

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

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

22	<p>For our CIP work, it would be really helpful to me to understand what staff members are seeing when they talk about vacating the MPSA wait list as a way to address capacity issues in some of our S Arlington schools. I may be missing something, but here's what I see when I look at wait lists for ES option programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. MPSA: 332 b. ATS: 647 c. Campbell: 233 d. Claremont: 130 e. Escuela Key: 132 <p>Then I look at data about which neighborhood schools each option program draws from (supplied last summer to us by P&E) and I look at the percentage of each school's <i>current</i> enrollment that is drawn from neighborhood schools that are over capacity. I see this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPSA: 45% of current enrollment drawn from schools over capacity • ATS: 52% • Campbell: 80% • Claremont: 77% • Escuela Key: 28% <p>And I think, "Wow. The two option programs that are really doing the heavy labor of acting as the pressure release valve for neighborhood school capacity right now are Campbell and Claremont."</p> <p>If we add seats at MPSA, I acknowledge that provides *some* relief, but not as much as it would if we were expanding the capacity of the Campbell or Claremont option programs, which proportionately shoulder more of the capacity-relieving burden. (Or if we adjust boundaries across all our elementary schools so that we redistribute students, since we know we have plenty of ES capacity across our county, which is not 200 square miles.)</p>	Intake Center/F&O	6/3/2024	6/5/2024	6/6/2024
----	---	-------------------	----------	----------	----------

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	(Generally, I am not a fan of expanding option programs simply because they have a wait list. I would expand an option program if it had a wait list AND it demonstrated compelling evidence of doing something really successful, however we wanted to define success. If we used wait list alone as the criterion, we would have added at least one more HB Woodlawn site by now, since it has a current wait list of about 1,000 across grades 6-12.) I should have clarified that the wait list numbers I referenced are only K-5 (there are separate data for PreK). (MK)				
23	I'd be interested to understand how much of the wait list is for primary Montessori spots. I didn't look myself at the data Mary did, so it may be that the transfer report is only K-5. But, if it's not, then some portion of the WL is arguably attributable to the demand for high-quality preschool (which MPSA absolutely is). (MT)	Intake Center/F&O	6/3/2024	6/5/2024	6/6/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
24	<p><i>I wanted to follow up to provide some additional context to my remarks last night. When I bring up school moves, closing schools, repurposing schools, etc. etc.–by whatever name we want to call it—it is because I recognize it as a tool that we, like probably every other school board and school division, may have to deploy in certain circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>A critical question is, “In what circumstances would we choose to explore or exercise that option?” I would argue that when our operating budget is seriously constrained, when we know that we have many facilities that need significant attention, and when we have excess capacity, it is a time when we should be preparing to explore that option in a careful and responsible manner.</i></p> <p>As someone whose APS neighborhood school was closed/repurposed, I could easily be the school board member who says, “Absolutely not. Never again.” Instead, I am the person saying, “Hey, we as a community need to talk about this.” I went through it as a parent in that community, and I went through it twice as a student (long ago) in Fairfax County. There should be no reason why I, personally, want to bring this up, but I feel like it’s the responsible thing to do. If I can bring that personal experience to be helpful in this difficult community conversation, I want to do so.</p> <p>In the same way our capital planning has to reckon with capacity shortages, it should reckon with excesses as well.</p> <p>(MK)</p>	Planning/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

ci#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
25	The CIP presentation states that per SB direction, this CIP has prioritized five major infrastructure projects/sites (Slide 25) with some possible adds at each of those sites. What would trigger the things listed as “possible adds” to be given the green light? (MK)	Maintenance/ D&C/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024
26	When I look at the financial spreadsheet (Slide 2) and the Major Infrastructure row, I’m assuming that the dollar amount reflected is the amount we think will be required to complete the major infrastructure projects listed on slide 25. Is that right? (MK)	Maintenance/ D&C/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

27	<p>I have spent a bunch of time with the Facilities Condition Assessment Report, and I am seeing some near-term infrastructure projects that are not reflected in either the Major Infrastructure Projects list (Slide 25) nor in the list of schools that are on the list for feasibility studies and thus candidates for renovation (Slide 29). When I look at the FCA report, I am seeing things like the items below listed in each school's Projected Needs Report: (examples)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof Covering for Long Branch (Red), 2025, \$1.26M • Roof Covering for Ashlawn (Red), 2025, \$1M • Roof Covering for Campbell (Red), 2026, \$1.95M • Roof Covering for Gunston (Red), 2025, \$3.2M • Roof Covering for Innovation (Red), 2025, \$1.5M • Roof Covering for Claremont (Red), listed as \$1.8M in 2024 and \$1.6M in 2026 • The report recommends a Roof Covering for Drew in 2026 (Yellow) at \$1.25M, Roof at Nottingham in 2026 (Yellow) at \$1.89M, and Cooling and Heating for Oakridge in 2026 (Yellow) at \$4.16M. 	Maintenance/ D&C/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024
----	--	-------------------------------	----------	----------	-----------

