

FY 2021 SCHOOL BOARD CIP Questions

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
1	<p><u>Transportation Staff Facility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why can't this project's start be delayed? Belts are being tightened all over in response to the COVID impact on revenue. Why not this one? • Can the 2 phases of this project be separated and Phase 2 not started? • In the face of seat deficits, why was completing this project and adding more monies to it considered urgent? 	Facilities and Operations	May 22, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
2	<p><u>The Heights Building</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In slide #14 from the Interim Superintendent's Proposed FY 2021 CIP, it is ambiguous if the costs outlined apply to both a covered parking and synthetic turf field? • Arlington County Government (ACG) denied permission to APS (in either 2016 or 2017) from building the parking garage at the same time of constructing the rest of the building, saying they would review the need when the temporary firehouse moved off site from The Heights property. Has APS gotten the green light from ACG to add an underground parking garage at the Heights? 	Facilities and Operations	May 22, 2020	May 31, 2020	June 1, 2020
3	<p><u>Kitchen Renovations</u></p> <p>What is the rationale behind kitchen renovations and why are they considered necessary to include in the CIP?</p> <p>Specifically, regarding McKinley and Key:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are McKinley and Key's kitchen renovations estimated at exactly the same amount since their permanent capacities are different? • McKinley's 241 seat expansion was completed in 2016, bringing its permanent capacity to 684. Now ATS is planned to move to that building. ATS' enrollment is 589. If the kitchen at McKinley is sized for 684, then it can handle 589. We are in control of ATS' enrollment. If the plan is to expand ATS' enrollment when moving to the McKinley building, then why not expand it only to the McKinley permanent capacity, and save the kitchen renovation costs. • Separate from the kitchen renovation, why do we need to spend \$100K to refresh the McKinley building that had a major renovation less than 4 years ago? Can't we tighten the belt here? • Key's current enrollment is 56 students above permanent capacity. But during the upcoming ES boundary adjustment process, we can adjust Key's boundary and resulting enrollment so that it matches capacity when the boundary changes goes into effect. Key is an old school so I understand the need for refresh (paint, lighting, floors, etc.), but why do we need to spend \$2.8M on renovating its kitchen? 	Facilities and Operations Planning and Evaluation	May 22, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
4	<p><u>Career Center Expansion Project Concept Design</u></p>	Facilities and Operations	May 22, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020

FY 2021 SCHOOL BOARD CIP Questions

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In slide #10 of the <i>Arlington Career Center Expansion Project Concept Design</i> presentation, the space programming for academic and technical space accounts for 41.7% of total space. How much of that space is traditional lab and classroom space? How many new classrooms are needed and what is the square footage that corresponds with those spaces? • In slide #15, how many of the 420 parking spaces are required for each building on the site? • In slide #17, the Career Center BLPC suggested that eventually the Montessori school needed to move off the site. What is the corresponding cost for the parking needs related to the Montessori school? • What can be done to help ensure that current students can have the amenities they need as soon as possible even if the 800 seats can't be built. • What site barriers are in place that may be removed to help make the vision for a high school campus more affordable and delivered on time? 				
5	<p><u>Major Infrastructure Projects</u> The Oakridge PTA and a parent want to know when the HVAC will be fixed at Oakridge. They report that the classrooms at the south/southeast parts of the building are extremely hot and difficult for learning. A School Board member explained that the work was delayed and is done in priority order based on budget. Can someone from Facilities please address this directly with PTA and the concerned parent? Perhaps via the principal?</p>	Facilities and Operations	May 26, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
6	<p><u>Fields</u> Why have field renovations been de-emphasized in the current proposed CIP? What is the plan for keeping up with the necessary field improvements?</p>	Reassigned to F&MS	May 27, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
7	<p><u>The Heights Building Proposed Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many parking spaces will be provided in the recommended \$16.4M parking project at The Heights? • When the County denied APS' plan to build the parking garage, they said they wanted to see the experience of Heights users (staff and parents) using nearby commercial parking garages before they approved the underground parking. What is that experience? • How many of the 100 spaces APS is getting in the Penzance underground parking can be used for the short-term parking needs that the Heights parking project addresses? • What are the plans for staff parking originally envisioned in the underground lot under the field? Has the notion of staff parking at the school been dropped? • What happened to the \$5M originally planned for the cost of staff parking under the field? That original project envisioned 90 parking spaces, covered access to the school and a field on top of it. This new project has all these same elements (but fewer? parking spaces). What is the actual escalation 	Facilities and Operations	May 27, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020

FY 2021 SCHOOL BOARD CIP Questions

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	of that project from \$5M to \$16.4M in 4 years? It appears to be 50% escalation per year. How can that be?				
8a	<u>The Heights Building Proposed Parking</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 300%+ increase in cost? Please justify. • What is our experience with parking, Penzance, and leased spaces? We really do need this information to support plans for this build. 	Facilities and Operations	May 27, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
8b	<u>The Heights Building Proposed Parking</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we increase the number of student at HBW by leasing nearby office space for teaching and repurposing some of the Shriver space? 	Planning and Evaluation and Teaching and Learning	May 27, 2020		
9	<u>The Heights Building Proposed Parking</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we splitting the cost of the field with the county? • What would it cost to just build the field? • What is the comparison of building a garage vs. leasing parking spaces and using the parking provided on the new Penzance building (next to The Heights)? • Is it possible to build a smaller parking garage, perhaps 20 spaces. Would the cost saving be meaningful 	Facilities and Operations	May 27, 2020, Work Session	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
10	<u>Kitchen Renovations</u> Can the kitchen renovations happen at other years (summers), other than the timeframe in the proposed CIP?	Planning and Evaluation and Facilities and Operations	May 27, 2020, Work Session	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020
11	<u>High School Boundary Adjustments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the plan for HS boundary changes as a result of the changes in seat expansion due to the reduced CIP funding? • If the Ed Center opens in January 2022, won't we still need HS boundary changes to go into effect in the Fall of 2021? • Is the HS boundary change process still envisioned for Fall 2020? 	Planning and Evaluation	May 27, 2020		
12	<u>Transportation Staff Facility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is true, as the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Operations informed the School Board at 5/21 meeting, that the Transportation Staff Facility project has not started, then what is the actual impact of cancelling or delaying the start of the Transportation Staff Facility? As the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Operations said, Teaching and Learning must be the priority. • How will eliminating the 2 Transportation Staff Facilities projects have an impact on funding and debt 	Facilities and Operations and Finance and Management Services	May 27, 2020	June 1, 2020	June 1, 2020

FY 2021 SCHOOL BOARD CIP Questions

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	service ratios in the years beyond FY22?				
13	Future Funding Need talking points: what will happen if revenues do not recover and APS will not have funds to build new (beyond this CIP) seats at the middle (548 seats in 2025) and high school levels (800 seats).	Finance & Mgmt. Services F&O P&E	May 27, 2020, Work Session		
14	List of all projects and costs	F&O	May 28, 2020, Work Session	Adding for 6/2 for work session	
15	What has to be funded now – Supt.'s CIP?	Finance & Mgmt. Services F&O P&E	May 28, 2020, Work Session	Adding for 6/2 for work session	
16	Additions at Yorktown and Wakefield	F&O	May 28, 2020 Work Session		
17	Unused Bonding Capacity Following up on a question from the CIP work session #2 (May 28) about possible additional projects to use the \$53M in currently-unused available bonding capacity, what are the costs and staff recommendations for including projects found on slide 13 of the WS #2 presentation, https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/arlinfo/Board.nsf/files/BQ2R676BDB06/\$file/CIP%20Work%20Session%20%20-%20Presentation%20052820.pdf	Facilities and Operations and Finance and Management Services	May 29, 2020		
18	In December 2019, the SB approved \$600K to do 14 design studies on projects that would inform CIP development (see attached CIP Direction presentation from Dec 5, 2019 SB meeting). Those Design Studies were completed at the end of April but I don't recall that they were shared with the SB. For Tuesday's WS, I would like to see staff's explanations, costs, and recommendation on which of the 14 Design Studies items should be included in the SB's Proposed CIP. I want to propose for our discussion on Tuesday: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Heights item in the Supt's proposed CIP be scaled back to include only finishing the Heights project (bus loop, field, etc) without the underground parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See Design Studies slide 20 ○ need for short-term parent parking is unclear ○ approval of an underground garage by ACG is unknown/uncertain at this time • Expansion of Kenmore to create 525 additional seats for ~\$20M be added to the SB's Proposed CIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See Design Studies slides 50 & 52 ○ Adds construction funding to the planning and design funding already proposed in the CIP ○ gets an earlier start on providing MS seats whose need we know is coming • Add kitchen renovation projects at Campbell, Carlin Springs, Randolph, Sci Focus and Ashlawn to the FY19-30 	Facilities and Operations	May 31, 2020		

FY 2021 SCHOOL BOARD CIP Questions

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	CIP that are now being conceived for the next tier of CIP projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$13.8M (assuming \$2.76M each school based on Mck and Key kitchen renovations proposed in current CIP) ○ Improves inadequate facilities earlier than planned ○ Prepares 3 Col Pike area and 2 R-B corridor schools (per SB direction in Dec 2019) for results of the ES boundary process beginning in Fall 2021 				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #1:

Transportation Staff Facility

- Why can't this project's start be delayed? Belts are being tightened all over in response to the COVID impact on revenue. Why not this one?
- Can the 2 phases of this project be separated and Phase 2 not started?
- In the face of seat deficits, why was completing this project and adding more monies to it considered urgent?

RESPONSE:

The existing Transportation Staff Facility was built many years ago when the number of drivers and attendants was a great deal lower than it is now; its condition has deteriorated due to use by so many staff for so long. The bathrooms, break room and kitchen area are inadequate given that the drivers and attendants arrive and leave within a short period, and that some of them remain in the facility on the extended break between shifts because they live too far away to go home and return. It has become common for drivers to cook and share food from the many different countries from which they came.

The existing facility cannot accommodate required training sessions for nearly 300 staff, and the meeting room at the Parks and Recreation building nearby which is used for this purpose, is not always available when needed. APS devices are not issued to drivers and attendants. Today there is only space and no privacy in the breakroom for them to share a few devices to complete on line training, evaluations and other required HR tasks.

Phase 1 of the renovation will be located in the eastern end of the existing Trades Center warehouse. It will provide much larger bathrooms plus showers, a larger kitchen area, a break room that will accommodate all staff for trainings, an exercise room, a smaller training room and offices for the cluster leads to meet confidentially with the drivers and attendants. Thirty or more computer work stations will be provided with attention to privacy. Construction drawings for the project have been completed, the project is out to bid, demolition in the existing space has been completed. Construction is scheduled to begin in early summer and be completed before the end of the December this year.

Phase 2 of the renovation will include an accessible ramp to provide handicapped access for the first time to the warehouse loading dock, the Phase 1 renovation, the Transportation administrative area, the warehouse, and all the Facilities and Operations shops and offices on

the main floor of the building. A new entrance lobby will be constructed on the loading dock to connect the Transportation administrative offices to the Transportation staff area. The administrative offices will be expanded into the former break room to accommodate the additional staff included in the budget and anticipated for future operations, and the restrooms will be renovated and made fully accessible.

Phase 1 and 2 are both essential and the one cannot be completed without the other. The handicapped ramp is long overdue for the entire Trades Center facility. The new entrance lobby will make administrative staff accessible to drivers and attendants; without they will be entirely separated which will be detrimental to operations and staff morale.

All APS staff are valued. All staff facilities at APS should be of similar quality. Transportation facilities are of very much lower quality than any other staff facilities at APS. Transportation staff have been promised this project for some years, and are eagerly looking forward to it. This essential project cannot be delayed any longer without causing substantial damage to staff morale.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #2:

The Heights Building

1. In slide #14 from the Interim Superintendent's Proposed FY 2021 CIP, it is ambiguous if the costs outlined apply to both a covered parking and synthetic turf field?
2. Arlington County Government (ACG) denied permission to APS (in either 2016 or 2017) from building the parking garage at the same time of constructing the rest of the building, saying they would review the need when the temporary firehouse moved off site from The Heights property. Has APS gotten the green light from ACG to add an underground parking garage at the Heights?

RESPONSE:

1. The costs outlined in slide #14 include the synthetic turf field, the covered walk/ramp to the existing ground floor entrance to the building from the corner of N. Quinn St. and 18th St. N, and the covered short-term parking and drop-off, which also provides direct access to the existing ground floor entrance to the building.
2. Arlington County Government deferred approval of the work described above in the original Use Permit for The Heights Building until APS was ready to complete the project following removal of the temporary fire house. The Arlington County Board must approve an amendment to the existing Use Permit before the work can proceed.

County staff believe the 100 parking spaces that will be provided in the adjacent Penzance development for the Heights Building, along with up to 50 additional leased parking spaces in other nearby buildings, are adequate to meet the needs of The Heights Building. APS experience at Fleet and The Heights Building since they opened in September 2019 demonstrates unequivocally that the parking beneath the field is needed to provide short term accessible parking and drop-off for parents, particularly parents of Shriver students, plus short-term parking for visitors, itinerant APS staff and substitute staff, who would have to find temporary parking and enter the building to obtain an access card or fob to enter the garage before driving into it and parking.

It should also be noted that the covered parking area will be designed so that it could be converted to instructional space in the future, if, and when the parking spaces and drop-off are no longer needed. If the field is constructed without the covered parking beneath it, there will be no opportunity to expand instructional space at The Heights Building.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #3:

Kitchen Renovations

What is the rationale behind kitchen renovations and why are they considered necessary to include in the CIP? Specifically, regarding McKinley and Key:

1. Why are McKinley and Key's kitchen renovations estimated at exactly the same amount since their permanent capacities are different?
2. McKinley's 241 seat expansion was completed in 2016, bringing its permanent capacity to 684. Now ATS is planned to move to that building. ATS' enrollment is 589. If the kitchen at McKinley is sized for 684, then it can handle 589. We are in control of ATS' enrollment. If the plan is to expand ATS' enrollment when moving to the McKinley building, then why not expand it only to the McKinley permanent capacity, and save the kitchen renovation costs.
3. Separate from the kitchen renovation, why do we need to spend \$100K to refresh the McKinley building that had a major renovation less than 4 years ago? Can't we tighten the belt here?
4. Key's current enrollment is 56 students above permanent capacity. But during the upcoming ES boundary adjustment process, we can adjust Key's boundary and resulting enrollment so that it matches capacity when the boundary changes goes into effect. Key is an old school so I understand the need for refresh (paint, lighting, floors, etc.), but why do we need to spend \$2.8M on renovating its kitchen?

RESPONSE:

1. McKinley and Key's kitchen renovations happen to be estimated at the same cost, despite the difference in student capacity between the two schools, because approximately the same amount of construction is required at both, and the size of the kitchen is more dependent on the equipment and number of serving lines than the differences in student capacity.
2. The need for kitchen renovations has less to do with the overall population than the number of students who actually eat school lunch every day which is a factor of the F&RL population. McKinley has 8.8% F&RL whereas ATS has 30.7%. This means that when ATS moves to McKinley, the kitchen would have to serve double or more the number of students who currently eat school lunch. The McKinley kitchen does not have

sufficient storage, refrigerator, and freezer space to serve more students than they currently do. In addition, there is only one oven in the kitchen, there is not enough prep space, and with our focus on farm-to-school and local produce, we require an area to clean and store the produce we use. None of these issues can be fixed without a complete renovation of the kitchen.

3. \$100,000 is proposed to refresh the McKinley building to \$100,000 is proposed to refresh the McKinley building to cover the following items:
 - Signage changes: \$20,000
 - Furniture addition and replacement: \$80,000
(During the 2019 refreshes adjustments were required to accommodate the specific programs; also there are some classrooms that did not receive furniture in the McKinley renovation project and do not meet current Teaching and Learning standards.)
4. The kitchen at Key is currently overtaxed. The refrigerator and freezer space are inadequate, there is little to no work/prep space, the storage room is inadequate, the plumbing is outdated, and the hand sink is not properly located, resulting in health code violations.

An FAQ section will be added to the Engage CIP website, <https://www.apsva.us/engage/cip/>, which will include an FAQ on the kitchen renovations. This FAQ is below:

Why are school kitchen renovations included in the proposed APS FY 2021 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and future CIPs?

With our school division's focus on the whole child, APS has sought to provide access to food for all students, but a staff analysis determined that this is not possible with all of our school kitchens. Staff from the Dept. of Facilities and Operations worked with the Office of Food and Nutrition Services to assess the status and function of all APS elementary school kitchens. A decision was made several years ago to shift from preparing food at a central kitchen to, instead, preparing food at each school, which has greatly improved the quality of meals. The staff recommendation for specific kitchens to be expanded and renovated is considered urgent because APS is committed to continuing to provide higher-quality meals and no longer has a central kitchen to serve these schools. The freezers in the Trades Center warehouse—which had not been functional for years—were removed as part of the expansion of the Transportation staff facility, and the central kitchen at Jefferson is not equipped to handle current needs.

In planning for the priority capital investment needs for APS infrastructure, staff identified the elementary schools in need of kitchen renovations. These capital improvements would create additional space for food storage and preparation and add common space for more effectively managing lunch lines, serving food and seating more students during the typical three lunch cycles. With an expanded kitchen and choice, more students would opt to eat school-prepared lunches, reducing the concern that many students who bring food are not storing their lunches properly. Funding for renovations would include kitchen and additional space, kitchen equipment and any other owner (soft) costs—the specifics would vary according to each school site. APS is requesting funding in the FY 2021 CIP for three kitchen renovations, and then funding over the next three years for renovations on four additional kitchens.

Many school kitchens were designed and equipped to serve food that was prepared at a central location, rather than to prepare food on-site, as is done today. The kitchens in many schools are only half the size they should be, given the number of lunches that are currently—or will be—prepared in them. Cooking space in the kitchens of the schools identified is generally not laid out properly nor does it contain the equipment needed for today's menus. Rearrangement of kitchen equipment will not suffice. Inadequate space to store, prepare and serve meals in many schools has led to food waste, long lines, and challenges with providing lunches that students want to eat.

As APS works to comply with new regulations and focuses on serving farm-to-school meals and local produce, our kitchens require additional space to clean and store produce. Many school kitchens lack adequate refrigeration and freezer space, for example, and have only one oven, which is not sufficient. Schools with additions and relocatable classrooms are serving considerably more students from the same small kitchen space and serving line set-up designed for the initial, much smaller student body. Some school administrators have cited these kitchen challenges as a major factor in the instructional schedule because of the difficulty in serving all students in the allotted lunch periods.

The Advisory Council on School Facilities and Capital Programs (FAC) has discussed common spaces in our schools and how these are affected by a school's overall capacity when relocatable classrooms are used. The first tier of school facilities for kitchen renovations—Arlington Traditional, Key Immersion and McKinley—are included in the proposed FY 2021 CIP. Since these buildings are slated for facility refreshes in Summer 2020 due to school moves, the work can be done at the same time to ensure these schools are fully ready for students in Fall 2021. Without the kitchen expansions and renovations at these school facilities, APS will be unable to fully serve the incoming student population at these schools. The next tier of school facilities identified as priorities for kitchen renovations in future CIPs are Ashlawn, ASFS, Campbell, and Carlin Springs.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #4:

Career Center Expansion Project Concept Design

1. In slide #10 of the Arlington Career Center Expansion Project Concept Design presentation, the space programming for academic and technical space accounts for 41.7% of total space. How much of that space is traditional lab and classroom space? How many new classrooms are needed and what is the square footage that corresponds with those spaces?
2. In slide #15, how many of the 420 parking spaces are required for each building on the site?
3. In slide #17, the Career Center BLPC suggested that eventually the Montessori school needed to move off the site. What is the corresponding cost for the parking needs related to the Montessori school?
4. What can be done to help ensure that current students can have the amenities they need as soon as possible even if the 800 seats cannot be built?
5. What site barriers are in place that may be removed to help make the vision for a high school campus more affordable and delivered on time?

RESPONSE:

1. The Educational Specifications (Ed. Specs.), approved by the School Board, accommodate all existing programs at the Career Center plus the 800 additional seats, which have been assumed to be for CTE programs like Arlington Tech. The Ed. Specs. provide a total of 122 teaching stations. 58 teaching stations (44 regular classrooms and 14 science classrooms) are provided for traditional academic classes. The total area for the 58 spaces, including supporting preparation and storage areas, is 57,700 net square feet. Another 44 teaching stations (18 classrooms and 26 laboratories) are provided for Career Technical Education (CTE) classes. CTE spaces total 155,900 net square feet. The additional 20 teaching stations serve the other 200 full time students and programs.
2. The demand for 420 spaces was calculated by population type rather than by building:

High school staff (CC & ACHS):	210
Elementary school staff:	72
Students (CC & ACHS):	103
<u>Library and visitors:</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>Total:</u>	<u>420</u>

The parking model identifies demand by population type. It shows the greatest demand to be at 2:00 p.m. on a school day:

Total Parking Use	6 AM	7 AM	8 AM	9 AM	10 AM	11 AM	12 PM	1 PM	2 PM	3 PM	4 PM	5 PM	6 PM	7 PM	8 PM	Max
Arlington Tech	4	27	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	31	10	3	0	0	0	35
Academic Academy	1	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	4
HILT	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	1	0	0	0	5
PEP	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	1	0	0	0	5
New HS Seats	5	36	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	41	13	4	0	0	0	47
ACHS Students	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	7	5	8	10	10	10	9	10
HS Students (All Programs)	14	79	101	101	101	101	101	102	103	89	36	20	10	10	9	103
CC Staff	21	77	177	181	189	190	185	181	185	170	109	100	59	59	57	190
ACHS Staff	4	11	21	22	24	24	24	24	25	24	24	25	21	27	28	28
HS Staff (ACC and ACHS)	25	88	198	203	213	214	209	205	210	194	133	125	80	86	85	214
ES Staff	9	20	49	59	65	66	64	67	72	72	72	60	13	13	4	72
Library and Visitors	7	9	15	15	23	31	35	36	35	32	32	35	33	35	28	36
Total Demand	55	196	363	378	402	412	409	410	420	387	273	240	136	144	126	420

3. The 72 parking spaces required for the Montessori Public School of Arlington will cost between \$45,293 and \$98,409, depending on parking option selected. The total cost for the spaces would therefore be between \$3,261,096 and \$7,085,448, not including cost escalation through the date they were constructed.
4. If no current programs are relocated from the Career Center when the 800 seats are added, as has been the direction to date, it will require a capacity of about 2,200 students, which is about the same as that of Yorktown, Wakefield and Washington-Liberty (not including the Education Center). The Ed. Specs. were therefore developed with the Department of Teaching and Learning to provide Career Center students with the same amenities found at the three high schools. Because staff was directed that the instructional program for the 800 seats would not be determined until two years before it opened, the Ed. Specs. assume a CTE program like Arlington Tech to provide a margin of error, because CTE programs take up more space than regular high school programs. To construct the Career Center Expansion Project in more manageable, less costly, phases staff recommends collaboration among Department of Teaching and Learning staff, Career Center administration and staff, and Facilities and Operations staff on the following steps:
 - Through the Instructional Program Pathways (IPP) process identify the program for the 800 seats as soon as possible, so that only the instructional spaces and amenities that are specifically required for the program are constructed;
 - Also through the IPP process, evaluate whether efficiencies could be realized by consolidating one or more of the programs currently at the Career Center at other APS sites;
 - Review delivery of CTE to students at the other high schools and programs to determine if any of the classes currently offered at the Career Center could be offered at the high schools and programs to open up space to full-time Career Center students;
 - Revise the Ed. Specs. for the project accordingly; and
 - Having completed the above four steps determine which of the amenities that will eventually be constructed are required for students who will attend the Career Center in the next few years, and develop a first phase of construction that can be completed as soon as possible to include them.

Other considerations that would help complete the Career Center Expansion Project more cost effectively include:

- Focusing physical education spaces more on lifetime fitness than competitive sports;
 - Designing performance space with flat floors, movable seating and movable stages, rather than sloped floors with fixed seats and a proscenium stage, so that they may have a wide variety of uses;
 - Combining spaces like a gym/auditorium or dining commons/auditorium, at least in initial phase of construction;
 - Focusing the art program more on digital art than traditional art, which would reduce the need for art rooms and make them more multi-use;
 - Focusing the music program more on digital music and recording than band, chorus & orchestra, which would reduce the need for music rooms and make them more multi-use;
 - Conceive the library as collaboration space with a digital collection and casual reading, more than a traditional high school library with a large book collection;
 - Design the cafeteria to be a dining commons that will also highlight the food service program and may be used throughout the school day for informal teaching and learning; and, most importantly
 - Differentiate rigorously between “have to have” and “like to have”.
5. Site barriers that might be removed to help make the vision for a high school campus more affordable, and more able to be delivered on time include:
- Failing to accept that this is a very complex site with many logistical challenges, and that phasing should be logical to meet program needs and minimize disruption to ongoing teaching and learning at the Career Center;
 - Insisting, as in the FY 2019-28 CIP, that all the parking be beneath the field and that it be delivered before the 800-seat addition;
 - Refusing to consider the far less expensive and logistically challenging above grade parking structure on the corner of 7th St. S and S. Walter Reed Drive, as some County Board members, some County staff, and many members of the community have done; and
 - Failing to consider relocation of Arlington Community High School to an existing building nearby sooner rather than later, so that the Fenwick Building could be used as swing space during construction, permanent space thereafter, and could eventually be replaced with a larger building.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #5:

Major Infrastructure Projects

The Oakridge PTA and a parent want to know when the HVAC will be fixed at Oakridge. They report that the classrooms at the south/southeast parts of the building are extremely hot and difficult for learning. A School Board member explained that the work was delayed and is done in priority order based on budget. Can someone from Facilities please address this directly with PTA and the concerned parent? Perhaps via the principal?

RESPONSE:

Major infrastructure bonds are included in the Interim Superintendent's Proposed CIP at \$15.4 million for the next two years. Oakridge is one of next three schools due for a substantial HVAC system replacement. The needs of Oakridge will be compared to those of the other two schools during our regular Major Infrastructure and Minor Construction/Major Maintenance (MC/MM) evaluation process this fall. Prioritization of the three schools will be established during the process.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020

TO: Members of the School Board

VIA: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Leslie Peterson, Assistant Superintendent, Finance & Management Services

QUESTION:

Fields

Why have field renovations been de-emphasized in the current proposed CIP? What is the plan for keeping up with the necessary field improvements?

RESPONSE:

Field renovations have not been de-emphasized in the current proposed CIP. We have included the only field conversion that will take place in the next ten years for which APS must contribute. Field replacements cannot be bond funded so will be funded in the annual MC/MM budget in the years in which they are required.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020

TO: Members of the School Board

VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent

FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #7:

The Heights Building Proposed Parking

1. How many parking spaces will be provided in the recommended \$16.4M parking project at The Heights?
2. When the County denied APS' plan to build the parking garage, they said they wanted to see the experience of Heights users (staff and parents) using nearby commercial parking garages before they approved the underground parking. What is that experience?
3. How many of the 100 spaces APS is getting in the Penzance underground parking can be used for the short-term parking needs that the Heights parking project addresses?
4. What are the plans for staff parking originally envisioned in the underground lot under the field? Has the notion of staff parking at the school been dropped?
5. What happened to the \$5M originally planned for the cost of staff parking under the field? That original project envisioned 90 parking spaces, covered access to the school and a field on top of it. This new project has all these same elements (but fewer? parking spaces). What is the actual escalation of that project from \$5M to \$16.4M in 4 years? It appears to be 50% escalation per year. How can that be?

RESPONSE:

1. Approximately 70 parking spaces would be provided in the covered drop-off/pick-up and parking area. The exact number of spaces is contingent on the final design of the drop-off area and the number of accessible parking spaces to be provided.
2. The parking experience has been acceptable for staff who spend all day at the Building. It has not been acceptable for parents, especially those of students in the Shriver Program, and for short-term or infrequent visitors including substitutes and itinerant APS staff. On-street accessible spaces on N. Quinn St. near the ground floor entrance are temporary pending approval from the County to make them fully accessible; they are frequently occupied by other vehicles, and it takes some time to reach the building from them in all weathers, given the length of the ramp. Other short-term or infrequent visitors must find metered spaces on the street, or park temporarily, enter the building to obtain a fob or pass, drive to the leased spaces down the block, find a parking space, and then walk back to the building, which leads to considerable parking anxiety for visitors to the building.

3. It has not been determined how many of the parking spaces in the Penzance Building will be available for short term or irregular parking. Access will be by card or fob, so all visitors will have to find temporary parking on the street, enter the building to obtain a fob or pass, drive into the parking structure, park and return to the building.
4. In addition to the drop-off/pick-up, accessible parking spaces, and spaces reserved for short-term and infrequent visitors, there will be some spaces for full-time staff in the covered parking area. The exact number of spaces for full-time staff will be determined during design, and may be increased or reduced in the future based on actual usage of the accessible and short-term parking spaces.
5. It is unlikely that the \$5 million originally earmarked for the covered parking at the time it was deferred, would have been adequate to complete the parking, though completing the entire project at one time would have resulted in some cost efficiencies. The number of spaces in the covered parking will be reduced because experience has demonstrated that more accessible parking spaces, and a larger drop-off/pick-up area than originally planned are now required. In addition, some of the space originally intended for parking has been taken up by a storm water structure, the need for which became apparent during the permitting process. The cost has increased because of the same unexpectedly high escalation in construction costs that was experienced on the building itself, because it will be built separately from and later than the building, and because the original estimate of cost was inadequate.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #8a:

The Heights Building Proposed Parking

1. A 300%+ increase in cost? Please justify.
2. What is our experience with parking, Penzance, and leased spaces? We really do need this information to support plans for this build.

RESPONSE:

1. Please refer to response #5 to CIP Question #7.
2. Please refer to response #4 to CIP Question #7, and the response provided below:

We do not yet have any experience with Penzance regarding the 100 spaces assigned to APS in the adjacent building because construction of the spaces has not yet been completed. Under its agreement with the County Penzance is required to provide 100 leased parking spaces in nearby buildings until its parking structure is available to APS. Penzance did offer APS 100 spaces in a nearby building, but many of them were two, three or four vehicles deep. This was not acceptable to APS, because of the inconvenience it would cause to staff. Despite vigorous protests to Penzance through the County, Penzance would not offer additional drive-in spaces. As a result, APS could only use about 50 of the spaces and had to rent about 50 more spaces in a nearby building in addition to the 50 it had already budgeted to lease. APS also had to lease four accessible parking spaces in the building directly across the street for The Heights Building staff.

Though our experience with leased spaces has been reasonable to date, the long-term availability of leased spaces in Rosslyn is uncertain. Landlords will not sign leases for more than a few months at a time in buildings that are not 100% leased, because they must remain able to offer future tenants the number of spaces they require. Some of the older buildings have excess spaces available even when the buildings are full, but the newer buildings do not, and the County has reduced the zoning requirements for parking in future buildings. We have been paying between \$120 and \$140 per month per parking space, and are careful when suspending leases to be certain that the spaces will be available again when we need them.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

FY 2021 CIP QUESTION #9:

The Heights Building Proposed Parking

1. Are we splitting the cost of the field with the county?
2. What would it cost to just build the field?
3. What is the comparison of building a garage vs. leasing parking spaces and using the parking provided on the new Penzance building (next to The Heights)?
4. Is it possible to build a smaller parking garage, perhaps 20 spaces? Would the cost saving be meaningful?

RESPONSE:

1. The County has not been asked to share the cost of the field with the County. The County has not yet agreed to pay its share of increased costs for the items it has already agreed to share on The Heights Building.
2. The estimated cost to construct the field and covered entrance to the ground floor of the building is \$4,667,693 for August 2022 completion and \$4,901,078 for August 2023 completion. The estimated cost to construct the field, covered entrance to the ground floor of the building, and the covered drop-off/pick-up and parking spaces is \$16,375,420 for August 2022 completion and \$17,194,191 for August 2023 completion. The difference between the two is \$11,707,227 or \$12,293,113. Since approximately 70 parking spaces would be available, the approximate cost per parking space is \$167,253 or \$175,616 (difference in cost divided by the number of spaces).
3. APS has been assigned 100 parking spaces in the Penzance building adjacent to The Heights at no cost. The spaces are scheduled to be available to APS in late 2021 or early 2022. If APS were able to lease 70 additional spaces, at the current cost of \$120 to \$140 per space per month, costs would be between \$7,200 and \$8,400 per month and \$86,400 and \$100,800 per year. In addition, short term spaces need to be secured for itinerant staff, visitors and evening events currently accommodated with validation stamps and stickers. Other considerations when making this comparison include availability of leased spaces in the future, and the needs for covered pick-up/drop off, accessible and short-term parking at the building.

4. Given the configuration of the covered parking area below the field and the existing topography there would be very little, if any, saving in cost if fewer spaces were constructed.

DRAFT

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent
FROM: Leslie Peterson, Assistant Superintendent, Finance & Management Services

QUESTION:

Kitchen Renovations

Can the kitchen renovations happen at other years (summers), other than the timeframe in the proposed CIP?

RESPONSE:

It is imperative that the three kitchens slated for renovation prior to Fall 2021 be completed in that timeframe. These three kitchens do not have adequate storage, refrigerator, freezer, oven, or prep space for the number of students who currently eat school lunch at those buildings. With the program moves, the number of students who eat school lunch at McKinley is expected to double and at ATS it is expected to increase by 125 or more. The kitchen at Key is currently overtaxed. In addition to the issues outlined above, the plumbing is outdated and the hand sink is not properly located, resulting in health code violations.

An FAQ section will be added to the Engage CIP website, <https://www.apsva.us/engage/cip/>, which will include an FAQ on the kitchen renovations. This FAQ is below:

Why are school kitchen renovations included in the proposed APS FY 2021 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and future CIPs?

With our school division's focus on the whole child, APS has sought to provide access to food for all students, but a staff analysis determined that this is not possible with all of our school kitchens. Staff from the Dept. of Facilities and Operations worked with the Office of Food and Nutrition Services to assess the status and function of all APS elementary school kitchens. A decision was made several years ago to shift from preparing food at a central kitchen to, instead, preparing food at each school, which has greatly improved the quality of meals. The staff recommendation for specific kitchens to be expanded and renovated is considered urgent because APS is committed to continuing to provide higher-quality meals and no longer has a central kitchen to serve these schools. The freezers in the Trades Center warehouse—which had not been functional for years—were removed as part of the expansion of the Transportation staff facility, and the central kitchen at Jefferson is not equipped to handle current needs.

In planning for the priority capital investment needs for APS infrastructure, staff identified the elementary schools in need of kitchen renovations. These capital improvements would create

additional space for food storage and preparation and add common space for more effectively managing lunch lines, serving food and seating more students during the typical three lunch cycles. With an expanded kitchen and choice, more students would opt to eat school-prepared lunches, reducing the concern that many students who bring food are not storing their lunches properly. Funding for renovations would include kitchen and additional space, kitchen equipment and any other owner (soft) costs—the specifics would vary according to each school site. APS is requesting funding in the FY 2021 CIP for three kitchen renovations, and then funding over the next three years for renovations on four additional kitchens.

Many school kitchens were designed and equipped to serve food that was prepared at a central location, rather than to prepare food on-site, as is done today. The kitchens in many schools are only half the size they should be, given the number of lunches that are currently—or will be—prepared in them. Cooking space in the kitchens of the schools identified is generally not laid out properly nor does it contain the equipment needed for today's menus. Rearrangement of kitchen equipment will not suffice. Inadequate space to store, prepare and serve meals in many schools has led to food waste, long lines, and challenges with providing lunches that students want to eat.

As APS works to comply with new regulations and focuses on serving farm-to-school meals and local produce, our kitchens require additional space to clean and store produce. Many school kitchens lack adequate refrigeration and freezer space, for example, and have only one oven, which is not sufficient. Schools with additions and relocatable classrooms are serving considerably more students from the same small kitchen space and serving line set-up designed for the initial, much smaller student body. Some school administrators have cited these kitchen challenges as a major factor in the instructional schedule because of the difficulty in serving all students in the allotted lunch periods.

The Advisory Council on School Facilities and Capital Programs (FAC) has discussed common spaces in our schools and how these are affected by a school's overall capacity when relocatable classrooms are used. The first tier of school facilities for kitchen renovations—Arlington Traditional, Key Immersion and McKinley—are included in the proposed FY 2021 CIP. Since these buildings are slated for facility refreshes in Summer 2020 due to school moves, the work can be done at the same time to ensure these schools are fully ready for students in Fall 2021. Without the kitchen expansions and renovations at these school facilities, APS will be unable to fully serve the incoming student population at these schools. The next tier of school facilities identified as priorities for kitchen renovations in future CIPs are Ashlawn, ASFS, Campbell, and Carlin Springs.

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2020
TO: Members of the School Board
VIA: Dr. Francisco Duran, Superintendent
FROM: John Chadwick

QUESTION:

Transportation Staff Facility

- If it is true, as the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Operations informed the School Board at 5/21 meeting, that the Transportation Staff Facility project has not started, then what is the actual impact of cancelling or delaying the start of the Transportation Staff Facility? As the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Operations said, Teaching and Learning must be the priority.
- How will eliminating the 2 Transportation Staff Facilities projects have an impact on funding and debt service ratios in the years beyond FY22?

RESPONSE:

- Please refer to staff response to CIP Question #1 for staff response to the first bullet point.
- The Transportation Staff Facilities projects are funded from the Capital Reserve and would have no effect on debt service ratios in the years beyond FY22.