

## SCHOOL BOARD SWING SPACE QUESTIONS

APRIL 4, 2019

### QUESTION LIST

Questions from School board members sent to staff .....1

**Question 1:** At the last PH Advisory Committee meeting on March 25, 2019, Mr. David Banks indicated that Douglas MacArthur did not have enough land to sustain portable classrooms for all students during a construction period. He further explained that the amount of land needed for portables to house roughly 700 students and 80 faculty/staff would be approximate to the amount of land needed to build a permanent swing space building. Can you provide a rough idea of the numbers to explain this conclusion (i.e. square footage requirements, #of pupils allowed per portable, land requirements, etc.)? .....1

**Question 2:** In the Brailsford & Dunlavey white paper (dated March 26, 2019), there is a brief summary of the potential costs of a long-term suspension of construction activities (3-5 years) at PH, which includes storage for items that have been bought but not installed. What items does this include? Could the stored materials possibly need to be repurchased in 2023? .....1

**Question 3:** This has been addressed in a variety of ways at the community listening sessions, but I'm hoping for further detail if permitted to be shared. To what degree have we explored retrofitting another office building to be used as swing space? Were there any other feasible options discovered during the Ferdinand T. Day development phase? .....1

**Question 4:** What spaces are intended to act as evacuation sites or safe gathering spaces in the PH swing space concept plan? Have these been identified yet? .....2

**Question 5:** According to the proposed timeline, the old PH school would not be in use from June 2019-September 2020. What if additional issues pop up in this interim period that were not accounted for in the existing feasibility study? Was this factored into the 15% contingency funding set aside in the \$5.9M estimated renovation costs? .....2

**Question 6:** What commitments (verbal or otherwise) from the city, if any, have been made to address the transportation and safety concerns in the surrounding neighborhoods of PH? .....2

**Question 7:** How would moving up the design and build of MacArthur affect the schedule of the design and build of a high school building on the Minnie Howard site? Would the new high school building open in the fall of 2023 as currently scheduled in our CIP? .....3

**Question 8:** The Potomac Energy Group (PEG) in their MEP Systems Evaluation of Patrick Henry school recommends installment of a sprinkler system if we renovate PH for swing space. As I read the reports by C & D and B & D, I get the impression we will seek a waiver to the code requirement of a sprinkler system because it is a new requirement (2015) and PH is a renovation and not a new school. Given the findings and recommendations of the PEG report, shouldn't a sprinkler system be installed for safety of the children regardless of whether the code applies? .....3

**Question 9:** On the first page of the draft cost estimates by B& D, under "Acoustical Ceiling Grid" there is a note inserted by C & D that says " considerations of asbestos ceiling above ACT (Acoustical Ceiling Tile)." If there did turn out to be asbestos in the ceiling above the tile, how much more time and money would it take to replace all of the tile in order to install a sprinkler system? The estimate now is \$389,250 (which may be a bit high according to the table). But I assume this doesn't include money and time for asbestos abatement , or does it? I wasn't sure about the significance of the note .....3

**Question 10:** This is kind of a picky question but could have consequences for costs-- In the draft cost table B & D suggests we assume that 25% of the light fixtures at PH would be replaced. The PEG report says all of the lights need to be "re-lamped". Is re-lamping different from re-placing? On the same table, B & D says to assume 28 RTUs will be repaired or replaced at the old PH. But the PEG reports says there are a total of 21 RTUs at PH. Given a price of \$65 - 85k/unit, we could be charged as much as \$595,000. to replace 7 units that don't exist. I guess my question is, does PH have 21 or 28 RTUs-- all of which are in need of servicing and some of replacement?.....4

**Question 11:** One of the concerns is the discussion/planning around narrowing seminary road to two lanes. If the school board moves to approve Patrick Henry as swing space for Douglas MacArthur, will the city temporarily put off any plans around this project for the duration of the occupancy of the old Patrick Henry Building? .....4

**Question 12:** Based on my initial observations we would need to commit to following traffic and safety supports for approximately one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon, including: Police Presence and or Traffic direction (at Taney and Latham, Polk and Latham, Taney and North Jordan). Additional crossing guards (at least one at Taney and Latham (unless there is a crossing guard) and one at Taney and North Jordan). Parking enforcement on Taney (towing cars that are parked along Taney in front of the old building during allotted time windows). Has the city committed to implementing and maintaining these services for the duration of occupancy? .....4

**Question 13:** Why do we not have safety patrols at all of our elementary schools? This discussion seems to highlight a need in this area. Safety patrols can work in conjunction with crossing guards to help pedestrians navigate safely before and after school. This also builds citizenship and community and provides another avenue of continuity and sustainability in terms of how we provide safety for our students. Can we consider a full implementation of the safety patrol program to be implemented in 2020? Having this temporary Quasi Campus Model would seem to make this even more beneficial.....5

**Question 14:** The voices of the teachers and staff involved in this have not been very clear to me. Though I have been able to speak to a few of the teachers, admin, and staff who are outside during the arrival and dismissal process at PH, I do not have a sense of the overall voices or concerns of the staff impacted. Is it possible to get a quick anonymous survey out to staff so that the board can capture a true glimpse of their concerns around the issue. In particular, it feels as though the voices of teachers and staff have been co-opted by members of the community. I think it is important for the board to hear directly from as many teachers and staff as possible. I am thinking that an anonymous survey will allow or us to get the most honest perspective possible. ....5

**Question 15:** What, if any, impact will using PH as swing space and accelerating MacArthur rebuild have on high school expansion project? .....6

**Question 16:** How will outdoor activities be altered for both elementary and middle school students at PH (and MacArthur)? .....6

**Question 17:** Are there plans to add features to the bus loop blacktop that would better accommodate recreational needs, e.g., basketball hoops, games painted on the blacktop? How often do vehicles other than school buses enter this area? .....6

**Question 18:** Will traffic study be conducted as part of the DSUP process? .....7

**Question 19:** I think you should cover the DSUP timeline and the general components of such an application so that the public understands we know w still have lots of work to do. Also, somehow incorporate that the 4-year stipulation is from the City. In other words, what guarantee does the community have that the swing space will be discontinued after MacArthur is rebuilt? .....7

**Question 20:** What, if any, types of sites are we currently looking for in our real estate search, e.g., are we currently searching for sites suitable for elementary and high school swing space? .....7

**Question 21:** If we found a site for swing space today what is the best case scenario for how soon it would be ready for use as swing space? What is the range of time required based on type of site found? .....8

**Question 22:** Are there any historical preservation considerations related to the George Mason rebuild? .....8

**Question 23:** Since we have recognized safety issues with the current school configuration, what steps will be taken immediately and as the project progresses to increase the safety around the school site for walkers, drivers and others? .....8

**Question 24:** Will impact to Polk school community traffic patterns be studied as well? .....8

**Question 25:** Can you walk us through how the site will change over the course of use as swing space? In other words how will the remaining construction be phased? Will the outside playgrounds, parking be completed before work starts on the inside of the building? When will the grounds be completed for use as swing space and when will inside construction be completed? I would love for the public to understand as easily as possible when the site will look somewhat normal before and after its use as swing space. ....9

**Question 26:** When would MacArthur students start and stop using the PH swing space? It’s in the written materials but it would be good to state it. There has been some confusion so it would be good to publicly state this again.....9

**Question 27:** What are the future decision points are related to this project including what happens with the disposition of the current contract? .....9

**Question 28:** A major rationale for using the old PH building as swing space for DM is that, we are told, no other space can be located in the city. Can you review the steps ACPS has taken to identify swing space and the results of that search? If possible, can you discuss sites that members of the community frequently reference, such as Landmark Mall, the Victory Center, Potomac Yard, Chinguapin, NOVA’s Alexandria campus, as well as the use of portables? What will happen with the DM rebuild if we reject PH as a swing space?.....10

**Question 29:** It’s been stated that the old PH building is in better shape than DM, which leads me to question why DM wasn’t rebuilt first? Additionally, the Joint Task Force and our CIP recommends finding a swing space that can eventually be converted into a new school. Does ACPS think we no longer need swing space? It also seems that there is a desire to reallocate the CIP money for swing space to the high school project. How will pursuing an updated PH contract and accelerating the DM rebuild impact ACPS’ ability to plan and execute the

high school capacity project? Additionally, does it make sense to commit to using PH as a swing space before we receive the updated building assessments in June? I'm concerned that a rushed decision may cause us to lose sight of our long-term needs. ....11

**Question 30:** I'd like to have a better understanding of the financial impact if we decide to move forward using PH as swing space. B&D has submitted a renovation cost estimate that could total \$5.9M. What additional costs should we anticipate that are not included in this estimate? Additionally, if the DM rebuild is accelerated, how will that impact other projects in the CIP? .....11

**Question 31:** The leading objection from the community to using PH as swing space centers on traffic and safety concerns. Neighbors say they have been asking for additional stop signs, tree trimming, more prominent cross walks and crossing guards for months, but that these requests have been ignored. Why haven't these concerns been addressed, and what steps will be taken in the future? Can this site even accommodate double the number of students, staff and traffic? Another complaint is that construction workers regularly park on local streets even though they are not supposed to. Who is responsible for enforcing compliance and what is the penalty? .....12

**Question 32:** Another major concern has been access to outdoor recess and physical education. If both schools share the PH site, is there adequate outdoor space to accommodate all students getting outside on a daily basis? Where can middle school students participate in outdoor P.E.? I continue to hear that there is still no outdoor equipment (balls, hula hoops, etc.) for use during outdoor recess on the bus loop. Why is that and what is the plan to address this situation?.....12

**Question 33:** I understand the estimate to renovate the old PH building ranges up to \$5.9m. the old PH building ranges up to \$5.9M. I also understand that ACPS is anticipating a \$3M credit from Keller if we cancel Phase III. Is there a breakdown in the existing contract for Phase III? In other words, what is the total cost for Phase III and how much is ACPS responsible for v. the City? Also, is there a typical percentage increase in cost by year for construction projects that allows us to anticipate how much more Phase III might cost to re-bid in 3 years?.....13

**Question 34:** Can you review the anticipated future decision points that the Board will make if we move forward with this project? For example, since we don't have an actual budget for the project now, I'm assuming we will have to vote on a budget for this project once that it is determined? Will we also be voting on the design of the swing space? We've seen the concept, but will the actual design need to be voted on? what other decision-making points will there be for the board? .....13

**Question 35:** What, if any, types of sites are we currently looking for in our real estate search, e.g., are we currently searching for sites suitable for elementary and high school swing space? .....14

**Question 36:** It might be good to mention we are already in the process of confirming whether or not we will need swing space for GM and cora kelly. ....14

## QUESTIONS FROM SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS SENT TO STAFF

**QUESTION 1:** AT THE LAST PH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON MARCH 25, 2019, MR. DAVID BANKS INDICATED THAT DOUGLAS MACARTHUR DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH LAND TO SUSTAIN PORTABLE CLASSROOMS FOR ALL STUDENTS DURING A CONSTRUCTION PERIOD. HE FURTHER EXPLAINED THAT THE AMOUNT OF LAND NEEDED FOR PORTABLES TO HOUSE ROUGHLY 700 STUDENTS AND 80 FACULTY/STAFF WOULD BE APPROXIMATE TO THE AMOUNT OF LAND NEEDED TO BUILD A PERMANENT SWING SPACE BUILDING. CAN YOU PROVIDE A ROUGH IDEA OF THE NUMBERS TO EXPLAIN THIS CONCLUSION (I.E. SQUARE FOOTAGE REQUIREMENTS, #OF PUPILS ALLOWED PER PORTABLE, LAND REQUIREMENTS, ETC.)?

