



ED COMMITTEE #2, 3
March 21, 2016

Worksession

M E M O R A N D U M

March 18, 2016

TO: Education Committee

FROM:  Keith Levchenko, Senior Legislative Analyst
Essie McGuire, Senior Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item #2:** Special Appropriation and CIP Amendment – MCPS - \$2.25 Million for Relocatable Classrooms (Source of funds: Current Revenue)

Agenda Item #3: FY17-22 Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Capital Improvements Program (CIP) (continued)

- **Artificial Turf Program (new project)**
- **Revitalizations/Expansions Discussion**

The following officials and staff are expected to participate in this meeting:

MCPS

Michael Durso, Board of Education President
Judith Docca, Board of Education Vice President
Patricia O'Neill, Board of Education Member
Jill Ortman-Fouse, Board of Education Member
Larry Bowers, Interim Superintendent
Dr. Andrew M. Zuckerman, Chief Operating Officer
James Song, Director, Department of Facilities Management
Adrienne Karamihas, Budget and Operations Manager, Department of Facilities Management

County Government

Erika Lopez-Finn, Office of Management and Budget

Agenda Item #2: Supplemental Appropriation – MCPS - \$2.25 Million for Relocatable Classrooms (Source of funds: Current Revenue)

Background

On March 3, 2016, the County Council received a recommendation from the County Executive for approval of a Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) supplemental appropriation request for

\$2.25 million for the leasing, purchase, movement, and rehabilitation of relocatable classrooms needed for the 2016-17 school year (©1-7). MCPS' request would accelerate \$2.25 million in current revenue-funded requested appropriation from FY17 to FY16 in order to allow MCPS to move forward with contractual work this spring, so that the relocatable classrooms can be ready by the start of the 2016-17 school year. The expenditures related to the appropriation would still occur in FY17.

Within the Approved FY15-20 CIP, the Relocatable Classrooms project includes \$5.0 million in expenditures in FY17. MCPS' Proposed FY17-22 CIP assumes \$2.25 million in FY17 for this project, so the supplemental appropriation request does not involve an expenditure increase above what is already approved or currently proposed.

Current Allocation of Relocatable Classrooms

MCPS currently uses 500 relocatable classrooms for a variety of purposes (see ©7A for a detailed listing of placements). Seventy-four relocatable classrooms are being used at holding schools. Another 38 are being used for miscellaneous purposes at schools and non-school locations. The remaining 388 units are spread across elementary, middle, and high schools and are being used to address capacity issues (381) or provide daycare space (7).

As shown in the chart below, the overall number of relocatable classrooms in use is down by 26 from FY15. Most of this drop is from enrollment-related units. In some clusters, notably the B-CC cluster, the number is down as school additions have come on-line (such as at Bethesda ES, North Chevy Chase ES, and Rosemary Hills ES). Other clusters have seen increases in the number of units (such as the Whitman and Wootton clusters).

Table 1:
Use of Relocatable Classrooms

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY16-FY15
Phased Construction	45	41	40	24	29	23	3	1	0	(1)
Holding Schools	41	43	50	53	73	75	73	76	74	(2)
Day Care	11	11	11	12	10	10	9	7	7	-
Enrollment/CSR/FDK	454	413	426	406	340	385	373	404	381	(23)
Misc	24	24	24	44	42	40	40	38	38	-
Total	575	532	551	539	494	533	498	526	500	(26)
change from prior year	-5.4%	-7.5%	3.6%	-2.2%	-8.3%	7.9%	-6.6%	5.6%	-4.9%	

Other reasons for the reduction in FY16 in particular is that MCPS was able to convert a number of computer labs to classroom space and the capacity of class-size reduction schools was re-rated, resulting in additional capacity in some cases. MCPS provided the following explanation:

As indicated on the PDF, the Board of Education's request for FY 2017 for relocatable classrooms was reduced from the FY 2017 expenditure in the approved Capital Improvements Program, due to the ability to utilize some expenditures from FY 2016 as a result of the conversion of computer labs to classrooms at some elementary schools, as well as the rerating of the class-size reduction schools, which resulted in the placement of less units for the 2015-2016 school year. The expenditures shown in FY 2018 and beyond will once again show the level of effort for this project and do not anticipate that these expenditures will be reduced.

Overall, the number of relocatable classrooms is about at the same level as in FY12. However, given enrollment increases that have occurred since then and are projected, it will be a challenge for MCPS to reduce its use of relocatable classrooms over the next six years.

Request Detail

This following chart breaks out the components of the request:

Table 2:
FY17 Relocatable Classrooms Project Costs

	# of Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Moves	55	60,000	3,300,000
- New	55		
- Existing			
Returns	40	15,000	600,000
Design per site	40	7,500	300,000
Fire Access			120,000
Other (electrical upgrades)			100,000
Maintenance (Rehabs)			330,000
Contingency			250,000
	minus surplus funds from FY16		(2,750,000)
Total Request			2,250,000

The numbers shown are preliminary. Each year, many units are moved from where permanent classroom additions are completed. However, exactly where the units will go is more complicated and will not be firm until revised enrollment projections for each school (and the number of teaching stations required) are finalized later this spring. Given enrollment trends, the overall number of relocatable classrooms in use is expected to rise in FY17, as the number of new units brought in will exceed the number of returns.

The bulk of the request is for the movement and placement of the units. The move cost (currently estimated at \$60,000 per unit) covers the first year lease, moving, utilities, and furniture and equipment.

Over the past several years, MCPS has returned older units (when no longer needed on their current sites) back to the vendor and, where needed, replaced them with newer units. In addition to being in better condition, the newer units also take up less space on a site, since groups of the newer units can be clustered closer together than is possible with the older units.

MCPS estimates that the average age of its units is 9 1/2 years old with its oldest unit from 1983. MCPS has 68 units that are from before 1999, 120 units from between 2000-2006, and 312 units from 2007 or later. All of its older units have been rehabilitated at least once.

As noted earlier, MCPS' conversion of computer labs and recalculation of capacity at class size reduction schools reduced the number of relocatable classrooms needed during the current year. This also resulted in some substantial one-time cost savings. These savings from the current year reduce the appropriation requirement needed for the upcoming year.

Council Staff recommends approval of the MCPS' Relocatable Classrooms supplemental appropriation request. Public Hearing/Action is scheduled for March 22.

Agenda Item #3: FY15-20 Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

Artificial Turf Program (PDF on ©8)

	Total 6 Years	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
FY15-20 Amended	-							n/a	n/a
FY17-22 BOE Proposed	11,000			2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
change from amended	11,000	n/a	n/a	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	n/a	n/a
percent change from amended	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a

The Board of Education requested a new project to fund installation of artificial turf stadium fields at high schools that do not currently have them.

Currently there are six MCPS high schools that have artificial turf stadium fields, leaving 19 high schools without artificial turf stadium fields. Design and engineering has also begun for a seventh artificial turf field at Churchill High School. Many of the high school artificial turf fields in place have been funded through public-private partnerships to reduce the cost to the County.

The County and the Board have generally endorsed the approach of installing artificial turf due to the increased playing hours and durability provided by artificial turf. In 2008, the Board and M-NCPPC partnered on the construction of an artificial turf field at Blair High School. In 2009, the Board of Education proposed an artificial turf field at Richard Montgomery High School with financial support from a private soccer organization. Since then, MCPS has built artificial turf fields as part of “rev/ex” projects at Paint Branch High School and Gaithersburg High School. In the Wheaton High School rev/ex project, currently in progress, MCPS will bid both a natural and artificial turf field to determine whether the project funding can support an artificial turf field. Fields have also been installed as stand-alone projects (with private support), such as at Wootton High School and Churchill High School.

The Council approved a resolution last February calling for the use of plant-based infill material in all new or replacement artificial turf fields funded or constructed by the County. MCPS states its intent that any fields constructed going forward, through this project or through other funding means, will comply with this policy guidance.

MCPS estimates the cost of installing an artificial turf high school stadium field to be between \$1.2 million and \$1.5 million. Costs vary largely based on the site work and stormwater management required. The intent for this project is to develop a Countywide approach and preserve fiscal capacity for artificial turf fields while private partnerships are being explored in various communities. The final number of fields that can be supported by this project will vary depending on how partnerships and other private funds are developed and individual project costs.

MCPS convened a multi-agency work group to develop recommendations for a sustainable program to install, replace, and manage artificial turf fields at all MCPS high schools. The report identified a number of possible ways to increase private funding for artificial turf fields, including naming rights and other advertising or contributor recognition possibilities. Many of these ideas would require further analysis and possible changes to Board of Education policies.

Council staff appreciates the intent to strategically increase the number of artificial turf fields in MCPS high schools and to increase the number of communities that may be able to benefit from these projects. Council staff also appreciates that the program is consistent with County policy on artificial turf infill material and the goal of increasing access to playing fields. The primary question for the Committee

may be one of affordability, given the pressures on the CIP this year. The Education Committee has asked MCPS (see ©9-10) to provide a priority list of project cuts to address a substantial gap in funding between the Board of Education's proposed CIP and the funding assumptions in the Executive's Recommended CIP.

It is difficult to imagine a CIP reconciliation scenario in which Council Staff can recommend approval of this project even as various capacity and "rev/ex" projects are deleted or deferred in the CIP. If this project is ultimately not approved by the Council, then presumably, MCPS' current practice would continue of considering artificial turf fields as part of high school rev/ex projects and/or through public/private partnership opportunities that may arise.

Revitalization/Expansions (PDFs on ©11-12)

MCPS' revitalization/expansion (rev/ex) program involves two "umbrella" projects in the CIP: Current Revitalization/Expansions and Future Revitalization/Expansions.

Project: Current Revitalizations/Expansions

	Total 6 Years	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
FY15-20 Amended	685,556	99,774	120,654	113,789	104,300	132,435	114,604	n/a	n/a
FY17-22 BOE Proposed	726,544	99,774	120,654	121,794	110,970	123,905	161,691	139,022	69,162
change from amended	40,988	n/a	n/a	8,005	6,670	(8,530)	47,087	n/a	n/a
percent change from amended	5.98%	n/a	n/a	7.0%	6.4%	-6.4%	41.1%	n/a	n/a

Project: Future Revitalizations/Expansions

	Total 6 Years	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
FY15-20 Amended	33,140	-	-	-	3,368	5,532	24,240	n/a	n/a
FY17-22 BOE Proposed	32,330	-	-	-	-	1,612	4,022	10,444	16,252
change from amended	(810)	n/a	n/a	-	(3,368)	(3,920)	(20,218)	n/a	n/a
percent change from amended	-2.44%	n/a	n/a	#DIV/0!	-100.0%	-70.9%	-83.4%	n/a	n/a

Total Revitalizations/Expansions (Current and Future Projects)

	Total 6 Years	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
FY15-20 Amended	718,696	99,774	120,654	113,789	107,668	137,967	138,844	n/a	n/a
FY17-22 BOE Proposed	758,874	99,774	120,654	121,794	110,970	125,517	165,713	149,466	85,414
change from amended	40,178	n/a	n/a	8,005	3,302	(12,450)	26,869	n/a	n/a
percent change from amended	5.59%	n/a	n/a	7.0%	3.1%	-9.0%	19.4%	n/a	n/a

In total, these projects are proposed to be \$758.9 million in FY17-22 (an increase of 5.6% over the FY15-20 Amended CIP) and make up about 44 percent of the MCPS CIP.

Each of these projects is made up of numerous school rev/ex projects. The approved rev/ex cost schedule by project and fiscal year is shown on ©13. A similar list showing the Board of Education's FY17-22 request is attached on ©14. Appendix E from the Superintendent's Recommended CIP also presents the proposed schedule (©17).

Council Staff is concerned that the Board's proposed rev/ex expenditure schedule includes cost reductions in eight elementary school rev/ex projects (Cold Spring ES through Rosemary Hills ES). The Approved CIP assumed \$20.3 million for each of the first four of these schools and \$25 million for the next four of these schools. The Board's proposed CIP assumes \$10.3 million for each of these schools. Council Staff asked MCPS about this cost change. MCPS responded:

As a result of the Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight's study on the revitalization/expansion program, the Facilities Assessment and Criteria Testing (FACT) Review Committee has reconvened to review the FACT methodology and consider changes to parameters measured in FACT scoring. At the completion of the FACT Review Committee process, the superintendent of schools will forward a recommendation to the Board of Education on the FACT methodology and how the schools in the queue will be addressed in the future. It is anticipated that the Amended FY 2017-2022 will include realistic project estimates that align with the decisions of the Board of Education.

The FACT Review Committee, in which Council Staff is participating, is considering changes to the rev/ex assessment criteria and process that could affect the ordering of projects, the length of the project queue, and the timing for future reassessments. However, other possible changes in the rev/ex program, such as the scope of individual rev/ex projects are not currently under consideration by this group. While Council Staff believes that the Education Committee should discuss some of these broader rev/ex issues at a later date, the current assumptions in the Approved CIP should be carried forward into the FY17-22 CIP for now.

Since these elementary school cost reductions are paper changes only (not based on actual or expected project scope changes), the impact of these reductions is to create an additional potential expenditure gap in the rev/ex program of about \$99 million. Prior to CIP reconciliation (which could result in deferrals of one or more of these projects), **Council Staff recommends that the costs for these elementary school projects be reflected at their approved placeholder dollar levels to bring the assumed costs in line with the proposed rev/ex queue.**

Because the rev/ex projects make up such a substantial portion of the CIP, and because the Board of Education and Council have generally prioritized urgent school capacity ahead of rev/ex projects,¹ in recent years the Council has had to repeatedly defer the start dates for rev-ex projects to reconcile the CIP within approved spending affordability limits. The FY17-22 CIP review may be no different, as the Council faces a substantial fiscal challenge this time around as well.

Holding Schools

Elementary and middle school rev/ex projects are done with the students and staff moved to holding facilities (typically a two-year construction period). There are four elementary school holding facilities and one middle school holding facility.² The current holding facility use schedule is attached on ©15.

Holding schools represent an important constraint in terms of the number of elementary and middle school rev/ex projects that can be done at one time and also create complications when deferrals of elementary and middle school rev/ex projects are considered, as there is a domino effect created (i.e., if you defer one you most likely have to also defer the schools in the rev/ex queue behind them).

¹ NOTE: Many rev/ex projects also include increases in school capacity. The capacity benefits of many of the rev/ex projects were discussed at the Education Committee's February 22 meeting.

² MCPS is planning to add the Woodward Center as a secondary holding school facility once Tilden Middle School moves to the Tilden Center.

High school rev/ex projects are currently done with the students and staff on-site. Therefore, deferring high school rev/ex projects does not involve a similar domino effect, since each high school rev/ex is independent of another. High school rev-ex projects also happen to be far more expensive than elementary and middle school rev/ex projects and, thus, deferrals can represent more substantial expenditure shifts in the CIP.

Costs

As mentioned earlier, rev/ex projects make up nearly half of the MCPS CIP. Rev/ex projects, in most cases, are equivalent in cost to new schools. Typical rev/ex projects are about \$27.5 million, \$47.5 million, and \$112.5 million for elementary, middle, and high schools respectively. However, there can be a significant variation in project costs, especially at the high school level.

Overall, MCPS has over 60 schools in its current rev/ex queue (including 47 schools assessed as recently as 2011). This means that, under the current rev/ex model, MCPS expects this program to continue for many years.

The chart below shows how these costs add up quickly in the CIP. MCPS used to have a policy goal of a 40 year cycle for rev/ex projects. However, for many years the actual replacement cycle for each school level has been much higher. The 40 year and the actual replacement cycles are presented below for illustrative purposes.

Fiscal Impact of MCPS School Rev-Ex Program									
		School Category						Totals	
		Elementary		Middle		High School			
1	Number of Schools*	133		38		25		196	
2	Replacement Cycle Examples	40	65	40	76	40	50	40	actual
3	Annual Pace of Rev/Ex Program	3.3	2.0	0.95	0.50	0.63	0.50		
4	Estimated Cost Per Rev/EX (in \$000s)**	27,500		47,500		112,500			
5	Annual Fiscal Impact (in \$000s)	91,438	56,269	45,125	23,750	70,313	56,250	206,875	136,269
6		Six-Year Fiscal Impact in (\$000s)						1,241,250	817,615
7		MCPS' FY15-20 Current and Future Rev/Ex Budget (as amended)						718,696	718,696
8		% Increase Required						72.7%	13.8%
9		MCPS' FY17-22 Current and Future Rev/Ex Budget Proposal						758,874	758,874
10		% Increase Required						63.6%	7.7%

*does not include special schools

**Based on MCPS' latest assumptions for projects in the Rev/Ex program. Note: There can be a wide variation in project costs.

While a 40 year replacement cycle pace is well out of reach, even keeping up with the recent actual replacement cycle pace going forward is a challenge. MCPS' FY17-22 rev/ex request is still short by about \$59 million over six years. The amended CIP is even further behind (about \$99 million over six years).

These cost issues and the currently constrained bond-funding environment were factors in MCPS updating its modernization policy (Policy FKB) which notes that, *"maintenance and systemic replacement activities need to serve as the primary means for keeping all schools in good condition over the extended life of the facility."*

As a result, MCPS has sought, and the Council has approved in recent years, significant increases in annual spending levels for MCPS' major systemic projects such as Roof Replacement,

HVAC/Electrical Replacement, and Planned Lifecycle Asset Replacement. MCPS is seeking increases again within its FY17-22 CIP request.

Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) Report and MCPS Response

On July 28, 2015, the Council received and released Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) Report 2015-12, A Review of the MCPS Revitalization/Expansion Program.³ The report raised several policy and methodological questions around how school facilities were assessed in the 2011 FACT Assessment and how the various elements of the CIP can be integrated to maximize effective use of limited resources. The Education Committee discussed the OLO report and the implications for the rev/ex program at a meeting on September 21, 2015.

In response to the OLO report, the Interim Superintendent reconvened an interagency FACT Review Committee. This group was charged with addressing errors OLO identified in the 2011 assessment and considering how best to establish a new rev/ex queue given changing conditions at schools over time (which OLO had identified as a major flaw in the queue established through the 2011 assessment). This group has met several times and has additional meetings planned before it will submit a report to the Interim Superintendent later this spring.

FY17-22 CIP Considerations

Council Staff suggests the Committee address some short-term CIP issues regarding the “rev/ex” program now but defer a discussion of some broader, long-term policy issues until after budget. This timeframe will provide time for the FACT Review Committee to complete its work and for the Superintendent and Board of Education to respond to the report. The Committee can also have time to take up some of the issues identified by OLO that were not within the scope of the FACT Review Committee’s work.

With regard to some short-term issues, Council Staff has the following recommendations:

- **Funding for the rev/ex program in the FY17-22 CIP period will need to be considered in the context of CIP reconciliation in early May.** At the February 22 Education Committee worksession, the Committee agreed to ask MCPS to review its FY17-22 Proposed CIP and develop a list of projects in priority funding order by project or by group of projects. This package should reduce the MCPS FY17-22 CIP by fiscal year down to a level that would offset both the Executive’s recommended reductions to the Board’s CIP Request and any shortfall in state aid for school construction from what the Executive has recommended.
- **Keep the first four elementary schools (Cold Spring, Dufief, Belmont, and Stonegate) in the project queue as proposed.** For the FY17-22 CIP, there are eight elementary schools in the rev/ex queue with funding in the FY17-22 Proposed CIP that were part of the 2011 FACT Assessment. OLO staff have indicated that, based on their review of the 2011 FACT Assessment, the first four schools in the queue would likely remain the top four even after correcting for the issues identified by OLO (see OLO memorandum detailing this conclusion on ©24-25). The first four schools

³ The OLO report is available for download at:

http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Resources/Files/2015_Reports/MCPS%20Revitalization%20Expansion%20Program%202015-12.pdf

completed facility planning during FY16 and are scheduled to move into design in FY17.

- **Remove the names in the rev/ex queue for the elementary schools from the 2011 FACT Assessment, beyond the first four schools noted above, pending the outcome of the Fact Review Committee's efforts and Education Committee review of rev/ex program policy issues after budget.** Starting with the fifth elementary school from the 2011 FACT Assessment, OLO found that a reordering of schools would occur when addressing key concerns raised in the OLO report. The placeholder costs can remain in the schedule (pending the outcome of CIP reconciliation) and should reflect accurate placeholder costs (as noted earlier).

Attachments

- County Executive Transmittal: Relocatable Classrooms Supplemental Appropriation (©1-7)
- Current Placement of Relocatable Classrooms (2015-2016 schoolyear) (©7A)
- Artificial Turf Program Project Description Form (©8)
- Letter dated March 8, 2015 from Education Committee Chair Craig Rice to Board of Education President Michael Durso (©9-10)
- Current Revitalizations/Expansions Project Description Form (©11)
- Future Revitalizations/Expansions Project Description Form (©12)
- FY15-20 Latest Approved Rev/Ex Schedule by Project (©13)
- FY17-22 Board of Education Proposed Rev/Ex Schedule by Project (©14)
- Holding Facility Schedule (from the Superintendent's Recommended FY17 Capital Budget and FY17-22 CIP) (©15)
- Appendix E: Revitalization/Expansion Schedule for Assessed Schools (©17)
- Appendix F: Assessing Schools for Revitalization/Expansion (©18-20)
- Appendix V: Policy FKB, Sustaining and Modernizing Montgomery County Public Schools Facilities (©21-23)
- January 4, 2016 Office of Legislative Oversight Memorandum to Council Staff (©24-25)

KML:f:\levchenko\mcps\fy17 22 cip review\ed 3 21 2016.docx




OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

March 3, 2016

TO: Nancy Floreen, President, County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Supplemental Appropriation #18-S16-CMCPS-4 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)
Relocatable Classrooms (No. 846540), \$2,250,000

I am recommending a supplemental appropriation to the FY16 Capital Budget in the amount of \$2,250,000 for Relocatable Classrooms (No. 846540) for the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Appropriation for this project will fund the moving and installation of relocatable classrooms to accommodate student population changes for the upcoming 2016-2017 school year.

This increase is needed to allow MCPS to begin contracting work related to FY17 Capital Budget Expenditures during FY16 so that new and existing relocatable classrooms can be moved early in the summer of 2016 and therefore be ready for use for the next school year beginning on August 2016.

I recommend that the County Council approve this supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$2,250,000 and specify the source of funds as Current Revenue.

I appreciate your prompt consideration of this action.

IL:rs

Attachment: Supplemental Appropriation #18-S16-CMCPS-4
Board of Education Request

cc: Larry A. Bowers, Interim Superintendent of Schools
Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Resolution No: _____
Introduced: _____
Adopted: _____

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

SUBJECT: Supplemental Appropriation #18-S16-CMCPS-4 to the FY16 Capital Budget
Montgomery County Public Schools
Relocatable Classrooms (No. 846540), \$2,250,000

Background

1. Section 307 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week's notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a Federal, State or County law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget.
2. The County Executive recommends the following capital project appropriation increases:

<u>Project</u> <u>Name</u>	<u>Project</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>Cost</u> <u>Element</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Source</u> <u>of Funds</u>
Relocatable Classrooms	846540	Planning, Design, and Supervision	\$250,000	Current Revenue
		Construction	<u>\$2,000,000</u>	
TOTAL			\$2,250,000	

Supplemental Appropriation #18-S16-CMCPS-4

Page Two

3. This increase is needed to allow MCPS to begin contracting work related to FY17 Capital Budget Expenditures during FY16 so that new and existing relocatable classrooms can be moved early in the summer of 2016 and therefore be ready for use for the next school year beginning on August 2016.
4. The County Executive recommends a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$2,250,000 for Relocatable Classrooms (No. 846540), and specifies that the source of funds will be Current Revenue.
5. Notice of public hearing was given and a public hearing was held.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following action:

A supplemental appropriation to the FY16 Capital Budget is approved as follows:

<u>Project</u> <u>Name</u>	<u>Project</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>Cost</u> <u>Element</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Source</u> <u>of Funds</u>
Relocatable Classrooms	846540	Planning, Design, and Supervision	\$250,000	Current Revenue
		Construction	<u>\$2,000,000</u>	
TOTAL			\$2,250,000	

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

Relocatable Classrooms (P846540)

Category Montgomery County Public Schools
Sub Category Countywide
Administering Agency Public Schools (AAGE18)
Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 11/17/14
Required Adequate Public Facility No
Relocation Impact None
Status Ongoing

	Total	Thru FY14	Rem FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	3,475	1,575	400	1,500	500	500	500	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	42,336	25,236	3,600	13,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	45,811	26,811	4,000	15,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Current Revenue: General	41,387	26,333	4,000	11,054	1,054	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0
Current Revenue: Recordation Tax	4,424	478	0	3,946	3,946	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	45,811	26,811	4,000	15,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 16	0
Supplemental Appropriation Request	2,250	0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		40,811
Expenditure / Encumbrances		26,811
Unencumbered Balance		14,000

Date First Appropriation	FY 84	
First Cost Estimate		
Current Scope	FY02	21,470
Last FY's Cost Estimate		45,811
Partial Closeout Thru		56,588
New Partial Closeout		0
Total Partial Closeout		56,588

Description

MCPS currently has a total of 498 relocatable classrooms. Of the 498 relocatables, 382 are used to address over utilization at various schools throughout the system. The balance, 116 relocatables, are used at schools undergoing construction projects on-site, or at holding schools, or for other uses countywide. Units around 15-20 years old require general renovation if they are to continue in use as educational spaces.

An FY 2011 supplemental appropriation of \$2.2 million was approved by the County Council to accelerate the FY 2012 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatable units ready for the 2011-2012 school year. An FY 2012 supplemental appropriation of \$4.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2013 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatable units ready for the 2012-2013 school year. An FY 2013 supplemental appropriation of \$4.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2014 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatables ready for the 2013-2014 school year. An FY 2014 supplemental appropriation of \$5.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2015 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatables ready for the 2014-2015 school year. An FY 2016 appropriation is requested to address the overutilization at MCPS schools through relocatable classrooms.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

CIP Master Plan for School Facilities

Relocatable Classrooms (P846540)

Category
Sub Category
Administering Agency
Planning Area

Montgomery County Public Schools
Countywide
Public Schools (AAGE16)
Countywide

Date Last Modified
Required Adequate Public Facility
Relocation Impact
Status

11/17/14
No
None
Ongoing

	Total	Thru FY16	Est FY16	Total 6 Years	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	4,225	2,475	500	1,250	250	500	500	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	48,836	33,336	4,500	11,000	2,000	4,500	4,500	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53,061	35,811	5,000	12,250	2,250	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0
FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
G.O. Bonds	48,837	31,387	5,000	12,250	2,250	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0
Total	53,061	35,811	5,000	12,250	2,250	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 17	2,250
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 18	5,000
Supplemental Appropriation Request		2,350
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		35,811
Expenditure / Encumbrances		35,811
Unencumbered Balance		0

Date First Appropriation	FY 84
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	FY02 21,470
Last FY's Cost Estimate	45,811
Partial Closeout Thru	58,588
New Partial Closeout	0
Total Partial Closeout	58,588

Description

For the 2015-2016 school year, MCPS has a total of 500 relocatable classrooms. Of the 500 relocatables, 381 are used to address over utilization at various schools throughout the system. The balance, 119 relocatables, are used to provide daycare at schools, are used at schools undergoing construction projects on-site, or at holding schools, or for other uses countywide. Units around 15-20 years old require general renovation if they are to continue in use as educational spaces. An FY 2013 supplemental appropriation of \$4.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2014 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatables ready for the 2013-2014 school year. An FY 2014 supplemental appropriation of \$5.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2015 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to allow MCPS to enter into contracts in order to have the relocatables ready for the 2014-2015 school year. An FY 2015 supplemental appropriation of \$5.0 million was approved to accelerate the FY 2016 appropriation requested by the Board of Education to enter into contracts in order to have relocatables ready for the 2015-2016 school year. An FY 2017 appropriation is requested for the placement of relocatables for the 2016-2017 school year. The expenditure for FY 2017 reflects the ability to utilize some expenditures from FY 2106 due to the conversion of computer labs to classrooms at some elementary schools, as well as the rerating of the class-size reduction schools, which resulted in the placement of less units for the 2015-2016 school year. The expenditures showing in FY 2018 and beyond will once again show the level of effort for this project.

Fiscal Note

CIP Master Plan for School Facilities

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Office of the Superintendent of Schools
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Rockville, Maryland

February 25, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Isiah Leggett, County Executive
The Honorable Nancy Floreen, President, Montgomery County Council

From: Larry A. Bowers, Interim Superintendent of Schools

Subject: Transmittal of Board of Education Agenda Item #7.3

Fiscal Year 2016 Supplemental Appropriation Request for Relocatable Classrooms

BOE Meeting Date: February 22, 2016

Type of Action: FY 2016 Supplemental Appropriation

LAB:AMZ:JS:ak

Attachment

Copy to:
Dr. Zuckerman
Ms. Karamihas
Mr. Song
Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget

Office of the Superintendent of Schools
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Rockville, Maryland

February 22, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Board of Education

From: Larry A. Bowers, Interim Superintendent of Schools *Larry A. Bowers*

Subject: Fiscal Year 2016 Supplemental Appropriation Request for Relocatable Classrooms

WHEREAS, The Board of Education Requested Fiscal Year 2017-2022 Capital Improvements Program includes \$2.250 million in Fiscal Year 2017 for relocatable classrooms to accommodate student population changes for the 2016-2017 school year; and

WHEREAS, These funds are programmed to be expended during summer 2016, but will not be available until the Montgomery County Council takes final action on the Board of Education Capital Improvements Program request in May 2016; and

WHEREAS, The contracts for the leasing, relocation, and installation work for the Fiscal Year 2017 relocatable classroom moves must be executed prior to May 1, 2016, in order to have the units ready for the start of school in August 2016; and

WHEREAS, The appropriation authority to expend the funds programmed for Fiscal Year 2017 must be approved by the Montgomery County Council before the Board of Education may enter into contracts; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests a Fiscal Year 2016 supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$2.250 million to accelerate the requested Fiscal Year 2017 appropriation to provide for the execution of contracts for leasing and relocatable classroom moves planned for summer 2016 to address school enrollment changes in time for the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year; and be it further

Resolved, That this request be forwarded to the county executive and the Montgomery County Council for action.

LAB:AMZ:JS:mas

Appendix D

Montgomery County Public Schools Relocatable Classrooms: 2015–2016 School Year

Cluster/ School	Relocatables on site for 2015–2016 to Address:			Cluster/ School	Relocatables on site for 2015–2016 to Address:			Cluster/ School	Relocatables on site for 2015–2016 to Address:		
	Overutilization	DC	Total		Overutilization	DC	Total		Overutilization	DC	Total
Bethesda-Chevy Chase				Col. Zadok Magruder				Watkins Mill			
Bethesda-Chevy Chase HS	8		8	Cashell	1		1	South Lake	4		4
Westland MS	6		6	Flower Hill	3		3	Total	4	0	4
Chevy Chase ES	1		1	Mill Creek Towne	3		3	Walt Whitman			
Total	15	0	15	Judith A. Resnik	6		6	Bannockburn	2		2
Winston Churchill				Total	13	0	13	Burning Tree	4		4
Potomac	5		5	Richard Montgomery				Total	6	0	6
Total	5	0	5	Julius West MS	6		6	Thomas S. Wootton			
Clarksburg				Beall	8		8	Thomas S. Wootton HS	6		6
Clarksburg HS	11		11	College Gardens	6		6	Cold Spring	1		1
Rocky Hill MS	11		11	Ritchie Park	6		6	DuFief	1	1	2
Clarksburg ES	4		4	Twinbrook	2		2	Total	8	1	9
Daly	4		4	Total	28	0	28				
Wilson Wims	2		2	Northeast Consortium*				Grand Total by Use	381	7	388
Total	32	0	32	Burnt Mills	4		4	SCHOOL TOTAL: 388			
Damascus				Burtonsville	6		6	Other Relocatable Uses			
Cedar Grove	7		7	Cloverly	2		2		# Units		Comment
Total	7	0	7	Galway	2		2	Construction			
Downcounty Consortium*				Greencastle	6		6	Total	0		
Wheaton HS	2		2	JoAnn Leleck ES at Broad Ac	8		8	Holding Schools			
Takoma Park MS	1		1	Page	2		2	Emory Grove Center	18		Brown Station ES
Arcola	6		6	Stonegate	3	1	4	Fairland Center	0		
Forest Knolls	4		4	Westover	2		2	Grosvenor Center	17		Wayside ES
Harmony Hills	5		5	Total	35	1	36	North Lake Center	16		Wheaton Woods ES
Highland View	6		6	Northwest				Radnor Center	23		Wood Acres
Oak View	1		1	Clopper Mill	4		4	Total	74		
Kemp Mill	3		3	Diamond	4	1	5	Other Uses at Schools			
Oakland Terrace	2		2	Great Seneca Creek	3		3	Gaithersburg ES	1		Parent Resource Ctr.
Pine Crest	5		5	Spark M. Matsunaga	14	1	15	Monocacy	1		
Rolling Terrace	10		10	Ronald McNair	7		7	Seneca Valley HS	1		Transitions (CCC)
Sargent Shriver	9		9	Total	32	2	34	Sherwood ES	1		Baldrige Lab
Wheaton Woods	9		9	Quince Orchard				South Lake	1		Linkages to Learning
Woodlin	9		9	Brown Station	6		6	Summit Hall	1		Judy Center
Total	72	0	72	Rachel Carson	10	1	11	Total	6		
Gaithersburg				Fields Road	4		4	Non-school Locations			
Gaithersburg ES	7		7	Jones Lane	4		4	Bethesda Depot	3		Offices
Goshen	5		5	Marshall	5		5	Children's Res. Ctr.	1		Infants & Todd. offices
Laytonsville	0	1	1	Total	29	1	30	Clarksburg Depot	1		Maintenance
Rosemont	2	0	2	Rockville				Clarksburg Depot	2		Transportation
Strawberry Knoll	6		6	Lucy V. Barnsley	10		10	Kingsley	5		Transitions
Summit Hall	10		10	Flower Valley	1		1	Lincoln Warehouse	1		Copy Plus Program
Total	30	1	31	Maryvale	1		1	Montgomery College	2		Germantown
Walter Johnson				Meadow Hall	5		5	Randolph Depot	3		Offices
North Bethesda	3		3	Rock Creek Valley	4		4	Rocking Horse Road	2		Offices
Ashburton	8		8	Carl Sandburg Center	2		2	Shady Grove Depot	10		
Kensington-Parkwood	7		7	Total	23	0	23	Smith Center	2		Outdoor Education
Luxmanor	3		3	Seneca Valley				Total	32		
Total	21	0	21	Lake Seneca	9		9	OTHER TOTAL:			112
				S. Christa McAuliffe	8		8				
				Sally K. Ride	4		4				
				Total	21	0	21				
				Sherwood							
				Belmont	0	1	1				
				Total	0	1	1				

DC = Paid for by day-care provider to enable a day-care center to operate inside school.

* In terms of the number of schools, the Downcounty Consortium is the equivalent of 5 clusters, and the NE Consortium is the equivalent of 3 clusters.

Artificial Turf Program (P651742)

Category
Sub Category
Administering Agency
Planning Area

Montgomery County Public Schools
Countywide
Public Schools (AAGE18)

Date Last Modified
Required Adequate Public Facility
Relocation Impact
Status

11/17/14

	Total	Thru FY15	Est FY16	Total 6 Years	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	1,100	0	0	1,100	250	250	150	150	150	150	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	2,000	0	0	2,000	450	450	275	275	275	275	0
Construction	7,900	0	0	7,900	1,800	1,800	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11,000	0	0	11,000	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0
FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
G.O. Bonds	11,000	0	0	11,000	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0
Total	11,000	0	0	11,000	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 17	2,500
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 18	2,500
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		0
Unencumbered Balance		0

Date First Appropriation	FY 18
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	0
Last FY's Cost Estimate	0

Description

Montgomery County Public Schools has 25 high schools in the county. Of those school, six have artificial turf fields. The school fields are constantly used by the school and the community and the artificial turf will provide safe playing conditions for all participants in sporting activities. This program will fund artificial turf installation at all remaining high schools in the county. It is anticipated that funding for this program can be accomplished through a public/private partnership to ensure all of the MCPS high schools have artificial turf in the future. An FY 2017 appropriation is requested to begin this program.



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

CRAIG RICE
COUNCILMEMBER
DISTRICT 2

CHAIRMAN
EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Montgomery County Public Schools
President, Michael Durso
Board of Education Office
Carver Education Services Center
850 Hungerford Drive, #123
Rockville, MD 20850

March 8, 2016

Dear Mr. Durso:

At the Council's Education Committee meeting on February 22, the Committee discussed the Board of Education's Proposed FY17-22 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and in particular the difficult fiscal situation the County finds itself in again this year even as Montgomery County Public Schools faces capital needs related to continued enrollment growth, aging schools, and construction cost increases.

The County Executive's FY17-22 Recommended CIP, which assumes the Council's overall spending affordability guidelines for General Obligation Bonds of \$340 million per year, includes funding for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) slightly above the Amended FY15-20 CIP. This increase is notable given the overall decrease in the Recommended CIP from the Amended CIP (down 3.1 percent). However, the Executive's MCPS CIP recommendation for FY17-22 is still \$160 million below the Board's Proposed CIP. The Council will face a big challenge in balancing CIP funding across all agencies while also seeking to fund the many critical capital needs in the Board's Proposed CIP.

The County also faces uncertainty again this year in terms of school construction funding from the State. The County Executive's Recommended CIP assumes a higher annual level of school construction funding (\$55.5 million) than was received last year (\$45.7 million). However, the statewide allocation for school construction funding is at a similar level to last year.

While the Council reconciles the CIP each year in early May, the Council will need the assistance of MCPS to address such a large potential hole in funding. Therefore, as we have done the past two years, the Education Committee is asking MCPS to develop a priority list of project changes to the Board of Education Request that (if all made) would bring the annual and six-year funding in the MCPS CIP down to the levels assumed in the County Executive's FY17-22 CIP and would address any potential State aid gap (from the County Executive's assumptions) in FY17 and beyond. Hopefully, the Council will not have to take all of the cuts on your priority list, so it would be helpful if your priority list indicates in what order the Board would like to see individual or groups of projects restored to the original Board proposal.

STELLA B. WERNER OFFICE BUILDING • 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, 6TH FLOOR • ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850
240-777-7828 OR 240-777-7900 • TTY 240-777-7914 • FAX 240-777-7989

WWW.MONTGOMERYCOUNTYMD.GOV

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

9

The Education Committee plans to meet in late April or early May after the conclusion of the State Legislative session to discuss the reconciliation of the MCPS CIP. The Committee would appreciate receiving MCPS' expenditure reduction scenarios in time for discussion at that meeting.

The Education Committee looks forward to working with you, and all of the groups supportive of your CIP Proposal, to make a strong push for the funding we need from the State. We also appreciate your continued cooperation in helping the Council make the best decisions it can with regard to the MCPS CIP.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig Rice", written over a circular stamp.

Craig Rice, Chair
Education Committee
Montgomery County Council

Current Revitalizations/Expansions(P926575)

Category Montgomery County Public Schools
 Sub Category Countywide
 Administering Agency Public Schools (AAGE18)
 Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 11/17/14
 Required Adequate Public Facility No
 Relocation Impact None
 Status Ongoing

	Total	Thru FY15	Est FY16	Total 6 Years	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	98,174	51,416	8,741	36,017	9,367	8,942	8,403	5,223	4,082	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	217,253	90,243	17,359	108,651	10,434	23,430	20,928	14,507	26,952	13,400	0
Construction	1,075,487	389,633	91,276	556,322	99,394	75,989	91,036	132,953	102,688	54,262	38,256
Other	46,142	17,410	3,278	24,554	2,599	2,609	3,538	9,008	5,300	1,500	900
Total	1,435,056	548,702	120,654	726,544	121,794	110,970	123,905	161,691	139,022	69,162	39,156

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Contributions	2,791	2,791	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Revenue: General	44	0	0	44	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Revenue: Recordation Tax	116,811	36,142	1,984	78,885	23,047	11,489	13,936	30,213	0	0	0
G.O. Bonds	1,127,965	403,746	97,277	587,786	98,703	85,877	86,547	108,475	139,022	69,162	39,156
School Facilities Payment	655	517	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schools Impact Tax	83,185	23,156	0	60,029	0	13,804	23,422	23,003	0	0	0
State Aid	103,605	82,350	21,255	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,435,056	548,702	120,654	726,544	121,794	110,970	123,905	161,691	139,022	69,162	39,156

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (\$000s)											
Energy				3,515	869	1,178	734	734	0	0	
Maintenance				7,872	1,770	2,598	1,752	1,752	0	0	
Net Impact				11,387	2,639	3,776	2,486	2,486	0	0	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 17	17,842
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 18	261,463
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		888,741
Expenditure / Encumbrances		548,702
Unencumbered Balance		340,039

Date First Appropriation	
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	331,923
Last FY's Cost Estimate	1,455,058
Partial Closeout Thru	583,813
New Partial Closeout	137,813
Total Partial Closeout	721,626

Description

This project combines all current revitalization/expansion projects as prioritized by the FACT assessments. Future projects with planning in FY 2019 or later are in PDF No. 886536. Due to fiscal constraints, the County Council adopted FY 2015-2020 CIP includes a one year delay, beyond the Board of Education's request, for elementary school projects and a one year delay of secondary school projects beginning with Tilden Middle School and Seneca Valley High School; however, all planning funds remained on the Board of Education's requested schedule. An FY 2015 appropriation was approved to provide planning funds for two revitalization/expansion projects, construction funds for one revitalization/expansion project and the balance of funding for three revitalization/expansion projects. An FY 2015 supplemental appropriation of a \$2.5 million contribution from Junior Achievement of Greater Washington was approved to include a Junior Achievement Finance Park during the revitalization of Thomas Edison High School of Technology. An FY 2016 appropriation was approved for the balance of funding for one project, construction funding for four projects, and planning funding for five projects. The Board of Education's FY 2017-2022 CIP maintained the approved completion dates for the revitalization/expansion program. An FY 2017 appropriation is requested to build out the 24 classroom shell at Wheaton High School, and the balance of funding for Wayside, Brown Station and Wheaton Woods elementary schools and Thomas Edison High School of Technology.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Public Schools (A18) asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Mandatory Referral - M-NCPPC, Department of Environmental Protection, Building Permits, Code Review, Fire Marshal Inspections, Department of Transportation, Sediment Control, Stormwater Management, WSSC Permits

Future Revitalizations/Expansions(P886536)

Category Montgomery County Public Schools
Sub Category Countywide
Administering Agency Public Schools (AAGE18)
Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 11/17/14
Required Adequate Public Facility No
Relocation Impact None
Status Ongoing

	Total	Thru FY15	Est FY16	Total 6 Years	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	11,742	0	0	11,742	0	0	1,612	4,022	5,438	672	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	19,041	0	0	15,821	0	0	0	0	4,800	11,021	3,220
Construction	62,169	0	0	4,767	0	0	0	0	208	4,559	57,402
Other	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000
Total	95,952	0	0	32,330	0	0	1,612	4,022	10,444	16,252	63,622

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
G.O. Bonds	95,952	0	0	32,330	0	0	1,612	4,022	10,444	16,252	63,622
Total	95,952	0	0	32,330	0	0	1,612	4,022	10,444	16,252	63,622

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 17	0
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 18	0
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		0
Unencumbered Balance		0

Date First Appropriation	
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	50,028
Last FY's Cost Estimate	150,076
Partial Closeout Thru	0
New Partial Closeout	0
Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

The Board of Education strongly supports the upgrading of facilities through comprehensive revitalization/expansion to replace major building systems and to bring schools up to current educational standards. As feasibility studies are completed and architectural planning is scheduled, individual schools move from this project to the Current Revitalization/Expansion PDF No. 926575. The adopted FY 2011-2016 CIP moved three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school from this project to the Current Revitalization/Expansion project. Also, the adopted FY 2011-2016 CIP provided completion dates for one middle school and one high school. The Board of Education's Requested FY 2013-2018 CIP moves three elementary schools and one high school from this project to the Current Revitalization/Expansion project. Also, based on the new Facility Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT) conducted in 2010-2011, eight elementary schools were appended to the current revitalization/expansion schedule. Due to fiscal constraints, the County Council's adopted FY 2013-2018 CIP includes a two year delay for middle school revitalizations/expansions beginning with Tilden Middle School and a two year delay for high school revitalizations/expansions beginning with Seneca Valley High School. The Board of Education's Requested FY 2015-2020 CIP moved one middle and one high school from this project to the Current Revitalization/Expansion project. Due to fiscal constraints the County Council adopted FY 2015-2020 CIP delayed elementary school projects one year beyond the Board of Education's request and delayed secondary projects one year beginning with Tilden Middle School and Seneca Valley High School; however, all planning funds remained on the Board of Education's requested schedule. The Board of Education's requested FY 2015-2020 Amended CIP reinstated the construction schedule previously requested by the Board. Due to fiscal constraints, the County Council did not approve the Board's request. Therefore, the revitalization/expansion projects beginning with Potomac ES, Tilden MS, and Seneca Valley HS will remain on their approved schedules. The Board of Education, in the FY 2017-2022 CIP, maintained the approved completion dates of all revitalization/expansion projects. As a result of the Office of Legislative Oversight's study on the revitalization/expansion program, the FACT Review Committee will reconvene to review the FACT methodology and consider changes to parameters measured in FACT scoring. The Board of Education will, based on the superintendent's recommendation, determine, in the next CIP, how the queue of schools will be addressed. A complete list of the revitalization/expansion schedule is in Appendix E of the Superintendent's Recommended FY 2017 Capital Budget and FY 2017-2022 CIP.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Amended FY15-20 Rev/Ex Expenditure Schedule

Completion Date	School	Total	Through FY14*	Total 6 Years	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	Beyond 6 Years
Aug-13	Gaithersburg HS	107,149	95,812	11,337	11,337						
Aug-14	Bel Pre ES	28,872	17,206	11,666	11,666						
Jan-15	Candlewood ES	24,133	5,224	18,909	9,763	9,146					
Jan-15	Rock Creek Forest ES	29,100	4,677	24,423	11,839	12,584					
Aug-16	William Farquhar MS	50,892	1,035	49,857	13,767	29,061	7,029				
Aug-18	Wayside ES	24,074	329	23,745		4,661	12,339	6,745			
Aug-18	Brown Station ES	34,446	400	34,046		4,988	16,405	12,653	-		
Aug-18	Wheaton Woods ES	33,406	457	32,949		5,483	15,930	11,536			
Aug-19	Seneca Valley HS	129,126	200	113,870	3,298	2,624	875	43,750	35,186	28,137	15,056
Aug-15/18	Wheaton HS/Edison Tech	174,095	8,917	165,178	38,104	48,585	54,910	16,941	6,638		
Jan-20	Potomac ES	21,320		21,320		457	909	5,739	10,039	4,176	
Jan-20	Maryvale ES/Sandburg	48,908		48,908		894	1,694	2,852	23,839	19,629	
Jan-20	Luxmanor ES	20,747		20,747		257	609	926	11,117	7,838	
Aug-20	Tilden @ Woodward MS	54,985		44,593		1,107	1,476	738	22,602	18,670	10,392
Aug-21	Wootton HS	101,767		64,008		807	1,613	2,420	23,014	36,154	37,759
Subtotal - Current Rev/Ex		883,020	134,257	685,556	99,774	120,654	113,789	104,300	132,435	114,604	63,207
Aug-21	Cold Spring ES**	20,273		6,565				403	805	5,357	13,708
Aug-21	Dufief ES**	20,273		6,565				403	805	5,357	13,708
Aug-21	Belmont ES**	20,273		6,565				403	805	5,357	13,708
Aug-21	Stonegate ES**	20,273		6,565				403	805	5,357	13,708
Aug-22	Eastern MS	50,786		2,406				802	604	1,000	48,380
Jan-23	Damascus ES**	25,012		403					200	203	24,609
Jan-23	Twinbrook ES**	25,012		403					200	203	24,609
Jan-23	Summit Hall ES**	25,012		403					200	203	24,609
Jan-23	Rosemary Hills ES**	25,012		403					200	203	24,609
Aug-23	Poolesville HS	83,889		2,862				954	908	1,000	81,027
	TBD E. Brooke Lee MS	50,028		-							50,028
	TBD Poolesville ES**	-		-							
	TBD Burnt Mills ES**	-		-							
	TBD South Lake ES**	-		-							
	TBD Woodfield ES**	-		-							
Subtotal - Future Rev/Ex		365,843	-	33,140	-	-	-	3,368	5,532	24,240	332,703
Total Rev/Ex		1,248,863	134,257	718,696	99,774	120,654	113,789	107,668	137,967	138,844	395,910

*Through FY14 costs shown here only includes costs for projects with spending in FY15 and beyond. Costs for projects completed before FY15 are not shown.

**Part of the 2011 FACT Assessment

Board Proposed FY17-22 Modernization Expenditure Schedule

Completion Date	School	Total	Through FY16*	Total 6 Years	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	Beyond 6 Years
8/16	William Farquhar MS	50,892	43,863	7,029	7,029						
8/18	Wheaton HS/Edison Tech	185,095	95,606	89,489	61,910	16,941	10,638				
8/17	Wayside ES	24,074	4,990	19,084	12,339	6,745					
8/17	Brown Station ES	34,446	5,388	29,058	16,405	12,653					
8/17	Wheaton Woods ES	33,406	5,940	27,466	15,930	11,536					
8/19	Seneca Valley HS	152,121	6,122	145,999	875	28,348	25,925	53,901	36,950		
1/20	Potomac ES	30,391	457	29,934	631	8,390	11,558	9,355			
1/20	Maryvale ES/Sandburg Learning Ctr.	58,997	894	58,103	2,170	12,256	17,736	25,941			
1/20	Luxmanor ES	29,190	257	28,933	1,416	7,575	13,700	6,242			
8/20	Tilden MS @ Tilden Center*	54,985	1,107	53,878	1,476	738	16,602	18,670	16,392		
8/21	Wootton HS	101,767	807	100,960	1,613	2,420	23,014	36,154	25,317	12,442	
8/21	Cold Spring ES**	→ 10,273		10,273		403	805	2,357	3,708	3,000	
8/21	Dufief ES**	→ 10,273		10,273		403	805	2,357	3,708	3,000	
8/21	Belmont ES**	→ 10,273		10,273		403	805	2,357	3,708	3,000	
8/21	Stonegate ES**	→ 10,273		10,273		403	805	2,357	3,708	3,000	
8/22	Eastern MS	50,786		42,450		802	604	1,000	22,474	17,570	8,336
8/23	Poolesville HS	83,889		53,069		954	908	1,000	23,057	27,150	30,820
Subtotal - Current Rev/Ex		931,131	165,431	726,544	121,794	110,970	123,905	161,691	139,022	69,162	39,156
1/23	Damascus ES**	→ 10,273	-	6,273	-	-	403	805	2,057	3,008	4,000
1/23	Twinbrook ES**	→ 10,273	-	6,273	-	-	403	805	2,057	3,008	4,000
1/23	Summit Hall ES**	→ 10,273	-	6,273	-	-	403	805	2,057	3,008	4,000
1/23	Rosemary Hills ES**	→ 10,273	-	6,273	-	-	403	805	2,057	3,008	4,000
8/24	E. Brooke Lee MS	54,860	-	7,238	-	-	-	802	2,216	4,220	47,622
TBD	Poolesville ES**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TBD	Burnt Mills ES**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TBD	South Lake ES**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TBD	Woodfield ES**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal - Future Rev/Ex		95,952	-	32,330	-	-	1,612	4,022	10,444	16,252	63,622
Total Rev/Ex		1,027,083	165,431	758,874	121,794	110,970	125,517	165,713	149,466	85,414	102,778

*Through FY16 costs shown here only includes costs for projects with spending in FY17 and beyond. Costs for projects completed before FY17 are not shown.

**Part of the 2011 FACT Assessment

A boundary study is recommended to determine the service area for Bethesda-Chevy Chase Middle School#2. Representatives from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Cluster will participate in the boundary advisory study. The boundary study will begin in January 2016 with Board of Education scheduled for November 2016. The new middle school is scheduled to open in August 2017.

OBJECTIVE 3: Sustaining and Revitalizing Facilities

The Board of Education, superintendent of schools, and school community recognize the necessity to maintain schools in good condition through a range of activities that includes routine daily maintenance to the systematic replacement of building systems. A number of capital projects provide funds for systematic life-cycle asset replacement, including the Roof Replacement Program, the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Program, and the Planned Life Cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) Program. Because schools built or revitalized since 1985 are generally of higher construction quality than schools built prior to 1985, it is possible to extend the useful life through a high level of maintenance and replacement of building systems. In the coming years, more funds will be directed to capital projects that sustain facilities in good condition for longer periods than have been feasible in the past.

The Board of Education, superintendent of schools, and school community also recognize that even well-maintained facilities eventually reach the end of their useful life span and require revitalization. Revitalization/expansion projects update school facilities and provide the variety of instructional spaces necessary to effectively deliver the current curriculum. These projects also bring schools up to current design and code standards. The cost to revitalize/expand an older school so that it is educationally, technologically, and physically up-to-date, is

similar to the cost to construct a new school. In most cases, a life cycle cost analysis shows it is more cost effective to replace an older school facility rather than attempt to salvage portions of the old facility.

In recognition of the need to place more emphasis to sustain all schools in good condition, the Board of Education recently updated its policy on school revitalization/expansion projects. The previous policy, called Policy FKB, Modernization/Renovation, was adopted in 1992. On December 7, 2010, the Board of Education adopted a new policy, called FKB, Sustaining and Modernizing Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Facilities. The policy is found in Appendix V. The updated Policy FKB enacts a long-term view for sustaining MCPS facilities until the point where a full revitalization/expansion project is necessary. The greater emphasis to maintain schools in good condition addresses concerns over the length of time it takes before schools are revitalized/expanded. Although a large number of schools have been revitalized since 1985—66 elementary schools, 13 middle schools, and 13 high schools—the availability of funds and the limited number of holding centers constrains the pace of revitalization/expansion projects. At the current rate, revitalizations/expansions of elementary schools occur on a 65-year cycle, middle schools occur on a 76-year cycle, and high schools occur on a 50-year cycle. By providing a higher level of maintenance at schools, facilities will be in good condition for a longer period of time.

The original list of schools for revitalization/expansion projects was scheduled using a standardized assessment tool called Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT). Schools beyond a certain age were assessed and scored on a standard set of facility and educational program space criteria. Schools scheduled for revitalization/expansion projects were rank ordered after the assessment. Because the original list of elementary schools in the queue for revitalization/expansion projects is almost complete, it was necessary to prepare

Holding Facility Schedule

Holding Facility	SY 15–16	SY 16–17	SY 17–18	SY 18–19	SY 19–20	SY 20–21	SY 21–22
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS							
Emory Grove Center		Brown Station				DuFief**	Damascus**
Fairland Center						Stonegate**	
Grosvenor Center		Wayside		Luxmanor		Cold Spring**	Twinbrook**
North Lake Center		Wheaton Woods		Maryvale		Belmont**	Summit Hall**
Radnor Center	Wood Acres			Potomac			Rosemary Hills**
MIDDLE SCHOOLS							
Tilden Center/ Woodward Center*				To be revitalized/expanded		Eastern	

* Tilden Middle School is currently located in the Woodward Center. A revitalization/expansion for Tilden Center is scheduled for completion in August 2020 which will house Tilden Middle School and Rock Terrace School. The Woodward Center will then become a secondary holding school facility for school revitalization/expansion projects scheduled after Tilden Middle School.

**Pending the outcome of the FACT Committee reassessment, these schools are subject to change. (See Appendix F for more information.)

for the assessment of additional schools that are aging and in need of revitalization/expansion projects. Therefore, the FACT methodology used to assess schools was updated in the 2010–2011 school year to reflect current educational programs and school design and code standards. The updated FACT methodology describes the following: the criteria used to assess the condition of schools; the measures that define each criterion; and the relative weights applied to the various criteria to obtain an overall score for each facility. The Board of Education adopted the updated FACT methodology on July 8, 2010, and 53 school assessments were completed at the end of June 2011.

The Recommended FY 2017–2022 CIP maintains the current revitalization/expansion approved schedule. However, based on the Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) study released in July 2015, regarding the revitalization/expansion program and the Facility Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT) methodology used to rank the schools, MCPS will reconvene the FACT Review Committee to update the FACT methodology and the revitalization/expansion program process. Pending the outcome of this review, the queue for the revitalization/expansion projects may change. For more information see Appendix F. Schools that have planning or construction funds approved in the six-year CIP period appear in Appendix E with a completion date.

OBJECTIVE 4:

Provide Schools that Are Environmentally Safe, Secure, Functionally Efficient, and Comfortable

To maintain and extend the useful life of school facilities, MCPS follows a continuum of activities that begins the first day a new school is opened and ends when a school's revitalization/expansion begins. Funding for maintenance activities is found in both the capital and operating budgets. The trend for the past five years has been to provide a level of funding effort in both budgets for building maintenance and systemic renovations. Understanding the full cost of building maintenance is critical to develop a balance between the comprehensive maintenance plan and a revitalization/expansion schedule that reflects the school system's priorities.

MCPS has many projects designed to meet the capital maintenance needs of schools across the county. These countywide projects are described in Chapter 5. Countywide projects work with environmental issues, safety and security, and major building system maintenance in schools. These projects require an assessment of each school relative to the needs of other schools and include scheduled major repairs and replacement activities. The assessment process for most of the countywide projects is carried out through an annual review that involves a team of maintenance professionals, school principals, and consultants. On some projects, local, state, and federal mandates affect the scope and cost of the effort required.

Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) and other countywide projects that focus on roof and mechanical system rehabilitation are essential to the long-term protection of the county's capital investment in schools. Because the projects to revitalize older schools must compete for funding with projects for building new schools, maintenance and rehabilitation projects for schools and relocatable classrooms take on even greater importance. A list of projects that were completed during summer 2015 can be found in Appendix R.

The Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Improvements Project funds mechanical retrofits and building modifications to address indoor air quality projects in MCPS schools. An amendment to the FY 2000 Capital Budget created this project and funds improvements, such as major mechanical corrections, carpet removal, floor tile replacement, and minor mechanical retrofits. MCPS staff is required to report periodically to the County Council's Education Committee on the status of this project.

MCPS is committed to sustainability and conservation of resources in the design and operation of all facilities. Several programs exist to support these activities. The School Energy and Recycling Team (SERT) Program promotes efficient and responsible energy use and active recycling in all schools. The SERT Program strives to significantly reduce energy consumption and to increase recycling systemwide by providing training and education; incentives, recognition, and award programs for conservation; accessible energy and recycling data; individual school programs for energy and environmental investigation-based learning opportunities; and conservation operations and procedures. SERT staff works with students, teachers, staff, and the community to practice environmental stewardship and to develop strategies to reduce the carbon footprint of MCPS.

MCPS has implemented measures to reduce the environmental impact of its buildings through a comprehensive revision of its construction design guidelines. This revision incorporates best practices from the widely recognized Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system of the United States Green Building Council. Great Seneca Creek Elementary School, which opened in September 2006, was the first public school in Maryland to be "gold" certified under the LEED rating system for green buildings. Beginning in FY 2007, all new schools and revitalization/expansion projects are designed to achieve a LEED for Schools "silver" certification. The following schools have earned LEED for Schools "gold" certification: Cabin John and Francis Scott Key middle schools; and Carderock Springs, Cannon Road, Cashell, Cresthaven, Farmland, William B. Gibbs, Seven Locks, and Flora M. Singer elementary schools. Smaller green technology and conservation pilots have been introduced at several schools to provide a healthy and effective learning environment for students and staff.

Appendix E

Revitalization/Expansion Schedule for Assessed Schools

Schools	Year Built	Year Renovated	FACT Score	Schedule
Elementary				
Wayside	1969		1502	8/2017
Brown Station	1969		1516	8/2017
Wheaton Woods	1952	1976	1525	8/2017
Potomac	1949	1976	1550	1/2020
Luxmanor	1966		1578	1/2020
Maryvale/Sandburg Learning Center	1969/1962		1578/414.05	1/2020
<i>Cold Spring*</i>	1972		382.04	8/2021
<i>DuFief*</i>	1975		357.01	8/2021
<i>Belmont*</i>	1974		349.28	8/2021
<i>Stonegate*</i>	1971		334.95	8/2021
<i>Damascus*</i>	1934	1980	331.89	1/2023
<i>Twinbrook*</i>	1952	1986	330.58	1/2023
<i>Summit Hall*</i>	1971		328.90	1/2023
<i>Rosemary Hills*</i>	1956	1988	327.05	1/2023
Middle				
William H. Farquhar	1968		1434	8/2016
Tilden/Rock Terrace School	1966/1950		1455/382.13	8/2020
Eastern	1951	1976	1472	8/2022
E. Brooke Lee	1966		1479	8/2024
High				
Wheaton/ Thomas Edison	1954	1983	1220	1/2016 Building 8/2017 Building 8/2018 Site
Seneca Valley	1974		1254	8/2019 Building 8/2020 Site
Thomas S. Wootton	1970		1301	8/2021 Building 8/2022 Site
Poolesville	1953	1978	1362	8/2023 Building 8/2024 Site
Col. Zadok Magruder	1970		1471	TBD
Damascus	1950	1978	1496	TBD
Northwood	1956	2004	****	TBD

Note: Schools were assessed in 1992, 1996, and 1999. Assessments were completed on the remaining 34 elementary and 11 middle schools during December 2010 and June 2011. (These schools are listed above in italics.) Schools will be added to the revitalization/expansion list once planning and or construction expenditures are included in the six-year Capital Improvements Program. See Appendix F for a complete list of schools that were assessed in the 2010–2011 school year.

*These eight elementary schools were assessed using the updated FACT methodology in the 2010–2011 school year. Based on the Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) study released in July 2015, regarding the revitalization/expansion program and the FACT methodology used to rank schools, MCPS will reconvene the FACT review Committee to update the FACT methodology and revitalization/expansion program process. The completion dates for these schools may change pending the outcome of the review. See Appendix F for more details on this review.

Appendix F

Assessing Schools for Revitalization/Expansion (Formerly Known as Modernizations)

On December 7, 2010, the Board of Education adopted Policy FKB, *Sustaining and Modernizing Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Facilities*. This policy updated Policy FKB, *Modernization/Renovation* that was adopted in 1992 and had never been updated by the Board of Education. The updated version of Policy FKB provides for a new emphasis on sustaining Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) facilities in good condition through systematic life-cycle asset replacement. At the same time, the policy recognizes the need to modernize schools as a facility reaches the end of its useful lifecycle. The name of “modernizations” was recently changed to “revitalizations/expansions” to accurately reflect the scope of work detailed in the MCPS educational specifications.

Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT)

While a primary factor in the need to revitalize a school is the age of the facility, a number of other factors also are considered in assessing the condition of a school. When the MCPS modernization program began in the early 1990s, a methodology known as Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing (FACT) was developed. The original FACT methodology was applied to three groups of school assessments—the first group in FY 1993, the second in FY 1996 and the third in FY 2000. Through the 2014–2015 school year, these assessments resulted in the revitalization/expansion of 41 elementary schools, 9 middle schools, and 10 high schools. From the round of assessments done in FY 1993, FY 1996 and FY 2000, another 8 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 8 high schools are now either under construction, in design, or are in the queue for revitalization/expansion. The list of these schools is provided in Appendix E, and they appear without italics.

The list of elementary schools from this older queue for revitalization/expansion is almost complete, with the last three elementary schools in the scheduled for completion in January 2020. Because the school system is nearing the end of the old queue of schools for revitalization/expansion, it was necessary to assess additional elementary and secondary schools that are aging. Beginning in spring 2010, a process to update the FACT methodology was undertaken. A multi-stakeholder committee reviewed and prepared recommendations to update the methodology. The Board of Education supported the recommendations of the committee by adopting the updated

FACT methodology on July 8, 2010. The updated FACT methodology describes the criteria to assess the condition of schools, the measures for each criterion, and the relative weights to apply to various criteria to obtain an overall score for each facility. Consultants EMG, Inc. provided technical expertise in the development of the detailed revised FACT methodology and the firm was responsible for conducting the assessments.

A total of 53 facilities were identified for the new FACT assessments. The new list includes facilities that were built prior to the mid-1980s and that had never been revitalized, although some of these schools may have had some renovation work performed. The old FACT methodology scoring system used a 2,000 point scale and schools in worse condition scored lower while schools in better condition received a higher score. In contrast, the new FACT methodology uses a 600 points scale in which the buildings in worse condition received higher scores and the buildings in better condition received lower scores. “Educational Program” parameters such as educational specifications, open plan schools, and controlled access were assigned 300 points and “Physical Infrastructure” parameters, such as facility design guidelines, utility and energy efficiency, maintenance cost, and community use of public facilities, were assigned 300 points. The final report of the assessments, including the facility scores, was presented to the Board of Education on October 11, 2011.

The table on the following page presents the scores that each school assessed received in rank order for elementary schools and secondary schools. As the current queue of schools scheduled for revitalization/expansion projects is completed (see Appendix E), schools on the following page will be placed in the revitalization/expansion queue according to their score.

In addition to 34 elementary schools and 11 middle schools, the recent FACT assessments included three special education program centers—Stephen Knolls, Rock Terrace, and Carl Sandburg—the Blair G. Ewing Center, and the Fairland, Grosvenor, North Lake and Radnor elementary school holding centers. Stephen Knolls is placed in the list of elementary schools on the following page and the Blair G. Ewing Center is placed in the list of secondary schools. The Carl Sandburg Learning Center is not included on the following table because of the adopted plan to collocate this school at Maryvale Elementary School as part of the revitalization/expansion project. And,

the Rock Terrace School is not included on the following table because of the adopted plan to collocate this school at Tilden Middle School as part of the revitalization/expansion project. Finally, the elementary school holding centers are not included on the following table because improvements to these facilities will be addressed through a separate capital project.

Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight Report

On July 28, 2015, the Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) released a study entitled, *A Review of the MCPS Revitalization/Expansion Program*. The study focused on two main concerns with the revitalization/expansion program and the 2010–2011 school year FACT methodology used to assess school conditions. First, the OLO study noted that the length of the queue of schools to be revitalized/expanded is long and would take 20 to 30 years to complete, pending funding levels.

Because the time period is long, the OLO study raised the concern that conditions at schools may change over time and the FACT scores schools received in the 2010–2011 school year may become less accurate. Associated with this concern was the OLO finding that some of the conditions measured at schools are less permanent and could be addressed through maintenance projects prior to a revitalization/expansion project. Given these concerns, questions were raised about whether to change the conditions the FACT measures and/or shorten the list of schools assessed so the score does not become out of date. A second concern raised had to do with errors that were found in some of the conditions measured during the FACT assessments.

In response to the OLO study, the interim superintendent of schools will reconvene the FACT Review Committee that developed the 2010–2011 school year methodology. During the 2015–2016 school year, the reconvened FACT Review Committee will consider the OLO study findings and make recommendations to the interim superintendent of schools by late spring 2016. The interim superintendent of schools will make recommendations for any possible changes in the FACT methodology and revitalization/expansion program to the Board of Education. Depending on the recommendations and Board of Education action, reassessment of schools using an updated FACT methodology could be required. In addition, scores for schools could change as well as the order of schools in the queue.

FACT* Scores

Rank**	Elementary Schools	Total FACT Score Maximum Score = 600
1	Cold Spring Elementary School	382.04
2	DuFief Elementary School	357.01
3	Belmont Elementary School	349.28
4	Stonegate Elementary School	334.95
5	Damascus Elementary School	331.89
6	Twinbrook Elementary School	330.58
7	Summit Hall Elementary School	328.90
8	Rosemary Hills Elementary School	327.05
9	Burnt Mills Elementary School	318.29
10	Poolesville Elementary School	314.42
11	Woodfield Elementary School	314.09
12	South Lake Elementary School	302.69
13	Cedar Grove Elementary School	302.46
14	Greenwood Elementary School	300.47
15	Piney Branch Elementary School	294.73
16	Whetstone Elementary School	293.22
17	Takoma Park Elementary School	292.86
18	Gaithersburg Elementary School	290.88
19	Strathmore Elementary School	289.46
20	Diamond Elementary School	286.57
21	Fox Chapel Elementary School	278.71
22	Stephen Knolls School	276.56
23	East Silver Spring Elementary School	276.41
24	JoAnn Leleck Elementary School at Broad Acres	275.88
25	Woodlin Elementary School	273.72
26	Germantown Elementary School	272.61
27	Fallsmead Elementary School	267.41
28	Watkins Mill Elementary School	266.33
29	Fields Road Elementary School	257.61
30	Stedwick Elementary School	249.55
31	Cloverly Elementary School	244.31
32	Darnestown Elementary School	241.67
33	Washington Grove Elementary School	227.68
34	Bradley Hills Elementary School	212.04
35	Sherwood Elementary School	210.92

Rank**	Secondary Schools	Total FACT Score Maximum Score = 600
1	Blair G. Ewing Center	380.99
2	Banneker Middle School	341.88
3	Argyle Middle School	322.24
4	Newport Mill Middle School	315.72
5	Ridgeview Middle School	309.03
6	Silver Spring Intl. Middle School	301.37
7	Neelsville Middle School	291.74
8	Baker Middle School	279.58
9	Frost Middle School	255.22
10	Loiederman Middle School	254.66
11	Redland Middle School	245.35
12	North Bethesda Middle School	240.74

* FACT refers to the Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing methodology for evaluating and scoring the condition of schools. The higher the FACT score the worse the condition of a facility. These assessments were completed during the 2010–2011 school year.

**Based on the Montgomery County Council Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) study released in July 2015, regarding the revitalization/expansion program and the FACT methodology used to rank schools, MCPS will reconvene the FACT review Committee to update the FACT methodology and revitalization/expansion program process. The rank for these schools may change pending the outcome of the review.

Appendix V

FKB

POLICY

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Related Entries: FAA, FAA-RA
Responsible Office: Chief Operating Officer
Facilities Management

Sustaining and Modernizing Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Facilities

A. PURPOSE

To affirm the Board of Education's (Board) commitment to maintain all school facilities in conditions that maximize learning opportunities for every student in the county. Sustaining Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) facilities is accomplished by pursuing systematic maintenance programs that renew facilities on a life cycle replacement basis. Modernizing MCPS facilities is accomplished by pursuing the systematic assessment of older facilities that have reached the end of their useful lifecycle, and placing these schools in a queue for modernization based on their relative condition.

To establish a systematic approach for replacement of building systems and facilities for MCPS. The approach is intended to address changing educational program standards and aging of building systems at reasonable cost while providing appropriate spaces for educational programs and services and maintaining a safe, secure, and healthy physical environment for students and staff.

Many schools were built in the decades between 1950 and 1980. Since that time many code requirements have changed and construction methods have been improved, resulting in facilities that are capable of being sustained in good condition over a longer period of time than was the case with older school facilities. A rigorous maintenance program for well-built schools is critical to ensuring that the substantial taxpayer investment in school infrastructure is preserved. This policy recognizes that maintenance and systemic replacement activities need to serve as the primary means for keeping all schools in good condition over the extended life of a facility. At the same time, the policy recognizes that at some point the useful life-cycle of a facility has been reached and major modernization is necessary.

B. ISSUE

School facilities, building systems, and equipment all require various and continuing levels of attention to achieve their expected life-cycle. MCPS views facility maintenance as being on a continuum ranging from routine repairs to replacement of building systems to complete modernization of facilities.

The Board of Education (Board) should determine when funds will be spent on school facilities:

- a) To sustain facilities through routine maintenance of building systems.
- b) To replace building systems on a systematic schedule based on the anticipated life-cycle of these systems.
- c) To modernize facilities in accordance with an established queue when overall physical limitations of the facility can no longer support the educational program or comply with applicable building codes and regulations.

C. POSITION

The pursuit of the systematic life-cycle replacement of building systems and facilities will:

1. Enable school facilities to remain in good condition for a long period of time through the coordinated scheduling of building system repairs and replacements. These activities are based on routine maintenance protocols and anticipated life expectancies of various building systems. Examples of the buildings systems that lend themselves to replacement include heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) and mechanical systems, roofs, restrooms, information technology systems, safe access to schools, and school security systems. In addition numerous other building systems, covered under the Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) and Building Modifications with Program Improvements (BMPI) capital programs, lend themselves to replacement.
2. Allow the Board to dedicate appropriate levels of funding for systemic projects that ensure all MCPS facilities stay in good condition.
3. Allow the Board to dedicate appropriate levels of funding to complete modernization of school facilities on an established queue when overall physical limitations of the facility can no longer support the educational program or current building codes.

4. Determine when a facility needs to be modernized based on the ability of systemic projects to sustain the facility in good condition. If it is determined that systemic maintenance is no longer viable for a school, then it will be added to the next group of schools to be assessed for modernization using the Facilities Assessment with Criteria and Testing methodology.
5. Maintain all school facilities at consistently high operational levels and maximize the life-span of existing physical plant asset.

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

In order to support its educational programs, MCPS will sustain the life of MCPS facilities through a balanced approach of maintaining and replacing building systems, while also providing for modernization or replacement of facilities when physical limitations of a facility can no longer support the educational program. MCPS will provide sufficient holding facilities so as to allow modernization of facilities to be scheduled.

E. REVIEW AND REPORTING

The *Educational Facilities Master Plan* will constitute the official reporting on the annual funding of systematic life-cycle replacement of building systems and facilities. This document will reflect facilities actions taken by the Board, and funds approved by the County Council for systemic capital projects needed to sustain schools in good condition.

This policy will be reviewed in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Policy History: Adopted by Resolution No. 835-91, October 8, 1991; amended by Resolution No. 571-10, December 7, 2010.

MEMORANDUM

January 4, 2016

To: Essie McGuire
Keith Levchenko
Council Staff

From: Aron Trombka *AT*
Stephanie Bryant *SB*
Office of Legislative Oversight

Subject: Elementary Schools at the Top of the Revitalization/Expansion Queue

This memo responds to your request for an analysis of how changes in the calculation of the 2011 FACT assessments would affect the elementary schools at the top of the MCPS Revitalization/Expansion program queue.

As shown in Appendix E of the Superintendent's Recommended FY17-22 Capital Improvements Program, four elementary schools (Cold Spring, DuFief, Belmont, and Stonegate) are currently scheduled for Revitalization/Expansion completion by August 2021. These four schools received the highest scores in the 2011 FACT assessments. Appendix E shows no other elementary schools (assessed in 2011) have a scheduled completion date within the six-year time frame of the FY17-22 CIP.

Although our report raised questions about the methodology and calculations used to determine the FACT scores, we believe correcting these concerns would not affect the placement of the top four elementary schools in the queue. We come to this conclusions based on the following two observations.

1. Nearly all of the methodological and mathematical questions raised in our report concern the 300 points assigned to the Physical Infrastructure parameters; we found no major problems in the scoring of the 300 points assigned to the Educational Program parameters. Moreover, unlike the Physical Infrastructure parameters, the Educational Program parameters assessed building elements that are mostly permanent conditions. When the 2011 FACT scores are sorted by the Educational Program parameters exclusively, the top four schools remain unchanged. Beginning with the fifth school in the current queue, sorting by Educational Program parameters exclusively would result in a re-ordering of the schools.

2. We re-calculated the 2011 FACT scoring by making several adjustments to address many of the concerns raised in our report. Specifically, we re-calculated scores to:
 - eliminate double counting of the Administrative parameter;
 - correct errors in building square footage;
 - remove the FY09 maintenance cost outlier for Summit Hall ES (by assuming FY10 costs for FY09);
 - correct the formula for calculating water consumption per square foot; and
 - remove the effect of the Piney Branch ES swimming pool on water consumption rates (by assuming the average water consumption rate for Piney Branch).

After making the above adjustments, the four top-scoring (as measured by the combined Educational Program and Physical Infrastructure scores) schools remained unchanged. However, the ordering of the schools did change beginning with the fifth school in the current queue.

In summary, while addressing the methodological and mathematical raised in our report would result in re-ordering of many schools in the Revitalization/Expansion queue, this effort likely would have no effect on the top four schools in the queue. Please note, however, that this analysis does not take into account any building improvements that may have been undertaken since 2011.