

ANC 3E Special Committee
June 8, 2007

Attendees:

Anne Sullivan, ANC 3E05
Carolyn Sherman, ANC 3E03
Dan Carozza, Community Member
Marvin Tievsky, Friendship/Tenleytown Citizens' Association
Armond Spikell and **Susan Linsky** Roadside Development, LLC
Kristen Barden, Executive Office of the Mayor
Susan Banta, Chief of Staff, CM Cheh's Office
Cathy Wiss, ANC 3F Chairperson
Cheryl Browning, Tenleytown Neighborhood Association
Jane Waldmann, CSTO
Gina Mirigliano, Friendship Neighborhood Association
Frances Anderson, St. Ann's Parish Council
John F. Ritchotte, St. Ann's parish
Scott Cartland, Principal of Janney
Sekou Biddle, DCPS Board of Education
Kimberly C. Driggins, Director, DCPS Office of Strategic Funding Opportunities,
Robin O'Hara, DCPS Office of Facilities Management
Amy McVey, ANC 3E01
Talia Primor, ANC 3E02
Sue Hemberger, Community Member
Nancy MacWood, ANC 3C Chairperson
Allison Feeney, Ward 3 Vision
Deacon Whitaker, St. Ann's Rectory,
Sherry Ettleson, Janney School

The minutes of the meeting are described in length in this document. Main points of the meeting are as follows:

- The main Janney School building has a capacity of 364, but the actual school population is 485 (with portable classrooms on site), with a maximum expected enrollment of 550 in the future.
- The current Master Facilities Plan (MFP) recommends well over \$20 million for Janney in the Capital Improvement Plan to begin construction in 2013 (with a feasibility study beginning in 2011).
- The current MFP recommendations call for around 40,000 additional square feet of building space, while the Roadside Development proposal adds only 13,000 square feet to the site.
- Any revenue from the Roadside Proposal would not be added to the amount that DCPS will appropriate for Janney's modernization; in fact, it would be subtracted from DCPS's appropriation. DCPS budgets a maximum allowable amount of money that can be spent on each project. Additional sources of revenue would not change that amount.
- The public/private/partnership would not mean that DCPS would release the Capital Improvement Plan funds any earlier than scheduled. The school would

not move up in the modernization schedule unless a ppp would cover the entire amount needed for the maximum allowable amount of money.

- \$500,000 in “blitz” repairs is scheduled to be released to Janney School this summer.

Detailed Minutes:

The meeting was opened and Scott Cartland, Principal of Janney Elementary briefly described his growing interest in the Roadside Development concept of a public/private/partnership to build a residential unit partly on library property and partly on school property to earn revenue for both entities. He mentioned that some library people, school people and Victor Reinoso (who was then a DCPS Board of Education member) had been involved in discussions regarding the proposal. Mr. Cartland believes that the proposal has merit and should be seriously considered.

Robin O’Hara, from the DCPS Office of Facilities Management spoke about the Master Facilities Plan that was adopted on January 14, 2007. Janney School is in Area G, and the proposed boundaries for Janney, Wilson High School and Deal Junior High School are on-line. Potential changes to the Wilson and Deal boundaries are more substantial than those to Janney School as the intent is to have whole elementary schools feed into a middle school, and whole middle schools to feed into a high school. Currently Alice Deal JHS feeds into a variety of high schools. There will be community meetings regarding school boundary changes, but because of the possible change in governance structure for DCPS, this is a transitional time. It may be necessary for a directive for some of the boundary changes.

Ms. O’Hara then discussed demographics and future projections for the Janney School population. Generally, preliminary projections of enrollment, the history of enrollments grade by grade are taken into account over a 3 to 5 year period, as well as special programs such as Pre-Kindergarten and special education and out of boundary enrollment. If a school has already reached capacity, the Office of Facilities Management will not recommend taking in more out of boundary students. Non-senior citizen new housing developments and projected housing developments of more than studio and one-bedroom units have a “capture” rate of 40 DCPS children per 100 homes.

The demographics discussion turned to a possible closing of Hearst Elementary School, which was recommended by the Board of Education but is not definite due to the expected change in school governance. John Eaton Elementary and Janney Elementary Schools would need to be modernized to be ready to absorb the students from Hearst. A minimum number of students necessary to fully fund an elementary school is said to be 330. The projected maximum number of students for the Janney Elementary site is 550, and Ms. O’Hara said over 600 would not be acceptable. There are new DC guidelines for new school projects in terms of design specifications for the school facilities, and Ms. O’Hara has the relevant information available on a CD.

There are general educational specifications for schools, and a site specific plan is developed during a “feasibility stage” prior to modernization/construction. For an existing building, you have to live with some of what you have and make adjustments to the specifications, but new construction will follow the new guidelines. Code requirements (versus design standards) call for 35 square feet per student in the classroom, and design standards ask for 75 square feet of outside space per student and overall (inside the building) 150 square feet per student. There are additional codes for the number of bathrooms, Americans with Disabilities Act adjustments, kitchens, fire codes and other components of the school. There is an “amenities ranking” for the schools. These rankings were based on a walk-through of every school building, and the architects have put together a Facilities Condition Index. Ms. O’Hara will get back to the committee with details of what comprises the amenities ranking.

