

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Meeting #2 Agenda
February 24, 2016, 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.
Walter Johnson High School, Cafeteria

Desired Outcomes

By the end of this meeting, we will have:

- Reviewed feedback, agenda, outcomes, and process;
- Developed Roundtable criteria;
- Brainstormed possible secondary school approaches; and
- Discussed next steps and provided feedback.

Activity	Facilitator(s)	Process	Time
Review feedback	Dana Davison	Review	7:00-7:05 5'
Review agenda, outcome, and process	Debbie Szyfer	Review	7:00-7:15 10'
Roundtable Criteria	Dana Davison/Debbie Szyfer/Corinne Blackford/Roundtable members	Develop/List/Clarify/Combine	7:15–8:00 45'
Brainstorm Secondary School Approaches	Dana Davison/Debbie Szyfer/Corinne Blackford/Roundtable members	Develop/List Clarify/Combine	8:00-8:50 50'
Next Steps, Observer Questions, Feedback	Debbie Szyfer	Determine/Share	8:50–9:00 10'

Ground Rules

1. Share openly
2. Give and receive constructive feedback
3. Appreciate everyone's ideas
4. Suspend judgment
5. Limit discussions to the topic
6. Do homework and be prepared
7. Abide by decisions made by the facilitator
8. Start and end meetings on time



Walter Johnson Roundtable Discussion Group

Summary of Meeting #1 — February 17, 2016

The Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group (Roundtable) met for its first meeting on February 17, 2016. The meeting was held in the Library Media Center of Tilden Middle School from 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. The materials handed out at the meeting follow this summary.

Ms. Deborah S. Szyfer, senior planner, Division of Long-range Planning, Department of Facilities Management, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), facilitated the meeting. Roundtable members introduced themselves. She began with introductions of special guests that included Mr. Bruce Crispell, director, Division of Long-range planning, Ms. Dana Davison, Office of the Chief Operating Officer, MCPS, Mr. N'kosi Yearwood, Ms. Nancy Sturgeon, and Ms. Andrea Gilles from Montgomery County Planning Department who assisted at this meeting.

Ms. Szyfer reviewed the agenda, outcomes for the meeting, and shared the ground rules that will be followed for the Roundtable meetings. The roundtable members agreed to the ground rules that follow:

1. Share openly
2. Give and receive constructive feedback
3. Appreciate everyone's ideas
4. Suspend judgment
5. Limit discussions to the topic
6. Do homework and be prepared
7. Abide by decisions made by the facilitator
8. Start and end meetings on time

The Board of Education (BOE) resolution of November 16, 2015, which creates the Roundtable, was shared with the Roundtable. (The resolution is included as part of the handouts.) The Roundtable charge directs the Roundtable to discuss general approaches to solve the near-term and long-term enrollment increases and solve the projected space deficits in the elementary, middle, and high schools in the Walter Johnson Cluster, was presented by Ms. Szyfer. The scope includes looking at closed schools in the cluster including Woodward High School, and Alta Vista, Arylawn, Grosvenor, Kensington, and Montrose elementary schools. (The charge is included as part of the handouts.)

Ms. Szyfer explained that the process is guided by the Board of Education Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy (FAA) and MCPS Regulation (FAA-RA). These documents can be found on the Montgomery County Public Schools website at the following link:

http://gis.mcpsmd.org/cipmasterpdfs/CIP17_AppendixT.pdf

Ms. Szyfer explained the role of the Roundtable members and that the Roundtable serves in an advisory role to the superintendent who will make recommendations for Board of Education consideration and decision. No specific boundary changes will be considered by the Roundtable. No recommendations or decisions will be made as part of the Roundtable. The Roundtable members will develop criteria to help develop and evaluate approaches to solve the space deficits in the Walter Johnson cluster schools; will schedule meetings with the school communities they represent to obtain feedback on the approaches; and will report out on the feedback they have received.

The roles of MCPS staff was explained and include the following:

- To facilitate all meetings
- To prepare all materials and develop additional approaches if appropriate
- Invite staff from MCPS and other agencies to meet with the Roundtable as appropriate.

The Roundtable report will include the following information:

- Background information
- Description of approaches
- Pros and cons of each approach
- Roundtable member evaluations
- Parent Teacher Association (PTA) position papers, if submitted.

The report will be submitted to the superintendent and BOE for consideration and will be posted online. No recommendations or decisions will be included in the report. Position papers are optional.

A Google form will be available for feedback on the approaches. A link will be on the Division of Long-range planning website at the following link:

<http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/planning/roundtable.aspx>

Next, Ms. Szyfer reviewed the schedule of upcoming Roundtable meetings. The schedule of meetings is included in the handout. Important dates to note for the Board of Education schedule include:

- June 1- Roundtable Report*
- October 2016, Superintendent's Recommendation
- Early November 2016 Board of Education worksession
- Mid November 2016 Board of Education public hearing
- November 2016 Board of Education action

Ms. King requested a list of the MCPS staff. This information will be provided to the Roundtable members at the next meeting.

Next, Montgomery County planning staff reviewed Master Plans and Sector Plans within the Walter Johnson cluster. The locations of these plans were referenced on the cluster map. Mr. N’Kosi Yearwood, Montgomery County Planning Department, reviewed the White Flint Sector Plan. It is a staged plan, in order to link infrastructure to development as it moves forward. There is no time limit on how long Phase 1 of the plan will run; it will depend on how long it takes for the allowed development to be built. Many infrastructure requirements of Phase I are not yet complete and Phase II cannot begin until these infrastructure requirements are built.

The county council does not include funding of schools as one of the infrastructure requirements for development to proceed. Ms. Nancy Sturgeon, Montgomery County Planning Department, shared that specific school-related infrastructure requirements have never been tied to the amount of development allowed by a staged plan such as this one, or any master plan. Staging is in fact rather unique to the White Flint Sector Plan and is a tool used for areas where significant change is anticipated to continue over a very long period of time. Other areas that have utilized staging include the Great Seneca Science Corridor and Clarksburg. Ms. Sturgeon explained that the policymakers believe the best way to plan for school needs is through the Subdivision Staging Policy and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) processes, which are far more nimble and flexible processes and can thus accommodate school need fluctuations better than a master plan can. She further explained that the number of allowed dwelling units put forth in master plans are theoretical numbers, chosen to enable planners to frame worst-case infrastructure need scenarios.

Phase I of the White Flint Sector Plan has a cap of 3,000 dwelling units. To date, 493 units (a little more than 10%) of phase I units have been built. Pike and Rose is the only complete project and all Staging Allocation Request (SAR) units have been allocated at Pike and Rose. Mr. Yearwood answered questions about SAR allocations versus preliminary plan approvals and explained that once a project receives SAR allocations, there is certainty about the number of units being constructed. He also noted that the time lag between submission of development project plans and those projects being occupied by residents is roughly 2-4 years, though plans that are submitted for approval are sometimes never built. He estimated that it will be another 10 or 15 more years before all of the 3,000 allowed Phase I units would be built.

Next, Ms. Andrea Gilles of the Montgomery County Planning Department discussed the Rock Spring Master Plan, which is currently under development by staff. It covers an area of 535 acres. The North Bethesda Transitway is planned to run through the center of the plan area. So far, 386 units have been built at Rock Spring Center, which were previously approved under the North Bethesda Master Plan. The Rock Spring Master Plan approved by the county council.

Planning staff noted that the plans shared do not include the WMAL property or other development projects outside of the master plan areas. Planners are working closely together with MCPS and the number of units expected from all of these developments will be sent to MCPS together once the developments have approval.

Mr. Crispell explained the difficulty of attaching dates to pending development projects and stated that MCPS will continue to work closely with county planners to estimate and revise the numbers of expected housing units over time.

Mr. Bruce Crispell presented on enrollment projections and the student yields that result from housing developments. The components of enrollment change at schools include the following:

1. The size of the Kindergarten cohort moving into a school;
2. The difference between the size of the incoming Kindergarten and the size of the fifth grade leaving a school; and
3. The number of students migrating into or out of the county. Migration into the school service area is calculated by comparing K–4th enrollment last year to 1st–5th enrollment this year.

The official enrollment forecast must be credible, based only on approved developments, for county council to fund MCPS capital projects. Enrollment projections thus only include approved housing units. However, county planning staff does provide housing unit estimates beyond what is approved to MCPS, for internal analysis. For the purposes of the Roundtable, models using proposed housing developments in addition to those that have been approved will be discussed.

In response to questions, Mr. Crispell and Ms. Szyfer explained that the County Executive made recommendations to reduce the FY 2017–2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and the County Council will act in May. It was noted that six of the ten cluster schools have projects in the pipeline in the CIP, which could be impacted by the county council final action on the CIP.

