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STAFF REPORT

ISSUE

The Frederick County Public Schools is requesting that the 2015 Superintendent’s Recommended Educational Facilities Master Plan be found consistent with the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Educational Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) serves as a tool to evaluate current facilities, future needs, and project priorities. The Board of Education (BOE) updates the 10-year Master Plan annually and is used as a basis for the BOE’s submission for the subsequent Capital Improvement Program (CIP) review.

Finding of Consistency Review Guidance

The Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland provides general requirements with regards to a finding of consistency with a comprehensive plan. Section 1-303 Consistency – General requirement of the Land Use Article further defines consistency with a comprehensive plan to mean “ an action taken that will further, and not be contrary to the following items in the plan:

1) Policies;
2) Timing of the implementation of the plan;
3) Timing of development;
4) Timing of rezoning;
5) Development patterns;
6) Land uses; and
7) Densities or intensities

The Maryland Department of Planning in its Models and Guidelines document titled: ‘Achieving Consistency under the Planning Act’ also provides guidance on determining consistency with a comprehensive plan. It states:

“…land use regulations and decisions should agree with, and implement what the Plan recommends and advocates. A consistent regulation or decision may show clear support for the Plan. It may also be neutral – but it should never undermine the Plan.”

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The Educational Facilities Master Plan serves a number of important functions including:

- To inform the public about long-range plans for educational facility improvements in Frederick County
- To present long-range enrollment projections and future facility needs
- To coordinate future new educational facility locations with County and municipal officials
- To coordinate with State officials regarding future facility needs and funding requirements
- To establish a schedule of needed major renovation and maintenance projects for existing buildings
- To comply with State regulations for an annual update of the local jurisdiction’s facilities plan
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

Within Chapter 7 Serving Our Citizens, the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan contains a number of general community facility policies as well as several that are specifically related to schools. The following policies together with the concept of consistency as discussed above should be considered by the Planning Commission in an evaluation of the EFMP:

**General Community Facility Policies**

SC-P-01 Place major facilities such as schools, libraries, fire/rescue facilities and senior centers within community growth areas with an emphasis in the central portion of community growth area, preferably adjacent to commercial centers.

SC-P-02 Prioritize funding for those capital projects, which correct existing deficiencies.

SC-P-03 Prioritize land acquisition for capital facilities as part of a land banking program well in advance of the need for new facilities and acquired through the development review process.

SC-P-04 Work collaboratively with all of the municipalities in Frederick County to adopt an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) which complements the County’s APFO.

SC-P-05 Consider joint use of County facilities, including but not limited to libraries, senior centers, health clinics, schools, and public safety facilities.

SC-P-06 Employ Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and Low Impact Development (LID) standards in County facilities.

**School Policies**

SC-P-07 Standardize school design to accommodate additions and reduce design & construction costs.

SC-P-08 Maintain a system wide enrollment capacity of 90% at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

SC-P-09 Stage development of new school facilities concurrent with new residential growth.

SC-P-10 Maximize the use of school sites through the construction of multi-story buildings to reduce building footprints and emphasizing bicycle and pedestrian access to minimize parking needs and bus transportation.

SC-P-11 Utilize school building(s) or sites no longer needed for educational purposes for re-use as public uses or private redevelopment.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

Enrollment Highlights (refer to pages 14, 27-30 of the Plan)

- Projected enrollments for September 2015 (page 14) show 21 of the County’s K-12 schools to be at or over 100% capacity, including 15 elementary, five (5) middle schools, and one (1) high school. System-wide capacities for each grade level, projected for September 2015, are expected to be 96% of capacity at the elementary level, 81% of capacity at the middle school level, and 85% of capacity at the high school level. System wide enrollment, including the special schools, is expected to be 89% of capacity across in September 2015, which is up from 88% in 2014.

- Total equated enrollment is projected to increase by 104 students for the 2015-2016 school years.

- The graph below shows historic enrollment growth by decade along with the projected growth for the 10-year period of 2014 – 2024.

The 10-year enrollment growth for the period 2014 – 2024 is projected to be 3,491, which is an increase of 844 students over the projection from the 2013 – 2023 period. This increase is occurring at the elementary and high school levels. The annual enrollment increases are projected to average 216 students in the first half of the period and increase to an average of 482 students in the second half.

Projected enrollment increases by grade level for 2014-2024 are:

- Elementary – 1,807 students
- Middle – 402 students
- High – 1,282 students
- 10-year Total – 3,491 students
Recommended Facilities Plan (refer to pages 37-56)

There are four major categories of projects identified in the Educational Facilities Master Plan:

- **New Capacity Projects**
  These projects involve construction of new schools or additions that add capacity. Eight (8) of the eleven projects in the 2015 EFMP will add capacity.

- **Modernization/Renovation**
  These projects involve schools that are scheduled for modernization based on several criteria. In general, the criteria are: at least 50% of the building is over 40 years old and the school ranked as a priority in the FCPS “School Modernization Project – Assessment Report”. Limited renovation is also scheduled when it could be coordinated with a new addition planned for the building. Four (4) renovation projects are recommended in the 2015 Educational Facilities Master Plan.

- **Land Acquisition**
  Land acquisition is necessary when it is not anticipated that land dedications will occur through the development review process. Land acquisition is typically necessary for secondary school projects.
  Sites recently dedicated or to be dedicated through the development review process include:
  - Sugarloaf ES – dedicated in the Urbana Town Center MXD project
  - Monrovia Area ES – dedicated in the Landsdale PUD (alternate site for East County ES)
  - Linganore Area ES – dedicated in Hamptons West of Linganore PUD (alternate site for East County ES)
  - Monrovia Area HS – site identified adjacent to Monrovia Town Center PUD project
  - New Market Area ES – site identified in the Casey PUD project
  - Linganore Area MS – site identified in the Blentlinger PUD project
  - Butterfly Ridge ES – Hargett property site dedicated by the City for the West Frederick City ES project
  - North Frederick Area ES – site identified in the Tuscarora Crossing development
  - South Frederick Area ES – site identified in Ballenger Run PUD project

- **Major Capital Systemic Projects**
  These projects involve all major improvements to existing schools either for instructional purposes or systemic repairs due to age or condition. These types of projects include science lab renovations, roof replacements/renovations, mechanical projects, and flooring replacement.
  See pages 44-57 for a detailed listing of these projects.
New **Recommended** Capacity and Modernization/Renovation Projects (see page 42)

FREDERICK COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RECOMMENDED FUTURE PROJECTS
2015-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Added Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf ES</td>
<td>New School</td>
<td>2018-Aug</td>
<td>Under Design</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Ridge ES</td>
<td>New School</td>
<td>2018-Aug</td>
<td>Under Design</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana ES</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>2020-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley ES</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>2021-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Area ES</td>
<td>New School</td>
<td>2021-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty ES</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>2022-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Frederick City Area ES</td>
<td>New School</td>
<td>2023-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown MS</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>2023-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick HS</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>2017-Aug</td>
<td>Under Con.</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown HS</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>2024-Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>2020-Aug</td>
<td>Future Project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below reflects both current capacity and projected capacity based on the recommended future projects and projected enrollments (See pages 29, 30, & 42).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Capacity</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Capacity without planned additional capacity</th>
<th>% of Capacity with planned additional capacity (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>18,636</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>20,443</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9,018</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12,361</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>40,219</strong></td>
<td><strong>88%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,711</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Based on future project recommendations from the 2015 Educational Facilities Master Plan (See page 42 of EFMP)

(2) Rock Creek, Heather Ridge, evening high. Does not include Special Ed Pre-K

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SCHOOL SITES**

The County Comprehensive Plan, as amended in 2012, included the addition or relocation of planned school sites to serve the community growth areas. The following school sites were either added or relocated:

- Linganore Area ES – site moved from the Linganore Town Center to the Woodridge area.
- New Market Area ES – new site between Boyers Mill Rd. and MD 75
- New Market Area MS – site moved from the eastern part of the New Market community
- Monrovia Area HS – new site in the vicinity of MD 75/80
- Urbana Area ES – new site in the Urbana Future Growth Area in vicinity of Ball Rd.
- Urbana Area MS – new site in the Urbana Future Growth Area in vicinity of Ball Rd.

The County Comprehensive Plan (as amended in 2012) identifies planned school sites as outlined in the table below. The locations of planned school sites are approximate. The 20-year planning period of the County Comprehensive Plan exceeds the 10-year timeframe of the 2015 Educational Facilities Master Plan so there should not be the expectation that every planned school in the Comprehensive Plan would also be listed in the EFMP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Region</th>
<th>County Comprehensive Plan (20 year outlook)</th>
<th>2015 EFMP (10 year outlook)</th>
<th>FY 2016-2021 CIP* (6 year outlook)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>Brunswick Area ES: two alternative sites at Gayln Manor or Brunswick Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Waverly ES: addition open 2021</td>
<td>Waverly ES: addition open 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dearbought ES: e/s MD 26 on the northeast side of Frederick City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Frederick City Area ES: near Christopher’s Crossing and Walter Martz Rd.</td>
<td>N. Frederick City Area ES: new, open 2023</td>
<td>Not in the CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Frederick City Area ES: two alternate sites along Butterfly Ln. (Hargett and Summers properties)</td>
<td>Butterfly Ridge ES: new, open 2018</td>
<td>Butterfly Ridge ES: new open 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Frederick City Area MS: near Christopher’s Crossing &amp; Yellow Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Frederick City Area HS: Poole Jones Rd and Christopher’s Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>Harvest Ridge ES: the vicinity of Bill Moxley Road and Lomar Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linganore Area ES: site identified in Hamptons West in Linganore PUD</td>
<td>East County Area ES: new, open 2021</td>
<td>East County Area ES Open after 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenview PUD ES: at Mussetter Road and Whiterose Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Market Area ES: site identified in the Casey PUD property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Market Area MS: e/s Boyers Mill Rd. across from Summerfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Airy Area MS: north side of Town in Frederick County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>Landsdale PUD ES: w/s of Ed McClain Road north of MD 80</td>
<td>East County Area ES: new, open 2021</td>
<td>East County Area ES: new, open after 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugarloaf ES: new Open 2018</td>
<td>Sugarloaf ES: new, Open 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urbana ES: replacement, open 2020</td>
<td>Urbana ES: replacement, open 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urbana Area ES: vicinity of Ball Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urbana Area MS: vicinity of Ball Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monrovia Area HS: MD 75/MD 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

Based upon a review of the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan, the Staff makes the following findings with regard to the 2015 Superintendent’s Recommended Educational Facilities Master Plan:

1. The location and the number of new capacity projects recommended in the Educational Facilities Master Plan conform to the planned school sites identified on the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan.

2. The Educational Facilities Master Plan generally conforms with the appropriate policies within the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Frederick County Planning Commission find the 2015 Superintendent’s Recommended Educational Facilities Master Plan to be consistent with the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

MOTION OF FINDING OF CONSISTENCY

I move that the Planning Commission find the Superintendent’s Recommended 2015 Educational Facilities Master Plan to be consistent with the Frederick County Comprehensive Plan based on the findings of the staff report and the testimony and documentary evidence produced at the public meeting.