

April 27, 2023

Mr. Josh Hamlin Director of Budget and Policy Analysis Division Prince George's County Council Budget & Policy Analysis Division

RE: FY 2024 Second Round Questions Budget Review Questions

Dear Mr. Hamlin:

Please find below our responses to the Second Round FY 2024 Budget Review Questions for Prince George's County Public Schools.

From: Board Approved Request for the FY 2023 Capital Budget

- 1. Page A-16 (Suitland HS): Why is the "Unit Cost" for "New Construction: Area in excess of State formula" higher for County-only construction than for construction funded by State and County.
 - a. Page A-16 (Suitland HS): Which portions of construction are not covered by the State and necessitate additional funding from the County?

RESPONSE:

For the Suitland High School replacement project, the IAC staff-recommended maximum state allocation for this project is \$75 million, anything above that amount is paid for by the County. PGCPS has requested additional State funding, which is pending before the IAC.

2. Page A-16 (Suitland HS) and A-24: Why do "Architect/Engineering Fees" change between a percentage of "Construction + Site Cost" and "Actual Contract."

RESPONSE:

A16 was a planning tool and not an actual budget. We now have a contract with the Architect, and that is reflected in the documents.



3. Page A-16 (Suitland HS): Provide the criteria or estimate guidance support used when calculating the percentages for "Planning Soft Costs."

RESPONSE:

Some of the costs are based on approved contracts: Architectural fees, CMR Services, and CMR General Conditions (based on their projected costs). Other cost estimates are based on standard percentages typically applied to new construction: FF&E, High-Performance Cost. There were no land acquisition costs associated with this project.

4. Page A-16 (Suitland HS) and Page A-24 (New Northern Area HS): line "Variables" (another name for CMR General Conditions?), does not have a number assigned to the category. Why does Suitland HS have around \$10 million, while this school does not?

RESPONSE:

No CMR has been retained so, we don't have actual numbers for everything, however, there are estimates, which are subject to change, in subcategories of the table as follows:

1. Surveys, geotechnical and construction testing, etc.		\$5,441,123	\$5,441,123
2. Temporary Construction/ Portable Classrooms		N/A	N/A
3. Asbestos Surveys, monitoring, removal abatement (\$6.00 per sq. ft.)		N/A	N/A
4. Demolition: Existing Building	(\$5.00 per sq. ft.)	N/A	N/A
5. All Permit Fees by regulatory Agencies (DER, SCD, GRADING, BUILDING, etc.)		\$2,720,562	\$2,720,562
6. Electric Power (Pepco) GAS, WSSC and sever Connection fees		\$3,627,415	\$3,627,415
7. Stadium & Athletic Facilities		\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000

5. Page A-16 (Suitland HS): Line item "(6%) DCP Administrative Expenses – CIP Operating Back Charge Based on Invoice Billed." What is the intended use of this line item and what is the guidance to calculate at 6% in FY 2022 and at 8% in FY 2023.

RESPONSE:

The Department of Capital Programs ("DCP") plans, permits, and oversees the capital budget and all capital projects that it funds. The DCP is funded through the capital budget as a percentage of project costs, usually between 6-8% of expenditures over the life of the project. This line reflects the estimated charges as it relates thereto.



6. Page A-24 (New Northern Area HS): Which portions of construction are not covered by the State and necessitate additional funding from the County?

RESPONSE:

The State of Maryland pays for 73% of construction cost, it may also supplement the FF&E cost. Design costs are already under contract, so the State will not share in the cost. All other costs fall to the County. No staff-recommended maximum state allocation has been provided to PGCPS at this time.

7. Page A-28 (High Point HS): Which portions of construction are not covered by the State and necessitate additional funding from the County?

RESPONSE:

The State of Maryland pays for 73% of construction cost, it may also supplement the FF&E cost. Design costs are already under contract, so the State will not share in the cost. All other costs fall to the County. The IAC staff-recommended maximum state allocation for this project is \$95,946,000.

8. Page A-28 (High Point HS): the line "CMR General Conditions" has a total of \$10,196,423; however, sub-categories add up to more than that total. What accounts for the discrepancy?

RESPONSE:

This is an estimate, nothing has been bid.

From: County Executive's FY 2024 Proposed CIP Budget

9. Page 131, ACF: Wasn't the yearly expected amount to be \$15 million per year?

RESPONSE:

\$15 million is the availability payment for the 1st set of schools.

10. Page 131, ACF: Why is there no funding for FY 2029?



RESPONSE:

In Appendix B, there are two (2) lines for ACF, County funding for Phase 1 is listed as \$19 Million, this includes funding for the Infrastructure offices. Phase 2 has no budget, because no deal has been completed for that set of projects.

11. Page 135, Bowie: FY 2024 budget shows money was spent in FY 2023; however, the FY 2023 Approved CIP Budget does not show any spending. Discuss this discrepancy?

RESPONSE:

There is no discrepancy, capital budgets are not annual budgets, budgets are anticipated to be spent over multiple years. The spending is money from previous years' allocation.

