

DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS MASTER FACILITIES PLAN 2008

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES MODERNIZATION



Allen Y. Lew
Executive Director

2400 East Capitol Street, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
Phone: (202) 698-7762

2008 Master Facilities Plan

Plan Detail

March 3, 2009

DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS MASTER FACILITIES PLAN 2008

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Legislated MFP Requirements
3. The Phased Approach
 - 3.1. Impact of the Indoor Environment on Student Performance
 - 3.2. Elementary & Middle Schools
 - 3.3. High Schools
 - 3.4. New Construction Projects
 - 3.5. City-wide Phasing Summary
 - 3.6. Program Goals
4. Schedule
 - 4.1. The First 5 Years
 - 4.2. Later Years
 - 4.3. Project Implementation Timelines
 - 4.3.1. Phase I Modernizations
 - 4.3.2. Combined Phase Modernizations
 - 4.3.3. Phase III Modernizations
 - 4.4. The First 2-Year Plan
 - 4.5. Future MFP Evaluations
5. Budget
 - 5.1. 8-Year MFP Financial Projection
 - 5.1.1. Sources of Funds
 - 5.1.2. Uses of Funds
 - 5.2. Scope of Work and Estimating Methodology
 - 5.2.1. Conceptual Nature of Budgeting
 - 5.2.2. Elementary & Middle Schools
 - 5.2.3. High Schools
6. Mini-Master Plans
 - 6.1. Aerial Photo / Site Plan
 - 6.2. Proposed Program Profile
 - 6.3. Condition Assessment
 - 6.4. Recent History of Modernization
 - 6.5. Concept Plans
7. Glossary of Terms

DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS MASTER FACILITIES PLAN 2008

1.0 Introduction

This document outlines the overall implementation strategy and provides school-by-school detail for the Master Facilities Plan (“MFP”), submitted to the Council of the District of Columbia by the Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization (“OPEFM”) on September 10, 2008. As a master plan, this document is intended to serve as a guiding tool for the phased implementation of modernization projects. As such, it describes the approach to project scoping, establishes parameters for scheduling, and illustrates a framework for project budgeting; however, it is not intended to serve as the definitive basis for construction activity at each school. Rather, each individual project summarized herein will be subject to more detailed scoping, programming, budgeting, and review as its implementation date is reached.

It is anticipated that the formal design and construction planning activities will involve input from school and community constituents as an integral component of the process. Moreover, the detailed project scoping will give consideration to evolving academic initiatives and the realities of the condition of the facility in question at the time. In addition to embracing the desired educational and associated facility outcomes, each project will be managed to achieve essential goals relating to green design, CBE participation, and on-time and on-budget delivery.

This document is an extension of the work completed by the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education and builds upon the public meeting data gathered during the previous planning process. The outreach process included twelve community meetings and over 40 total community planning sessions. Over 1,000 residents participated in the public forums with resultant changes to the MFP clearly documented.

In addition, OPEFM conducted four city-wide Community Information Sessions and presented the entirety of the MFP to parents, students, teachers, and neighborhood leaders. The meetings were hosted between September 22, 2008 and October 6, 2008 and all were recorded by the DC Office of Cable Television. The sessions were publicized by issuing public service announcements to the local print and broadcast outlets, all ANCs, and listserves and blogs for community organizations, school modernization advocates, and civic associations. Advertisements were also purchased in the Washington Post, Washington Informer, and El Tiempo Latino. Each meeting was transcribed and the transcripts are available on the OPEFM website.

OPEFM senior administrators and planners have also met monthly for over a year with the legislatively mandated Modernization Advisory Committee (“MAC”). The MAC is comprised of Council, Mayoral, and former Board of Education appointees. The MAC has served as a sounding board for OPEFM initiatives and has been briefed on the MFP. MAC recommendations have been given great weight in the planning process and have been incorporated in the final draft.

DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS MASTER FACILITIES PLAN 2008

2.0 Legislated Plan Requirements

The MFP addresses and responds to the several specific requirements of the plan legislated by the DC City Council. The Executive Summary outlines the analysis of historical and projected enrollment data, current and projected demographic information, and other relevant neighborhood and planning issues. The Mini-master Plans developed for each school address required, building-specific evaluations, including facility condition assessments; existing capacities, utilization levels, and appropriate consolidations; and incorporate school disposition considerations. The Plan Detail narrative and the Executive Summary both describe the education objectives of the OOC and outline specific facility requirements and potential public – private partnerships that work to advance the stated education goals and outcomes.

District legislation also creates a Modernization Advisory Committee that is responsible for participating in the planning process and offering specific comments on and assessments of draft versions of the MFP. OPEFM has worked to keep the MAC engaged in the planning process, providing draft planning documents for review, participating in evaluation sessions, collecting Advisory Committee assessments, and incorporating comments and suggested refinements. As per the legislation, the MAC reviewed the MFP to verify the adequacy of the planning and facility information, the support created for the educational programs, the consideration of community planning issues, and the participation of disadvantaged business enterprises in the modernization program. In addition to the verification process, the MAC also offered detailed assessments and suggestions for improvements regarding the alignment with educational outcomes, the sufficiency of the capital budget, the quality of community participation, the potential role private and agency partnerships, and the establishment of measurable benchmarks for the implementation of the MFP.