

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL FACILITIES AND CAPITAL PROGRAMS (FAC)  
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday May 13, 2024  
6:30pm @ Barcroft Elementary Library.  
Notes by Hans Bauman

Members present: Hans Bauman, Rosa Cheney (Chair Emeritus), Kateri Garcia, David Goodman, Cynthia Hilton (Acting Chair), Sally Hoekstra, Jessica Hubley, Zachary Larnard, Steven Leutner, Adam Rasmussen, Matthew Thoman  
APS Staff present: Jeff Chambers, Mike Freda, Renee Harber, Cathy Lin  
APS Board present: Mary Kadera  
Liaisons present: Greg Lloyd – Superintendent’s Sustainability Committee  
Community present: Michael Bruno, Jonathan Hui

*Numbers below refer to agenda items listed on published agenda.*

1. Cynthia acknowledged quorum and called the meeting to order promptly at 6:30pm.

Cynthia briefly celebrated and Mary Kadera elaborated the School Board’s approval of the construction contract for Phase 1 of the Career Center site. Additionally, she reported that the Board did not further cut MC/MM funding after the County Board approved a \$0.02/\$100 real estate valuation. Finally, she reported that new documents are available on [FAC website](#) under the resource section and that members were invited to the ACC groundbreaking on May 16<sup>th</sup>.

2. Kateri Garcia and Zach Larnard did brief personal introductions to the group.

3. FAC election: Zach was unanimously elected acting vice-chair.

4. Hans agreed to act as Secretary at this meeting. Kateri took notes also, which were incorporated into these.

5. The group toured Barcroft prior to the meeting. Cynthia noticed that the classrooms seem small by current standards. Matthew noted that did not seem to be reflected in the building inventory, which shows adequately sized rooms. Rosa raised questions about how today’s findings would be reflected in future analysis. Jeff assured us that the inventory would be updated in the future. He also stated that classroom uses and configurations have changed over time and that might explain some disparities.

6. Liaison reports:

Zach: No JFAC report this month.

Cynthia: BAC report: Looking ahead to FY 26, the BAC sees a 30% cut to APS funding. Areas BAC mentioned as places they would look for savings that would impact FAC were choice schools, which create transportation, boundary changes, and utilization concerns. (Students who go to choice schools cost more on average than those at neighborhood schools, due to transportation costs.)

Mary clarified on budget: 80% is staff, 9% is debt service, remainder is everything else. To make the FY 25 budget work, the Board is considering some central office cuts, some planning factor cuts at elementary, salary step increase + 1% COLA. Salaries are a priority but not keeping pace. APS does not expect to get more money from tax increases next year (FY 26). Debt service will be a serious conversation next year. The School Board may be forced to make decisions around closing a school instead of renovating.

Sustainability: Rosa has declared the Sustainability Subcommittee defunct due to lack of interest from FAC members. She is exploring possibilities to partner/collaborate with County advisory entities.

7. Public Comment: MPSA PTA reps Michael Bruno and Jonathan Hui came with prepared remarks to support funding of Phase 2 of the CC Project, including new parking, green spaces, and move of the MPSA to the old CC building. They like the location and the savings achievable by staying in the same building. Refer to their written remarks. [LINK to STATEMENT](#)

A question was raised about Arlington Community High school, which was in the Fenwick Building. The ACHS will eventually move into the Amazon complex in Pentagon City when it is completed. ACHS is currently in leased space @ 4420 Fairfax Drive.

8. The March meeting minutes were approved with one abstention.

There is a rumor that the new security vestibule at Swanson is not ADA compliant. That is incorrect – the old one had some access issues. Apparently, there was some confusion, including on the part of senior County folks.

9. Extended CIP/Methodology/Major Infrastructure/Deep Dive Conversation

Jeff explained APS's process to develop the major infrastructure and deep dive lists. Renee described her process in detail to develop a priority list of projects.

Cynthia reported that a "straw poll" of committee members clearly prioritized Jefferson, Taylor, and Barrett, mirroring staff's deep dive priorities.

Robust conversations that nonetheless supported staff's work, mostly supported staff's recommendation, and the value of the data and methodologies.

Committee expressed concerns about details of how methodology was applied and lack of transparency into staff's recommendation; concerns about capacity/utilization not being factored into methodology; acknowledgement that we helped create this methodology with intentional subjectivity. There is some tension between that built-in subjectivity and the algorithmic suggestion of the methodology process.

Additionally, there was discussion about consideration of student populations to be served, and how the School Board needs to decide how to handle MC/MM "Long term plan" projects for schools on the Major Infrastructure and Deep Dive lists. Renee suggested the Board should weigh in on how to handle MC/MM projects for schools under review.

**Motion:** FAC endorses the proposed Deep Dive studies for Jefferson, Taylor, and Barrett.

**Passed** 7 for 4 against

Discussion raised concerns about whether FAC considered all relevant facility factors, including utilization, in our motion. Members expressed appreciation for this concern but also recognition that these three schools rose to the top of the list. General support was expressed for further elaboration in our communications to the Board, specifically in reference to additional considerations that should influence priority sites. By consensus, it was agreed to revise the first motion. This revision clarifies that the three schools identified were a result of application of the methodology specifically:

**Revised Motion:** FAC evaluated the data using the Board-adopted methodology and identified Jefferson, Taylor, and Barrett as highest priority.

There then was a discussion of the areas of concern, particularly related to investing heavily in schools that are showing decreasing enrollment and/or underutilization. Kateri documented some of her recommended considerations, which are included at the end of these minutes.

**Motion:** In the Board's evaluation and consideration of the CIP, we feel there are critical considerations and community values that should be considered when recommending schools for deep dive feasibility studies.

**Passed** 7 for 4 against

MPSA funding options discussion. General support of Option 2. Option 3 came too close to the Board's \$45M cap for renovating the legacy Career Center building to serve the MPSA community, especially with an expected new policy requiring prevailing wage clauses in contracts. Option 1 was rejected as insufficient to create spaces suitable for the MPSA program.

**Motion:** Support of MPSA Option 2

**Passed** 10 for 1 against

**Motion:** Support major infrastructure staff recommendation

**Passed** 9 for 2 abstained.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:40pm.**

*Proposed recommendations from Kateri:*

Critical Considerations -

- 1) The school board should consider inclusion of current average classroom size (not only the educational space specifications for grade level) and projected student population. Inclusion of this data would likely indicate a different set of schools for deep dives, due to the current and projected overcrowding in the southern part of the county.
- 2) The school board should assess the identified deep dives schools from a cost effectiveness lens and consider the greatest value of the renovation based on the size of the population that would be positively affected.
- 3) Equity is a critical consideration that was not factored into the methodology. It is unclear if the currently identified schools meet the school board's goal to create equity across the county.
- 4) In addition to the individual facilities and their current and projected population, the school board should give preference to renovations that could potentially add more seats - decreasing the number of relocatable units required at the facility and allowing for boundary changes that could potentially decrease overcrowding at other schools.

Long-term recommendations for improvements to the methodology:

- Develop standard/repeatable process to determine schools for major renovation and show results of each step in the process for transparency.
- Include FCI, education space adequacy (with some additional factor to account for the average classroom size at present and APS student population projections), common space adequacy, security.
- Consider utilization of an equation (or script within the database) that would allow for a repeatable process and potentially leverage weighting of factors based on priority.
- Add glossary tab to the spreadsheet/data (i.e. include "DM - deferred maintenance" and "AM - accumulated maintenance")

Question:

- Why was common space adequacy (i.e. whether or not the kitchen could serve the number of students) considered equally?