12. Page 135, Bowie: When will the project be closed out? Do contractors have a deadline to submit invoices?

RESPONSE:

In order to comply with the 2018 building code, the inspector added a sprinkler, which requires a water main upgrade. Because this wasn't part of the original scope, we had to request additional funding. Once funding is secured it will take six (6) months to permit and two (2) months to install at a minimum. We anticipate it will take at least a year to close. The original scope for Bowie is substantially complete, but we can't close it until the sprinklers are installed.

13. Page 137, C. Elizabeth Rieg: FY 2024 budget shows money was spent in FY 2023; however, the FY 2023 Approved CIP Budget does not show any spending. What is this discrepancy?

RESPONSE:

There is no discrepancy, capital budgets are not annual budgets, budgets are anticipated to be spent over multiple years. The spending is money from previous years' allocation.

14. Page 137, C. Elizabeth Rieg: When will this project be closed out?



DEPARTMENT OF CAPITAL PROGRAMS

Shawn Matlock, Director | shawn.matlock@pgcps.org 13300 Old Marlboro Pike | Upper Marlboro, MD 20772 | 301-952-6548

RESPONSE:

In order to comply with the 2018 building code, the inspector required a fix to the therapy pool, because this wasn't part of the original project scope, we had to request additional funding. Once funding is secured we expect to complete the project this summer. We expect to close out the project at the end of 2023. The original scope for C.E. Reig is complete, but we can't close it until the pool is repaired and deemed to be functional by the inspector.

15. Page 138, CTE Southern Hub: There is no money listed for the current or outgoing years; however, the project is not complete. What is the current status of the project?

RESPONSE:

We are using a design/build method to construct a modular stand-alone building for CTE program expansion. Most of the funding is coming from a Pass-Through-Grant. Design/Build projects require special approval from the IAC and documentation is being reviewed for that approval.

16. Page 139, Central Garage: Project Completion Date is FY 2028; however, funding is listed as far as FY 2029. Should this be listed as "Ongoing"?

RESPONSE:

We are strategically updating all of our bus lots, so yes funding is "Ongoing."

17. Page 140, Cherokee Lane ES: FY 2024 budget shows money was spent in FY 2023; however, the FY 2023 Approved CIP Budget does not show any spending. What is this discrepancy?

RESPONSE:

There is no discrepancy, capital budgets are not annual budgets, budgets are anticipated to be spent over multiple years. The spending is money from previous years' allocation.

18. Page 142, Cool Spring: Why did total project cost decrease? What was accelerated?



RESPONSE:

We reduced the projected size of the building by roughly 15,000 square feet. Nothing has been accelerated.

19. Page 144, Early Childhood Center: Why is this project still on the budget if there is no spending planned for current or future years? Is the project complete? If not, discuss the current status of the project and what the money spent on construction was used for.

RESPONSE:

The funding from this project is through a Pass-Through-Grant from the State and private funds, there is no traditional County or State funding for this project. This project was not part of early EFMPs, but it has now been incorporated for the purpose of meeting our new Pre-K requirements.

20. Page 145, Fairmont Heights HS: Temporary occupancy achieved in 2017; however, the page states that design completion began in FY 2022 and construction has not yet begun. The highlights show that the project is awaiting fiscal closeout. What are these discrepancies? Provide an update on the actual numbers.

RESPONSE:

The building is substantially complete and has been occupied since 2017. There was an interruption in funding, and the project has a number of issues that we are resolving with the General Contractor.

21. Page 148, High Point HS: Why did total project cost increase?

RESPONSE:

There is no final budget for High Point High School as we are still working through the method and timing of construction, what you see in the CIP is an adjustment on the estimated cost of construction. These numbers will continue to change as estimates are adjusted until the project is bid out. As on other projects, the actual budget may be lower, but we have to account for risk factors in the estimated budget that may be resolved or eliminated in the actual budget.

22. Page 154, New Glenridge MS: Highlights: "Funding has been deferred" – deferred to what year? There is no future funding listed.



RESPONSE:

New Glenridge MS appears on page 156 and indicates that the project is in construction. We have received all of the budget allocations for this project from both the County and the State. There is no requirement for additional funding.

23. Page 161, SSR: Isn't this an Ongoing project? The "Highlights" section mentions that the project is awaiting fiscal closeout. What is the status of the project?

RESPONSE:

SSR is a project category, so yes it is an "Ongoing project," We may have one or more projects in that category that are awaiting fiscal closeout. If a project is awaiting fiscal closeout, it means that all of the work has been completed and that we are attempting to get a final Use and Occupancy permit, release all retainage, and close out the projects on the State, County, and School System's books.

24. "Ongoing Projects": Many "Ongoing" projects (HVAC Upgrades; Kitchen and Food Services; Land, Building, and Infrastructure; Major Repairs; Planning and Design; Security Upgrades; and Staged Renovation Projects) have been affected by the increase of Suitland HS construction. How will this affect small projects at PGCPS? What steps will PGCPS take to ensure that needed improvements continue despite a rechanneling of resources away from these projects.