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	How should we interpret the timing and ratings laid out in the Projected Needs Report? It would be helpful to know if I am missing or misinterpreting something. (MK)				
28	Even before this CIP, we have heard some concerns about air quality in some of our buildings. In the FCA report, how is air quality measured? What are the ways that APS could remedy poor air quality in any of our schools? (MK)	Maintenance/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024
29	In its CIP, the County is working to adhere to this practice: its debt service should not increase by a greater percentage year-to-year than the projected increase in its revenue year-to-year. Does our CIP align with that practice? (MK)	Finance/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024
30	Question I asked in last week's work session): If we wanted to hold debt service flat—that is, no increase over the current \$67M dollars we pay each year out of our operating budget—how would that change the amount of total available funding for this CIP? (MK)	Finance/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024
31	According to our best available projections, what is the difference between the capacity of our buildings and projected elementary enrollment in 2025 and again in 2028, overall and by zone/area of the County? (MK)	Planning/ F & O	6/6/2024	6/7/2024	6/14/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

32	<p>At last night’s board meeting, I was somewhat surprised to learn that there was a different way that readers should be utilizing the Facilities Condition Assessment data. If I heard correctly, the FCA ratings and recommendations for various systems at each school are not to be taken as the most accurate, source-of-truth statements (at least, as of last fall when the report was delivered). So when the report says “Roof Covering for Long Branch (Red), 2025” what I understood from your answer last night was that this recommendation from the consultants did not capture /reflect information about repairs that had been made to the roof that could extend its useful life beyond 2025.</p> <p>I am surprised because when I read the FCA report, I am seeing a lot of information/evidence that the consultants did look carefully at the present condition and factor in “evidence of repairs.” So my question is: shouldn’t the recommendations about timing be considered an accurate reflection of what needs to be done, when? Here are a couple of examples of what I’m seeing, which are contributing to my confusion:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Gunston Roof (Red), Recc 2025: “Built up roof surface. Active leaks present in several areas of the building along with damaged ceiling tiles. Damage present near roof hatches due to water infiltration. Evidence of patching in several areas and pending water present. Roof is in poor condition.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Claremont Roof (Red), Recc 2024 and 2026: “For both the BUR (assumed 1994) and hybrid (2003), there are patched areas with coatings or newer membrane, especially at building edges. The hybrid roofing exhibits cracking, blisters, loose granule accumulations, ponding areas, and coating failures where repairs have been attempted; it is in poor condition. The BUR is also in poor condition based on appearance, prior surveys, and age. The metal roofing appears to be in good condition. Leaks were reported by staff in Rooms 169, 185, Library, and</p>	F & O Maintenance	6/10/2024	6/10/2024	6/14/2024
----	--	----------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	<p>Gymnasium. Evidence of leak damaged ceilings was observed in the west wing main floor (near door 11) and Rm 168, . There is evidence of active leaks down exterior walls. Metal gutters and downspouts exhibit deformation, with numerous patches apparent at downspouts. Some metal flashings have localized deformation. Local Project: Replace hybrid roofing Local Project: Replace built-up roofing Local Project: Removal and disposal of exposed aggregate concrete awnings over exterior classroom doors for safety. Repair walls at attachment points.”</p> <p>Innovation Roof (Red), Recc 2025: “Roof is low slope, built up asphalt roof with gravel. The roof rating is poor, based on both condition and age. This is consistent with the 2016 APS roof survey which described the roof condition as poor to fair at that time. The ponding area near the building entrance identified in the 2015 report has worsened. There is continued evidence of ponding near roof drains, and many areas have been treated with elastomeric coating for repairs. Evidence of leak damaged ceilings was observed in Room 312, outside Room 203A, as well as the top of the exterior gymnasium wall (2 leaks). The APS survey recommended the roof be replaced by 2022, and the roof is at the end of its EUL.” (MK)</p>				
33	<p>Thanks to Ms. Lin last night for the information about how we would manage/treat air quality concerns. I generally get the principles of ventilation (air changes per hour) and filtration (MERV 13) and I see that these concerning at a number of our schools, including MPSA, Gunston, Claremont, and Oakridge. I am still not sure that I understand how this is fixed, though. (MK)</p>	F & O Maintenance	6/10/2024	6/11/2024	6/14/2024
34	<p>Debt Service: If we wanted to hold steady the amount of debt service we are paying in our annual operating budget (at its FY2025 level), what would that do to our total available funding in this CIP? (MK)</p>	F & O Finance	6/10/2024	6/10/2024	6/14/2024

FY 2025-34 SCHOOL BOARD CIP QUESTIONS

cl#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
35	In the column "Proposed FY2025" the "Bond Funding" line item, why does the amount of \$89.93 not match the total in the "2024 Referendum" section totaling \$83.98? (BZK)	Finance	6/13/2024	6/13/2024	6/14/2024

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

I wanted to follow up to provide some additional context to my remarks last night. When I bring up school moves, closing schools, repurposing schools, etc..., by whatever name we want to call it—it is because I recognize it as a tool that we, like probably every other school board and school division, may have to deploy in certain circumstances.

A critical question is, “In what circumstances would we choose to explore or exercise that option?” I would argue that when our operating budget is seriously constrained, when we know that we have many facilities that need significant attention, and when we have excess capacity, it is a time when we should be preparing to explore that option in a careful and responsible manner. (MK)

RESPONSE:

When school districts close schools, mostly what is saved is labor costs according to Georgetown University’s Edunomics Lab’s¹. We share two examples of consolidating elementary school communities below. One that occurred in 1983 in Arlington County and more recently in 2023 in St. Paul, Minneapolis. Both plans recommend consolidating an elementary school community when enrollment goes below two hundred fifty (250) students. The goal was to ensure students received well-rounded educational services and support.

From the APS’ Superintendent’s Recommendations: School Consolidation and Building Utilization Study (1983)²,

¹ <https://edunomicslab.org/>. Analysis: Closing schools: How much money does it save, and is it worth it?

² [Superintendent Recommendations School Consolidation Building Utiliz Study 1983.pdf](#)

*“The Board has established a minimum of two classes per grade level as an objective in its guidelines for elementary schools. I strongly support this objective, for as elementary schools in Arlington dropped to less than two classes per grade level, **serious organizational hardships developed, especially in schools with a wide range of student needs.**”* (Page 7) Bold emphasis placed by staff.

St. Paul Public Schools: Envision SPPS (2023)³

“The goal is for every school to have at least 350 students, which district leaders say would allow for instruction in music, art, and science, as well as support staff such as nurses, counselors, and librarians.”

Class Size: 25	Large Elementary 600+ students	Small Elementary 251-450 students	Unsustainable Elementary < 250 students
K-5 Grade Teachers	Each grade: 4 classes (100 students) X4 teachers X6 grades 24 generalists 4 specialists/ resource teachers 2 specialists (e.g., literacy coaches) 30 teachers total	Each grade: 2 classes (50 students) X2 teachers X6 grades 12 generalists 1 specialist/resource teacher 14 teachers total	Each grade: 1 class (25 students) X1 teacher X6 grades 6 generalists 0 specialists/resource teachers 5-6 teachers total

If we use the 1983 APS recommendations and apply it today, an elementary school community with less than 252 students, less than 2 classes per grade level, would be identified for consolidation (252 students was calculated using the average class size of twenty-one (21) students from SY2023-24 Class Size Report⁴).

³ <https://www.spps.org/about/departments/innovation/strategic-plan/envision-spps>

⁴ <https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/57/2024/06/CSR-Revised-5.7.24.pdf>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

The CIP presentation states that per SB direction, this CIP has prioritized five major infrastructure projects/sites (Slide 25) with some possible adds at each of those sites. What would trigger the things listed as “possible adds” to be given the green light? **(MK)**

RESPONSE:

Based on School Board direction, the methodology used to produce the list of five projects included prioritizing based on the following criteria:

- FCI score
- Remaining useful life
- Infrastructure type

Possible additions from long-range data could be recommended, like the current scenario with the Barcroft project. In this case, staff recommend completing the roofing project along with the current HVAC systems replacement, rather than waiting until the projected 2028 timeline.

Given that major infrastructure costs could range from approximately \$500,000 to \$15,000,000, any additional project additions would require School Board approval.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

When I look at the financial spreadsheet (Slide 2) and the Major Infrastructure row, I'm assuming that the dollar amount reflected is the amount we think will be required to complete the major infrastructure projects listed on slide 25. Is that right? **(MK)**

RESPONSE:

The Major Infrastructure funding encompasses roofing, lighting, and HVAC bond projects outlined in the ten-year MCMM plan. The presentation on May 16, 2024, includes slides 47-49, which detail the projected pace of these projects over the 10 years. If there are remaining funds within a given year, staff may propose additional capital projects aligned with the School Board's priorities, direction and approval.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

I have spent a bunch of time with the Facilities Condition Assessment Report, and I am seeing some near-term infrastructure projects that are not reflected in either the Major Infrastructure Projects list (Slide 25) nor in the list of schools that are on the list for feasibility studies and thus candidates for renovation (Slide 29). When I look at the FCA report, I am seeing things like the items below listed in each school’s Projected Needs Report: (examples)

- Roof Covering for Long Branch (Red), 2025, \$1.26M
- Roof Covering for Ashlawn (Red), 2025, \$1M
- Roof Covering for Campbell (Red), 2026, \$1.95M
- Roof Covering for Gunston (Red), 2025, \$3.2M
- Roof Covering for Innovation (Red), 2025, \$1.5M
- Roof Covering for Claremont (Red), listed as \$1.8M in 2024 and \$1.6M in 2026
- The report recommends a Roof Covering for Drew in 2026 (Yellow) at \$1.25M, Roof at Nottingham in 2026 (Yellow) at \$1.89M, and Cooling and Heating for Oakridge in 2026 (Yellow) at \$4.16M.

How should we interpret the timing and ratings laid out in the Projected Needs Report? It would be helpful to know if I am missing or misinterpreting something. **(MK)**

The following chart contains data captured in the FCA Report. Estimates are raw costs are based on 2023 values.

School	Infrastructure type	RUL	FCI _{AD}	FCI _{DM}	Note	Other consideration(s)
Long Branch	Roof (complete replacement)	2	0.118(good)	0.111 (good)	CIP Projected replacement in 2032 Estimate cost \$1.3 M	In program from our own prior studies
Ashlawn	Roof (south corner canopy)	2	0.213 (fair)	0.067 (good)	Estimated cost \$75 K	This will likely be an MC/MM level project
Campbell	Roof (complete roof)	3	0.179 (fair)	0.105 (good)	Estimate cost \$ 1.9 M	Out years in next CIP 34-36

Gunston	Roof (complete roof)	2	0.2(fair)	0.166(fair)	CIP Projected replacement in 2031 Estimate cost \$3.2M	In program – bought more time with recent mid-term repairs
Innovation	Roof (complete roof)	2	0.168(fair)	0.108 (good)	CIP Projected replacement in 2030 Estimate cost \$1.5M	In program from our own prior studies
Claremont	Roof (complete replacement)	3	0.152 (fair)	0.156 (fair)	CIP Projected replacement in 2033 Estimate cost \$1.8M	In program from our own prior studies
Drew	Roof	3	0.135 (good)	0.093 (good)	Estimate cost \$1.3M	Out years in next CIP 34-36
Nottingham	Roof (complete roof)	3	0.115 (good)	0.121 (good)	Estimate cost \$1.8M	Out years in next CIP 34-26
Oakridge	HVAC(Heat/Cool)	3	0.176(fair)	0.247(fair)	Estimate cost \$3.5 M	Currently under consideration for next D&C full HVAC redo after Hoffman-Boston

RESPONSE:

Ideally, we aim to complete at least two full roofing projects each year, targeting the summer recess to avoid disrupting instruction during the school year. This approach also takes the school offline for summer school use and many DPR-organized activities. For perspective, 26 of our schools are dedicated to Summer School and DPR camp activities this year, involving multiple APS departments and the County. This process, which started last October and concluded in February, exemplifies our collaborative planning efforts.

Some projects, such as the planned roof replacements for Escuela Key and Barcroft, require two summer sessions due to their scope. Additionally, our summer work window has been reduced in recent years due to the earlier start of school.

It's important to note that most issues raised pertain to the roof covering, while our structures remain in good shape. We have implemented interim measures to extend the life of our roofs by 4-6 years where feasible. Recent examples include Gunston (extended until 2031) and Swanson (extended until 2028).