Currently there is a ten-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) adopted by the Board of Education in January, but the City Council has indicated it prefers a 15 year plan because the cost of speeding up the MFP would be about ½ billion dollars. It is unclear if that 15 year plan would change the start date of feasibility study and construction for Janney.

The maximum allowable cost for Janney’s modernization could not be raised higher by entering into a ppp. DCPS subtracts its own funds when it adds private funds.

The availability of private funds doesn’t speed up allocation of public funds. The relevant code provision is 3514, and it is currently being redrafted. While the general principle will remain, minor adjustments are being made to strengthen the provision.

A representative from St. Ann’s noted that the Archdiocese of Washington educates many poor and affluent children and that the parochial schools need to be taken into consideration when “capturing” data from new residential units. The representative also noted that the public owns the land, not the School Improvement Team, and if a ppp does go forward, there will be pressure for a competitive process as this concerns public land. Additionally, he advised the school and Roadside to proceed under the assumption that they would not be granted an easement from the Archdiocese of Washington for a driveway for the project that would pass close by where St. Ann’s school children enter and exit their school building.

Ms. Driggins hastened to explain that this ppp is simply a conversation that the community is now engaged in, and that no proposal has been received yet, nor has DCPS taken a position on the ppp. In response to questions, Ms. Driggins said that the standard for sole-source involves a demonstration of uniqueness -- the fact that a decision was urgent or that a proposal was a good one wasn't sufficient to justify sole-source contracting. Nothing she had heard thus far led her to believe that a sole-source contract made sense for this project. In her experience, a sole source is an option, but many hurdles exist for that situation.

Ms. Banta noted that the competitive bidding process was a valid concern and confirmed the analysis of when sole-source contracting could be used. She stated that there was a need to establish timelines for all the “moving pieces” of the proposal.

Dan Carozza, who, as a parent, worked on the School Without Walls (SWW) ppp was asked to describe that experience. Dan pointed out that Susan Linsky had shared it and should chime in. The SWW-GWU (George Washington University) partnership permitted a "favored partner" contract for a couple of reasons: SWW and GWU had a decades-long and ongoing educational relationship, and the SWW campus is an island in the midst of GW's campus. The land (parking lot) involved in the deal was deemed to be not developable by any other entity.

SWW and GWU's educational partnership allowed SWW to be modernized in ways that deviated somewhat from DCPS's design guidelines for high schools. In addition to teacher training, scholarships, counseling, mentoring, and access to classes, GWU provides SWW with access to the food court, gym, library, and computing facilities. SWW provides GWU access to its classrooms after DCPS school hours. The ability to outsource some of these functions is what made it possible for SWW to deviate from the educational design guidance and tailor the educational specifications to SWW's needs.

Ms. O'Hara spoke from the perspective of an urban planner in regard to the site. Each site needs to be evaluated according to the topography and the community in which it is located. In an urban environment, there is a need to build up instead of out, and one way to get more program space is to sink the gym partially underground and consider other design ideas.

Ms. O'Hara pointed out that the Oyster Bilingual School got rid of ½ of their land in exchange for facilities. A bad outcome is that the playground is too small and is artificial turf. Ms. O'Hara has given some thought to different scenarios regarding the Janney School site.

Jack Ritchotte brought up the question of Metro rail capacity and traffic from residents, fire and EMS vehicles, trash trucks, visitors, loading trucks, delivery trucks, repair people, etc. and asked Roadside Development to discuss traffic concerns from a broader perspective when continuing to pursue this proposal.

Jane Morrissey, DCPS Office of Facilities Management, sent an e-mail to the ANC 3E Special Committee in response to a publicized \$500,000 amount of “blitz” money that will be awarded to Janney School. She said that the Janney blitz walk-through is scheduled for 6/13/07, bids are due on 6/20/07 and work will begin on 7/1/07. The Scope of Work for the repairs is based on the deferred work orders that are currently in the tracking system, and all the repairs that are identified during the walk-through. The principal, building engineer, building custodian usually attend the walk-through and point out, room by room, all the work that needs to be done. Once the bids come in, if the proposal exceeds the budget, the principal will work with Ms. Morrissey's project

manager to prioritize the items to be completed under this program. Mr. Cartland said that the blitz money most likely will go to repairing the roof, doors, outdoor security lights, repairs for the demountables among other things. The blitz money is separate from the new demountable units that will be installed this summer. Although the blitz money will not be spent to provide an electrical upgrade to the school, there will be electrical work associated with the new demountables. Electricians will either tap directly into the street for electricity for the demountables or will “heavy up” the main school building’s supply.

Mr. Cartland also talked about the federal award to Janney School for the third year in a row under the testing guidelines of the “No Child Left Behind” Act. Janney achieved the rating of a Tier 1 school, and at \$201 per student, this will result in approximately \$97,000 to the school. There are guidelines for spending the money, one of which is to use part of the award to model effective teaching programs.