

2023-2032 CIP - FAC/JFAC Discussion

Opening Acknowledgements:

1. Mission/Vision/Charge

- JFAC mission that includes review of CIP (Stacy)
- FAC charge that includes review of CIP (Rosa)

2. Recognize increased collaboration between County and Schools, and any room for improvement.

- What successes have we seen with increased collaboration between APS and Arlington County?
 - Incorporation of ACHS into Pentagon City (Amazon HQ).
 - Pentagon City Long-Term plan with potential site for an elementary school.
 - Langston Blvd long-term planning that will include school.
 - Overall, an increase in communication and collaboration about planning and construction that impact seats for students.
- Are there areas for increased collaboration and improvement?
 - Joint use and co-location of public facilities. (Use of tools such as land swaps.)
 - How to recognize unique use and site requirements of schools and align and reconcile use permit process? (i.e., Heights Phase 2 proposal for accessible entrance and parking under field.)
 - How to improve communications to impacted neighbors when land use decisions are made (either permanent or temporary) by the County?

Background for CIP Discussion:

Enrollment projection have fluctuated over the past few years due to many factors. Over the past decade, we have seen period of consistent and rapid growth followed by enrollment leveling during pandemic and reduced birth rates show drop-off of enrollment in future. APS and the County have worked closely on projections, and the data included from County planning (i.e., new housing units) have improved long-term projects, but the next few years are difficult to predict.

CIP includes the following:

- Previous projects (Career Center, HVAC upgrades, roof replacements, kitchen modernizations, and security entry vestibules, The Heights parking and accessible entrance).
- New projects (IT modernization, lock and key unification, and PA system modernizations).
- Incorporation of planning studies (long-term renovation planning data collection and Career Center campus use).
 - CIP includes \$320M "Additional Bonding Capacity" spread across FY 2027-2032 that could be used toward construction of those initiatives but does not have placeholder or funds set aside. How should APS balance ability to put in a placeholder for a future project versus not actually knowing the funds associated with it as well as the perceived commitment to the Community once a placeholder is created?

- Timeline of Career Center and future projects.
- Recommendation by Superintendent that Career Center proceeds with full ed specs (i.e., larger building) and therefore campus use would have two buildings/two programs (i.e. demo existing MPSA building).

Discussion Questions:

- Feedback on what is in the APS CIP:
 - Does the proposed CIP present a clear and transparent picture to the public of the APS facilities planning and construction projects over the next decade?
 - How is APS balancing current building improvements with likely construction at some of those same buildings? (Concern raised that modernization of buildings currently listed on CIP would occur prior to renovation of same building. (i.e., Is replacement of Randolph's roof at odds with recommendations for rebuild/expansion?))
- Feedback on what is missing from CIP:
 - What are the next steps and costs for the completion of the Career Center site? How is the Board committing to funding completion of campus in this CIP? Next project may be demolishing and moving MPSA, even though not called out as a project and no placeholder provided. Possible placeholders:
 - Cost of building maintenance if legacy Career Center Building sits unused.
 - Refurbishment to make building appropriate for other use.
 - MPSA? Pre-K through 8th grade program?
 - Expansion of field space.
 - Would it be useful for APS to conduct a study on the need for Swing Space and Decommissioning planning?
 - Is there a clear commitment in this CIP for eventual construction of Long-Term Renovations?
 - Do the expenditures in this CIP reduce the number of relocatable classrooms in use?
 - What is the potential use of the \$320M "Additional Bonding Capacity".
 - Does APS intend to maximize bonding capacity each year, even though projects are not currently included in the CIP?
 - Would it be advisable for APS to have placeholders in the interest of transparency, even if final costs are not yet known?
 - Is this CIP clear about including cost escalation and inflation in the amounts shown?
- Do FAC and JFAC members have feedback on the Career Center site, including the recommendation by the Superintendent that Career Center proceed with full ed specs (i.e., larger building)?
 - Dr. Kanninen has asked for recommended language for Board direction concerning the additional bond capacity in the out years of the CIP in relation to the Career Center site. What would the FAC and JFAC recommend the School Board include in such direction?
- Has APS addressed in this CIP community concerns about the following?
 - Structured parking.
 - Long-term planning for site prior to proceeding with Career Center concept design (past/approved) and schematic design (upcoming).
 - Ultimate use of the site clear to the community, especially in terms of limits on site use: # students vs. # programs vs. # buildings.

- Max 2500 students - promised to community.
 - 2 vs 3 programs - 2 programs suggested to community (traffic planning).
 - 2 vs 3 buildings - 2 buildings implied as final site use.
- General Feedback:
 - Has holistic planning been done and is it reflected in the CIP?
 - Do current planning practices ensure that data-driven decisions are made?
 - Is equity part of the conversation at all levels of planning for construction, building, and schools or other public facility improvements?
 - Do APS and the County make a convincing business case for expenditures? How does the CIP impact mission/vision and strategic plan?
 - How is value measured and communicated? Does each project define clear goals and identify and include a measure of results?