**Question Number:** 1  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Our elementary educational specification for a school for 700 students gives a gross building square footage of 107,129 square feet with all spaces built to the latest size standard. That does not include any outdoor play areas. Given typical zoning requirements in areas with schools, this space would require roughly 5 acres. Portable spaces also may be difficult to customize for some of the larger spaces, such as gymnasiums and cafeterias, and difficult to have more than 2 levels.

**QUESTION 2:** IN THE BRAILSFORD & DUNLAVEY WHITE PAPER (DATED [MARCH 26, 2019](#)), THERE IS A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE POTENTIAL COSTS OF A LONG-TERM SUSPENSION OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (3-5 YEARS) AT PH, WHICH INCLUDES STORAGE FOR ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN BOUGHT BUT NOT INSTALLED. WHAT ITEMS DOES THIS INCLUDE? COULD THE STORED MATERIALS POSSIBLY NEED TO BE REPURCHASED IN 2023?

**Question Number:** 2  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS's general contractor has purchased items such as stormwater equipment that will not be able to be installed. We are not anticipating the need to re-purchase such items when the site is completed.

**QUESTION 3:** THIS HAS BEEN ADDRESSED IN A VARIETY OF WAYS AT THE COMMUNITY LISTENING SESSIONS, BUT I'M HOPING FOR FURTHER DETAIL IF PERMITTED TO BE SHARED. TO WHAT DEGREE HAVE WE EXPLORED RETROFITTING ANOTHER OFFICE BUILDING TO BE USED AS SWING SPACE? WERE THERE ANY OTHER FEASIBLE OPTIONS DISCOVERED DURING THE FERDINAND T. DAY DEVELOPMENT PHASE?

**Question Number:** 3  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

In 2016, ACPS received responses to a request for proposals for spaces that could be suitable for a pre-K center, new elementary school and swing space. Four responses were received, one of which ended up being a purchase for what is now Ferdinand T. Day Elementary School and the others were determined unsuitable for the swing space or pre-K center requirements at that time.

In late 2018, given the facility challenges at Mount Vernon Community School, ACPS sought information regarding sites that could potentially be used as a 800+ student elementary school. Staff received information and conducted site visits on five commercial properties, none of which were deemed suitable for an elementary school at that time. Some of the criteria considered included availability, accessibility, existing physical condition and environmental concerns, parking, etc.

If swing space is not pursued at Patrick Henry, this option will be explored again as part of the FY 2021-2022 swing space project.

**QUESTION 4: WHAT SPACES ARE INTENDED TO ACT AS EVACUATION SITES OR SAFE GATHERING SPACES IN THE PH SWING SPACE CONCEPT PLAN? HAVE THESE BEEN IDENTIFIED YET?**

**Question Number:** 4  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Evacuation of the old Patrick Henry school would be to the new Patrick Henry school. In the event of an emergency at both schools, students would evacuate to James K. Polk Elementary School. This is consistent with evacuation procedures at other ACPS schools.

**QUESTION 5: ACCORDING TO THE PROPOSED TIMELINE, THE OLD PH SCHOOL WOULD NOT BE IN USE FROM JUNE 2019-SEPTEMBER 2020. WHAT IF ADDITIONAL ISSUES POP UP IN THIS INTERIM PERIOD THAT WERE NOT ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE EXISTING FEASIBILITY STUDY? WAS THIS FACTORED INTO THE 15% CONTINGENCY FUNDING SET ASIDE IN THE \$5.9M ESTIMATED RENOVATION COSTS?**

**Question Number:** 5  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The 15% contingency will be used for any unforeseen conditions not identified in this interim period.

**QUESTION 6: WHAT COMMITMENTS (VERBAL OR OTHERWISE) FROM THE CITY, IF ANY, HAVE BEEN MADE TO ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY CONCERNS IN THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS OF PH?**

**Question Number:** 6  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Thornton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS has been working closely with the City's Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES) Department. T&ES has committed to studying the three-way stop at Polk Avenue and Latham Street, assessing the light signal at Taney Avenue and Jordan Street and adjusting trash truck schedules. Alexandria Police Department has also committed to additional patrolling.

**QUESTION 7:** HOW WOULD MOVING UP THE DESIGN AND BUILD OF MACARTHUR AFFECT THE SCHEDULE OF THE DESIGN AND BUILD OF A HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING ON THE MINNIE HOWARD SITE? WOULD THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING OPEN IN THE FALL OF 2023 AS CURRENTLY SCHEDULED IN OUR CIP?

**Question Number:** 7  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Lorber  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The High School Project will continue as scheduled.

**QUESTION 8:** THE POTOMAC ENERGY GROUP (PEG) IN THEIR MEP SYSTEMS EVALUATION OF PATRICK HENRY SCHOOL RECOMMENDS INSTALLMENT OF A SPRINKLER SYSTEM IF WE RENOVATE PH FOR SWING SPACE. AS I READ THE REPORTS BY C & D AND B & D, I GET THE IMPRESSION WE WILL SEEK A WAIVER TO THE CODE REQUIREMENT OF A SPRINKLER SYSTEM BECAUSE IT IS A NEW REQUIREMENT (2015) AND PH IS A RENOVATION AND NOT A NEW SCHOOL. GIVEN THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PEG REPORT, SHOULDN'T A SPRINKLER SYSTEM BE INSTALLED FOR SAFETY OF THE CHILDREN REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE CODE APPLIES?

**Question Number:** 8  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Lorber  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

7 of our 18 schools do not have sprinkler systems, not including the old Patrick Henry building. The funding required if ACPS chooses to add a sprinkler system is included in the cost estimate provided by B&D. Staff will continue to evaluate the

**QUESTION 9:** ON THE FIRST PAGE OF THE DRAFT COST ESTIMATES BY B & D, UNDER "ACOUSTICAL CEILING GRID" THERE IS A NOTE INSERTED BY C & D THAT SAYS " CONSIDERATIONS OF ASBESTOS CEILING ABOVE ACT (ACOUSTICAL CEILING TILE)." IF THERE DID TURN OUT TO BE ASBESTOS IN THE CEILING ABOVE THE TILE, HOW MUCH MORE TIME AND MONEY WOULD IT TAKE TO REPLACE ALL OF THE TILE IN ORDER TO INSTALL A SPRINKLER SYSTEM? THE ESTIMATE NOW IS \$389,250 (WHICH MAY BE A BIT HIGH ACCORDING TO THE TABLE). BUT I ASSUME THIS DOESN'T INCLUDE MONEY AND

TIME FOR ASBESTOS ABATEMENT , OR DOES IT? I WASN'T SURE ABOUT THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NOTE

**Question Number:** 9  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Lorber  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Asbestos abatement was included as part of ACPS's existing contract and that is why it is not reflected in this cost estimate. All building work will be completed by summer 2020.

**QUESTION 10:** THIS IS KIND OF A PICKY QUESTION BUT COULD HAVE CONSEQUENCES FOR COSTS-- IN THE DRAFT COST TABLE B & D SUGGESTS WE ASSUME THAT 25% OF THE LIGHT FIXTURES AT PH WOULD BE REPLACED. THE PEG REPORT SAYS ALL OF THE LIGHTS NEED TO BE "RE-LAMPED". IS RE-LAMPING DIFFERENT FROM RE-PLACING? ON THE SAME TABLE, B & D SAYS TO ASSUME 28 RTUS WILL BE REPAIRED OR REPLACED AT THE OLD PH. BUT THE PEG REPORTS SAYS THERE ARE A TOTAL OF 21 RTUS AT PH. GIVEN A PRICE OF \$65 - 85K/UNIT, WE COULD BE CHARGED AS MUCH AS \$595,000. TO REPLACE 7 UNITS THAT DON'T EXIST. I GUESS MY QUESTION IS, DOES PH HAVE 21 OR 28 RTUS-- ALL OF WHICH ARE IN NEED OF SERVICING AND SOME OF REPLACEMENT?

**Question Number:** 10  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Lorber  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Re-lamping involves replacing the bulb, not the fixture. Regarding the roof top units (RTUs), during design, the number of RTUs that need to be repaired or replaced will be reconciled and reflected in the final cost estimate.

**QUESTION 11:** ONE OF THE CONCERNS IS THE DISCUSSION/PLANNING AROUND NARROWING SEMINARY ROAD TO TWO LANES. IF THE SCHOOL BOARD MOVES TO APPROVE PATRICK HENRY AS SWING SPACE FOR DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, WILL THE CITY TEMPORARILY PUT OFF ANY PLANS AROUND THIS PROJECT FOR THE DURATION OF THE OCCUPANCY OF THE OLD PATRICK HENRY BUILDING?

**Question Number:** 11  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Alderton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS does not have control of the Seminary Road project but has communicated these concerns with Transportation & Environmental Services. If any significant impact is expected from this project, it will be identified in the addendum to the traffic study.

**QUESTION 12:** BASED ON MY INITIAL OBSERVATIONS WE WOULD NEED TO COMMIT TO FOLLOWING TRAFFIC AND SAFETY SUPPORTS FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE HOUR IN THE



MORNING AND ONE HOUR IN THE AFTERNOON, INCLUDING: POLICE PRESENCE AND OR TRAFFIC DIRECTION (AT TANEY AND LATHAM, POLK AND LATHAM, TANEY AND NORTH JORDAN). ADDITIONAL CROSSING GUARDS (AT LEAST ONE AT TANEY AND LATHAM (UNLESS THERE IS A CROSSING GUARD) AND ONE AT TANEY AND NORTH JORDAN). PARKING ENFORCEMENT ON TANEY (TOWING CARS THAT ARE PARKED ALONG TANEY IN FRONT OF THE OLD BUILDING DURING ALLOTTED TIME WINDOWS). HAS THE CITY COMMITTED TO IMPLEMENTING AND MAINTAINING THESE SERVICES FOR THE DURATION OF OCCUPANCY?

**Question Number:** 12  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Alderton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS has been working closely with the City's Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES) Department. T&ES has committed to studying the three-way stop at Polk Avenue and Latham Street, assessing the light signal at Taney Avenue and Jordan Street and adjusting trash truck schedules. Alexandria Police Department has also committed to additional patrolling.

**QUESTION 13:** WHY DO WE NOT HAVE SAFETY PATROLS AT ALL OF OUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS? THIS DISCUSSION SEEMS TO HIGHLIGHT A NEED IN THIS AREA. SAFETY PATROLS CAN WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH CROSSING GUARDS TO HELP PEDESTRIANS NAVIGATE SAFELY BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL. THIS ALSO BUILDS CITIZENSHIP AND COMMUNITY AND PROVIDES ANOTHER AVENUE OF CONTINUITY AND SUSTAINABILITY IN TERMS OF HOW WE PROVIDE SAFETY FOR OUR STUDENTS. CAN WE CONSIDER A FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SAFETY PATROL PROGRAM TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN 2020? HAVING THIS TEMPORARY QUASI CAMPUS MODEL WOULD SEEM TO MAKE THIS EVEN MORE BENEFICIAL.

**Question Number:** 13  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Alderton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Safety patrol programs are optional at schools, related to this work, safety patrol programs do currently exist at Douglas MacArthur and Patrick Henry.

**QUESTION 14:** THE VOICES OF THE TEACHERS AND STAFF INVOLVED IN THIS HAVE NOT BEEN VERY CLEAR TO ME. THOUGH I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO SPEAK TO A FEW OF THE TEACHERS, ADMIN, AND STAFF WHO ARE OUTSIDE DURING THE ARRIVAL AND DISMISSAL PROCESS AT PH, I DO NOT HAVE A SENSE OF THE OVERALL VOICES OR CONCERNS OF THE STAFF IMPACTED. IS IT POSSIBLE TO GET A QUICK ANONYMOUS SURVEY OUT TO STAFF SO THAT THE BOARD CAN CAPTURE A TRUE GLIMPSE OF THEIR CONCERNS AROUND THE ISSUE. IN PARTICULAR, IT FEELS AS THOUGH THE VOICES OF TEACHERS AND STAFF HAVE BEEN CO-OPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY. I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE BOARD TO HEAR DIRECTLY FROM AS MANY TEACHERS AND STAFF AS POSSIBLE. I AM

THINKING THAT AN ANONYMOUS SURVEY WILL ALLOW OR US TO GET THE MOST HONEST PERSPECTIVE POSSIBLE.

**Question Number:** 14  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Alderton  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS was not able to conduct an anonymous survey during this time; however, separate meetings were held with both Patrick Henry staff and Douglas MacArthur staff prior to meeting with the community. There was open and frank discussion at these meetings.

**QUESTION 15:** WHAT, IF ANY, IMPACT WILL USING PH AS SWING SPACE AND ACCELERATING MACARTHUR REBUILD HAVE ON HIGH SCHOOL EXPANSION PROJECT?

**Question Number:** 15  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The High School Project will continue as scheduled. Using the old Patrick Henry as swing space will allow for funds originally allocated in ACPS FY 2020-2029 Proposed CIP for swing space, to fund other ACPS CIP projects, such as increased funding needed for the high school project and expected construction cost increases.

**QUESTION 16:** HOW WILL OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES BE ALTERED FOR BOTH ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS AT PH (AND MACARTHUR)?

**Question Number:** 16  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The new basketball court, intermediate playground and recreation playground will be installed per the original Patrick Henry plan on the west end of the site. The existing playground at the old Patrick Henry building will also be modified and available for school use. Schools will work collaboratively to schedule outdoor activities.

**QUESTION 17:** ARE THERE PLANS TO ADD FEATURES TO THE BUS LOOP BLACKTOP THAT WOULD BETTER ACCOMMODATE RECREATIONAL NEEDS, E.G., BASKETBALL HOOPS, GAMES PAINTED ON THE BLACKTOP? HOW OFTEN DO VEHICLES OTHER THAN SCHOOL BUSES ENTER THIS AREA?

**Question Number:** 17  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The bus loop blacktop should not be needed next school year with the completion of the intermediate playground and basketball court this summer. During the school day, only school buses enter this area.

Any other vehicles are allowed via controlled access only, such as food delivery trucks and occasional special parking.

**QUESTION 18: WILL TRAFFIC STUDY BE CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE DSUP PROCESS?**

**Question Number:** 18

**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson

**Staff Respondent:** Operations

An addendum to the original traffic study, dated September 2016, will be required as part of the Development Special Use Permit process to include the added capacity and assess the impact of staggered start times.

**QUESTION 19: I THINK YOU SHOULD COVER THE DSUP TIMELINE AND THE GENERAL COMPONENTS OF SUCH AN APPLICATION SO THAT THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS WE KNOW W STILL HAVE LOTS OF WORK TO DO. ALSO, SOMEHOW INCORPORATE THAT THE 4-YEAR STIPULATION IS FROM THE CITY. IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT GUARANTEE DOES THE COMMUNITY HAVE THAT THE SWING SPACE WILL BE DISCONTINUED AFTER MACARTHUR IS REBUILT?**

**Question Number:** 19

**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson

**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The Development Special Use Permit amendment that ACPS will be requesting in Fall 2019 will be approved based on a total timeframe not to exceed an approximate four year delay of the final intended Patrick Henry condition. The four years includes:

1. DSUP Amendment and upgrading of the old Patrick Henry building and site to accommodate Douglas MacArthur
2. Douglas MacArthur Occupancy
3. Demolition of old Patrick Henry building and completing the Patrick Henry site to the originally approved condition

The DSUP amendment process will include:

- a. A Planning Commission public hearing and City Council public hearing;
- b. ACPS ongoing engagement through the design process;
- c. An addendum to the original traffic study;
- d. Site plan review.

An additional DSUP amendment would be required in the future for any use beyond the four year condition and is not expected.

**QUESTION 20: WHAT, IF ANY, TYPES OF SITES ARE WE CURRENTLY LOOKING FOR IN OUR REAL ESTATE SEARCH, E.G., ARE WE CURRENTLY SEARCHING FOR SITES SUITABLE FOR ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL SWING SPACE?**

**Question Number:** 20  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS is actively working with its real estate advisors, Planning and Zoning and Alexandria Economic Development Partnership to identify suitable and available sites throughout the City. Given capacity needs and CIP projects span all grade levels, ACPS does not restrict its search to any one purpose.

**QUESTION 21:** IF WE FOUND A SITE FOR SWING SPACE TODAY WHAT IS THE BEST CASE SCENARIO FOR HOW SOON IT WOULD BE READY FOR USE AS SWING SPACE? WHAT IS THE RANGE OF TIME REQUIRED BASED ON TYPE OF SITE FOUND?

**Question Number:** 21  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The main benefit of using the old Patrick Henry is that it does not require a change in use or acquisition that would require a significant amount of time, effort and funding. There are many variables that contribute to the amount of time required; making a realistic answer to this question is not possible.

**QUESTION 22:** ARE THERE ANY HISTORICAL PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE GEORGE MASON REBUILD?

**Question Number:** 22  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

George Mason Elementary School is not currently on any historic registers.

**QUESTION 23:** SINCE WE HAVE RECOGNIZED SAFETY ISSUES WITH THE CURRENT SCHOOL CONFIGURATION, WHAT STEPS WILL BE TAKEN IMMEDIATELY AND AS THE PROJECT PROGRESSES TO INCREASE THE SAFETY AROUND THE SCHOOL SITE FOR WALKERS, DRIVERS AND OTHERS?

**Question Number:** 23  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS has been working closely with the City's Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES) Department. T&ES has committed to studying the three-way stop at Polk Avenue and Latham Street, assessing the light signal at Taney Avenue and Jordan Street and adjusting trash truck schedules. Alexandria Police Department has also committed to additional patrolling.

**QUESTION 24:** WILL IMPACT TO POLK SCHOOL COMMUNITY TRAFFIC PATTERNS BE STUDIED AS WELL?

**Question Number:** 24  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Intersections required to be re-examined during the traffic study addendum will be determined by the City's Department of Transportation & Environmental Services. The scoping for this addendum has not occurred yet.

**QUESTION 25:** CAN YOU WALK US THROUGH HOW THE SITE WILL CHANGE OVER THE COURSE OF USE AS SWING SPACE? IN OTHER WORDS HOW WILL THE REMAINING CONSTRUCTION BE PHASED? WILL THE OUTSIDE PLAYGROUNDS, PARKING BE COMPLETED BEFORE WORK STARTS ON THE INSIDE OF THE BUILDING? WHEN WILL THE GROUNDS BE COMPLETED FOR USE AS SWING SPACE AND WHEN WILL INSIDE CONSTRUCTION BE COMPLETED? I WOULD LOVE FOR THE PUBLIC TO UNDERSTAND AS EASILY AS POSSIBLE WHEN THE SITE WILL LOOK SOMEWHAT NORMAL BEFORE AND AFTER ITS USE AS SWING SPACE.

**Question Number:** 25  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Summer 2019: New playgrounds along Latham Street will be completed .Summer 2020: The site will be in a finished condition, following DSUP approval in the fall, to accommodate both schools with additional parking and upgraded existing playground. All building modifications to the old Patrick Henry building will be completed by this time.

Winter 2022-2023: Construction will resume on the Patrick Henry site to demolish the old building and complete the site improvements from the originally approved site plan.

Fall 2023: The final condition of the Patrick Henry site will be complete.

**QUESTION 26:** WHEN WOULD MACARTHUR STUDENTS START AND STOP USING THE PH SWING SPACE? IT'S IN THE WRITTEN MATERIALS BUT IT WOULD BE GOOD TO STATE IT. THERE HAS BEEN SOME CONFUSION SO IT WOULD BE GOOD TO PUBLICLY STATE THIS AGAIN

**Question Number:** 26  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Start: Fall 2020  
Stop: Winter 2022-2023

**QUESTION 27:** WHAT ARE THE FUTURE DECISION POINTS ARE RELATED TO THIS PROJECT INCLUDING WHAT HAPPENS WITH THE DISPOSITION OF THE CURRENT CONTRACT?

**Question Number:** 27  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Based on a decision point by the Board on April 4, 2019, the current construction contract will follow one of two paths:

1. If the Board votes to abandon the PHES as a swing space, the current construction contract will continue as originally contemplated, understanding the delays associated with this exploratory effort.
2. If the Board votes to authorize the use of PHES as a swing space, the current construction contract and construction company will continue completion of the work remaining in Phase II (e.g. exterior cladding on the building, and other site work required to complete Phase II). Additionally, the work we have identified as “Phase III(a)”, which includes the three (3) playgrounds/fitness area, brick work, guard rails and other ADA compliance requirements, retaining walls and other final infrastructural conditions for defined areas unaffected by this site’s use as a swing space, and the basketball court, will continue uninterrupted (note that this work is currently in process). Once that work has been completed, approved, and accepted by ACPS, the current construction contract will terminate.

