

be informative. At this point they did not have recommendations to offer, but he noted that the principal indicators pointed to sustained growth in the county and there would be a continuing need for expenditures to support the additional growth.

Dr. Cody introduced Dr. David N. Thomas, the newly appointed associate superintendent for supportive services. He asked Dr. Phil Rohr, director of planning, to lead the Board and audience through the process.

Dr. Rohr stated that they had now received the 30-day enrollment figures and were reviewing the data. They would be meeting with some of the clusters in the next month with the goal of presenting capital budget recommendations on November 3. On November 6, the Board was scheduled to discuss alternatives to the superintendent's proposals, and public hearings had been scheduled for November 17 and 18. The Board would take action on November 24 and 25. The budget would then be sent on to the county government for public hearings and approval. Dr. Rohr reported that he and his staff had received positive feedback about the new facilities process.

Dr. Rohr said they had the preliminary September 30 enrollment data, and he reported that they were within 145 students of their kindergarten projection, within 15 for Grades 1-6, within 20 for Grades 7-9, and 630 under projection for Grades 10-12. Overall they were within 900 students of their projection, and MCPS had 1,700 more students than last year at this time.

Dr. Rohr said that Mr. Bruce Crispell, demographic planner, would be speaking about population projections in the county. Dr. Rohr and Mrs. Ann Briggs, planning coordinator, would be discussing the cluster reports. Dr. Rohr emphasized that this was not a solutions meeting. The clusters had provided voluminous documents which had to be reduced to one or two sentences in the report before the Board. He was sure that he would be contacted by the clusters if staff missed the point of the cluster reports. He pointed out that the facilities policy had a deferral date for actions, and they would not be proposing boundary changes for new schools until February-March.

Re: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF MONTGOMERY
COUNTY

Mr. Crispell explained that he had examined all of the recent reports on economics and growth in the metropolitan area. The surge of growth in the elementary school population was a convergence of economic and demographic factors. The Washington area was experiencing strong economic growth, and the employment sector was driving the housing sector. He reported that the Washington region was based on growth industries including services industries. In addition, there was a surplus of office space in the area which was appealing to companies wanting to relocate quickly. The unemployment rate was low, and in Montgomery County that rate was 2 percent. In 1970, 43 percent of females were in the labor force, and that figure had gone to 61 percent. There were 44,000 housing units with sewer authorizations, and it would take five plus years for the build-out

of these units. It was expected that there would be two more years of low mortgage rates, and the county had an adequate supply of land. In addition, the county continued to be ranked highly as a desirable place to live because of the quality of life and the public school system.

Mr. Crispell stated that there were several negative factors to consider. The region was becoming more private economy based rather than government based which made it more susceptible to recessions. Recent tax reform legislation made it less attractive for developers to invest in real estate. He said that about 10 percent of the population worked in the construction industry, and if the building boom slowed these people could be out of work. The high cost of housing in the county made for an inadequate supply of affordable housing, and the pace of growth had resulted in an overutilization of public facilities.

Mr. Crispell noted that the Planning Board was predicting record housing growth in 1986 and 1987. In addition, a lot of households were being formed or reformed and buying houses. The Planning Board estimated that from the 1990's to the year 2000 there would be over 10,000 resident live births in the county. While the fertility rate of women aged 20 to 29 was less than the national average, the rate for Montgomery County women aged 30 to 39 was higher than the national average. While the baby boomers were aging, in Montgomery County this group would have a longer sustained level of births. He reported that the kindergarten population had been steadily increasing and by 1990 there would be 9,000 kindergarteners. He said that the elementary population would peak around 1995 and remain sustained to the year 2000. The decline in secondary school population would turn around in the late 1980's.

Mr. Crispell showed slides of housing forecasts, and he indicated that the MCPS planning staff worked with Park and Planning and the developers to get these forecasts. After the four year period shown, they turned to the Planning Board for their forecasts. Dr. Rohr pointed out that the most startling figure was that between 1985 and 1991 there would be almost a one third increase in elementary school enrollment in MCPS. A few years ago they were down to 5,000 students for kindergarten and would be at the 9,000 level by 1990.

Re: CLUSTER REVIEWS BY ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS

Mrs. Briggs explained that there was no change in the program capacity of secondary schools, but at the elementary level the new capacity was reflected in the document with one or two exceptions. Mrs. Briggs and Dr. Rohr reviewed cluster comments, current staff views on those comments, and the possible timing of the superintendent's recommendations.

Mrs. Slye inquired about the staff's being in touch with the City of Rockville Planning staff. Dr. Cody replied that he had asked Dr. Rohr to provide a list of factors the City was considering in developing their master plan revision, and he indicated that this

information would be available in a few weeks. In regard to Area 3, Mrs. Praisner pointed out that at the J/I/M level they had talked about space being provided when high schools went to a 9-12 organization. She requested information about the long-term expectations at the intermediate level in this area.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that while the June 1986 Master Plan for Educational Facilities document was useful, it contained projections on the present grade organization of the individual schools. He suggested that it would be helpful if the November data showed the projections for any grade reorganization proposed. Mrs. Praisner indicated that some time ago she had received a response to her memo on the status of subdivision approval by the Planning Board vis-a-vis school system recommendations on the subdivision requests. She asked that the Board be provided with an update on this subject.

Dr. Shoenberg asked that the Board's appreciation be conveyed to the individual or individuals who had done the typing on the very complex document before the Board. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that in discussing the report they had not spent as much time on the Blair and B-CC areas as they had done in the past because they were beginning to focus on other areas such as Sherwood, Springbrook, Kennedy, Rockville, and the Route 29 corridor. He also stated that it was clear that some solutions might cover larger areas that they had previously considered, and it was clear that the Board was facing a new set of problems. Mr. Ewing asked if it was a fair assessment to say that Dr. Rohr was assuming it was the desire of the Board of Education to provide as much school capacity as they could in advance of the presence of the need wherever they could and to do the best they could to catch up. They would either have a plan that met that need based on existing formulas or be able to identify where the gaps were. Dr. Rohr agreed that this was a fair assessment of what he and his staff were doing.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw