

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

ci#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
1	On slides 32-34, does FN 2 need to be updated? It has the same text about the \$25M placeholder per year, but the slides appear to indicate \$50M per year. (MT)	Finance	5/13/2024	5/13/2024	5/17/2024
2	The line toward the bottom, in the secondary chart, that is titled Debt Service Ratio: minor, but the full title needs to be shown; substantively, what is the denominator used to calculate the ratio? I can back it out math-wise, but I don't know what the number is supposed to represent. For example, for FY 2025, 8.15% divided by \$46.18M equals \$566.63M. What does the \$566.63M represent? (MT)	Finance	5/13/2024	5/13/2024	5/17/2024
3	In the proposed budget, at page 33, there is an All Funds Expenditure Summary reflecting a proposed \$67.3M proposed debt service amount, which would be an increase of \$2.4M or 3.7%. If the proposed CIP figure of \$2.64 is used, should that proposed debt service amount be updated to \$67.54M? (MT)	Finance	5/13/2024	5/13/2024	5/17/2024
4	Can I get please the charts reflected at pp. 401-03 of the proposed budget updated to how they would look if the borrowing reflected in the proposed CIP were adopted? (MT)	Finance	5/13/2024	5/13/2024	5/17/2024
5	I would also like to know in the feasibility studies which schools would have been chosen if the three with asterisks are taken off the list (those that have had more recent roofing and HVAC work). Not for Thursday, but submitted as a CIP question for the running list from board members. (MK)	D&C/Facilities	5/13/2024	5/14/2024	5/17/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
6	Additionally, I'd point out that I don't believe the MPSA numbers should be as high as you've made them. I really don't think that prevailing wage adds 15% as the consultant study suggests, at least not in Northern VA. Since prevailing wage has not been adopted, I think it's appropriate for us to note that prevailing wage will add cost that is TBD, but we can note that studies done in adjacent localities have estimated that prevailing wage has added anywhere from 0-5% to total project costs. The 15% estimate that was done at the state level is more reflective of the added costs in other VA counties where labor was getting paid far less than prevailing wage rates, which is not the case in Northern VA... I think you've overshot the actual project costs for MPSA by quite a bit by including it, though I appreciate the reason why you wanted to do so. (MK)	D&C/Facilities	5/14/2024	5/14/2024	5/17/2024
7	At one point it was stated that once the Henry building was demolished, a geothermal field for the new ACC building could be installed. Approximately how much would that cost? Could that also serve MPSA in the legacy ACC building as well? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
8	How do we envision those who travel to the Grace Hopper Center from the parking garage will walk to the building from the garage—what will be their route? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
9	How many accessible parking spaces are we required to have for the Grace Hopper Center and how proximate must they be to the building? What is the plan for this? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
10	How does the size of the MPSA playground (the main playground at the back of the building) compare to the size of the playgrounds of other schools at the 700+ ES spec? (e.g., Cardinal, Fleet) in square footage? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
11	For MPSA, the new field adjacent to S. Highland St would be shared with students at the Grace Hopper Center, correct? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

ci#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
12	For MPSA it looks like in Option 3 there is a lot of unlabeled (unused?) space in the center of the second floor. Can you provide more info about that? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
13	Feasibility Studies: Can you confirm that a) these studies can be conducted concurrently, and b) that these will include information about costs associated with renewable energy options (e.g., solar, geothermal)? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
14	<p>According to the FCA, how many of our buildings will need some form of major infrastructure system replacement within the next 10 years (within the span of this CIP) according to the assessment conducted and the system’s Remaining Useful Life?</p> <p>(When I look at the report, I see the following systems/items that are listed in Red, though I also see that some other things that were Yellow were prioritized for this CIP (e.g., HVAC at Hoffman Boston):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Williamsburg: Roof 2. Taylor: Food Service 3. Randolph: Floors 4. Long Branch: Roof 5. Jefferson: Roof 6. Jamestown: Central Plant Heating, Water Heaters, Ceilings 7. Innovation: Roof 8. Gunston: Walls, Floors, Ceilings, Roof 9. Glebe: Elevators 10. Hamm: Roof 11. Planetarium: Roof 12. Claremont: Exterior Doors, Roof 13. Campbell: Roof 14. Ashlawn: Roof 15. Science Focus: Roof <p>If we were to total up all the major infrastructure projects that we would need to do according to acute need of repair and RUL over the ten-year span of this CIP, how many projects would that total? (I understand there is no way we will be able to afford to do all of them—I am just trying to get a sense of how many of our buildings would be in that queue.)</p> <p>(MK)</p>	Facilities	5/21/2024	5/23/2024	5/23/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
15	Then in response to #14: How many of those buildings and major infrastructure projects are we able to address in this CIP, through a combination of naming them as major infrastructure projects or putting them on the list for the 3-5 feasibility studies, where presumably the major infrastructure components would also be addressed (am I correct in assuming that)? (MK)	Facilities	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
16	Trade Center Optimization: “Adequate Parking for Staff” has been a bone of contention for a while for our Transportation team. Does this mean that our bus drivers and bus attendants will be able to park on-site? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
17	Trade Center Optimization: When will we have an actual dollar figure for this? My understanding is that we’re doing a study together with the County—is that correct? When would actual changes be made to the site? (MK)	D&C	5/21/2024	5/22/2024	5/23/2024
18	If APS were to close an elementary school at some point in the future, what annual cost savings would we expect to realize? (We could assume that a good number of the staff would be needed at other schools where students were rezoned, but we could expect to see savings in other areas, including administration, transportation, utilities, equipment, maintenance, etc.) (MK)	Facilities/ Finance	5/21/2024		
19	Debt Service: Let’s say that instead of increasing the debt service, I wanted to cut our annual debt service payment by at least \$10M by 2027. Is that possible, and how would we do that? (MK)	Finance	5/21/2024	5/21/2024	5/23/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

ci#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
20	Can I get please the charts reflected at pp. 401-03 of the proposed budget updated to how they would look if the borrowing reflected in the proposed CIP were adopted? Assuming annual 2.5% increases, and using the debt service ratios reflected in the CIP Assuming annual 2.5% increases, and using the debt service ratios reflected in the CIP. In other words, comparing to the debt service chart in the super's proposed budget, it looks to me that our debt load would remain essentially the same from 2025 through 2026, go up \$1M in 2027, then go up \$6M in 2028 and \$10M+ in the years after that. Am I interpreting this correctly? (MT)	Finance	5/23/2024	5/23/2024	5/23/2024
21	Could I please get information about expected delivery date for Options 2 and 3 for MPSA actually moving into the legacy ACC building? (MK)	D&C	5/23/2024	5/23/2024	5/23/2024
22					

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: At one point it was stated that once the Henry building was demolished, a geothermal field for the new ACC building could be installed. Approximately how much would that cost? Could that also serve MPSA in the legacy ACC building as well?

RESPONSE:

The cost for the geothermal field and its connection to the new building has not been estimated yet. This could be included in a future project. Extending the geothermal system to serve the legacy ACC building can also be considered, but it would increase renovation costs. Currently, the plan is to reuse the existing equipment in the legacy ACC building, as it is still operational and in good condition.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: How do we envision those who travel to the Grace Hopper Center from the parking garage will walk to the building from the garage—what will be their route?

RESPONSE:

Visitors will have the option to leave the garage walk along the west side of the legacy ACC building to the pedestrian way turning right toward the Grace Hopper Building or east along 9th Street and north on Walter Reed. Staff could also be permitted to walk through the legacy ACC Building if/when allowed door access.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: How many accessible parking spaces are we required to have for the Grace Hopper Center and how proximate must they be to the building? What is the plan for this?

RESPONSE:

Accessible spaces are calculated as a percentage of the total spaces provided and are included in the garage, as it is the only parking area on the campus. Eight accessible spaces were required and have been provided. These spaces are located closest to the main building entrances. Additionally, staff have collaborated with the County to provide ADA accessible street parking: two spaces on 7th Street and four on Walter Reed, like the arrangements at Fleet, The Heights, and the bus circle at Dorothy Hamm Middle School.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: How does the size of the MPSA playground (the main playground at the back of the building) compare to the size of the playgrounds of other schools at the 700+ ES spec? (e.g., Cardinal, Fleet) in square footage?

RESPONSE:

The playgrounds are not yet designed. However, Design & Construction (D&C) will work to maximize the size and accessibility of both primary and secondary play areas, ensuring they are comparable to those at other schools, within the space available once the building design is finalized.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: For MPSA, the new field adjacent to S. Highland St would be shared with students at the Grace Hopper Center, correct?

RESPONSE:

The new field is intended for the Grace Hopper Center (GHC) PE programs, while MPSA will continue to use the grass field created with the playground relocation last fall. It has been discussed that when the MPSA program relocates to the legacy ACC and the existing building is replaced with a full-sized field, MPSA would likely gain full-time use of the field adjacent to Highland, and GHC would use the new larger field.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: For MPSA it looks like in Option 3 there is a lot of unlabeled (unused?) space in the center of the second floor. Can you provide more info about that?

RESPONSE:

The building design is still in progress. The study focused on accounting for "scheduled spaces," and not all support spaces have been identified yet. The unlabeled spaces in the center of the second floor are intended for service areas, faculty workrooms, security spaces, conference rooms, itinerant rooms, counseling spaces, breakout spaces, and other support rooms.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: Feasibility Studies: Can you confirm that a) these studies can be conducted concurrently, and b) that these will include information about costs associated with renewable energy options (e.g., solar, geothermal)?

RESPONSE:

Yes, the feasibility studies will be conducted concurrently. Additionally, these studies will include information about the costs associated with renewable energy options, such as solar and geothermal. It is a standard requirement that the studies ensure the projects are solar-ready, assess the feasibility of geothermal systems where space permits, aim for low carbon emissions, and target an Energy Use Intensity (EUI) in the low to mid-twenties.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: According to the FCA, how many of our buildings will be in need of some form of major infrastructure system replacement within the next 10 years (within the span of this CIP) according to the assessment conducted and the system’s Remaining Useful Life?

(When I look at the report, I see the following systems/items that are listed in Red, though I also see that some other things that were Yellow were prioritized for this CIP (e.g., HVAC at Hoffman Boston):

1. Williamsburg: Roof
2. Taylor: Food Service
3. Randolph: Floors
4. Long Branch: Roof
5. Jefferson: Roof
6. Jamestown: Central Plant Heating, Water Heaters, Ceilings
7. Innovation: Roof
8. Gunston: Walls, Floors, Ceilings, Roof
9. Glebe: Elevators
10. Hamm: Roof
11. Planetarium: Roof
12. Claremont: Exterior Doors, Roof
13. Campbell: Roof
14. Ashlawn: Roof
15. Science Focus: Roof

If we were to total up all the major infrastructure projects that we would need to do according to acute need of repair and RUL over the ten-year span of this CIP, how many projects would that total? (I understand there is no way we will be able to afford to do all of them—I am just trying to get a sense of how many of our buildings would be in that queue.)

RESPONSE:

Based on the provided list, focusing on the roofing program is appropriate and constitutes most of the infrastructure projects proposed by the Maintenance Department. It is reassuring to see such alignment between the data in the FCA (Facility Condition Assessment) ATTACHMENT C.4 and the previously determined Roofing program from other inspections and reports, as presented in the Appendices (Slides 47-49) in the Superintendent's Proposed FY2025-34 CIP presentation H-1 on May 16.

Seven of the roofs identified overlap directly with our program, and the remaining ones were already on our radar. We have already extended the life of the Planetarium roof with a recoat. Staff believe there is enough bond capacity to address all these roofs within the next 10 years. These roofs will be prioritized along with any other items that received a 'poor' rating in the study.

