

TEAM MEETING MINUTES

FCPS BUS FACILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY

JANUARY 19, 2016

Attendees:

Tiana Haile
Mark Maggitti
Steve Boling
Brad Ahalt
Todd Eudy
Heather Clabaugh
Ruth Biser
Holly Nelson

1. Update on consultant work for market analysis and cost benefit analysis

We have an agreement with Macro to perform a market analysis. It should take about three weeks. We are expecting a fee proposal this week for a cost benefit analysis. Century Engineering is working on a concept plan for scenarios B, C, and D for Hayward Road and the Public Safety Facility site. This will also help determine the costs for the cost benefit analysis. Mark asked is the warehouse still part of scenario B? Holly, said yes, it is part of the scope.

2. Discussion of analysis rubric used in report draft

a. Are we happy with the overall weight of the categories?

Holly reviewed the information she provided for weighting the evaluation criteria

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Legal (30 points)
- Development Potential (10 points)
- Geographical Efficiency (20 points)
- Access (10 points)
- Security (10 points)
- Physical Characteristics (20 points)

FCPS
Frederick County Public Schools
Reach. Challenge. Inspire.

b. Do any points need to be adjusted within each category?

Holly noted she may have to re-weight the criteria dependent on the results of the market analysis. She may need to add off-site improvements. Holly asked do we need to adjust the weight of the site work costs? Brad noted telecom services should also be added.

LEGAL

* I discovered an error in the legal rubric – some points in the ownership and zoning categories were out of 4 instead of 2

Criteria	Scenario A	Scenarios B, C, D	Scenario E
Ownership of the site (20%)		High score for sites owned by FCPS, medium score for sites owned by the County, State Highway or future sites to be acquired by FCPS, low score for distant future FCPS school sites and sites that would have to be purchased	
Site Zoning (20%)		High score for industrial zone, medium for institutional zone, and low score for all other zones (a change in zoning may not be possible)	
Impacts on neighbors (20%)		High score for sites with few residential neighbors, low score for sites predominantly surrounded by residences	
Cost of site (40%)		High score for sites with no acquisition cost for FCPS	



Frederick County Public Schools
Reach. Challenge. Prepare.

Scenario B site evaluation is based on the existing site at Hayward Road being the primary site, and the secondary site could be one of 6 sites under consideration.

DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Criteria	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D	Scenario E
Buildable area (60%)		High score for sites with a minimum of 6 buildable acres	High score for sites with a minimum of 8 buildable acres	High score for sites with a minimum of 7 buildable acres	
Existing parking assets that could be used for buses (20%)		High score for sites with 1 acre of parking or more			
Potential for expansion (20%)		High score for sites with 2 or more additional acres beyond buildable area required			



Frederick County Public Schools
Reach. Challenge. Prepare.

Scenario C is for a new main shop with the Hayward Road site the secondary site. Should we leave in the Greenview PUD site? Heather noted it would depend on which scenario you would be considering it for. Brad suggested removing the Monocacy MS/ES site due to the consideration of the site for the Rock Creek project. Heather agreed that leaving it in would send mixed messages. Also, under Scenario C its location is too close to Hayward Road, and wouldn't make much sense. It might work for parking. Maybe a parking

site could be included in the Rock Creek design. Holly suggested this might replace the gravel lot we are going to be losing. Walkersville doesn't suit our needs. The southeast Frederick sites do fairly well.

GEOGRAPHICAL EFFICIENCY



Criteria	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D	Scenario E
Proximity of bus eligible students (20%)		Number of bus eligible students within 10 miles of a candidate site that are not within 10 miles of the Annex	Number of bus eligible students within 10 miles of candidate site	B+C	C
Proximity of students from future developments (20%)		Number of projected future students within 10 miles of a candidate site that are not within 10 miles of the Annex	Number of projected future students within 10 miles of candidate site	B+C	N/A (short term analysis only)
Proximity of schools (20%)		Number of schools within 10 miles of a candidate site that are not within 10 miles of the Annex	Number of schools within 10 miles of candidate site	B+C	C
Feeder pattern efficiency (20%)		Number of bus routes within the candidate site's feeder	Number of bus routes within the candidate site's feeder	Number of bus routes within the candidate site's feeder	Number of bus routes within the candidate site's feeder
Location Allocation Analysis (20%)		Candidate site is selected by location allocation analysis of two sites with 25 percent capacity allocated to the candidate site	Candidate site is selected by location allocation analysis of two sites with 75 percent capacity allocated to the candidate site	Candidate site is selected by location allocation analysis of two sites with 50 percent capacity allocated to the candidate site	Candidate site is selected by capacitated coverage location allocation analysis that chooses up to 5 sites

Scenario D is for two equal facilities. Brad asked which scenarios included the warehouse. Holly stated it is part of scenarios B & D. It was noted the rezoning for the Public Safety site should be considered since it is currently zoned Ag. Knowledge Farms is also zoned Ag. Costs should be similar for either since both are currently owned by the county.

ACCESS



Criteria	Scenarios A, B, C, D, E
Access to major highways (30%)	Higher scores for shorter distances to the nearest highway on-ramp
Road network efficiency (30%)	Highest score for sites on major arterials, medium score for minor arterial, low score for collector, no score for local roads
Access to all regions of the county (40%)	Higher scores for lower total of distances to the centroid of each high school feeder

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS



Criteria	Scenarios A, B, C, D	Scenario E
Access to water service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Access to sewer service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Access to electric service (20% A-D, 50% E)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	
Access to gas service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Cost of SWPPP compliance (10% A-D)	High score for sites with lower cost to prepare for compliance with environmental regulations for industrial sites	N/A
Site work costs (10% A-D, 50% E)	High score for sites with lower cost to grade and otherwise prepare the site for development	

We need more information still to finish the evaluations.

3. Other feedback on the report draft

The group felt the report format is good.

4. Discussion of Scenario A analysis

Holly reviewed the considerations for the analysis. Heather noted the neighbor evaluation is different. The impact is negligible since the facility already exists. Holly added she is not sure the ownership matters. Mark asked, how do we evaluate the inefficiency of the site? Holly asked what would be the criteria for improvements in efficiency. Heather stated the cost of inefficiency would be captured in the site's inability to grow and its inability to handle increases in service. Mark added that doing nothing has a cost. Efficiency is important. Heather noted there are new buses and drivers built into the budget but nothing is added for maintaining the buses. Maybe we need to rank the scenarios, saying "business as usual has these drawbacks..." Mark stated we need to include a valuation for outsourcing. Holly added it is too easy to say "do nothing". There are long term costs to doing nothing. The cost benefit analysis should help with this. The first three criteria were negligible since we already own the site, it is already zoned correctly, and the location is centralized.

ACCESS



Criteria	Scenarios A, B, C, D, E
Access to major highways (30%)	Higher scores for shorter distances to the nearest highway on-ramp
Road network efficiency (30%)	Highest score for sites on major arterials, medium score for minor arterial, low score for collector, no score for local roads
Access to all regions of the county (40%)	Higher scores for lower total of distances to the centroid of each high school feeder

SECURITY



Criteria	Scenarios A, B, C, D	Scenario E
Ability to consolidate currently unsecured buses (50% A-D, 30% E)	High score for sites that are within 5 miles of 10 percent of the currently unsecure buses	
Previous incidences of vandalism at a candidate site (50% A-D, 40% E)	High score for sites where no vandalism has occurred previously	
Ability to add security features to parking facility (30% E)	N/A	

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS



Criteria	Scenarios A, B, C, D	Scenario E
Access to water service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Access to sewer service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Access to electric service (20% A-D, 50% E)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	
Access to gas service (20% A-D)	High score for sites with service or gaining access to service in 1-3 years	N/A
Cost of SWPPP compliance (10% A-D)	High score for sites with lower cost to prepare for compliance with environmental regulations for industrial sites	N/A
Site work costs (10% A-D, 50% E)	High score for sites with lower cost to grade and otherwise prepare the site for development	

SCENARIO A RESULTS



Site Number	Site Name	Legal Score	Development Potential Score	Geographical Efficiency Score	Access Score	Security Score	Physical Characteristics Score	Scenario A Total Score
	Evaluation Criteria	30 points	10 points	20 points	10 points	10 points	20 points	
34	Hayward Road Annex	21	0	5	6	5	12	49

Holly will work with Mark on scenario ranking. We need to find parking because we are going to lose the gravel lot.

Our next meeting will be February 16 to discuss revisions to the Feasibility Study. On March 2, we will review the market analysis and concept plans. There will be no meeting on March 16.