

APPROVED  
17-2010

Rockville, Maryland  
June 22, 2010

The Board of Education of Montgomery County held a work session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on June 22, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Mrs. Patricia O'Neill, President  
in the Chair  
Mr. Christopher Barclay  
Ms. Laura Berthiaume  
Ms. Shirley Brandman  
Dr. Judy Docca  
Mr. Timothy Hwang  
Mr. Philip Kauffman  
Mr. Larry Bowers, Acting Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: Mr. Michael Durso

Board Staff Present: Mr. Ronald Ikheloa, Chief of Staff  
Ms. Suzann King, Staff Assistant  
Ms. Glenda Rose, Administrative Secretary

Staff Present: Dr. Frieda Lacey, Deputy Superintendent  
Mr. Bruce Crispell, Director,  
Division of Long Range Planning  
Mr. Joe Lavorgna, Acting Director,  
Department of Facilities Management  
Mr. James Song, Director,  
Department of Facilities Management  
Ms. Stephen Williams, Director I, Shared Accountability

Guest Presenter: Dr. David Lever, Executive Director,  
Interagency Committee on School Construction

### **Current Status of Facilities in Montgomery County Public Schools**

- Comprehensive review of the FACT assessment tool, including a discussion of the FACT Review Committee's charge, work, and recommendations.
- Discussion of plans to reassess remaining schools for modernization.
- Discussion of the optimal proposed schedule for modernizing schools, including the adequacy of holding facilities.
- Discussion of Draft of Policy FKB, *Modernization/Renovation*.

Staff presented information on the need to update Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT) methodology, and defined steps to be taken with timelines and Board of Education action with timelines. The FACT assessment is what MCPS relies upon to create the queue for modernizations. Staff also presented information on the

FACT Review Committee membership, FACT Review Committee Report, and comments received from stakeholders. Staff outlined the superintendent's recommendations and a timeline for next steps.

The Board members discussed the following areas of FACT assessment:

- Program parameters, such as biotech, digital music, science labs, storage.
- Parking for students and staff.
- Special education classrooms and needed support areas.
- Future state requirements.
- Core space.
- Schools in the "gray" area that were built between 1985 and 1990 without modernization and the impact on their unmet needs.
- School built to accommodate electronics, such as wireless and remote learning.
- The number of holding schools and modernization of those facilities.
- Assurance that no school will lose its place in the current queue for modernization/renovation.
- Plans for sports fields at smaller sites.
- Closed schools used for holding schools.
- Preferred range of students or capped capacity for enrollment.
- Assessment of stand-alone special education centers.

Follow-ups from the discussion were:

- Board will review complete FACT methodology at a September 2010 Board meeting.
- Staff will provide the Board with a list of those schools constructed or modernized between 1985 and the early 1990s and the assessment of their current needs for maintenance or system replacements.
- Ms. Berthiaume suggested that the Board schedule a discussion on the optimum size of an elementary school.
- On Ms. Brandman's suggestion, Mrs. O'Neill asked that an assessment of the special education centers be included in the superintendent's CIP recommendations in October.

Mrs. O'Neill stated that staff will move forward with the FACT methodology and parameters that puts all schools on the same footing, and will receive public input.

Staff presented Policy FKB, *Modernization/Renovation*, and the need to revise the policy to reflect efforts to extend the life of modernized facilities. First, a new name has been suggested for the policy—*Systemic Life-cycle Replacement of Building Systems and Facilities*. The fall CIP noted a need for a revision of the policy; the policy was discussed by the Policy Committee in January and June. Factors to consider are – (1) Policy FKB does not conform to current practice, (2) construction since the mid-1980s has been upgraded which allows for increased lifespan if maintained, (3) systemic life-cycle replacement can extend the life of facilities, and (4) the policy can guide efforts to sustain facilities in good condition and extend useful life.

The Board members discussed the following areas in the policy:

- Change the timing of maintenance and renovation; do both at the same time.
- Avoid losing the focus on older schools and lowering priority for modernizations.
- Policy shift would signal where the school system is going.
- Focus is to keep facilities functional at the maximum level for as long as possible.
- Timeline for maintenance as well as modernizations is needed.
- With changing economics, this might be the right time to get started.
- There is a need for balance between life-cycle replacement and modernizations.
- Specifics will be in the regulation of the policy.
- Title needs to be more specific and clear.

Follow-ups from the discussion were:

- Ms. Berthiaume requested that staff develop a graph with a timeline on modernizations and SLAR.
- Ms. Brandman suggested that staff develop a new title for Policy FKB to better communicate the intent of SLAR.
- Full discussion of the policy to occur on July 8, 2010.

The Board of Education recessed from 11:45 a.m. to 1:10 p.m. for lunch.

### **The Vision for Facilities in Montgomery County Public Schools**

- Consideration of any changes to the Capital Improvements Program priorities list.
- Exploration of alternatives to MCPS' current contracting methods that might shorten and accelerate the pace of already planned projects.
- Exploration of alternative financing methods for school construction.

Staff presented the vision for facilities, which included CIP priorities, alternatives to current contracting methods, project delivery methods, and exploration of alternative financing methods.

The Board members posed the following questions and made the following comments on the vision:

- What are the goals, needs, schedule, and funding requirements?
- How will the new policy restructure priorities?
- Board should maintain its priorities since most urgent facilities needs are related to health issues, such as HVAC, portables, etc.
- With capacity projects, will portables remain on sites longer?
- Should the Board look to a regular cycle of boundary changes in order to make decisions that do not need financing?
- Redistricting would save on transportation and be a more efficient model with a global reset.
- There is a need to plan for capacity, combining system replacement with modernizations, especially over the next five years.

The Board inquired about contracting and financing:

- Performance-based contracts could pay for themselves.
- The community thinks the process is from bids, to contracts, to finished building is too slow. Could projects be completed more quickly?
- Not everything can be done through bonds; creative financing is needed. Could MCPS take advantage of its assets?
- There could be changes through legislation at the state and local levels.
- Could a private developer build a school, not just donate land?

The work session adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY