

removal of any forested area on the park property and limit development to open space and passive recreation use; and

WHEREAS, The park development restrictions will require that staff and the community review the program requirements for the Stephen Knolls special education program and Glen Haven Elementary School's modernization to determine if the collocation is feasible with the limited use of the park property permitted by the Planning Commission; now therefore be it

Resolved, That action on the recommendation for the collocation of the Stephen Knolls special education program with Glen Haven Elementary School in the superintendent's FY 2001-2006 CIP be deferred until March 2000.

Re: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GYMS

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following motion was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, The primary goals of the Fiscal Year 2001 Capital Budget and the Requested FY 2001 to FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program are to provide needed capacity for MCPS students in growth areas of the county, modernize aging building, and implement new program initiatives to promote student achievement; and

WHEREAS, During the recession of the 1990s several elementary schools were built or modernized without gyms; and

WHEREAS, The Board reaffirms its commitment to the criteria currently used to rank elementary schools for the construction of gyms; and

WHEREAS, Two elementary schools without gyms are scheduled for construction projects in FY 2001 and FY 2002; and

WHEREAS, The savings is approximately \$200,000 per gym if it is built concurrently with other construction at the same site; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amends the Requested FY 2001-FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program to add \$4,290,000 to build gyms at Ashburton, Lakewood, Greenwood, and Dr. Charles R. Drew elementary schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education expects to continue the construction of elementary school gyms in subsequent years; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution and the attached list of elementary schools be forwarded to the County Executive and the County Council for consideration with the FY 2001-FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

The following people came to the table for the Board's discussion: Mr. Richard Hawes, director of the Department of Facilities Management; Mr. Joseph Lavorgna, director of the Department of Planning and Capital Programming; Mr. Bruce Crispell, Senior Planner, and Ms. Debbie Syzfer, Planner.

Ms. Signer explained that Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School and the new Northwest Elementary School #6 were already in the CIP for gyms, thereby removing the need for adding the cost of gyms for those schools. On the list of rank-ordered schools for gyms, Ashburton Elementary School was at the top. In the coming fiscal year, the motion would direct construction of three gyms: Dr. Sally K. Ride, Northwest #6, and Ashburton elementary schools. In the subsequent year, Lakewood and Greenwood elementary schools have construction projects. Dr. Charles R. Drew Elementary School was the next school on the list for a gym. Therefore, the motion was, essentially, an affirmation of the previous Board position that the school system would try to build three elementary school gyms per year. The motion did not address the out years of the biennial CIP because the Board would have an opportunity in two years, depending upon economic conditions, to address the need for additional gyms. Mr. Felton assumed that the intent of the motion, based on support of the Board and funding, was that the school system continue the construction of gyms similar to the air-conditioning project.

Mrs. Gordon asked about the ranking of elementary schools built in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Mr. Lavorgna replied that Montgomery Knolls and Cloverly elementary schools were not high on the list. Ms. Signer said the schools were ranked for gyms based on whether or not the schools have construction projects and capacity needs, and on the number of gyms in the cluster.

Mrs. O'Neill knew that Somerset Elementary School was in an out year, but she noted requests for gyms from Kensington-Parkwood and Somerset elementary schools. Ms. Signer replied that when the Board redid the CIP in two years, it would have a chance to do those gyms. Her goal was not to add too much to the six-year CIP. Surplus funding in the county should allow the school system to move forward on some of the gym backlog.

Mr. Felton was supportive of this approach, but wanted to be sure that the Board understood the rankings and the community understood the basis for the ranking. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the ranking of schools was based on a total number of points.

The first criterion was enrollment, the second was construction on-site, and third was the percentage of gyms in the cluster.

Mrs. Gordon asked if it was the intent of the motion that, if additional funds were not available for the gyms, it would not displace any other project. Ms. Signer confirmed that was the intent of the motion and accepted the wording as a friendly amendment.

RESOLUTION NO. 703-99 Re: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GYMS

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, The primary goals of the Fiscal Year 2001 Capital Budget and the Requested FY 2001 to FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program are to provide needed capacity for MCPS students in growth areas of the county, modernize aging building, and implement new program initiatives to promote student achievement; and

WHEREAS, During the recession of the 1990s several elementary schools were built or modernized without gyms; and

WHEREAS, The Board reaffirms its commitment to the criteria currently used to rank elementary schools for the construction of gyms; and

WHEREAS, Two elementary schools without gyms are scheduled for construction projects in FY 2001 and FY 2002; and

WHEREAS, The savings is approximately \$200,000 per gym if it is built concurrently with other construction at the same site; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amends the Requested FY 2001-FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program to add \$4,290,000 to build gyms at Ashburton, Lakewood, Greenwood, and Dr. Charles R. Drew elementary schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education expects to continue the construction of elementary school gyms in subsequent years; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education directs staff not to displace any other elementary school that is ranked for a gym; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution and the attached list of elementary schools be forwarded to the County Executive and the County Council for consideration with the FY 2001-FY 2006 Capital Improvements Program.

Re: BOUNDARY REVIEW PROCESS

On motion of Mrs. King and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent to conduct a boundary review process over the winter of 1999 to 2000 to explore the assignment of all of the area within the corporate limits of the Town of Kensington to Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School, North Bethesda Middle School, and Walter Johnson High School where the majority of the Town of Kensington is currently assigned, and subsequent to the advisory committee's process over the winter. The Superintendent would forward his recommendation to the Board of Education in February 2000.

Re: DISCUSSION

Ms. Signer understood that neither cluster supported a boundary study, although the Walter Johnson Cluster indicated it would accept the unification of the Town of Kensington if it were a technical amendment to the CIP, and the Albert Einstein Cluster opposed it entirely.

Mr. Abrams thought there could be a very easy solution if people sat down and came to a consensus. Absent a consensus by the representatives of the clusters, the only procedure that allowed the Board to move forward was to enter into a boundary process. When the Board reviewed the policy, an attempt was made to have standing afforded to other entities for precisely this kind of situation, and, unfortunately, that was not adopted. The procedure required that this request be considered in the context of a boundary, even though the cluster might have a negative recommendation. The ultimate decision is the Board's, and the Board can override any recommendation.

Mrs. Gordon said she would not support the motion based on the clusters', especially Einstein's, reluctance and adamant opposition to any kind of boundary review.

RESOLUTION NO. 704-99**Re: BOUNDARY REVIEW PROCESS**

On motion of Mrs. King and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. O'Neill, and Mrs. King voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon and Ms. Signer voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent to conduct a boundary review process over the winter of 1999 to 2000 to explore the assignment of all of the area within the corporate limits of the Town of Kensington to Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School, North Bethesda Middle School, and Walter Johnson High School where the

majority of the Town of Kensington is currently assigned, and subsequent to the advisory committee's process over the winter. The Superintendent would forward his recommendation to the Board of Education in February 2000.

Re: **BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION ON THE FY 2001
CAPITAL BUDGET AND FY 2001-2006 CAPITAL
IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM REQUEST**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, In accordance with 5-306 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the superintendent of schools has prepared a recommended FY 2001 Capital Budget request and FY 2001-2006 Capital Improvements Program (CIP); and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted public hearings on November 10 and 11, 1999, on all capital and non-capital recommendations in the superintendent's CIP; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in adopting this CIP considered the implication of decisions on the Annual Growth Policy and is aware that the requested timing of space solutions enables all clusters to remain open to residential development; and

WHEREAS, The County Council and the county executive, having demonstrated a long-standing commitment to appropriate significant local dollars to fund school construction, are properly expecting the state to continue to fund its appropriate share, amounting to no less than \$50 million for FY 2001; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the FY 2001 Capital Budget appropriation request totaling \$110,724,000 and the FY 2001-2006 Capital Improvements Program; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the attached priority list for state-eligible projects in the amount of \$59.3 million for FY 2001; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board acknowledges that the current state regulations for public school construction funding would result in a lower amount of funding from the state, but recommends that in the submission to the IAC, that will be forwarded from the county executive, the County Council, and the Board of Education by December 7, 1999, for FY 2001 should be for \$59.3 million; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education is committed to working with state and local officials to change the state regulations in order to be eligible for a higher level of state funding; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution with attachments be transmitted to the county executive and County Council.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Mrs. King asked if the Board would discuss the Kingsview Middle School addition. She had talked with people from the Seneca Valley, Quince Orchard, and Northwest clusters who were worried that the Board would take an action that would preclude future options. She wanted it reflected in the minutes that the Board would not take any action at this meeting that eliminated future options. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the motion before the Board included an addition to Kingsview and the resolution would not preclude other ideas for consideration in March 2000 or in the fall.

Mr. Abrams asked if there had been conversations with the City of Gaithersburg regarding a middle school. Mr. Lavorgna reported that he had talked to staff earlier in the week about the Lakeland site, and the city was not interested in considering it as a middle school site. The city was more interested in using the site for a recreation facility for Gaithersburg. Other discussions with city staff have focused on finding another middle school site within the city limits on property that would be developed.

Ms. Signer noted that the number of students in the northwestern part of the county in Kingsview, Roberto Clemente, Ridgeview, and Martin Luther King, Jr. middle schools indicated a need for another middle school. She asked why the Superintendent had not suggested building another school. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the current capacity of all the middle schools, along with a 10-room addition at Kingsview, fit almost perfectly with the projected enrollment for 2005.

Mrs. Gordon said she could not support a 28-room addition at Montgomery Blair High School as the school's enrollment was already quite large and she believed MCPS should not have any school with 3,500 or more students. She hoped the feasibility study would look at alternatives to an addition.

Mrs. O'Neill asked about the process that would be used with the Blair community in looking at this decision. Ms. Syzfer responded that staff had begun to look at all of the issues and had started discussions with the community.

Ms. Signer considered the funds in the budget as a placeholder. She was not prepared to support a 28-room addition for Blair on Kay. She hoped that the advisory committee would afford broad representation of the community, not just from PTAs. Given that there would be boundary changes, she hoped that adjacent clusters would be involved early in the process.

Mr. Burnett reported that Blair parents were concerned that not enough time had been allotted for the study. Mr. Lavorgna replied that staff would begin the study in December with completion by the middle of February.

Mrs. Gordon asked why the study had to be done that quickly. Mr. Lavorgna answered that the recommendation would go to the Superintendent for Board action in March. Mrs. Gordon asked about the impact for Blair if the Board did not get the report until November and the Superintendent did not make recommendations until the next CIP. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the school system would lose a year of planning to accommodate enrollment. Dr. Weast noted that those children are already there, and staff must accommodate them somewhere. Reopening another school was problematic, and the cost of Blair was indicative of the land and infrastructure in that area. Also, a boundary study was problematic because the area schools are over capacity. He did not want Blair to be almost three times bigger than some other MCPS schools.

Mrs. Gordon wanted to require the involvement of clusters adjacent to Blair. If these clusters are not involved and February is the timeframe, then there was no alternative to the 28-room addition at Blair. Mr. Lavorgna thought staff would recommend options that could be considered, such as adding capacity at Blair or elsewhere, changing programs, and changing boundaries.

Mrs. Gordon asked about the timeframe for a boundary study. Mr. Lavorgna replied that staff would do a boundary study next year between November and the spring, with Board action in November. Mrs. Gordon asked why the feasibility study could not include the boundary process.

Mr. Felton asked if there was something between a feasibility study and the boundary process with Blair and the adjacent clusters. Mrs. O'Neill asked if the studies could be done simultaneously, with a subcommittee including the adjacent clusters, as an overall charge to examine all options for the relief of Blair. Mr. Lavorgna answered that staff had to understand what the Blair community wanted. If the community provided no clear direction, staff could do a boundary study. However, a boundary study begun now would take four months.

Mr. Abrams thought that whatever process was used, people would see a boundary study versus a 28-room addition. Another option was more utilization of the existing facility. The Blair cluster needed to discuss going to 9-10 period day for more utilization of the same classrooms.

Mrs. King clarified that MCPS did not have to do a boundary study, but the other clusters should be included in the discussion of utilization.

Mrs. Gordon was concerned that staff thought the Blair cluster had not decided what it wanted. She believed the Board should set parameters about what needed to be done, then involve the community. The Board's parameters should be clearly communicated to the community to eliminate options that were not educationally sound.

Ms. Signer thought a boundary study was not the only alternative. Other alternatives might be to reopen Northwood High School, use the 20-room addition planned for Albert Einstein High School, or move students into Einstein or Kennedy. The process would move faster if adjacent clusters were involved earlier rather than later.

RESOLUTION NO. 705-99 Re: **FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE BLAIR CLUSTER**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent that during the time of the feasibility study to address the capacity issues at Montgomery Blair High School that the adjacent clusters be involved in the examination of all options.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Mrs. O'Neill thought staff should make every effort to notify the Newport School tenants that MCPS was planning to reclaim the school for educational use. Mr. Hawes said the school system could not give formal notification until the County Council approved the CIP.

Mr. Burnett noted that the Newport School staff had asked for help in relocating, and he asked what consideration had been given to that request. Mr. Felton answered that he had directed Newport staff to contact MCPS facilities and other community alternatives.

Of the schools that were the original pilots in technology, Ms. Signer said Gaithersburg High School had the most outdated technology. She wanted to know why it had not been updated in light of the school's modernization schedule. Mr. Bowers replied that staff was looking into some options and would report to the Board.

Mr. Abrams understood that Gaithersburg would be included in a review of modernizations. It was his assumption that the recommended 16-room addition will be contemplated in the context of a renovation of the school. Mr. Hawes responded that staff had asked for the feasibility planning funds to plan the modernization, then do the 16-classroom addition as the first phase of the modernization.

Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

On motion of Mr. Abrams and seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education accelerate the Richard Montgomery High School project by one year and to have a replacement facility built on site while students utilize the existing school in lieu of a holding school subject to the state approval as a replacement school.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mrs. King asked what the disadvantages would be of having students on site. Mr. Hawes replied that if MCPS built a replacement school, there were two options: (1) add to the front of the building then tear down parts of the existing building, or (2) build a new building where the football stadium is and leave the school without athletic competition fields and parking. He would not advocate for the on-site option.

Mrs. King asked if the only salvageable feature of the school was the auditorium. Mr. Hawes replied that the two-story building in the rear of the structure could be incorporated into the new school.

Mrs. Gordon said she would not support this resolution. She understood that the community wants the project done on-site just like the Winston Churchill High School community wanted their modernization done on site. Although all of the concerns were raised with the community, she did not believe that community members realized what situations and problems would affect the modernization and the students. She thought that, based upon Mr. Hawes' professional judgment and experiences, an on-site modernization would not be the best decision.

Mr. Felton explained that the motion was predicated on the fact that the state would have to designate this project as new construction, and, therefore, Montgomery County would qualify for the additional funding. If the state did not designate it as a new construction project, then this motion would be null and void.

Ms. Signer asked if Mr. Hawes would recommend a modernization or replacement on site. Mr. Hawes responded that the Richard Montgomery site did not lend itself to doing a modernization or replacement with students on site.

Ms. Signer asked what the likelihood was that the state could designate this as a replacement as opposed to a modernization of the school. Mr. Hawes answered that it

was not likely that MCPS could demonstrate that the replacement scheme was the most cost effective from the state's perspective.

Ms. Signer clarified that the only way to accelerate the project was to do it on site since Northwood was in use by Rockville High School.

Mr. Abrams asked that since the facility is within the Rockville city limits, as is Dogwood Park and a number of other facilities, what the likelihood was of exploring a relationship with the city to provide outdoor activities while the school was renovated. Mr. Hawes thought it could be a workable solution. Mr. Abrams thought there were some options for alternative arrangements, and the city would cooperate.

Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

On motion of Mr. Abrams and seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution failed with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Felton, and Mrs. O'Neill voting in the affirmative; Mr. Burnett, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education accelerate the Richard Montgomery High School project by one year and to have a replacement facility built on site while students utilize the existing school in lieu of a holding school subject to the state approval as a replacement school.

Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent to explore the feasibility of obtaining additional parcels of land to expand the Richard Montgomery High School site.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mr. Felton asked why Mrs. Signer did not want to couple the replacement facility subject to the approval of the state. Ms. Signer was not convinced that there was support on the Board for a replacement school with the students on site. She wanted to make clear that the Board wanted to enlarge the site, regardless of the modernization or construction with students on site. Mr. Abrams clarified that the motion was to expand the site and build a replacement school without addressing the issue of students. Ms. Signer stated that she supported expanding the site regardless of what option was chosen.

RESOLUTION NO. 706-99

Re: **RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL**

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present: #

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent to explore the feasibility of obtaining additional parcels of land to expand the Richard Montgomery High School site.

Re: **RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL**

On motion of Mr. Abrams and seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education build a replacement school subject to the availability of state funds.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Signer asked if the motion assumed that students would be on-site. Mr. Felton stated that it would be a replacement school without students on site.

