

## ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL FACILITIES AND CAPITAL PROGRAMS (FAC)

### MEETING MINUTES

December 13, 2021 – 6:30 PM

Innovation Elementary School - Library

In Attendance: Heather Carkuff Joson, Jeff Chambers, Rosa Cheney, Cecilia Ciepiela-Kaelin, Michael DePalma, Mike Freda, John Giambalvo, David Goodman, Cynthia Hilton, Sally Hoekstra, Rebecca Hunter, Daryl Johnson, Lois Koontz, Steven Leutner, Cathy Lin, Kelley Litzner, Greg Lloyd, Nathan McQueen, Adam Rasmussen, Stacy Snyder, Lisa Stengle, Brian Stockton

1. Minutes from the November 8, 2021, meeting still awaiting distribution.
2. Public Comment: No public comment.
3. Liaison Reports:

BAC: Noted that BAC discussed choice schools in the context of relieving overcrowding.

JFAC: JFAC last year working on facilities master plan, put on hold for COVID. APS and County asked JFAC to investigate a) other jurisdictions and how schools are included in land use and sector plans; and b) public/private partnerships. Question on sector plans completed and a report has been submitted. Recommendations for including schools in ongoing land-use studies. Noted that this work will inform that in a more complete way. JFAC rep. to FAC noted that the report is available. Regarding the missing middle studies that the counties are doing, the JFAC is examining other jurisdictions and how they're handling the missing middle.

Aquatics: At last meeting (November), leadership changed. Requested that, when the FAC tours WK, WL, or YK high school sites that the tours include the aquatic facilities. County owns property called Quincy site, formerly known as the Buck site. APS currently uses the Quincy site for parking white fleet vehicles, trucks, vans, and sprinters used by the Trades service. JFAC recommended that the site not be used for bus parking. Subsequently, an APS request to park school buses (yellow) was denied but APS was allowed white fleet parking privileges. Community was told December 9, 2021, that ART buses are going to be parked at this facility. Temporary use precludes spill-over use previously agreed to by County with APS. APS staff (Cathy Lin) notes that Arlington County has kept APS informed, and parking is available for W-L faculty spill-over.

ASAC: Last meeting about transportation.

ASTL: Discussing social-emotional issues.

Transportation Committee: Kristen Haldeman, Director of multi-modal transportation is leaving APS. Executive Director for Transportation Services has recently been created to oversee director of multi-modal transportation and the director of transportation operations. New position is intended to help ensure schools are best served with transportation services before and after schools. Discussion ensued around operational efficiencies and planning related to transportation, scheduling, and facilities. Member Question: what if we got rid of choice schools; how would that alleviate transportation issues? Posed less to eliminate choice schools and more to show a baseline that shows how choice schools cost the community vs. the education benefits of the choice schools. APS representative noted that, choice schools aside, the 8 bell times in the AM and 8 in the PM affect schools as much or more and being intentional about the impact on parents' lives while also creating efficiencies in the schedule. Suggestion from APS: FAC could recommend that we are interested in doing a study on transportation and choice schools as a baseline. If multiple committees determine that this study makes sense, it could be elevated to the board as an issue worth pursuing, and direction could be given to the multiple APS departments that would be required to conduct the baseline study. Question: to what degree will this new position enable additional students to walk.

4. Enrollment: First macro-look at County enrollment projections. Based on lower birth rates and other factors, enrollment is expected to grow slightly over the next four years and then begin trending down in subsequent years. The same trends have been seen across the region and across the US. This matches trends that the current County consultant sees. APS is working on bottom-up projections based on new boundaries. New projections should be released by end of January. APS rep noted that, beyond three years, data is uncertain and not necessarily dependable based on multiple assumptions made. The result is changing the conversation for seats and the need for building new schools vs. re-aligning seats. May open an opportunity to re-invigorate older sites as well as adding additional learning and equity measures to future construction.

5. Brian Stockton, Chief of Staff – Office of the Superintendent:

FY23 priorities:

- Compensation: several years where individuals have never received a step increase. Anyone on-board since 2009 without a step increase will be brought up to the appropriate level (up to 5 steps) to be equivalent with their peers.
- Math and Literacy a big focus
- Operational efficiencies are also a significant focus.

APS adding a policy person to the staff to help professionalize policy creation and management.

Projections: Planning to increase up to 700 students in the 2022-2023 school year (~27,735). Numbers were presented to Superintendent cabinet in high, medium, and low scenarios. Estimated peak around 27,800 children in next couple of years, but estimates are difficult due to uncertainties.