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

Even before this CIP, we have heard some concerns about air quality in some of our buildings. In the FCA report, how is air quality measured? What are the ways that APS could remedy poor air quality in any of our schools? **(MK)**

RESPONSE: We continue to keep air exchanges in the 4-6 range meeting our COVID induced goals. This includes the use of air purifiers with a robust filter changing schedule.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

In its CIP, the County is working to adhere to this practice: its debt service should not increase by a greater percentage year-to-year than the projected increase in its revenue year-to-year. Does our CIP align with that practice? **(MK)**

RESPONSE: Please see the following chart with our projections for annual debt service growth and debt service as a percentage of total expenditures:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Total Debt</i>	<i>Difference from Prior Year</i>	<i>Annual Debt Service Growth</i>	<i>Total Budget Expenditures</i>	<i>Debt Service as % of Total Expenses</i>
FY2025	67,207,104	2,557,665	3.96%	\$826,324,295	8.13%
FY2026	68,822,618	1,615,515	2.40%	\$846,982,402	8.13%
FY2027	71,521,910	2,699,292	3.92%	\$868,156,962	8.24%
FY2028	74,595,134	3,073,224	4.30%	\$889,860,886	8.38%
FY2029	77,279,363	2,684,230	3.60%	\$912,107,409	8.47%
FY2030	79,824,075	2,544,712	3.29%	\$934,910,094	8.54%
FY2031	82,243,374	2,419,299	3.03%	\$958,282,846	8.58%
FY2032	83,702,073	1,458,699	1.77%	\$982,239,917	8.52%
FY2033	84,147,752	445,679	0.53%	\$1,006,795,915	8.36%
FY2034	81,637,083	(2,510,669)	-2.98%	\$1,031,965,813	7.91%
FY2035	80,687,073	(950,010)	-1.16%	\$1,057,764,959	7.63%
FY2036	76,664,718	(4,022,356)	-4.99%	\$1,084,209,082	7.07%
FY2037	72,584,333	(4,080,385)	-5.32%	\$1,111,314,310	6.53%
FY2038	66,483,065	(6,101,268)	-8.41%	\$1,139,097,167	5.84%

Projecting year-to-year revenue growth for APS is challenging because the School Board relies on funding from Local, State, and Federal authorities. As a result, actual revenue growth can vary significantly each year. For demonstration purposes, the chart above assumes an annual increase of 2.5% in "Total Budget Expenditures." Over the ten-year CIP (FY2025 – FY2034), the average annual growth in "Annual Debt Service" is projected to be 2.38%.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

(Question I asked in last week’s work session): If we wanted to hold debt service flat—that is, no increase over the current \$67M dollars we pay each year out of our operating budget—how would that change the amount of total available funding for this CIP? **(MK)**

RESPONSE:

Please see the following chart with our projections holding debt service payments at approximately the FY2025 level of \$67,207,104:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Original Bond Debt Exercised</i>	<i>Total Debt Payment</i>	<i>Revised Bond Debt Exercised</i>	<i>Revised Total Debt Payment</i>	<i>Total Reduction In Debt Issued</i>	<i>Total Reduction In Debt Payments</i>
FY2024	\$ 31,420,000	\$ 64,649,439	\$ 31,420,000	\$ 64,649,439	\$ -	\$ -
FY2025	\$ 89,930,000	\$ 67,207,104	\$ 74,830,000	\$ 67,207,104	\$ 15,100,000	\$ -
FY2026	\$ 31,430,000	\$ 68,822,618	\$ 6,430,000	\$ 66,447,618	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 2,375,000
FY2027	\$ 76,150,000	\$ 71,521,910	\$ 53,150,000	\$ 66,703,160	\$ 23,000,000	\$ 4,818,750
FY2028	\$ 58,750,000	\$ 74,595,134	\$ 28,750,000	\$ 67,595,134	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 7,000,000
FY2029	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 77,279,363	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 67,455,613	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 9,823,750
FY2030	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 79,824,075	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 67,251,575	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 12,572,500
FY2031	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 82,243,374	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 67,497,124	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 14,746,250
FY2032	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 83,702,073	\$ 35,000,000	\$ 67,344,573	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 16,357,500
FY2033	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 84,147,752	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 66,729,002	\$ -	\$ 17,418,750
FY2034	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 81,637,083	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 64,694,583	\$ -	\$ 16,942,500
Totals	\$ 587,680,000	\$ 835,629,925	\$ 404,580,000	\$ 733,574,925	\$ 183,100,000	\$ 102,055,000

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024
TO: Members of the School Board
THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent
FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

According to our best available projections, what is the difference between the capacity of our buildings and projected elementary enrollment in 2025 and again in 2028, overall and by zone/area of the County? (MK)

RESPONSE:

Table 1 includes projected enrollment, the difference between design capacity and projected enrollment, and capacity utilization data for FY2026 (SY2025-26) and FY2029 (SY2028-29). All data reported by zone and system wide.

Reference Map 1, on the next page, includes a map of the Zones, which overlap County Planning Corridors and areas outside these corridors.

Table 1. Capacity Utilization by Zone for 2025 and 2028		Projected K-5 Enrollment		Difference between Capacity and Enrollment		Capacity Utilization (Enroll./Cap.)	
Zone	Design Capacity by Zone	2025	2028	2025	2028	2025	2028
1	4,885	4,265	4,048	620	837	87%	83%
2	3,464	3,279	3,193	185	271	95%	92%
3	5,203	4,837	4,677	366	526	93%	90%
4	1,240	1,323	1,544	(83)	(304)	107%	125%
Tot. Zones *	14,792	13704	13462	1,088	1,330	93%	91%
Tot. Including Integration Sta.	14,846	13,772	13,530	1,074	1,316	93%	91%

* Zones information excludes Integration Station (IS). IS reported as 68 PreK students by the Office of the Chief Academic Officer in the Fall 10-Year Enrollment Projections Report. The design capacity for IS is 54 seats.

Reference Map 1.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: Reneé Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

At last night's board meeting, I was somewhat surprised to learn that there was a different way that readers should be utilizing the Facilities Condition Assessment data. If I heard correctly, the FCA ratings and recommendations for various systems at each school are not to be taken as the most accurate, source-of-truth statements (at least, as of last fall when the report was delivered). So when the report says "Roof Covering for Long Branch (Red), 2025" what I understood from your answer last night was that this recommendation from the consultants did not capture /reflect information about repairs that had been made to the roof that could extend its useful life beyond 2025.

I am surprised because when I read the FCA report, I am seeing a lot of information/evidence that the consultants did look carefully at the present condition and factor in "evidence of repairs." **So my question is:** shouldn't the recommendations about timing be considered an accurate reflection of what needs to be done, when? Here are a couple of examples of what I'm seeing, which are contributing to my confusion:

Gunston Roof (Red), Recc 2025:

"Built up roof surface. Active leaks present in several areas of the building along with damaged ceiling tiles. Damage present near roof hatches due to water infiltration. Evidence of patching in several areas and pending water present. Roof is in poor condition."

Claremont Roof (Red), Recc 2024 and 2026:

"For both the BUR (assumed 1994) and hybrid (2003), there are patched areas with coatings or newer membrane, especially at building edges. The hybrid roofing exhibits cracking, blisters, loose granule accumulations, ponding areas, and coating failures where repairs have been attempted; it is in poor condition. The BUR is also in poor condition based on appearance, prior surveys, and age. The metal roofing appears to be in good condition. Leaks were reported by staff in Rooms 169, 185, Library, and Gymnasium.

Evidence of leak damaged ceilings was observed in the west wing main floor (near door 11) and Rm 168, . There is evidence of active leaks down exterior walls. Metal gutters and downspouts exhibit deformation, with numerous patches apparent at downspouts. Some metal flashings have localized deformation. Local Project: Replace hybrid roofing Local Project: Replace built-up roofing Local Project: Removal and disposal of exposed aggregate concrete awnings over exterior classroom doors for safety. Repair walls at attachment points.”

Innovation Roof (Red), Recc 2025:

“Roof is low slope, built up asphalt roof with gravel. The roof rating is poor, based on both condition and age. This is consistent with the 2016 APS roof survey which described the roof condition as poor to fair at that time. The ponding area near the building entrance identified in the 2015 report has worsened. There is continued evidence of ponding near roof drains, and many areas have been treated with elastomeric coating for repairs.

Evidence of leak damaged ceilings was observed in Room 312, outside Room 203A, as well as the top of the exterior gymnasium wall (2 leaks). The APS survey recommended the roof be replaced by 2022, and the roof is at the end of its EUL." (MK)

RESPONSE:

The following chart contains data captured in the FCA Report. Estimates are raw costs are based on 2023 values.

School	Infrastructure type	RUL	FCI _{AD}	FCI _{DM}	Note	Other consideration(s)
Gunston	Roof (complete roof)	2	0.2(fair)	0.166(fair)	CIP Projected replacement in 2031 Estimate cost \$3.2M	In program – bought more time with recent mid-term repairs
Innovation	Roof (complete roof)	2	0.168(fair)	0.108 (good)	CIP Projected replacement in 2030 Estimate cost \$1.5M	In program from our own prior studies
Claremont	Roof (complete replacement)	3	0.152 (fair)	0.156 (fair)	CIP Projected replacement in 2033 Estimate cost \$1.8M	In program from our own prior studies

It's important to note that most issues raised by the consultant pertain to the roof covering, while our structures remain in good shape. Staff highly values the recommendations developed through the data and information we shared with the consultant throughout the study, and based on this data, have implemented interim measures to extend the life of roof coverings and conditions by 4-6 years where feasible. Recent examples include Gunston (extended until 2031) and Swanson (extended until 2028).

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

Thanks to Ms. Lin last night for the information about how we would manage/treat air quality concerns. I generally get the principles of ventilation (air changes per hour) and filtration (MERV 13) and I see that these concerning at a number of our schools, including MPSA, Gunston, Claremont, and Oakridge. I am still not sure that I understand how this is fixed, though. (MK)

RESPONSE:

The indoor air quality assessment in the Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) workbook focused on HVAC equipment and did not include portable air cleaning devices that were installed in every classroom space during the pandemic. Staff use several strategies to achieve a recommended 4 – 6 eACH (equivalent air changes per hour). The strategies include maximizing outside air ventilation for HVAC equipment to the extent possible, upgrading HVAC filtration to MERV-13 where possible, and supplementing classroom spaces with portable air cleaning devices. This approach was used during the pandemic and continues today to achieve the recommended 4 – 6 eACH. All portable air cleaning devices are maintained with bi-annual filter changes. When schools are scheduled for HVAC replacement projects, staff specify filtration at a minimum of MERV-13 with eACH of 6.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024

TO: Members of the School Board

THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent

FROM: René Y. Harber, Assistant Superintendent, Facilities and Operations

CIP QUESTION:

Debt Service: If we wanted to hold steady the amount of debt service we are paying in our annual operating budget (at its FY2025 level), what would that do to our total available funding in this CIP? (MK)

RESPONSE:

Response provided by Mr. Hawkins in CIP Question #25-30

Please see the following chart with our projections holding debt service payments at approximately the FY2025 level of \$67,207,104:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Original Bond Debt Exercised</i>	<i>Total Debt Payment</i>	<i>Revised Bond Debt Exercised</i>	<i>Revised Total Debt Payment</i>	<i>Total Reduction In Debt Issued</i>	<i>Total Reduction In Debt Payments</i>
FY2024	\$ 31,420,000	\$ 64,649,439	\$ 31,420,000	\$ 64,649,439	\$ -	\$ -
FY2025	\$ 89,930,000	\$ 67,207,104	\$ 74,830,000	\$ 67,207,104	\$ 15,100,000	\$ -
FY2026	\$ 31,430,000	\$ 68,822,618	\$ 6,430,000	\$ 66,447,618	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 2,375,000
FY2027	\$ 76,150,000	\$ 71,521,910	\$ 53,150,000	\$ 66,703,160	\$ 23,000,000	\$ 4,818,750
FY2028	\$ 58,750,000	\$ 74,595,134	\$ 28,750,000	\$ 67,595,134	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 7,000,000
FY2029	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 77,279,363	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 67,455,613	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 9,823,750
FY2030	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 79,824,075	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 67,251,575	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 12,572,500
FY2031	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 82,243,374	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 67,497,124	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 14,746,250
FY2032	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 83,702,073	\$ 35,000,000	\$ 67,344,573	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 16,357,500
FY2033	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 84,147,752	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 66,729,002	\$ -	\$ 17,418,750
FY2034	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 81,637,083	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 64,694,583	\$ -	\$ 16,942,500
Totals	\$ 587,680,000	\$ 835,629,925	\$ 404,580,000	\$ 733,574,925	\$ 183,100,000	\$ 102,055,000

School Board CIP Question #25-35

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 14, 2024
TO: Members of the School Board
THROUGH: Dr. Francisco Durán, Superintendent
FROM: Andy Hawkins, Assistant Superintendent, Finance & Management Services

CIP QUESTION:

In the column "Proposed FY2025" the "Bond Funding" line item, why does the amount of \$89.93 not match the total in the "2024 Referendum" section totaling \$83.98? (BZK)

RESPONSE:

The \$89.93 amount includes all bond funding (all highlighted sections) for FY2025 regardless of when the bond referendum was approved. Therefore, the \$89.93 includes bond funding from the FY2022 approved bond referendum (highlighted in yellow) and proposed FY24 bond referendum funding.

