

APPROVED
36-1988

Rockville, Maryland
October 6, 1988

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Thursday, October 6, 1988, at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo, President
 in the Chair
 Dr. James E. Cronin
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn
 Mr. Chan Park
 Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner
 Mrs. Vicki Rafel
 Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools
 Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent
 Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re: GENERAL DISCUSSION OF FACILITIES ISSUES

Mrs. DiFonzo explained that there would be a staff presentation of the facilities planning process. Tonight was the first step in the process, but there would be no specific recommendations discussed. Dr. H. Philip Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, added that the superintendent's recommendations would become public on or about November 1. There would be a work session and Board alternatives on November 3 followed by public hearings on November 14, 15, and 16. The Board would act on the recommendations on November 21 and 22. Following those actions, the county executive would make his recommendations in January, and the County Council would look at the capital budget during the spring.

Mr. Bruce Crispell presented a demographic overview of projected growth in the county. The emerging planning issue was the relationship between growth and jobs and population and households. There were presently more jobs in the county than households, and the county was becoming an urbanized job center. Currently 59 percent of the residents were employed in Montgomery County with only 24 percent employed in the District of Columbia, and that latter percentage was going down every year. The county was now faced with an increased demand for housing which caused the price of housing to escalate. The rising cost of housing was pricing a whole segment of the population out of the county. All of this had implications for school populations. The issue facing the county planners was whether the county should continue to favor job growth over housing growth. If there were an increase in housing and in affordable units, they would see more school children in the future.

As far as resident births, Mr. Crispell reported that last year they

had exceeded the projection of 10,800 by 600 births. The forecasts had been revised upwards and should peak in 1995 with 12,300 live births. Therefore, they were facing a long period of sustained growth which continued upward in spite of the housing numbers coming down. He indicated that they would not reach the peak in public school enrollment for many years. In addition the population in the 20-44 age group had been climbing since 1970 and had reached 40 percent in 1987; however, he projected that this group would retain its 40 percent share to the year 2000. In addition, the median age of the population was projected to stay at around 34 to the year 2000. Mr. Crispell predicted that in their six-year planning period that the public school enrollment figure for 1994 would be 129,000. Mrs. Ann Briggs, acting director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming, reviewed cluster priorities and staff comments area by area. Board members requested the following information:

1. Mrs. Praisner requested information on the impact or potential impact of middle school conversions (especially in Area 1) on parental decisions to transfer their children to magnet schools, both at the elementary and intermediate/junior high level.
2. Mr. Ewing asked about the timing of plans for future magnet expansions at New Hampshire Estates and Oak View.
3. Mrs. Praisner suggested that at some point the Board have a review of the scoring process used to determine the condition of a building and the timing of the modernization.
4. In regard to the Sherwood cluster, Mrs. Praisner asked for information on and the location of the proposed intercounty connector and its relationship to schools.
5. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the minority enrollment at Broad Acres exceeded Board policy. He asked that staff provide information about possible options for this school.
6. Mrs. Praisner asked for a review of how capacity was determined, particularly when there was a difference of opinion between facilities staff and the principal.
7. Mrs. Rafel required information on the location of portable classrooms and how long they were expected to be in those locations.
8. Mrs. Praisner inquired about the status of road improvements to Muncaster Mill Road and what could be done regarding timing and safety. She wanted to know if this could be taken up with the County Council.
9. Mrs. Praisner asked for information about the number of students permitted to transfer out of South Lake Elementary School this year.
10. Dr. Cronin inquired about the accuracy of projections for students from the Ritchie Park community.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for their presentation. Mrs. Praisner extended thanks to the MCCPTA cluster coordinators for the work they had done.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw