



school board and while the school board was elected, the Planning Board was appointed. They met every Thursday evening and often had sessions on Monday evenings. The chair was full-time, and the other members were considered part-time, but they did put in a lot of hours. For example, they met with their counterparts in Prince George's County on Wednesday. He pointed out that they did not have authority over Rockville, Gaithersburg, Laytonsville, and four smaller towns. Mrs. Floreen added that they also commented on the school system's capital budget and would be looking at plans particularly those involving environmental concerns.

Mr. Bruce Crispell, demographic planner, reported that he and other MCPS had a very cooperative working relationship in forecasting and planning for schools. MCPS received land use data and long-range development patterns from Park and Planning as well as civic association lists and information on preliminary plans. They shared information on school population, census updates, and housing market trends. Mr. Crispell pointed out that in a sense MCPS did its own census every year because of its student population count.

Mr. Drew Dedrick, Park and Planning, indicated that since 1974 they had been surveying about 15,000 households every couple of years which provided an update to the census and information on housing yields. He used Bruce's data to help weight this sample, particularly in regard to minority populations. They developed forecast ranges which both organizations used. Mr. Crispell commented that Mr. Dedrick's demographic model projected the total population five years out which enabled MCPS to extend their school age estimates. Then the school forecast was integrated into a county and regional forecast.

Ms. Gutierrez asked where they got their birth data. Mr. Dedrick replied that state health departments were in an international computer network which provided information on all births to Montgomery County residents. For example, they knew that Montgomery County had the highest birth rate for women over 30 and that the county was in the top three in highest levels of education completed for parents. Mr. Robert Marriott, director of M-NCPPC, added that Mr. Dedrick's division also functioned as a research arm for the county government in the areas of map tracking, truck routes, sewers, and water.

Ms. Ann Briggs, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming, stated that the time was coming when the Board would be reviewing the CIP requests for the coming year. The planning process for staff started with the forecasts developed by Mr. Crispell and Mr. Dedrick. The second step was their annual description of the capacity of facilities. The final budget document approved by the County Council was a

meshing of the projections and what the Council approved to house that enrollment.

Ms. Deanna Newman, facilities planner, explained that the State of Maryland defined capacity as the maximum number of students that could reasonably be accommodated in a facility without significantly hampering delivery of the given education program. The actual capacity of a building was the number of teaching stations times the average class size for a particular program. In secondary schools, this number was multiplied by 90 percent. They used an average class size of 25 to one for regular classes for grades 1 to 12. However, they had different ratios for Head Start, kindergarten, ESOL, special education, and alternative programs. Each fall they sent out a survey to all schools asking what their programs were, and in that sense, capacity was very dynamic because of the changes in programs. Dr. Vance explained that the standards for regular classes were established by the Board of Education and for special education the standards were set by the state. He pointed out that for a number of years the Board had had the reduction of class size as a major goal. Ms. Newman noted that at present the state was using 30 to 1 for regular classes, but the state would be re-examining this criterion this year. Most counties were using a lower figure.

Ms. Newman stated that another piece of the formula was the teaching station. Montgomery County used a slightly larger figure than the state's 600 to 700 square feet. A teaching station was a place where students were assigned for all or part of a day. There were other parts of the school as well including the core which consisted of the cafeteria, media center, gym, etc. There was also circulation space which included hallways, bathrooms, boiler rooms, etc. Support rooms took up about 10 percent of the school and were used for instruction in addition to the instruction in the regular classroom. For example, these spaces might be used for computer labs, art rooms, or small group activities. She noted that the newer buildings were more compact and efficient. A new school might devote 33 percent of its space to circulation, but an older school might have 37 percent for this function. Dr. Vance was concerned about designating rooms as "support" which was a misnomer because everything in these rooms was curriculum related or mandated by law.

Mr. Marriott asked whether the state recognized the larger classrooms and the use of the support rooms. Ms. Newman replied that they did. Mrs. Floreen asked whether the state had standards for a particular support room, and Dr. Rohr replied that the state would review individual rooms if they felt the rooms sizes were out of line. Ms. Newman showed an overhead of a typical school and demonstrated how the capacity of that school was determined.

Mrs. Floreen asked about what would prevent their moving a special education program out of a school to add capacity. Ms. Newman replied that the Board of Education had a policy about not moving special education classes around. Once a program was installed it became a part of that school and in most cases articulated on to the next level in the cluster. Ms. Briggs recalled that a decade ago it was common practice to move special education programs to gain needed capacity, but it felt that students with special needs should be treated the same as regular students. Therefore, a five-year plan had been developed to assure stability for these students.

Mr. Charles Loehr, Planning Board staff, provided Board members with copies of the FY 93 Annual Growth Policy. He explained that the AGP was closely related to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. The Planning Board had to make a finding that public facilities would be adequate to support the development of subdivisions. Those public facilities included roads, sewer, police, fire, health, and schools. In 1987 the first AGP was adopted by the County Council and indicated where facilities were needed to support development. In past years transportation had been the limiting factor in subdivision approvals, prior to that it had been sewer, and now it looked as if it might be schools.

