

MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board Burkholder Administrative Center

Work Session No. 22/**Facilities and Operations**

November 7, 2005

MEETING OPENING

22.01 Call to Order and Announcements

Facilities and Operations Committee Chairman Brad Center convened the meeting in public session at 2:30 p.m. with the following Board members present:

Catherine Belter (Springfield)	Phil Niedzielski-Eichner (Providence)
Brad Center (Lee)	Janet Oleszek (At Large)
Stuart Gibson (Hunter Mill)	Kathy Smith (Sully)
Stephen Hunt (At Large)	Dan Storck (Mount Vernon)
Kaye Kory (Mason)	Jane Strauss (Dranesville ABSENT)
Ilryong Moon (At Large)	Tessie Wilson (Braddock)

Also present were Division Superintendent Jack Dale; Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger; Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Pam Goddard; Deputy Executive Assistant, Linda Sabo; Administrative Assistants Kathy Partlow and Darlene Chamberlain; Assistant Superintendent for Facilities and Transportation Services Dean Tistadt; Office of Transportation Director, Linda Farbry; Transportation Planner Tom Italiano; Facilities Planning Services Director Gary Chevalier; Design and Construction Services Director Lewis Rauch; Management Partnership Services (MPS) Consultants Tom Platt and Andy Forsyth; and certain other individuals. Student Representative to the Board Samantha Kunkle was absent.

DISCUSSION

22.02 Transportation Consultant Update (Exhibit A)

- MPS consultants presented the preliminary report of their transportation study analysis and resource implications for Fairfax County Public Schools transportation system with high school start times moved back and the existing three bell schedule maintained;
- key indicator was the annual transportation cost per student which was derived using all operational costs to transport students under the current system and was compared to national benchmarks; of note to FCPS, personnel costs accounted for 40+% of total; a secondary measure was used to evaluate performance of the current system and included average number of buses per 100 students transported, percent of planned bus capacity being utilized, and daily runs divided by total buses;
- the report numbers differed from prior information distributed by MPS to the Board, as the new figures included updated data adjusted for inflation;
- MPS stated a three-tier system was most efficient for transportation but was unrealistic for Fairfax County; FCPS transportation model had evolved in response to individual needs and situations, and had resulted in a rolling bell schedule;
- MPS analyzed six existing pyramids under a later high school start time, summarized the impact and presented findings to the Advisory Committee, concluding it was not

- the pyramid construct that was driving the results, but the non-uniform length of the instructional day across school levels;
- FCPS transportation problems occurred in the afternoon runs because the time window was compressed (as compared to the morning runs) and buffers between runs were eliminated;
 - FCPS current transportation system was at capacity and approaching the breaking point; changes must be made if only to maintain the status quo, with the current service delivery negatively impacted;
 - as more school programs were added such as elementary after-school tutoring for No Child Left Behind, transportation cannot meet the demands;
 - any future scenarios to revise the transportation system must address difficult issues such as historic boundaries, newly developed areas, contiguous schools with overlapping attendance areas, length of instructional day, fully staffing the driver work force, and right to ride for special programs and magnet schools; and
 - transportation was the only major business function that had not received an overhaul in the past 15 years; School Board reached a consensus to move forward, but no consensus on the scope of the next phase.

22.03 Capital Improvement Program Development Methodology (Exhibit B)

- Comments about the process of identifying capacity enhancements to schools included membership projections, construction site visits, membership and growth tracking, capacity updates, and comparison of capacity versus enrollment;
- question on the variance over the past few years of out-in migration patterns and whether changes were being made to get a better handle on the numbers; response that growth numbers from single family homes were predictable but numbers from high density, transient housing was not predictable; question whether there was a model for the current methodology; response that the county averages predicted a single family home, condo, townhome, or apartment would produce X number of kids; staff looked at what was unique to each school to build projections; capacity number was based on programs in each school;
- question about the life cycle of renovation; response was a 25-year life cycle; reviews were conducted in 1987 by Fairfax Architects and in 1999 by Peck and Peck to evaluate structures and determine a scope of work and the queue, putting safety at the top of the list;
- question whether there was a more efficient way to evaluate conditions of buildings; response that Facilities Management was working on a database for projections about the condition of each building;
- concern about construction cost increases and that historical projected increase costs of 4.5 percent were inadequate; concern that there were no competitive bids for projects due to the current cost of fuel and steel being shipped overseas; there was no historical reference for projections with escalation increases now at 13 to 14 percent;
- question whether any school had degraded more than another so that it should be moved up in the queue; negative response;

- recommendation for additional funding in the CIP for major maintenance needs such as roofing and replacement of air conditioners, a shorter queue list, start of special needs programs, and smaller school additions with the use of modulars if necessary;
- question about providing a five-year look at projections on a school-by-school basis; response that data was available and projections were made at the beginning of the five-year plan cycle; recommendation to consider using an outside consultant to compile data to save staff time and give an independent look at the numbers;
- comment about conducting a boundary study in the South County area instead of building a new middle school since two adjacent schools had available capacity; and
- summary of recommendations included: continue use of outside studies to determine priorities for renovation projects; limit the scope of the study to establish a queue no greater than three to four years; program needs for instructional programs, including alternative and special education, into the CIP; evaluate capacity numbers in the current CIP to determine appropriateness of requirements; consider boundary adjustments to meet capacity needs and to take advantage of available capacity in adjacent schools; and augment funding in the CIP for major maintenance items putting safety first.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.