

**Facility Capacity Needs Analysis Subcommittee Meeting
of the Long Range Educational Facilities Planning Work Group
City Hall, 301 King Street, Chet & Sabra Avery Conference Room 2000
Monday, February 10, 2014 – 6:00pm
Meeting Summary**

Meeting notes are recorded by City Staff to provide a written record of principal items of discussion, key comments, decisions of the Work Group, and comments from the public. They are not intended to be a verbatim transcription of the meeting.

Meeting Attendees

Subcommittee Members

Yvonne Folkerts
Tammy Mann

Members Not in Attendance

Chris Hartman
Judy Noritake

Work Group Members

Mayor Euille

Community Members

Jim Durham

ACPS

Bill Finn
Laurel Hammig

City of Alexandria

Chris Bever
Katherine Carraway
Steve Chozick
Pat Mann
Dana Wedeles

Welcome and Introductions

Laurel Hammig, Facilities Planner/GIS Specialist for Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) welcomed attendees and gave a brief overview of the meeting goals, which included reviewing the subcommittee work plan and the progress of Hughes Group Architects (HGA), as well as having a general discussion about capacity.

Review work program

Ms. Hammig summarized the subcommittee work plan, which involves assessing existing conditions in ACPS schools, reviewing the current capacity analysis methodology and how existing capacity is allocated to meet demand, establishing guidelines for adding capacity, and identifying potential school site types.

The work plan process includes developing a school facility and site inventory – the school interior inventory is underway with Hughes Group Architects, and the exterior site inventory is scheduled to be funded with FY15 CIP funds pending final City approval in May. The next step involves developing a capacity and utilization assessment for each school site and identifying space needs by types of use. Findings of the Enrollment and Ed Specs Subcommittees will then be reviewed as that information will inform the number of future students that can be expected, as well as proposed physical components of ACPS’s educational program. The findings of the interior site inventory can be incorporated upon completion, which is expected in late spring 2014. All of this information will facilitate a gap analysis and review of resource allocation.

Bill Finn, Director of Facilities, ACPS, underscored that this shows how all three subcommittees complement each other – enabling greater understanding of any potential gap in how ACPS facilities meet educational program needs, and ultimately leading to recommendations of how to address it.

Progress by Hughes Group Architects

Ms. Hammig updated the group on HGA’s progress to date, explaining that assessments must be conducted after regular school hours or on weekends and holidays. HGA has completed analyses in approximately 50% of the city’s schools – Samuel Tucker, James K. Polk, Lyles Crouch, Charles Barrett, Minnie Howard, Cora Kelly, George Mason, Matthew Maury, and John Adams. The remaining analyses will continue in George Washington, Douglas MacArthur, William Ramsay, Mount Vernon, Francis Hammond, and T.C. Williams (during spring break). Patrick Henry and Jefferson-Houston will not be included at this time. Jefferson-Houston will be addressed once construction is complete, and a feasibility study is underway for Patrick Henry which should provide some of the same information.

The exterior site inventory, pending funding approval, is scheduled to begin in July and will include assessments of playgrounds and fields, and will address if they are sized appropriately for the age groups being served. It will also include an inventory of existing site accessibility, traffic issues, and parking.

Capacity Discussion

Using a fictional scenario, Ms. Hammig summarized different methods for calculating capacity using several approaches – 1) physical (design or building), which addresses the number of students a school can accommodate with a traditional educational program; 2) programmatic, which addresses the number of students a school can accommodate based on the specific educational program; 3) core capacity, which includes spaces such as cafeterias, gyms, multipurpose rooms, library/media center and is calculated based on square foot allowance per student; 4) utilization factor, which applies a percentage to the optimum capacity to account for the uneven distribution of students across grade levels and cohort groups; 5) level of service, which addresses the goal for acceptable level of service provided by a facility based on the operational characteristics; and 6) the possibility of a combination of approaches.

Discussion continued surrounding questions on finding the best way to integrate all of the findings resulting from the 3 subcommittees. Ms. Hammig suggested that one avenue is to use the Ed Spec process to guide baselines – through the Facilities Subcommittee process the group can compare findings from HGA to the recommendations from the Ed Specs subcommittee. Ms. Hammig advocated making the capacity calculation as data driven as possible in order to maintain objectivity. The data would need to be maintained and updated annually.

Bill Finn added that each subcommittee is forming a piece of the puzzle – the Enrollment Subcommittee is addressing forecasting; the Ed Specs Subcommittee work will help determine what elementary and secondary schools look like for the future and what the requirements should be; and the Facilities Subcommittee findings will show the current status of ACPS school buildings. The goal is to blend the three in such a way as to achieve the work group’s core objective, while ensuring that each component contains some flexibility in their methodologies.

The group continued discussion regarding the fictional scenario Ms. Hammig applied to capacity models and the differences between them. Consensus formed on the need to ensure that the methodology the group recommends can be easily communicated to the public and staff, reflects existing conditions, can be repeated annually, and is defensible. Subcommittee members asked to look another school district that has an urban school model; and to look at retrofitting an existing school and building a new school, including pros and cons of both.

Next Steps

- Review progress of architect
- Review methodologies and finalize recommendation
- Apply recommended methodology to individual schools

Materials

[Agenda and Background Materials](#)

[Presentation](#)