Mr. Loehr indicated that once a year the Council made a finding in June as to whether or not schools were going to be adequate. This allow the Planning Board to approve subdivisions by high school cluster. The AGP analysis looked at projected enrollments compared to capacity at elementary, middle, and high schools. If anyone of these failed it could mean a moratorium on construction. The Council used 110 percent of school capacity which allowed for flexibility with the use of portables. If a particular high school cluster did not have capacity, the Council could look at adjacent clusters to offset the deficit.

Mr. Loehr reported that last December it looked as if everything would be okay, but when the numbers were reviewed in the spring the situation had changed. They had planned to use the capacity at Sherwood to offset the deficit in the Paint Branch cluster, but program changes reduced the capacity at Sherwood and there were changes in the Blair and Springbrook clusters. It was the Planning Board's position that there should be a moratorium. The Council's vote was unanimous about Blair because they had a place holder to do something about that situation, but the vote was five to four on Paint Branch. The Council stated that there could be program changes in the next four years at Paint Branch and the deficit was a small one.

Mr. Bauman commented that at the Planning Board under the rules of the AGP they had voted that Paint Branch was in deficit, and if the Council had followed that recommendation that area would be in a moratorium for housing. The Council had also said that

this issue should be taken up next year. He remarked that some of them had been saying that schools would be the problem in the 1990's, and this was the first time that schools had been debated. He also pointed out that the Planning Board was embarking on master plans for that area of the county which would be a mammoth undertaking. Mr. Bauman noted that the citizens in this area of the county were organized and would continue to stay on top of this issue.

Mrs. Fanconi requested information on what they had heard from the state about construction funding. Dr. Rohr replied that for the last couple of years Montgomery County had been doing quite well in getting money for construction thanks to the Delegation. However, the governor had just named a commission headed by Sid Kramer to study this issue. The state was facing limitations on their ability to sell bonds. He pointed out that MCPS was going to have to write off projects in the past six years that the state had never funded, and now they were building middle schools which cost more and were facing the need for high schools in the 90's.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was bothered by the Council's decision, and he was glad that they had this opportunity to talk about this. It was his view that the Council had violated their own procedures, and he was concerned about the kind of decision that implied there was no problem with overcrowding in schools. Mr. Bauman suggested that Board members might want to be in attendance when the Council discussed these issues. Mrs. Floreen added that the Council needed to understand that programs could not be moved around as Council staff had suggested.

Mr. Bauman said that the school board should stay on top of the Council's deliberations on the annual growth policy. For example, the Council held a public hearing on the AGP and Board staff should have been in attendance. He reported that the eastern part of the county was organized and had presented testimony at the Council's hearing. He thought these people would be back at the next go-round. He suggested that the Board president and superintendent attend the Council's work sessions on this issue and consider testifying at the Council's hearing. He pointed out that at one of the work sessions it was stated to the Council that all the school board had to do was move a program which would cure the problem at Paint Branch. He felt that in fairness to the Council he had to say that this issue came up at the end of the process and that the Council recognized that it would have to return to this issue next year.

Mr. Ewing thanked Mr. Bauman for his suggestions, but he thought the school board and the planning board needed to talk about a position they could present to the Council that spoke to the problem created when the Council took the position it took. The action taken by the Council affected the ability of MCPS to plan

facilities in advance so that they would not have new facilities opening already overcapacity. If they had to move programs around this was a short-term perspective that solved nothing in the long term.

Mr. Bauman commented that they were in a period of fundamental change in government, and elected officials were struggling with issues in an era of economic change. Mrs. Floreen added that the hard issue for the Board was program flexibility, and she believed they would be facing more of this as the Council reviewed the AGP. Mr. Marriott commented that the Council also needed to understand why the Board might modernize a school and reduce its capacity. The Planning Board was doing its part in explaining population growth, but there were concerns about the relationship between the facilities the Council had difficulty paying for and the growth the Council would like to see. For example, Clarksburg was an area designated to receive growth, but it had no sewer, roads, and schools. The idea was that growth would pay for the public facilities, but this concept only worked if they had the front-end money to pay for public services.

Mr. Ewing hoped that they wouldn't wait another five years for a joint meeting. He believed that they shared concerns at the policy and staff levels, and that the Board of Education would welcome the opportunity to talk again with the Planning Board. Mr. Bauman agreed and noted that there was a common understanding that public education was the number one priority in the county. He concurred that there were more issues to discuss when they had more time, but he was pleased by the positive interaction between the two staffs on such issues as the Kay tract.

Mrs. Baptiste said that she would like to add one final thought to tonight's discussion. She thought that the Board members to do some research on the moratorium on road capacity. The goal of the Board should not be to support a moratorium but rather to get the needed school facilities for children. She felt that this should be a wake up call for the school board to create a constituency for building more schools. She pointed out that roads could wait but kids could not.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

October 1, 1992

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw