MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County School Board Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 5, 2026

Date	Thursday, March 5, 2026
Place	Fairfax County School Board, Virginia
Length	1h 8m (video)

- Official meeting video (YouTube): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UecQ24JEjfI
- Official School Board page (FCPS): https://www.fcps.edu/about-fcps/leadership/school-board

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-28. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:03:28] Okay, in order to comply with section 2.2-3712D of the code of... The time is 7.23 p.m. in this March 5, 2026 public session of the Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee of the Fairfax County School Board will now come to order.

[00:03:48] Ms. Pitches has notified the chair of the committee and deputy clerk of the board that she's using remote participation and she's caregiving for an individual with a disability. Thus, Ms. Pitches will be counted as in person for the purpose of quorum tonight and does not need to be voted in by the board. She's located in Fairfax City, Virginia, and we've already done audio-visual checks.

[00:04:06] Mr. Dunn has submitted a request to attend tonight's meeting virtually due to personal reasons as he has a professional obligation conflict and is located in Mount Vernon, Virginia. I performed an initial review of Mr. Dunn's request and having found it to be in compliance with school boards without participation resolution, I've approved the request. Mr. Dunn, can you do an audiovisual check?

[00:04:24] Yes, can you hear me? We can hear you. I now ask committee members who are physically present to vote on the following. All those in favor of confirming the chair's approval of Mr. Dunn's request and this pitches, that's unanimous for board members present.

[00:04:40] All right. In order to comply with section 2.2-3712D of the Code of Virginia, it's necessary for the committee to certify that since the Fairfax County School Board Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee convened a closed meeting on March 5, 2026, to the best of each member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening a closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the committee during the closed session.

[00:05:06] Do I have a motion? Ms. Mirren, is there a second? Aye. Mr. Dunn seconds the motion. Mr. Dunn, was that for seconding the motion? Yes. Okay, thank you. All those in favor?

[00:05:24] That's unanimous. I call on Mr. Dunn for a motion. Getting there.

[00:05:40] I move that the Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee endorse Kathy Moy, Janice Szymanski, Anthony DeLorenzo, Rohit Setti, and Deborah Yap as community members of the Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee and authorize the CPDC chair and clerks to offer terms to these members based on their preference and advance this recommendation to the school board for its consideration.

[00:06:06] Is there a second? I'll second. All those in favor? Any discussion? Although we can't technically discuss this. No. All in favor? Ms. Pitches? Okay, that's unanimous.

[00:06:21] And I call on Mr. Dunn for another motion. I move that in the event that one of the five community member appointees declines, that the next ranked member of the winter 2026 candidate will be offered a community member seat.

[00:06:40] Is there a second? I'll second. All in favor? That's unanimous. And I call on Mr. Dunn for a motion. I move that the Comprehensive Planning and Development Committee adopt the double majority voting for community members of the CPDC.

[00:07:01] Is there a second? I shall second. All in favor? That's unanimous. All right, agenda item 3.03, approval of minutes. The minutes of the December 11th, 2025 CPDC meeting are before the committee for approval. Is there a motion? Aye, so move.

[00:07:18] Mr. Dunn, is there a second? I second. Ms. Mirren. Yes, I just wanted to note in the minutes on page three, it looks like there's supposed to be a link to the joint facility review. It says it can be accessed here.

[00:07:34] So if the clerks are able to just insert that, I am happy to vote on that. Is that amenable to the chair? Without objection, that's all in favor. I heard her say aye.

[00:07:50] That's unanimous. Okay, agenda item 3.04, policy review. So before we get into the specific policies, several policies have kind of been in and out of committee and discussions on the dais. And tonight we're going to be looking at, I believe it's six policies.

[00:08:08] Ms. Mirren is chair of the governance committee is intimately familiar with these. I think there were some questions by board members on some of these policies. So the recommendation was to have a discussion here CPDC on these so we'll just go down the list in order of the agenda so the first one on the block is policy 8410 leasing for school facilities and I'll call on mr. Gordon for an overview hey thank you sir so school board policy 8410 leasing of school facilities provides the means for the community at large the use of our facilities based on contract approval and a fee applicable and calls

[00:08:47] on the superintendent provide an annual report detailing usage within the floor for discussion mr chair if i can just give um an overview perhaps i could just before we discuss i could just crosswalk super quick about governance so governance had reviewed this on january 20th we might have reviewed it even quite a bit before then but we had approved it to go to the board on january 20th so governance was comfortable with it at the time but we're going to discuss

[00:09:17] further now thank you there any other discussion on the uh 8410 policy yes um uh i i had a question um so i have received over the past two or three years uh many reports and complaints from community groups that um they are unable to use um our school facilities anymore because again based on what i was told and so i'm seeking to clarify and see if it's been um if this cures

[00:09:53] the problem that they are required to have a one million dollar liability policy for any use and most of these groups you know operate with very small budgets they're not profitable they're non-profit groups boy scouts or fairfax federation or or other groups that are seeking to do you know beneficial community work and and and don't have recourse to our facilities and so i'm just trying to understand i i don't see that here in the policy maybe it's in the regulation but if it

