

EFTF Meeting 11-18-21

In attendance:

Jim Chandler, Stuart Eisenberg, Daniel Muth, Kat Schooley, Joanne Waszczak, Sarah Weston

- HMS
 - o Build is on schedule
 - o Grading is done
 - o Minor silt issue along Oliver alleyway – Gilbane has been informed
- Swing schedule
 - o Hope to have all 7th and 8th graders at RGMS by the end of the quarter (end of January).
 - o Previous meeting with Goldson earlier this week – frustrations were voiced and she is monitoring the situation closely.
 - o Waterline was not the issue
 - o Currently waiting to see how quickly forces can be mobilized
- HES
 - o Conversation w/Jason Washington about how the County envisions this process moving forward
 - o They want to be doing 800 seat elementary schools – will help with consolidations in north and south county locations
 - o 800 capacity ES will not fit on HES site, even with the addition of the adjacent parking lot
- ACF Moving parts:
 - o PGCPs want consistent project types across the ACF package (i.e. all 800 seat, not one 600 seat)
 - o They need to have identified land (suitable for the project scope) before recommending a school for the new ACF
 - o Recommendations will probably happen around June
- Looking for land that will fit this size building – would need to be available by June in order for HES to be included in next phase of ACF
- Justice Center parcel may be looking at redevelopment, but not in the immediate future, definitely not soon enough to consider for ACF timeline.
- Best case scenario seems to try and stay on the same site and include adjacent parcels
- Choices remaining:
 - o Opt to not be considered for inclusion in ACF Round 2 package and rely on typical funding cycle – would most likely push timeline back significantly
 - According to Jason Washington, if HES is not included in the ACF, HES will be pushed to the top of the CIP with a shovel ready date
 - o Push to get HES into the new ACF package (and risk a swing situation)
 - It would most likely be an exception to the scope since an 800 seat school, even built urban style, would not fit on the current elementary school site
 - Have discussed possibilities of sub-terranean parking area
 - Have discussed playground on the roof
 - Could possibly happen due to HES Cycle 1 status and how loud we are about it
 - PGCPs not willing to purchase land from a private entity – possibly from the city, or via land-use agreement
 - Preference is for the project to be modular so it can go up quicker and reduce swing time (1-year). St. Matthew's would be the targeted swing space location since Cherokee Lane will have been completed by that time to free up that space. New person has been brought onto PGCPs team dedicated solely to

figure out swing situations. PGCPs is confident that St. Matthew's and modulars brought on site could fit the whole school (HES)

- Question remains: should we continue to pursue looking for parcels of land – there is not really anything available or appropriate for a school.
 - o Werrlein lower parcel really does not seem like a viable option – vetted earlier on
 - o Justice Center parcel seems ok, but only the County Services building is really up for redevelopment and not the area behind it.
- SE: What is the minimum SF required to fit an 800 seat elementary school?
 - o DM: Boundaries might need to be redrawn – neighboring school Thomas Stone is not necessarily over crowded, would we even fill the seats?
 - o SE: If the space is there, we will grow into it.
- Use of Verizon building was discussed with the possibility of adding an annex – location doesn't seem well suited for a school and the cost of retrofitting the current building would be cost prohibitive.
- Site discussed across flyover bridge near the river, but the school would then no longer be walkable for most of the community, the bridge would need to be redone and made more pedestrian friendly as well as Armentrout, and the majority of that site is within the floodplain
-
- Any complications like retrofitting, multiple sites, etc could serve as an excuse for the HES build not to happen, though in a meeting with the City, Jason Washington made it clear that ensuring the delivery of this school on a very consolidated schedule was his number one priority. He thought there might be some wiggle room in the number of students on the site, but he seemed pretty convinced that using the existing site with some very minor acquisition that could be justified, is going to be the most likely path forward.
- Max height for an urban-build elementary school would most likely be four stories – considerations for little kids moving vertically and travel time for transitions
- Potential land acquisitions that would help expand the site:
 - o City parking lot, private land owner nearby, possibly some of St. Jerome's parking lot on the south side of the school
 - o This could increase the site at least 50% more area
 - o There is an opportunity to capitalize on planning next steps of development that might benefit both schools – HES and St. Jerome's (since they're planning on potentially expanding in the future as well)
- DM: Are we comfortable putting a new school on the exact same site if all the land use agreements fall through
- SE: What is the footprint we're looking at for a viable school?
 - o Nearby 750 seat repeat elementary schools (like Mary Harris Mother Jones) have an approximate 52,000 SF footprint
 - o With an expanded site, we could probably fit 800 kids, especially if we're building vertically
- Does the committee scope change – is the EFTF being charged to go on a land acquisition search again? Dan and Stuart plan to sit down to create a visual map to try and identify possible acquisition opportunities to be able to present at a future meeting and evaluate the pros and cons of different possibilities.
- Formal recommendations for acquisition would need to be made by the committee

- PGCPs is currently going through the process of evaluating what schools could be included in the next ACF package. We would most likely need to have a viable site by early summer to even be considered. Land would need to be signed/sealed/delivered by fall.
- Is the City Council representative comfortable moving forward with recommendations that might require city engagement in (land acquisition) that hasn't happened in 50-60 years?
 - o JW: lots of lessons were learned with HMS and there seems to be more appetite for a fresh approach to get things done than in the past. Seems like bundling the site with adjacent properties is the most viable path forward. Should there be more regular memos and periodic checkins with the city to allow an accrual of information so decisions can be made more easily?
 - o JC: City parking lot usage is quite easy to accomplish, the neighboring parcel accrual would be more challenging. Quickest, 4-5 months.
 - o DM: Trying to get more timeline information from PGCPs – if PGCPs could give us the green light that HES can be included (on its current site, as is), then there might be more time to do due diligence in property accrual, etc.
- Committee agrees that it wants to push HES to be included in the new ACF and perform due diligence in examining the land around the current site to evaluate the best way to consolidate and benefit the siting of an urban style school
- JC: Is there absolutely no appetite for HES to be placed back into the typical CIP cycle? If not, that needs to be articulated.
- KS: If the school ends up not being modular, will that preclude it from being included in the ACF?
DM: Has not been said that way, but will ask the question
- JC: Committee should prepare something that everyone can review so committee can adopt it and then send to City Council re: position on CIP vs ACF and rationale behind it.
- DM agrees to look on this – confirms how this work can be done within Open Meeting parameters.
- Stuart proposed new language to govern the committee to give us more leeway:
 - o **Mission Statement:** *The mission of this committee is to ensure that the State and County address the local public school infrastructure needs as reported in the Approved 2017 Facilities Master Plan or as needs develop, and do so in a manner informed by local needs and conditions.*
 - o **Scope:** *The committee shall advise the Mayor and City Council on matters related to its goal, and to accomplish its goal shall recommend action within its authority under advisement of City staff and Council liaisons. These advisements may include the consideration of options for targeted property acquisitions which might be necessary to meet local public school infrastructure needs. Such advisement might include assessing and determining the availability and feasibility of a variety of local real estate options.*
 - o **Deliverables:** Ongoing advisement and recommendations.
- Recommended for adoption and accepted. JW agrees to bring to council and talk to them about the language and mission of the committee.
- DM announces upcoming move to CO and asked for folks to think about next chair and how to continue to relationships already established.