RESPONSE:

PGCPS has made a three-year adjustment, however, we anticipate that Suitland HS will receive additional state funding that will allow us to restore some of the funding. All of the critical projects will be performed, some projects will be delayed but all will be completed.

25. Page 166, Stephen Decatur MS: FY 2024 budget shows money was spent in FY 2023; however, the FY 2023 Approved CIP Budget does not show any spending. What is this discrepancy?

RESPONSE:

There is no discrepancy, capital budgets are not annual budgets, budgets are anticipated to be spent over multiple years. The spending is money from a previous year's allocation.



26. Page 167, Suitland HS: Total Project Cost does not match the CEO's Proposed Budget. Did CEX Proposed Budget cut down the CEO's total project cost estimate?

RESPONSE:

No, we have requested additional funding from the State.

27. Page 169, Tulip Grove ES: Project closeout was scheduled for FY 2022 – has now been pushed back to FY 2023 – what caused the delay?

RESPONSE:

PGCPS is required to complete the Final Use and Occupancy permitting process prior to fiscal closeout. There were issues with scheduling inspections and getting final approvals, now that process is complete, we can closeout the project fiscally.

28. Page 171, William Wirt: When will project closeouts occur?

RESPONSE:

The replacement of William Wirt Middle School is under construction, the project will be closed out after it receives a final Use and Occupancy permit.

From: Responses to First-Round Questions

29. Q. 8: These projects seem to remain active from year to year – when are these past-year cleanups expected to occur? Discuss the notes that state "Need letter to move forward." Who is responsible for writing these letters? Is there a timeframe established for completing them?

RESPONSE:

PGCPS has been actively engaging with DPIE, the Fire Marshall and other organizations and vendors in closing out older projects. The backlog has been reduced significantly in the last two (2) years. There are some projects that require that a "cure" letter be sent to the independent inspectors to complete inspections that they have been required to complete in cases where PGCPS retain the inspector we must send the letter, but in the majority of cases the Architect or other vendor retain the inspector and they must send



the letter. We have approved a number of letters to be sent out on a subset of the open projects by the end of April.

Q. 10: PGCPS still has a lot of unspent allocations going back as far as FY 2014. (Example: Kitchen and Food Service – FY 2024 request is \$1.5 million. \$2.6 million remain unspent (not including \$325,000 in VLT allocations). Stadium Upgrades (\$5.2 million unspent, unencumbered. FY 2024 request: \$3.5 million). Discuss the plan to spend these unspent allocations.

RESPONSE:

Each project category has projects at various stages of planning, design, permitting, construction and closeout. Unspent funds are not an indication of inactivity. For example, we are moving forward with multiple stadium projects that will exhaust all our backlogged funds, it just took time to get them through scoping and procurement. Kitchen and Food Service projects have been in continuous design, permitting and installation, and the funds are being expended over multiple years. In some cases, there are funds that cannot be expended, because the allocation exceeds the actual budget and the funds cannot be reallocated until the associated project is completed. There are also some categories that are reserve allocation for future needs that are not project specific, for example, land acquisition is used for buying tree credits, adjacent land or land required for expanded needs, in some years this fund is not utilized and in other years we expend a significant amount of money.

30. Q. 16: Provide permission to view the Marlboro Clay map.

RESPONSE:

Access granted Marlboro Clay with schools (1).pdf

31. Q. 18: What is the correct number here?

RESPONSE:

\$50,084,000 is the correct number.



32. Q. 19: Provide permission to view the Suitland details.

RESPONSE:

Access granted

FY24 BOE 1st Round Questions - Question #19 Suitland Costs.pdf

Q. 21: Provide permission to view the "detailed memo attached."

RESPONSE:

Access granted Memo - Permit Requirements

Q. 28 B: Discuss why PGCPS will not attempt to receive federal grants for these types of projects.

RESPONSE:

In some cases the funds have timing elements, that permitting or material sourcing will not permit us to participate in those grant activities. DCP itself does not have the capacity to search for grants, but has participated in grant activities such as ESSER, when the administration has decided to pursue them.

33. Q. 29: Provide permission to view "Other County-Wide Projects"

RESPONSE:

Access granted.

Summer 2023-Facility Improvement Projects - 2023-2-28

34. Q. 30: If currently available, provide a list of HVAC Upgrade projects for FY 2024.

RESPONSE:

The list of FY24 HVAC projects have not been finalized at this time. PGCPS HVAC/Plumbing Upgrades Category was reduced by half the funding and HSFF HVAC funding was not received. PGCPS did receive an ESSER III Grant; however, there are restrictions to what type of projects can be executed. We are currently in the process of receiving cost estimates to better reprioritize projects based on the FY23 \$4.405M and FY24 \$4M received under HVAC/Plumbing. There is a scheduled meeting for May 10, 2023 to prioritize FY24 HVAC projects.



35. Q. 31: Provide a list of projects expected for FY 2024.

RESPONSE:

We expect the completion of feasibility studies for High Point HS and Cool Spring ES. We expect design completion for Cool Spring ES, Crossland HS CTE project, and New Northern Area HS in FY 2024

36. Q. 32: Provide permission to view the document.

37. RESPONSE:

Access provided.