Noted that APS is looking to the FAC to advise on facilities and CIP issues to help APS professionals due their job with community expertise and input to check their work and ensure that their work with the BLPC and other organizations has a well-rounded perspective.

Noted that Career Center working group after-action review helped fix some of the problems with the previous iteration, including having a known budget and specific guidelines and goals for the 2022 BLPC.

6. Subcommittee on the Long-Range Plan to Renovate Existing Schools:

Presentation of the proposed facilities ranking system created by APS. Noted that subcommittee members provided feedback on current plan, and comments will be incorporated in the coming weeks.

Four factors proposed with weighting: Building Condition (40 points); Capacity Utilization (30 points); Adequacy (20 points); and Special Considerations (10 points).

Input required for building conditions and adequacy. Special conditions require refinements. Capacity has decent metrics due to educational specifications.

The higher the score, the worse the condition is. As an example, if a facility is at 100, it's in pretty-bad shape; a lower score indicates a better condition/rating on some/all factors.

Note on the weighting: sub-committee member made the point that equity could be a deciding criterion for schools that have similar points.

FAC member disagreed with weightings and some of the metrics discussed between building, crowding, and adequacy. Suggested weighting adequacy higher and discussing equity in terms of the student experience as opposed to just looking at building safety and material items.

FAC member inquired as to whether there are parts of buildings/equipment that can't be replaced anymore (due to age, availability, etc.). Inquired about other items that

might affect ranking (sprinkler systems, high-efficiency toilets, electrical systems) that also affect long-term cost and sustainability issues.

FAC member noted that capacity issue shouldn't even be included based on the concept that it can be addressed with boundary moves. Not that it's not important for inclusion, but it should be added as a special consideration as a target for inclusion. APS member suggested that capacity is still a metric that deserves a rating, though perhaps not ranked at the current level.

APS member mentioned that some schools aren't enrolled by students to the building's maximum designed capacity, and perhaps one could come off-line and be used as a swing space.

FAC Chair suggested Adequacy should be rated higher because it speaks directly to the student experience. Mentioned daylighting as a potential measure as an example of adequacy. Also, outdoor spaces for exercise, ventilation, and other items that have been proven to affect learning. Focused less on where the metrics live and more how the overall categories are weighted.

Data and information related to various studies may be useful for refining weighting and metrics.

FAC member asked where we will get the standard for educational specifications. There are large differences between the schools in terms of size of classrooms, common spaces, outside areas, etc. Question: are the newest buildings going to be the standards for how we look at the other spaces that need renovations? What were the lessons learned from recent renovations, and how will they be applied/translated for new schools? Comment: we've had to create thousands of seats over the last several years, but there hasn't been a chance to consolidate lessons learned from recent construction and conducting a comparison of the pros/cons of each design for updated ed specs.

Jeff Chambers noted that you can do estimates for buildings and account for ranges that are written into the ed specs for each facility. Need to evaluate what ed spec call for and which standards are applied for things ranging from cafeterias, classroom sizes, kitchens, and a host of other metrics. Suggested measuring all buildings according to current standards but also accounting for the differences (classroom sizes, total size, special ed requirements, etc.).

FAC Member suggested breaking out all the sub-factors and evaluating them individually instead of aggregating factors into the larger bins.

A subcommittee member noted that each item should be maintained as its own, individual item to permit horizontal/vertical sorting and determine how sorting schools by each criteria affects the ranking structure. Categorization (binning) is one exercise;

observing how weights affect sorting and outcomes is another. Suggested separating the weighting from the evaluation.

An APS member suggested folding in building condition with Adequacy and moving Adequacy to the top and then increasing the weight of adequacy to a much higher level. APS member reminded the committee that end goal of this work is a framework for evaluation.

FAC member noted that suggestion for approaching the ranking from a data model perspective is a good approach. Suggested that weighting could be assessed and folded into other models.

FAC Member suggested other factors may affect models, such as aging, enrollment projections, and extended timelines (30 years) that may affect which projects are prioritized and addressed. First 10 years (safety health of students) may be different than 20–30-year time horizon needs (aging, capacity, etc.)

FAC Member: we want this tool to be as objective, measurable, and data driven as possible. Then, when needs arise, **context** can be added that will help with decision-making.

APS presented historical summary of past elementary renovations, ranging from minor renovations up to additions and full rebuilds.

APS requested additional feedback from FAC regarding member recommendations for prioritization and components.