**QUESTION 28:** A MAJOR RATIONALE FOR USING THE OLD PH BUILDING AS SWING SPACE FOR DM IS THAT, WE ARE TOLD, NO OTHER SPACE CAN BE LOCATED IN THE CITY. CAN YOU REVIEW THE STEPS ACPS HAS TAKEN TO IDENTIFY SWING SPACE AND THE RESULTS OF THAT SEARCH? IF POSSIBLE, CAN YOU DISCUSS SITES THAT MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY FREQUENTLY REFERENCE, SUCH AS LANDMARK MALL, THE VICTORY CENTER, POTOMAC YARD, CHINQUAPIN, NOVA’S ALEXANDRIA CAMPUS, AS WELL AS THE USE OF PORTABLES? WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH THE DM REBUILD IF WE REJECT PH AS A SWING SPACE?

**Question Number:** 28  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

In 2016, ACPS received responses to a request for proposals for spaces that could be suitable for a pre-K center, new elementary school and swing space. Four responses were received, one of which ended up being a purchase for what is now Ferdinand T. Day Elementary School and the others were determined unsuitable for the swing space or pre-K center requirements at that time.

In late 2018, given the facility challenges at Mount Vernon Community School, ACPS sought information regarding sites that could potentially be used as a 800+ student elementary school. Staff received information and conducted site visits on five commercial properties, none of which were deemed suitable for an elementary school at that time. Some of the criteria considered included availability, accessibility, existing physical condition and environmental concerns, parking, etc.

Landmark Mall and Victory Center are privately owned developments that are currently in the planning phase and will not meet ACPS's swing space timeline. The only NOVA and ACPS plan at this point is the Early College program at the Tyler Building on NOVA's Alexandria Campus. It is staff's understanding that Chinquapin was part of a federal designation of public open space that we cannot use. The Potomac Yard development plan has a less than an acre site designated for school use. ACPS will conduct its own feasibility study on this site; however, the size and current condition make it unlikely that this is suitable for Douglas MacArthur swing space. Relocatables are effective to add classrooms but not to provide adequate facilities for an entire school. Land to place relocatables has also not been identified.

If the old Patrick Henry is not used for swing space, the Douglas MacArthur project will begin design in FY 2022 and likely not occupy the new building until school year 2025. The Douglas MacArthur project will still require swing space and ACPS would continue to work with real estate advisors, Planning & Zoning and Alexandria Economic Development Partnership to identify a site to accommodate the intent of the proposed swing space project in the FY 2020-2029 CIP budget.

**QUESTION 29:** IT'S BEEN STATED THAT THE OLD PH BUILDING IS IN BETTER SHAPE THAN DM, WHICH LEADS ME TO QUESTION WHY DM WASN'T REBUILT FIRST? ADDITIONALLY, THE JOINT TASK FORCE AND OUR CIP RECOMMENDS FINDING A SWING SPACE THAT CAN EVENTUALLY BE CONVERTED INTO A NEW SCHOOL. DOES ACPS THINK WE NO LONGER NEED SWING SPACE? IT ALSO SEEMS THAT THERE IS A DESIRE TO REALLOCATE THE CIP MONEY FOR SWING SPACE TO THE HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT. HOW WILL PURSUING AN UPDATED PH CONTRACT AND ACCELERATING THE DM REBUILD IMPACT ACPS' ABILITY TO PLAN AND EXECUTE THE HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY PROJECT? ADDITIONALLY, DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO COMMIT TO USING PH AS A SWING SPACE BEFORE WE RECEIVE THE UPDATED BUILDING ASSESSMENTS IN JUNE? I'M CONCERNED THAT A RUSHED DECISION MAY CAUSE US TO LOSE SIGHT OF OUR LONG-TERM NEEDS.

**Question Number:** 29  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

Targeted Building Assessments, scheduled to be complete by June, will inform the FY 2021 CIP budget related to major capital repairs required at George Mason, Cora Kelly, Matthew Maury, Francis C. Hammond, George Washington and the Transportation Facility. The five-year Facilities Condition Assessments, scheduled to be complete in the fall, will determine the long term replacements required for each school and may impact the order or type of project for school modernizations. Staff maintains that Douglas MacArthur will be the first elementary school to be modernized.

**QUESTION 30:** I'D LIKE TO HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE FINANCIAL IMPACT IF WE DECIDE TO MOVE FORWARD USING PH AS SWING SPACE. B&D HAS SUBMITTED A RENOVATION COST ESTIMATE THAT COULD TOTAL \$5.9M. WHAT ADDITIONAL COSTS SHOULD WE ANTICIPATE THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THIS ESTIMATE? ADDITIONALLY, IF

THE DM REBUILD IS ACCELERATED, HOW WILL THAT IMPACT OTHER PROJECTS IN THE CIP?

**Question Number:** 30  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The B&D estimate excludes exterior/envelope changes which have not yet been identified, site lighting and storage for materials or equipment bought but not installed at this time. The estimate also does not include expected costs of completing the final Patrick Henry work after Douglas MacArthur students vacate. The estimate does not include the credit expected as a result of work not completed by the contractor.

Funding for Douglas MacArthur will be required at the same time as the High School Project in FY 2021 budget. Re-allocation of funds to complete the Patrick Henry project will be required in the FY 2023 CIP budget.

**QUESTION 31:** THE LEADING OBJECTION FROM THE COMMUNITY TO USING PH AS SWING SPACE CENTERS ON TRAFFIC AND SAFETY CONCERNS. NEIGHBORS SAY THEY HAVE BEEN ASKING FOR ADDITIONAL STOP SIGNS, TREE TRIMMING, MORE PROMINENT CROSS WALKS AND CROSSING GUARDS FOR MONTHS, BUT THAT THESE REQUESTS HAVE BEEN IGNORED. WHY HAVEN'T THESE CONCERNS BEEN ADDRESSED, AND WHAT STEPS WILL BE TAKEN IN THE FUTURE? CAN THIS SITE EVEN ACCOMMODATE DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS, STAFF AND TRAFFIC? ANOTHER COMPLAINT IS THAT CONSTRUCTION WORKERS REGULARLY PARK ON LOCAL STREETS EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENFORCING COMPLIANCE AND WHAT IS THE PENALTY?

**Question Number:** 31  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS has consulted with Planning & Zoning, Code Enforcement, Transportation & Environmental Services, including traffic, utilities and storm water, and the Fire Marshall, as well as consultants, to ensure that the site can physically accommodate the anticipated growth. Specific conditions to alleviate impacts from the additional occupants will be made during the formal design process. This will be submitted through the DSUP amendment process.

The general contractor is responsible for enforcing its employees and subcontractors' compliance with the parking management plan.

**QUESTION 32:** ANOTHER MAJOR CONCERN HAS BEEN ACCESS TO OUTDOOR RECESS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION. IF BOTH SCHOOLS SHARE THE PH SITE, IS THERE ADEQUATE OUTDOOR SPACE TO ACCOMMODATE ALL STUDENTS GETTING OUTSIDE ON A DAILY BASIS? WHERE CAN MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN OUTDOOR P.E.? I CONTINUE TO HEAR THAT THERE IS STILL NO OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT (BALLS, HULA HOOPS, ETC.) FOR USE



DURING OUTDOOR RECESS ON THE BUS LOOP. WHY IS THAT AND WHAT IS THE PLAN TO ADDRESS THIS SITUATION?

**Question Number:** 32  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The new basketball court, intermediate playground and recreation playground will be installed per the original Patrick Henry plan on the west end of the site. The existing playground at the old Patrick Henry building will also be modified and available for school use, which is the playground that was used by Patrick Henry students during construction. Staff are working on addressing the current recess operation to provide students with additional equipment as appropriate.

**QUESTION 33:** I UNDERSTAND THE ESTIMATE TO RENOVATE THE OLD PH BUILDING RANGES UP TO \$5.9M. THE OLD PH BUILDING RANGES UP TO \$5.9M. I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT ACPS IS ANTICIPATING A \$3M CREDIT FROM KELLER IF WE CANCEL PHASE III. IS THERE A BREAKDOWN IN THE EXISTING CONTRACT FOR PHASE III? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT IS THE TOTAL COST FOR PHASE III AND HOW MUCH IS ACPS RESPONSIBLE FOR V. THE CITY? ALSO, IS THERE A TYPICAL PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN COST BY YEAR FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS THAT ALLOWS US TO ANTICIPATE HOW MUCH MORE PHASE III MIGHT COST TO RE-BID IN 3 YEARS?

**Question Number:** 33  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

There is a breakdown for the existing contract for phase III between ACPS and the City. Given that portions of phase III are being completed now, this is not a straight forward calculation. If Patrick Henry is used for swing space, ACPS and the City will determine how much work will be completed and how the remaining costs and credits will be accounted for.

**QUESTION 34:** CAN YOU REVIEW THE ANTICIPATED FUTURE DECISION POINTS THAT THE BOARD WILL MAKE IF WE MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS PROJECT? FOR EXAMPLE, SINCE WE DON'T HAVE AN ACTUAL BUDGET FOR THE PROJECT NOW, I'M ASSUMING WE WILL HAVE TO VOTE ON A BUDGET FOR THIS PROJECT ONCE THAT IT IS DETERMINED? WILL WE ALSO BE VOTING ON THE DESIGN OF THE SWING SPACE? WE'VE SEEN THE CONCEPT, BUT WILL THE ACTUAL DESIGN NEED TO BE VOTED ON? WHAT OTHER DECISION-MAKING POINTS WILL THERE BE FOR THE BOARD?

**Question Number:** 34  
**Board Member(s):** Dr. Rief  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

The School Board will be voting on designs and contracts related to using Patrick Henry as swing space and the new Douglas MacArthur project throughout the next couple of years. A more accurate timeline will be shared with the School Board if this is pursued.

**QUESTION 35:** WHAT, IF ANY, TYPES OF SITES ARE WE CURRENTLY LOOKING FOR IN OUR REAL ESTATE SEARCH, E.G., ARE WE CURRENTLY SEARCHING FOR SITES SUITABLE FOR ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL SWING SPACE?

**Question Number:** 35  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS is actively working with its real estate advisors, Planning and Zoning and Alexandria Economic Development Partnership to identify suitable and available sites throughout the City. Given capacity needs and CIP projects span all grade levels, ACPS does not restrict its search to any one purpose.

**QUESTION 36:** IT MIGHT BE GOOD TO MENTION WE ARE ALREADY IN THE PROCESS OF CONFIRMING WHETHER OR NOT WE WILL NEED SWING SPACE FOR GM AND CORA KELLY.

**Question Number:** 36  
**Board Member(s):** Ms. Anderson  
**Staff Respondent:** Operations

ACPS is currently soliciting proposals for feasibility studies for George Mason and Cora Kelly to understand the opportunities and constraints associated with building the schools on-site while occupied. Construction funds in the proposed CIP budgets for George Mason and Cora Kelly are in the FY 2024 and FY 2027, respectively, meaning the schools would be estimated to open in FY 2027 and FY 2029.