

Downcounty Consortium Elementary School Site Selection Advisory Committee
Meeting #1 Summary
45 West Gude Drive
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Opening of Meeting

Site Selection Advisory Committee (SSAC) representatives and alternates were greeted and asked to check in. Fifty-three representatives were identified to participate on the SSAC of which thirty-three responded they would attend. Present at the meeting were 18 representatives (or a designated alternate if the representative was not in attendance.) The SSAC was held in the lower level café.

Mr. Peter Geiling, team leader, Real Estate Management, Department of Facilities Management, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) facilitated the meeting. Mr. Geiling had all members of the SSAC introduce themselves and state their affiliation. Mr. Geiling then presented the agenda and provided ground rules for the process. Mr. Geiling then began a presentation of the concerning the role of the committee and the process including:

- A description of the site selection criteria that will be used to evaluate sites;
- A description of activities for each meeting;
- A description of the process that leads up to Board of Education action on a site;

Mr. Geiling stated that the Site Selection Advisory Committee is not a decision making body. The SSAC is an advisory committee, providing input to Dr. Smith, superintendent of schools, so that Dr. Smith can make an informed recommendation to the Board of Education in February 2018. Geiling also indicated that the SSAC report may include minority reports by any representative of the committee if they either disagree with the recommendations of the SSAC or if they wish to include information that they do not believe is adequately covered in the SSAC report. The SSAC report, along with any minority reports, will be transmitted to the superintendent of schools and to the Board of Education at the conclusion of the SSAC process.

Mr. Geiling introduced Ms. Corrine Blackford, planner, Division of Capital Planning, Department of Facilities Management, Montgomery County Public Schools. Ms. Blackford reviewed the school capacity data for the Downcounty Consortium. Ms. Blackford explained how the projections for each school and how the total capacity numbers reflect a possible need for a new school in the Downcounty Consortium. Ms. Blackford explained the capacity numbers did not account for portable classrooms as these are considered temporary. Ms. Blackford told the committee the capacity data was available on the MCPS Capital Planning webpage. Committee members requested a map showing the areas most affected would be in the future. Ms. Blackford indicated a “heat” map could be provided to the committee.

Mr. Geiling introduced Mr. Seth Adams, director, Division of Construction, Montgomery County Public Schools. Mr. Adams explained five addition projects currently planned in the Capital Improvement Budget. He explained the Board would make a decision in the spring concerning construction of a new school, addition projects, or a combination of both.

Mr. Adams reviewed the optimal criteria for construction an elementary school. However, Mr. Adams indicated in many circumstances the optimal criteria cannot be meet, especially in urban areas. He discussed the need to construct multi-level buildings, sharing of park sites, and other innovative solutions to meet the programmatic needs on a small site. Mr. Adams also discussed the timeline for constructing a new elementary school and the additional time required for site acquisition if a private site is selected.

Presentation of Candidate Sites

Mr. Geiling continued the Power Point presentation explaining the selection process and criteria for site selection. The majority of the presentation consisted of aerial maps of each candidate site, with the characteristics of each site in terms of owner, location, size, access, topography, current use, and any additional relevant comments. Ms. Geiling reviewed nine (9) publicly-owned candidate sites and one privately owned site. During the presentation, committee members were encouraged to ask questions and provide comment on each site. One of the committee members asked if there was a standard distance between elementary schools. Mr. Adams replied there was not any rule of thumb distance. Mr. Geiling also encouraged the committee members to email any additional questions members may have between meetings.

Following the presentation of the information by Mr. Geiling, Mr. Adams, and Ms. Blackford, the committee members discussed the pros and cons of each site. Mr. Geiling systematically asked the SSAC members to offer either a pro or a con for the site under review. The process continued until no one had any further comments to offer. The pros and cons were recorded by Mr. Geiling and will be presented at the next meeting for committee review.

At the end of the meeting Mr. Geiling reviewed the actions in preparation of the next meeting which included the following:

- 1) Provide “heat” maps showing where the capacity is projected to be most dense.
- 2) Create a spreadsheet with all the properties and basic information.
- 3) Create a pros and cons spreadsheet for each site.
- 4) Distribute concepts for four sites to the committee members.
- 5) Draft meeting summary for committee review.
- 6) Post website link to committee information.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.