[00:10:28] maybe it was fixed and so i just like to make sure i understand um what's been done hey sir i'm not aware of a one million dollar requirement for insurance but it doesn't mean it doesn't exist so i'd have to take that to do out and do some further research may i ask my colleagues if i'm the only one who's heard this um i thought miss marron might have said something similar to me in the past but but maybe not no i i mean i have heard this and i do wonder if it's in regulation

[00:11:01] you're right that it's not in the policy so it's clearly not in the policy and i guess the question is you know actually i wonder if it's in community use do you know off hand i mean i could just do a quick search now but well let me just i'll just pull up the policy real quick um isn't this the policy this is entitled leasing and community use of facilities that is actually different than community use. Community use is a whole different policy. Then may I suggest we remove the words

[00:11:40] community use from this policy to avoid confusion? It does. It certainly does say that. Ms. Pitches, go ahead. I have had the exact same question from civic associations who have tried

[00:12:08] to use our school and i think it is in community use i'm just trying to crosswalk um if you just give me a minute to pull up the community use policy subject to ms marron's discovery um i my preference would be to postpone approval of this particular policy until we're able to get the information from mr gordon because i think it's a serious issue it's definitely an issue i've raised with the superintendent uh several times and you know other priorities have have taken place i've

[00:12:45] never really gotten a satisfactory answer but if we need to amend this policy to make clear that um you know consistent with the mandate uh from the county to make these facilities available for use um and to reduce um you know regulatory barriers to their use um that that would be my preference i believe i i was not in the meeting but i thought uh miss marron that maybe this was you know the community use and access to facilities was something that uh you and mr mcdaniel had discussed with Mr. McKay and whoever the other member of the joint board facilities board

[00:13:23] before it got dissolved. Yeah, so there's a lot of stuff I'm trying to pull together. So 8410, which is on the agenda, which deals with leasing, and it was updated per the January 20th governance meeting that is titled leasing of community use of facilities. 8420 is the community use of school facilities policy, which

I have done much editing and reworking of and gave that the superintendent in early December with recommendations and to my knowledge it has not gone anywhere and I will just say since you brought up the joint facility committee yes indeed that's

[00:14:02] finished and we don't have the product which is trying to find budget efficiencies to inform this budget cycle development and I have not heard if we're if anyone's going to be fulfilling what the chairman Jeff McKay proposed to bring forth from that work. Can I ask staff a question so in reading this, is there a bifurcation between any type of leasing and community use? Is all leasing community use? Or is there a different subset of leasing that is not community use, if that makes sense? So when I think leasing, that could also mean if we long-term leased a property

[00:14:37] out, which would not fall under community use. Correct. So there could be a separate path, right? So we do do leasing. We're talking about leasing out right-of-ways. There's also leasing of facilities. So I do think there are common crossovers, but there are separate paths as well. So it's possible that a title change of this document, since there is a

[00:15:11] separate true community use policy that deals with traditional community use, not necessarily leasing per se, would a title change satisfy? You know, I really can't say, because I wasn't, and forgive me maybe i missed this but i wasn't aware that that was the thrust of mr dunn's question and i know that community use is quite different so i think we do and i will voice once again this is my challenge with the policy work is that the superintendent the goal was for her

[00:15:45] to bring forth analyses that would allow us to crosswalk with other policies and it's irritating that were here months after this was reviewed and this wasn't called out in governance by the superintendent and legal. So I'd have to say that we should have 8410 and 8420 reviewed by the superintendent as a directive from CBDC, right? Is 8420 on your docket? It is not. I was

[00:16:19] just trying to be helpful because there was kind of a quagmire, but that continues. It seems like they're directly related because you know there's elements in here that's about long-term leasing permissive mcdaniel's comment but community use is really basically short-term leasing like you know the day rate or the hourly rate as opposed to you know weeks or months um maybe they should be combined into one policy because if you're talking about leasing and use for any period of time you know there should be a common set of terms and conditions whatever that is all right

[00:16:58] So without objection, what we'll do is we'll package 81, 40, 84, 20 and request the superintendent parallel. Sure. And so I've put them together. I'm just going to send an email to our committee so we all have the links. And then I'll leave it to the chair to communicate with the superintendent about those two policies.

[00:17:17] Do we need a motion to formally do that? I mean, technically. In governance, oh gosh, in governance, we don't usually. Let me check. Gosh, I can't remember. i know we obviously make a motion when we send it to the board uh do we make a motion when we send it to the superintendent a little more binding yes a motion isn't necessary but you

[00:17:46] can always move to remand it to the superintendent for the review mr mcdaniel do you have a preference i i mean it's going to get done either way so i mean without objection it is it can be so ordered if that works for everybody that works okay yeah i'm just trying to be consistent with how governance

[00:18:14] does it for whatever that's worth because does miss pitches have any objections so we're agreeing that um the superintendent will review those two in time for the next cpdc meeting in advance of the next cpdc meeting is that correct that's fine we'll move on to agenda item 3.05 policy review

[00:18:49] policy 8320 site and building acquisition yes sir school board policy 8320 uh site and building acquisition authorizes the vision to acquire real property that meets school and school related needs thank you uh may i ask a question sure um so uh we recently acquired the western

[00:19:29] high school now skyview um was has anyone taken a look at this through that lens um and through the lens of what was done at bailey's upper where we acquired an office building just to make sure that this policy enables acquisitions like those given even though they're rare once in a blue moon i just want to make sure that this policy supports that robust analysis well yes sir i believe it does under states you know um school board affirms that this program shall be beneficial to the

[00:20:07] fairfax county public schools the community the uh the county taxpayers by ensuring that the acquisition of sites and or building meets the school and school related needs i think that would beat both bailey's upper and the acquisition of skyview as well uh and and what about disposal because i know that um there was the clifton elementary we approved the i guess the destruction of that building the the demolition um but there have been occasions in the past when the school

[00:20:42] board has transferred properties to the county um and this only covers acquiring property is there a separate policy governing property disposal there is a separate uh disposal policy i don't have it in front of me but there is a separate one okay that's one to check yeah i have no more questions i will just add that this uh there was no objection in governance to this when

[00:21:12] we reviewed it in january 20 january 20th so without a we can do a motion to send this to the board that's fine uh is there a motion let me see all right is there a motion to advance policy 8320 site building acquisition as detailed in the agenda item of the school board for consideration i'm happy to make a motion okay miss mirin has made the motion is there a second second

[00:21:47] mr dunn is second would you like to speak to your motion no done would you like to speak to your second no all right all in favor that's unanimous all right agenda item 3.06 policy review policy 8310 site planning and development mr gordon to call you commissioner too funny yes sir uh school board policy 8310 site planning and development codifies the minimum amount of acreage required by by virginia regulations for our elementary school middle school and high schools it also details

[00:22:26] the waiver policies and processes also mentions the use of you know drought resistant vegetation and directs the installation of artificial turf fields whenever possible. Thank you. I did have questions.

[00:22:46] I think they were generally addressed, but I wanted to go back. My only concern is there's a reference to a state document. I believe there's a reference to a state document, the guidelines for school facilities in Virginia's public schools. I took a look at that. It seems like Virginia's a large commonwealth, and there are a lot of diverse school divisions in terms of land and size and student enrollment and enrollment at the school level, it seems like this document that the state's put out doesn't really recognize urban school systems like Fairfax County.

[00:23:22] And I mean, doing some simple math that this policy is going to effectively codify would suggest that some of our high school sites and some elementary school sites don't meet their own

requirements that would be approved in this policy.

[00:23:38] So my understanding is that we have to go to the state to get approval for new schools, and then they run this through this formula over acreage. Is there a waiver process for that, or are we setting ourselves up for failure? What I read here was we would submit a waiver to the school board.

[00:23:54] The school board then would approve or not approve it, and approval then would be sent for notification on to the state. Okay. I'm not tracking. It is a minimal threshold. Right. I'm not tracking where it would be waiting for approval from the state.

[00:24:10] Okay. Yeah, I wasn't quite clear reading that document from the state, whether there was, whether it was suggestion or requirements, whether waivers are actually debated and potentially rejected. But doing some math, I mean, playing off the Skyview example, Skyview would not meet because that site's just shy of 34 acres.

[00:24:33] And if you assume 2,000 enrollment, you know, 15 plus 20, that's 35. So 35 acres in this document would be required for Skyview. However, Skyview is 33 and about a half acre. So that was the math I was doing.

[00:24:50] And that was my only really concern with this policy. I think other areas across the state, whether it be Richmond, Tidewater, would be in the same predicament. May I ask, if we were acquiring another office building like Bailey's Upper, would, I mean, do we have to put in section,

[00:25:24] five um is that like a mandatory part of the policy or is that just discretionary for us because we're creating an extra process step where the school board needs to approve that or is that required by law i don't know that it's required by law but i understand it to be the minimal thresholds that is given guidance by the state but i think you know the intent is that you generally operate within the minimal thresholds but minimum thresholds are those established in law or simply a policy document because minimum thresholds can be discretionary or they can be

[00:26:03] like uh when when it goes to the state department of education do they have the right to to veto us to say we can't you know build a school there or use that site as a school i might have to get with general counsel to see if it's required by law i don't know the answer to that question because just to build off mr mcdanus comment i mean i would favor stripping out or suggesting the governance to strip out the size requirements because I just think going forward, we want to have maximum flexibility. And if something isn't legally required, I don't know why we would

[00:26:38] adopt into policy and making it legally required. I did review those guidelines previously. They did not seem, I didn't see any reference and it's been a while, but I didn't see any reference to any state law in there. I mean, I just would, again, I'll take a do out to check with general counsel on that. And, but I would say, you know, even some of these minimal thresholds aren't something that we would actively and necessarily do.

[00:27:04] So we're looking to acquire a new property, you know, we're going to look to acquire a property that would support the whole requirement or as much as possible. Yeah, I agree. I mean, I read that document. I couldn't find any reference to any code section that mandates compliance with it. I think there, in conversations with staff about a month ago, I know that there is some type of a waiver process which would imply that there's a requirement to do something, but it's apparently waiverable.

[00:27:34] Um, so I guess the question for the, for the committee is, do we want to, what do we want to do with this? Do we want to put a pin in this one and get, I'd like to get legal advice on this to see if it's legally required, because I'm not in favor of mandating that we submit anything to the state board of education that we don't need to by law.

[00:27:59] The guideline says not legally required, but I think it's still worth, um, checking with legal to make sure there's not some sort of second and third order effect by not complying. So without objection, we'll ask counsel for a review of this.

[00:28:19] That was 8310. All right, agenda item 3.07, policy review, policy 8275, facility design and construction value.

[00:28:52] Yes, sir. School board policy 8275, value engineering, directs the division superintendent, shall establish regulations and procedures to require all school construction projects to be value engineered as a standard practice. Thank you.

[00:29:11] I have a question about this, if I may. Sure. So, I am familiar with value engineering from having been responsible for facilities for a large federal agency, but I wanted to ask whether this concept is tied to one of the particular construction management methodologies.

[00:29:43] We've been discussing design-bid-build, design-build, and construction management at risk. And so what I wanted to understand is, does this policy apply? I believe it applies to design-bid-build, but I think the application to the other two management approaches, construction management at risk and design-build, would be somewhat more problematic.

[00:30:09] But I wanted to ask Mr. Gordon, because you're the expert here. Hey, sir, I would say with design build or CM at risk, inherently the way those two procurement options are set up, it has almost a value engineering component to that, because the purpose of when you look at a design build project is you're hiring that entity, and even with CM at risk, you're hiring the construction manager that works for the, as an owner's rep, they're out there looking for the best, you know, you give them a problem and they look how to solve it.

[00:30:45] And so they're supposed to come to those options, and especially with the CM at risk, you know, when you work through the process and get through design and the construction manager gives you the guaranteed maximum price, so that, you know, that entity then takes, assumes the risk for the price from that point forward.

[00:31:00] So I would say those two procurement methods have some sort of natural value engineering component part of it as part of the procurement method. And is that specifically called out, or is it just implicit? I don't recall that it's called out, but I think just in the process, you know, especially in design build, you know, as an owner, you give the problem set and then it's traditional and you give them some, you know, you give them our ed specs up front and then they solve the problem for you.

[00:31:28] They're out there looking for kind of the best value while meeting our design and master specs at the same time. Design guidelines mean the ed specs and the master specs at the same time. And in the federal space, there's lowest possible cost, but there's also best price and best price or best value, sorry, best value can be something other than the lowest possible cost.

[00:31:58] but the purpose section of this memo refers to lowest possible cost. Do you understand value engineering to always require the lowest bid, selection of the lowest bid? Or do you understand that to perhaps it might be a higher bid because it might result in a better quality work product?

[00:32:17] So I think we have best value as part of our procurement method. So we're not just picking, you know, the lowest quality material, right? So I think we have the ability to choose what's best for us as an organization. Okay, thank you.

[00:32:34] No more questions? This is 8725. It will be. I had a quick question.

[00:32:50] In the acquisition, in the entire bid acquisition process for capital projects, once everything goes to execution, is there any type of clause or stipulation that specifically calls out value engineering? Because it's kind of a philosophical concept.

[00:33:07] I would say typically, sir, in the true value engineering aspect, how I've been used to it in the time for, as Mr. Dunn was saying, it is a design, bid, design, build, design, bid, build process. Usually you get into it where you've got a bid bust, and now you're trying to work backwards.

[00:33:26] So now you're value engineering out some material type, putting in some lower cost type material to get you into an awardable project is how it usually works in that. But I think what this is telling us is to look at the costs on the front end to make sure they're in the design process that we've got the best, for lack of better terms, we're not gold plating, you know, a facility, right?

[00:33:49] I do have a question. So the policy that we updated in September about procurement methods, alternative procurement methods, it's not on this list. And is it, is it 8240, right, Mateo, right, 8240?

[00:34:09] Okay. It's 8275. That's the one we're discussing right now. Yes, Mr. Dunn. I was talking about the big procurement policy we updated in the fall. Oh, yes, 8 to 40. 8 to 40. Okay, so in our conversation today, we've just been talking about alternative methods of procurement, and that leads me to raise a point that has come up recently about do we need to add modular construction into that policy or this policy?

[00:34:38] And I don't know if that's a question for legal, but do we explicitly need to say that this is allowed? Am I right, Mr. Dunn? Yes. I prefer factory construction because it more clearly it distinguishes more clearly between the modulars that are trailers with plumbing versus the, you know, building a school in a factory. Okay. So again, so the question is,

[00:35:04] Does this need to be explicitly said that it's allowed, explicitly approved in our policy, and is that policy this value engineering policy, or is it 8240?

[00:35:21] Is that the question we have? Yes. Mr. Gordon, I don't know if you can answer that. I don't know if it's a legal thing. It might take some time, but that is the question. I mean, I have my emotional answer, I would say, but I think I need to go back to legal just to make sure the left and right limits are checked.

[00:35:37] I don't know why we would do that necessarily, but I'd need to at least get that from a legal perspective. So, thank you, and that's reasonable. So do we want to wait on the value engineering one in case it lives here? So correct me if I'm, let me ask this question.

[00:35:59] The three different forms of procurement, DB, design bill, design bid bill, and CM at risk, those are procurement methodologies. Correct. Yes, sir. Go ahead. Modular or factory construction is not how we acquire the building, but how we construct the building.

[00:36:23] So I would think that it would not live within a procurement acquisition policy. It would live somewhere else. I would agree. I think it would be part of our, you know, ed specs, master, you know, design schedule.

[00:36:40] How are we directing? Kind of what standards are we using? I think it would lie there. Okay. Is there anything now that stops you from looking at whether it's factory construction or? I don't think so.

[00:36:56] Because I know that the acquisition process, the acquisition methodologies, we did need to approve that. And I guess the question would be, do we need to approve factory construction for similar reasons? Does that make sense?

[00:37:13] Yeah. So, you know, just thinking out loud, and it's going back to A240, so you are correct. So our standard path forward for procurement is design, bid, build. And there is state regulation, state law that talks about you can only use design, build or CM at risk if it's a complex project.

[00:37:33] And it gives a definition of what complex is. So then if we're going to use design, build or CM at risk, we have to then submit a letter of sufficiency or request to the board asking permission basically to go forward.

[00:37:49] either one of those two types of procurement options. So then closing out from my perspective of this conversation, I'd like to go back to staff and say, you know, and get maybe a legal look as well. Again, I don't know anything that would stop us from using this factory-type build as part of it because when you look at the concept of it, you know, up to 35%, 40% of it can be a traditional build.

[00:38:13] So your classroom, I mean, your gymnasium, cafeteria. Core, service fee. Yeah, core, vertical, cavans are all traditional build. and the other stuff are just kind of add-on type factories build. So it sounds like the status is we could make it as staff will continue to review and return to CPDC with the updated recommendation because maybe it's ed specs, maybe it's something else, right, for $82.75.

[00:38:41] Okay. And can we get that for next month CPDC meeting just like the other do-out? Do you think you guys is a month enough to come back with? Okay. Yes, sir. So we can go ahead and move value engineering forward.

[00:38:59] What I'm hearing is we can go ahead and move value engineering forward. Well, are we going to approve the policy? I think we can approve the value engineering policy. And then in the meantime. And then at the next meeting, we can have a discussion around the factory construction. You don't think that that would go into the value engineering policy?

[00:39:16] I don't think it. But if it does, we could always amend the policy. Why don't we move it on its way? That's fine. Okay. So we would take a motion to send it to the full board and also have staff. We're not going to do a motion for that, but staff will return. At the next CPDC. is there a move I move that CPDC advance policy 8275 facilities design and construction value as detailed in the agenda item to the school board for

[00:39:48] consideration yes I second mr. don't I speak to your motion no yes okay the title of this is actually value engineering it's not facilities design and construction um that's the office that it's in so without objection the motion should read that we want to put forward 8275 which is titled value engineering that's sorry i was reading the

[00:40:26] script right yeah there's just a discrepancy in two of the agenda items and the titles it's a 3.07 and 0.08 it's confusing because every policy has three lines so this is facilities office of facilities design and construction the title of this policy is value engineering so i just want to make the motion aligned with the title of the policy and it's the same issue for the next one do you so mr dunn would it's just a title thing you want me to read it again why don't we clarify

[00:41:01] why don't we read the motion it also does say policy 8275 why don't we read that motion again just to make sure that we're on the short page um i moved that cpdc advanced policy 8275 value engineering as detailed in the agenda item to the school board for consideration okay is there a second thank you any discussion no no all in favor that's unanimous if i don't

[00:41:32] get this next one wrong oh okay okay agenda item 8.03 policy 3.08 policy review policy 8560 maintenance

[00:42:06] of physical facilities Mr. Gordon yes sir school board policy 8560 maintenance of public school facility assets is that the one we're on maintenance and physical assets thank you um directs the superintendent um with the oversight and uh maintenance of our real property inventory thank you other questions on this one may I ask uh Ms. Marin for just a brief explanation of the

[00:42:36] red line unless the red line was done by mr. Gordon so this was the main changes

[00:43:07] were that we created a philosophy about the facilities and then clarified who is responsible for maintenance and I recall that I particularly wanted to have these this language updated because as we did the facilities work it was clear that the school division is carrying the onus of maintaining facilities that are used beyond instructional hours by community use so we wanted to make that very clear in here and then we did not want the responsibility to rely on this

[00:43:45] to lie on the school principal we did talk about that because the principals know their buildings the best but ultimately it is the superintendent who carries that responsibility and so we also did not want to put it on custodians so that is why it's updated thank you it sounds like you're just kind of more aligning that control and responsibility yes and setting the stage for hopefully future help with maintaining our buildings when used by other people and organizations i i support that um i i think

[00:44:22] especially in light of our significant deferred maintenance backlog that's growing at a rapid rate we need to make sure that we assign appropriate responsibility to the superintendent because most of that is a budget matter and and at her level rather than some some someone beneath her all right notice if there's no discussion um is there a motion to send us to the board for approval

[00:44:46] i'll move okay is there a second second all right any discussion nope all in favor that's unanimous all right last item agenda item 3.09 policy review policy 8335 wireless telecommunications facilities mr. Gordon this our school board policy 8335 wireless telecommunication facilities directs

[00:45:24] the superintendent were feasible and unobtrusive to consider installation of monopoles given public proper public engagement has occurred and approval by the school board thank you and if I may just to note that governance did not review this because we knew that it was a coming so we're starting that discussion here um i i'm a little so this is an issue that can be of you know great concern for some members of the community um so i just wanted to ask a couple

[00:46:04] questions um when it refers to wireless telecommunication facilities um is that referring to uh kind of the mini cell phone towers is it referring to the big cell phone towers or What exactly is within the scope of wireless telecommunication facilities?

[00:46:24] So it's a monopole. And I don't know, you know, sort of what definition you're using from small to big, but it's a cell phone tower that would sit on a property. And granted, yes, these can be contentious with the community. That's why there's a community engagement requirement to occur.

[00:46:42] And then, you know, we would have to come back to the school board with demonstrating that we did go through the community at large to inform them and then seek approval from the school board. I think each one of these has to be approved by the school board as part of this policy. Sorry, can you define what a monopole is?

[00:47:03] Structurally, it's a vertical steel structure that has some sort of ability to have cell phone transfer, you know, cell phone, I don't know what am I looking for, apparatuses that would, you know, catch signals and transfer signals.

[00:47:24] So let me clarify what I meant. So there are the big towers that are usually just lattice framework, like the Eiffel Tower. They usually have four, you know, a square base, and then it goes up like a triangle, right?

[00:47:42] And it gets very thin towards the top. Usually, you know, there are cables holding it to prevent falling over in the wind. And then there's, you know, different, you know, communication devices up at the top. Sorry? flagpole. Well, I don't like the word pole because when I say the word telephone pole, like I think of a single piece of wood that's stuck in the ground, right? And a monopole can be a, it to me implies like a single steel beam that's put in the ground. But beyond those tall towers that you often see primarily in rural areas, you know, many, there are now many, many

[00:48:21] cell phone towers, which by the wrong word, but they put them on top of the church steeples, Sometimes school buildings, they're very small. They look like basically a satellite TV antenna, right? About that size. So which are the size of the monopoles to which you're referring? Because I mean, I type into Google, nothing comes up. And that just concerns me. If Google doesn't know, then I don't know how we'll be sure what a monopole is for our constituents.

[00:48:53] So the ones I've seen on our property are metal, and they resemble a flagpole, and they generally go up one or two stories, and there could be some sort of small building at the base of it. They're generally unobtrusive as far as the amount of square footies they take up, and it's generally placed on a piece of the property that wouldn't hinder us from doing any kind of feature renovations.

[00:49:22] Okay, thank you. Yeah, these are, if I recall, if you drive through Clifton, they try to dress them up as trees. It doesn't work. Once you've observed it, you observe it every time. But from my understanding, the monopoles are, it's the single pole, a couple stories tall, has the array at the top.

[00:49:43] And I would also note that any type of monopole construction would have to apply with county zoning ordinance, construction permits, all that. And that's all on the onus of the company putting it in, not the school division.

[00:50:03] You also have the right to refuse it as well, so you don't have to go with it. I don't understand under Roman numeral five authority B, where it says the school board reserves the right to review and

approve or disprove any application prior to any government review or approval.

[00:50:25] Based on what was just said, presumably we would refuse it rather than – it seems like we don't need to reserve the right. We have the inherent right to veto anything going on school property.

[00:50:40] So that just seems like we have that inherent right to reject it unless it's mandated by law. Well, I think the purpose here is to make sure that there is no misunderstanding that to do this, we have to have the school board policy approval to do that. So no one is acting unilaterally in my shop who maybe didn't know.

[00:51:00] I think it's good to keep it in there. That way it keeps us on our left and right limits. Well, could we change it to instead of the school board reserves the right to review, just say the school board shall review and approve slash disapprove? So it makes clear like there will be an affirmative vote of the school board on any monopole installations.

[00:51:19] No objection from staff. So I am scraping the recesses of my mind because when I first got on the board, this was a hot topic in 2020. And then it dissolved when COVID came about.

[00:51:38] And so the benefit of having a cell phone tower, which is really more of the language that we're familiar with, is coverage. And we have spaces that have dead zones in our community. And there was a discussion about what's needed.

[00:51:57] There was a planning process that intertwines this with Fairfax County government. And so, for sure, the school board did approve when these would happen, but then it had to ultimately be approved, if I remember correctly, by the county.

[00:52:14] So that's a bit of information, and then we haven't talked about it since. Now, I'm thinking about the security updates that have been done in our schools to increase communications capacity. And so, you know, there was a case to be made about cell phone towers for schools that needed better coverage and then there was a case to be made for neighborhoods that needed better coverage especially for emergency services so I think we need some more information on this and this is really the first discussion that we're

[00:52:49] having about it I haven't heard any requests coming through because we would have received them the board has to vote on them so is this still even a hot topic or is the technology changed so much you know because now like mr.

[00:53:08] Dunn was saying like you could put these things on little signs and you know I just would like it to reflect the most current terminology and use that's what I'm thinking so I get a question kind of teeing off of that let's playing off the example let's say it's not the three four story big tree looking thing let's say it is a to Mr. Dunn's point something smaller would that still be considered a telecom so it has to go through policy yes because you guys have to say yes or

[00:53:47] no to it before it goes to any permit regulation or any government agency beyond us. If it were something smaller like attached in a stadium to one of the light poles then the county could review it and determine whether they need to approve it. I mean it sounds like we might even want to talk with the county and say like what's their process and what do they need at this point it's really the last time we talked about this was five years ago so. I guess my

[00:54:22] question is i don't i have no desire either way but my question is if if if we approve if we approve the policy as is understanding that it still has to go through the zoning building permit all that stuff and come for board approval would that that would not necessarily preclude any any information that we would get on let's say the county land use process wouldn't be put into i don't think would be put into the policy so if we want to move the policy forward we could also

[00:54:55] get information from the county on their process I'm just trying to keep moving the stuff forward so we don't have to hold up the policy so to speak yeah no I appreciate that but even like the title of this telecommunications facilities is it one of these things a facility or it's an attachment or it's a like I just think it's it's dated too much to just send it through So if I may ask a question, and at some point, I have another question about 8310.

[00:55:35] I know we moved on, but since we put a hold on that, I just had one more thing I wanted to raise about that. But for this one and the purpose, it says to promote wireless connectivity and enhance the instructional program of FCPS and to get revenue.

[00:55:54] So when we put a monopole up, I guess it results in better cell phone coverage in the school. Is that correct? I think it supports cell phone coverage for the community within the school.

[00:56:09] I think it also helps. I don't know if it has a direct tie-in to some of our internal communications within the safety and security office. I think they have some of their own repeaters, but there could be some assistance in that communication as well. And does this provide revenue to FCPS?

[00:56:25] Yes, sir, it does. Do you know how much? I think the number off the top of my head is somewhere maybe a million dollars a year. For each monopole? No, in total. How many monopoles do we have?

[00:56:42] Approximately 36. And is the idea of disenhancing the instructional program, is that because there's greater cell phone coverage? You know, I don't know the answer to that question.

[00:57:04] I don't know if there's a, you know, again, a direct linkage to improving or what means it does improve instructional programs. I'd have to take that as a do out. Okay. I support moving it forward, but, you know, I'd like to hear Ms. Merritt's thoughts.

[00:57:27] I think Ms. Pitch has also had some thoughts. We have one at Fairbanks High School. We installed it in 2017. It has not provided any better cell phone coverage in our building.

[00:57:48] One poll does not bring in a significant amount of revenue. It also depends on how many providers are on the poll. Ours is currently a light, one of the field lights around the track.

[00:58:04] It's, I don't know, for lack of better words, they have it disguised as a light. But we had hoped it would improve the cell phone coverage in the building.

[00:58:20] It did not. And while we do get some revenue from the monopole, it's not significant enough, I would say. But the one upside is we have never received any complaints or concerns from the community about it.

[00:58:38] I think I calculated it as about $27,000 per year per poll. Yeah, I think we get a little bit more than that, but not much.

[00:58:56] So do we want to put a pin in this one or move it? I would like more information, a lot more information. What are the questions we have here? We want to know revenue generation, what exactly this structure is, how have current security upgrades, security and facilities upgrades impacted the need, the interaction with or the intersection with the county government

[00:59:32] and what they're doing? Are those kind of the questions that we have? Yes. Okay, so we're going to ask the superintendent to come back with additional information.

[01:00:00] Do we want to, along with the factory construction, do we want to agendize monopoles, telecom facilities in general? for CPDs. That'd be great. Yes. Yes. Yeah. And yeah, I, yes. So value engineer. And I would love actually, we could do a run through at the end of the status of everything. Yes. Okay.

[01:00:27] Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. Can I read something about 8310? Yeah. Let's, uh, let me button up this one and then we'll go back to 8310 if that works. Thank you. Um, so what we'll do is for 8335, we'll have along with, um, the factory construction, we'll just ask staff to come back with some more data on 83-35 at the next CPDC meeting. We'll also keep the policy document in the board docs as well, and any changes that we need to make on the policy as a result of the conversation can be made then. Does that work? Yeah. Okay. All right. Would you say about factory construction? Well, they're going to do a little primer on factory construction at CPDC as well.

[01:01:08] For 83-35 or for the other one? Separate. Yeah. Yeah. So those two items will be on the next CPDC agenda okay 8310 um sorry just one one more um uh thing on 8335 there's a there's a a statement that they prefer not having it on elementary school property um i i just if we can add that to the list of things to discuss because it's not clear to me why um elementary schools would be disfavored but middle schools and high schools wouldn't have that same disadvantage especially if there are no

[01:01:46] safety concerns but if there are safety concerns i'd like to know that yeah my recollection of that is that high schools just have a lot more property generally and um they're just yeah they had more space bottom are tied in with stadiums the stadium right the stadium lighting it fits in better and i did i did send you an article mr dunn thank you yeah um on 8310 um the very last paragraph it the last two sentences it states artificial turf will be installed on fields whenever possible these fields will result in the savings of millions of gallons of water

[01:02:25] minimize the introduction of harmful chemical fertilizers into the ecosystem and reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by mowing all respect to people who are fans of of artificial turf, there is very serious concern in recent years, especially with crumb rubber turf, about the spike in cancer incidents among soccer players, and especially shocking statistics for soccer goalies who spend more time on the ground than other soccer players getting cancer when they're

[01:03:03] college age or sometimes even high school age. So I'd like to understand what kind of artificial turf we're using, if we're using crumb rubber, because we're baking this into school board policy, which seems unusual. But then the kind of the champion language, it sounds like it's from a marketing brochure, because there's also a lot of concern with crumb rubber.

[01:03:25] Even if it saves greenhouse gas emissions, it emits volatile VOCs, the volatile organic compounds, that is extremely unhealthy, especially on very hot days when that crumb rubber can get up to, you know, on a 70 degree day or 80 degree day, that crumb rubber can be at 100 degrees, like enough to bake an egg.

[01:03:49] So I just wanted to understand why this is in here and if we can, you know, question whether we want to have that in there, especially the very last sense, it's like marketing brochure language. Yeah, I agree. And that language is dated because I know that the superintendent has explored other options for turf.

[01:04:13] Yes. So but so the policy 8310, the status when we reviewed it the first time just before was that we wanted more input from council. is that right and then so now we also want input about this so this whole policy we want to send for review for return to the superintendent it was originally coming back right so this especially this piece and so we would like the recommendation of what language should be in there since that language is not so last school board meeting put forth a new type of field I don't want to say the writer name but it's without crumb rubber or organics yes so we have

[01:04:51] take that language out of this policy okay which again frustrating that it's in there because that came from the superintendent's office so the review so we will send 8310 back and it needs to be updated with what the superintendent wants with the right kind of turf okay and and with an explanation not just a new red line correct with the memo all of that stuff yeah thank you for raising that mr dunn thank you all right so to go down the list 8140 is going to be combined with

[01:05:29] 8420 that this is the community use leasing 8410 84 excuse me 85 my numbers are 8140 8410 leasing of school facilities is going in tandem with in tandem with 8420 and we'll come back yes correct 8320 is going to the board 8310 this is the crumb rubber etc is going to come back 8275 is going to the board.

[01:06:07] And we're going to ask for the information about factory construction. Yeah, I'm getting to that. Okay, sorry. One second. No, you're fine. 8560 is going to the board. 8335 Telecom will come back. And also coming back is factory construction.

[01:06:25] Right. Isn't a policy. It's just a... Sure, yeah. We had raised it in light of 8275. But, yeah, sure. Okay. And I also have this all written out, as I do with my governance stuff, so I will send it. Okay. So we have those notes. Just for a point of clarification, are these going to the April 2nd CPDC meeting or the April 30th?

[01:06:51] Is April 2nd going to be, that's basically a month. Is that during spring break, the April 2nd meeting? Never mind. Okay, I guess it's going to be end of April. Are we going to hold that meeting during spring break?

[01:07:11] No. I don't know why April 2nd is on there. what we'll do is if you said April 30th okay do we want to meet prior to that okay well we'll definitely agendize it for the next one I'll circulate an email an overview of this and if there's a desire to have a meeting before the 30th but not during spring break we can change that date around if that works all right and I think that's it our next wonderful our I say that to

[01:07:49] say our next CPDC meeting technically is scheduled for April 2nd 2026 again at 430 here in Gatehouse administration center in 1600 subject to change this Fairfax County School Board comprehensive planning and development committee meeting is adjourned as of 8:28 p.m. thank you everyone

Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com