Ms. Signer thought the motion was to explore the feasibility of a replacement school by determining whether or not the school system could obtain state funds. Mr. Abrams stated that the motion approved a replacement school subject to the availability of state funds. It allowed staff to pursue the application for a replacement facility and work out the details on funding reimbursement. Mr. Hawes added that staff could submit a feasibility study with the process, and the state would respond whether or not it would meet their criteria.

Ms. Signer said she was not willing to commit to a replacement versus a modernization until she knew the net difference between the two projects. Mrs. King thought the school system should look for the best facility for the Richard Montgomery community.

Ms. Signer believed the school system should explore the feasibility of both a replacement school and a modernization and defer the decision about options. Mr. Hawes stated that a building study had been completed with three modernization options and one replacement option. Mr. Hawes stated that the committee's preferred option was for the modernization, and there was one replacement scheme with a \$4 million difference between the two plans.

Mrs. Gordon asked if the planning could progress regardless of whether there was a decision on a replacement facility and state funds. Mr. Hawes replied that as part of this

CIP, the Board must decide whether it endorsed modernization or a replacement facility, and the Board could direct staff to find out the status of state funding.

Ms. Signer did not want to foreclose on a replacement school, or opt for a replacement only if state funding was available. Mr. Abrams thought that the Board technically had to request the replacement and give authority to proceed with the state.

RESOLUTION NO. 707-99 Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

On motion of Mr. Abrams and seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative: #

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize staff to pursue the issue of a replacement facility and get a determination on state funding for a replacement facility at Richard Montgomery High School and preserve all options for future action.

FOR THE RECORD: Ms. Signer said: "As long as we understand (and the minutes reflect) that this is not a commitment to a replacement school even if the state says it is eligible as a replacement school."

Re: DISCUSSION

Mrs. Gordon asked what was planned for Cresthaven Elementary School other than facility planning in 2002 for modernization. Mr. Lavorgna replied that staff would plan for modernization with an addition to match the projected capacity for the 5th year of the CIP. Mrs. Gordon inquired if the site could accommodate a larger addition. Mr. Lavorgna noted that there was room for relocatables.

Mr. Burnett asked about the projection for the Weller Road Elementary School classroom addition. The school currently had six portables, and the population was increasing. Mr. Lavorgna replied that the long-range projection showed a decline in the enrollment.

Mr. Burnett noted that there was no relief for Parkland Middle School in this CIP. He was concerned about the number of students and hoped the Superintendent would look at that issue. Dr. Weast agreed with the Board, and said staff had concluded that it was a problem because of the available land and facilities.

Ms. Signer expected that the operating budget would include an initiative for the early childhood/pre-kindergarten program and that this may be in the budget as a placeholder, not a long-term item, since MCPS's role was coordinating the initiative. Dr. Weast said the placeholders were in the budget, and staff was collaborating with other agencies.

RESOLUTION NO. 708-99

Re: **BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION ON THE FY 2001
CAPITAL BUDGET AND FY 2001-2006 CAPITAL
IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM REQUEST**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously by members present:#

WHEREAS, In accordance with 5-306 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the superintendent of schools has prepared a recommended FY 2001 Capital Budget request and FY 2001-2006 Capital Improvements Program (CIP); and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted public hearings on November 10 and 11, 1999, on all capital and non-capital recommendations in the superintendent's CIP; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in adopting this CIP considered the implication of decisions on the Annual Growth Policy and is aware that the requested timing of space solutions enables all clusters to remain open to residential development; and

WHEREAS, The County Council and the county executive, having demonstrated a long-standing commitment to appropriate significant local dollars to fund school construction, are properly expecting the state to continue to fund its appropriate share, amounting to no less than \$50 million for FY 2001; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the FY 2001 Capital Budget appropriation request totaling \$112,289,000 and the FY 2001-2006 Capital Improvements Program (Attachment A); and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the attached priority list for state-eligible projects in the amount of \$59.1 million for FY 2001 (Attachment B); and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education is committed to working with state and local officials to change the state regulations in order to be eligible for a higher level of state funding; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution with attachments be transmitted to the county executive and County Council.

(Attachment A)

(Attachment B)

The Board of Education adjourned its meeting of November 18, 1999, at 9:03 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

JDW:gr