	Proposed FY 2025-34 10 Year Capital Improvement Plan (all \$ in millions)												Project Grand Total (Projected and Previously Approved)	
	Previously Approved	Proposed FY 2025	Projected FY 2026	Projected FY 2027	Projected FY 2028	Projected FY 2029	Projected FY 2030	Projected FY 2031	Projected FY 2032	Projected FY 2033	Projected FY 2034	Projected Total		
Funding Sources														
Bond Funding	\$110.98	\$89.93	\$31.43	\$76.15	\$58.57	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$558.08	\$887.04	
Capital Reserve ¹	\$4.10	\$6.65	\$0.33	\$0.30	\$0.82	\$0.33		\$0.62	\$1.38	\$1.70	\$0.19	\$12.31	\$16.41	
Operating/MC/MM-Other	\$8.36	\$1.25										\$1.25	\$7.61	
Funding Total	\$121.42	\$97.83	\$31.76	\$76.45	\$59.39	\$50.33	\$50.00	\$50.62	\$51.38	\$51.70	\$50.19	\$569.64	\$891.06	
Project Allocation (Projection)														
Division Wide														
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System	\$10.09	\$1.92											\$1.92	\$12.00
Long Range Implementation/Execution Plan - Facilities ²				\$39.56	\$39.94	\$37.00	\$38.40	\$37.80	\$37.20	\$36.80	\$35.90	\$302.40	\$302.40	
Improvements At Existing Facilities														
Major Infrastructure Projects	\$4.55	\$15.10	\$9.50	\$10.00	\$10.50	\$11.00	\$11.60	\$12.20	\$12.80	\$13.40	\$14.10	\$120.20	\$124.75	
Critical Notification/Public Address Systems Replacements	\$0.73	\$0.33	\$0.30	\$0.46	\$0.33							\$2.15	\$2.15	
Kenmore field conversion to synthetic turf (APS share)		\$2.44										\$2.44	\$2.44	
Synthetic Field turf replacement (APS share) ³				\$0.35			\$0.62	\$1.38	\$1.70	\$0.19		\$4.24	\$4.24	
Career Center Campus														
Career Center building	\$101.85	\$62.17	\$11.18									\$73.35	\$175.00	
Move MPGA into refreshed ACC building (Option Two)			\$10.75	\$26.59	\$8.13	\$2.00						\$45.47	\$45.47	
Damlish MPGA: green space												\$2.00	\$2.00	
Kitchen and Entrance Renovation Program														
Barrett/Carlin Springs Kitchens	\$3.05	\$4.05										\$4.65	\$7.70	
Science Focus/Ashlawn Kitchens	\$1.29	\$6.83										\$8.83	\$8.12	
Planning														
Study existing facilities	\$0.80	\$4.00										\$4.00	\$4.80	
Trade Center Optimization/Bus Electrification TBD														
Allocation Projections Total	\$121.42	\$97.83	\$31.76	\$76.45	\$59.39	\$50.33	\$50.00	\$50.62	\$51.38	\$51.70	\$50.19	\$569.64	\$891.06	

Color coding in the chart above corresponds with the bond referendum year in which it would be approved by the voters as shown on the line "Bond Referenda Amounts" below (e.g., figures in orange above would be in the 2024 referendum).
 Debt Service Ratio is calculated based on the FY 2025 Superintendent's proposed budget and County-provided revenue projections through FY 2034.

	2024 Referendum	2026 Referendum	2028 Referendum	2030 Referendum	2032 Referendum					
BOND REFERENDA AMOUNTS	\$83.98	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00					
Debt Service Ratio Target 59.8%	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034
Debt Service Ratio - APS	8.13%	8.38%	8.24%	8.38%	8.47%	8.54%	8.58%	8.52%	8.39%	7.91%
Annual Bond Issuance	\$83.93	\$31.43	\$76.15	\$36.57	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$30.00
Annual APS Debt Service Increase	\$2.56	\$1.87	\$2.70	\$3.07	\$2.68	\$2.54	\$2.42	\$1.45	\$0.45	(\$7.51)

¹ Capital Reserve funds are shown in *italic*.
² Funding amounts are PLACEHOLDERS ONLY based on the \$50 million per year for APS as directed by the County Manager's Office.
³ Future Synthetic Field Replacements are proposed to be funded by Capital Reserve.
⁴ FY 2025, includes \$62.17M already included in the FY 2022 bond referendum and \$1.25M is funded by Operating Fund; for FY 2026 \$11.18 was also included in FY 2022 Referendum.