Including the roofs, we currently have 24 projects planned at 17 locations.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: Then in response to #25-14: How many of those buildings and major infrastructure projects are we able to address in this CIP, through a combination of naming them as major infrastructure projects or putting them on the list for the 3-5 feasibility studies, where presumably the major infrastructure components would also be addressed (am I correct in assuming that)?

RESPONSE:

The projects selected for the feasibility study will have their infrastructure issues addressed as part of that work. If a project is ultimately not pursued, some infrastructure work may still be necessary for the building. This work will be informed by the findings from the feasibility study and planned future work at that building or campus.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: Trade Center Optimization: “Adequate Parking for Staff” has been a bone of contention for a while for our Transportation team. Does this mean that our bus drivers and bus attendants will be able to park on-site?

RESPONSE:

We are currently in the initial phase of the study, exploring multiple options with various pros and cons. Some options do include increased staff parking. However, it will depend on which option is ultimately chosen. There may still be a need for off-site parking due to space limitations and budget constraints at the Trades Center.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: Trade Center Optimization: When will we have an actual dollar figure for this? My understanding is that we're doing a study together with the County—is that correct? When would actual changes be made to the site?

RESPONSE:

We expect costs to be discussed at a future work session with both Boards. The division of costs between the County and the School Board also needs to be determined.

Changes to the site will be made once the scope and budget are finalized and incorporated into both the APS and County Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs).

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Andy Hawkins, Assistant Superintendent of Finance & Management Services

CIP QUESTION: If APS were to close an elementary school at some point in the future, what annual cost savings would we expect to realize? (We could assume that a good number of the staff would be needed at other schools where students were rezoned, but we could expect to see savings in other areas, including administration, transportation, utilities, equipment, maintenance, etc.)

RESPONSE: This question is complex due to the many variables involved. On average, the projected annual cost of an elementary school is approximately \$8.8 million (Superintendent’s Proposed FY2025 Budget, Page 115 – Total Cost divided by the total number of elementary schools). However, the savings from closing an elementary school largely depend on how students are redistributed to other schools and how this affects the Planning Factor requirements of the receiving schools.

Potential savings could arise from reduced staff needs, but this depends on the capacities and requirements of the schools receiving the students. Utility savings are possible, contingent on the size and capacity differences between the closed school and the receiving school. Questions to consider include whether the receiving schools have adequate capacity and if additional space is needed. If additional space is required, would it be in the form of relocatables/trailers?

Significant transportation savings are unlikely if students are transferred to nearby schools. Equipment and maintenance costs might be reduced depending on the specific needs of the receiving schools.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Andy Hawkins, Assistant Superintendent of Finance & Management Services

CIP QUESTION: Debt Service: Let’s say that instead of increasing the debt service, I wanted to cut our annual debt service payment by at least \$10M by 2027. Is that possible, and how would we do that?

RESPONSE: Below is the current debt repayment schedule:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>Interest</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reductions Compared to FY24</i>
FY2024	43,830,000	20,819,439	64,649,439	
FY2025	40,910,000	19,241,104	60,151,104	(4,498,335)
FY2026	38,550,000	17,832,518	56,382,518	(8,266,920)
FY2027	41,005,000	16,416,152	57,421,152	(7,228,286)
FY2028	39,820,000	14,762,794	54,582,794	(10,066,645)
FY2029	38,675,000	13,211,316	51,886,316	(12,763,123)
FY2030	38,500,000	11,653,745	50,153,745	(14,495,694)
FY2031	37,095,000	10,140,761	47,235,761	(17,413,677)
FY2032	35,455,000	8,756,178	44,211,178	(20,438,261)
FY2033	32,860,000	7,463,824	40,323,824	(24,325,615)
FY2034	28,060,000	6,265,123	34,325,123	(30,324,316)
FY2035	24,560,000	5,137,081	29,697,081	(34,952,358)
FY2036	22,925,000	4,196,693	27,121,693	(37,527,746)
FY2037	21,200,000	3,288,275	24,488,275	(40,161,164)
FY2038	17,440,000	2,393,975	19,833,975	(44,815,464)
FY2039	12,325,000	1,702,750	14,027,750	(50,621,689)
FY2040	9,155,000	1,139,400	10,294,400	(54,355,039)
FY2041	9,155,000	754,300	9,909,300	(54,740,139)

