cameras, and 80 cameras in elementary schools.

Mr. Abrams made a final comment on the collocation issue. He thought it was important to withdraw the recommendation since it was a failure to communicate and be sensitive with the community. The Board is concerned about communication with stakeholders.

Mr. Barclay applauded the president for working out a solution. There is a need to revisit communication with the community. Considering the history of the community, it is important to be sensitive to the issues and aware of the impact.

Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

By consensus, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

JDW:gr