Questions about school capacity calculations were brought up and were answered after the meeting.

Student yield rates, particularly for high rise and mid-rise housing were discussed since the new housing being built in these areas is primarily of those types. Mr. Crispell said generation rates have risen slightly since 2013.

To illustrate the impact of new housing on school enrollment in the cluster, Mr. Crispell showed that 22% of enrollment growth at the elementary level can be attributed to new housing completions since 2007. Meanwhile, 12.1% of growth at the middle school level and 18.6% of growth at Walter Johnson High School is attributable to housing development. Garrett Park Elementary School was presented as an example of how enrollment is forecasted. Enrollment there grew by over 300 students between 2007 and 2015. While there is no question that enrollments are high, it is clear that there is not enough of a space deficit in the cluster to justify a new elementary school in the next 6 years.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. Feedback forms were collected. The next meeting will be held on February 24, 2016 at Walter Johnson High School, 6400 Rock Spring Drive, Bethesda, Maryland, in the cafeteria. At this meeting, criteria will be developed and secondary school approaches will be brainstormed.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Meeting #2
February 24, 2016



Agenda

- Feedback of Meeting #1
- Outcomes
- Process
- Develop Roundtable Criteria
- Brainstorm possible secondary school approaches

Meeting #1 Feedback

- Most Helpful
 - Data presentation and explaining calculations
 - Understanding various county processes; presented by both agencies
 - General overview and understanding the goals, process, and ground rules
 - Explanation on cluster growth and long-term enrollment
 - Explanation of “soft” estimates of development and what gets built
 - Providing baseline information and the “big picture”

Meeting #1 Feedback

- Least Helpful
 - Participants “stuck” on concerns about developer projections
 - Managing discussion/comments to ensure that all points of view and communities are heard
 - Minimizing repetitive statements
 - Ensuring community viewpoint is respected
 - Providing sources of information
 - Laying out an agenda/timeframe for each item
 - Ensuring people listen and allowing more time for questions

Meeting #1 Feedback

- Suggestions for Future Sessions
 - Continue to take control of issues to stay on task
 - Provide 10, 15, 20 year projections
 - Remind members that we are supposed to think cluster-wide, not just by school
 - Give updated projections for schools including non-approved development
 - Layout agenda and timeframe for each item
 - Allow for all necessary discussion not just the things that MCPS will permit
 - More time for questions

Meeting Outcomes

- Develop roundtable criteria
 - Round robin process
 - All roundtable members will have an opportunity to share criteria
 - Consolidate and clarify criteria as appropriate
- Brainstorm secondary school approaches
 - Round robin process
 - All roundtable members will have an opportunity to provide ideas for approaches
 - Consolidate and clarify as appropriate

Development of Criteria

Criteria Development

- Criterion: “A standard on which a judgment or decision may be based.”
Merriam-Webster Dictionary
- All Roundtable members may suggest criteria
- Criteria will be considered to assist in the development of the approaches
- The criteria will be used to evaluate the approaches
- Some items that are suggested may be listed as implementation issues

Brainstorm Approaches

Brainstorm Approaches

- Scope of Approaches
 - Identify possible general approaches (possible solutions) to address the near-term and long-term enrollment increases and solve the projected space deficits in the Walter Johnson middle and high schools
 - MCPS staff will analyze the feasibility of the possible approaches

Next Steps



Roundtable Meetings

Meeting		Activities
1	Feb. 17	Process, Housing Development, Enrollment Projections
2	Feb. 24	Develop Criteria, Brainstorm Secondary School Approaches
3	Mar. 2	Review and discuss secondary school approaches
4	Mar. 16	Share pluses/minuses. Brainstorm elementary school approaches. Determine if additional secondary school approaches are needed.
5	Apr. 6	Review and discuss elementary school approaches/secondary school approaches. Continue discussion of secondary school approaches.
6	Apr. 21	Share pluses/minuses of elementary school approaches. Determine if additional elementary school approaches are needed.
7	May 4	Review additional approaches as needed. Continue discussion. Review items for report
--	May 11	2 nd Public Information Meeting—Present Approaches
8	May 18	Share pluses/minuses of elementary school approaches if needed. Finalize report.
		PTAs will schedule meetings to share approaches/gather feedback.