One option would be to not issue any more debt through FY2027. If this were to occur, the goal of attaining a \$10 million annual debt service payment reduction would not occur until FY2028. To attain the \$10 million goal by FY2027 the School Board would not issue any more debt and pay down the debt by an additional \$2.838 million prior to FY2027.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Andy Hawkins, Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Management Services

CIP QUESTION: Can I get please the charts reflected at pp. 401-03 of the proposed budget updated to how they would look if the borrowing reflected in the proposed CIP were adopted? This was a prior request and I didn't see it addressed; apologies if I missed it. It may also be that I can do it myself, based on Andy's response. Assuming annual 2.5% increases, and using the debt service ratios reflected in the CIP, I get the following:

Year	Budget	Debt
FY2025	\$ 826,792,137	\$ 67,383,559
FY2026	\$ 847,461,940	\$ 67,796,955
FY2027	\$ 868,648,489	\$ 71,837,230
FY2028	\$ 890,364,701	\$ 76,482,328
FY2029	\$ 912,623,819	\$ 79,215,747
FY2030	\$ 935,439,414	\$ 81,757,405
FY2031	\$ 958,825,400	\$ 83,034,280
FY2032	\$ 982,796,034	\$ 84,029,061
FY2033	\$ 1,007,365,935	\$ 84,115,056
FY2034	\$ 1,032,550,084	\$ 81,881,222

In other words, comparing to the debt service chart in the super's proposed budget, it looks to me that our debt load would remain essentially the same from 2025 through 2026, go up \$1M in 2027, then go up \$6M in 2028 and \$10M+ in the years after that. Am I interpreting this correctly?

RESPONSE: Your methodology is correct, but since our last communication (May 17th Friday Letter), APS has received new debt service projections from the County based on projected actual funding needs for the next 10-year proposed CIP. The following chart documents the latest projections:

Fiscal Year	Total Debt	Difference from Prior Year	Annual Debt Service Growth	Total Budget Expenditures	Debt Service as % of Expenditures
FY2024	64,649,439			\$797,815,899	8.10%
FY2025	67,207,104	2,557,665	3.96%	\$826,191,956	8.13%
FY2026	69,272,268	2,065,165	3.07%	\$846,846,755	8.18%
FY2027	71,719,077	2,446,809	3.53%	\$868,017,924	8.26%
FY2028	74,204,569	2,485,491	3.47%	\$889,718,372	8.34%
FY2029	76,711,341	2,506,772	3.38%	\$911,961,331	8.41%
FY2030	79,257,970	2,546,629	3.32%	\$934,760,364	8.48%
FY2031	81,679,186	2,421,216	3.05%	\$958,129,374	8.52%
FY2032	83,139,803	1,460,617	1.79%	\$982,082,608	8.47%
FY2033	83,587,399	447,596	0.54%	\$1,006,634,673	8.30%
FY2034	81,078,648	(2,508,751)	-3.00%	\$1,031,800,540	7.86%
FY2035	80,130,556	(948,093)	-1.17%	\$1,057,595,553	7.58%
FY2036	76,110,118	(4,020,438)	-5.02%	\$1,084,035,442	7.02%
FY2037	72,031,650	(4,078,468)	-5.36%	\$1,111,136,328	6.48%
FY2038	65,932,300	(6,099,350)	-8.47%	\$1,138,914,737	5.79%

This change has allowed for a more uniform rate of debt service growth for the next 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION: Could I please get information about expected delivery date for Options 2 and 3 for MPSA actually moving into the legacy ACC building?

RESPONSE:

The earliest delivery date for the project would be fall 2028, assuming renovation work begins immediately after the completion of the parking structure and the demolition of the legacy ACC shop bays, as outlined in the Grace Hopper Center construction contract.