

Civ Fed
Resolution:

Preventing Crumbling School Buildings

April 14, 2026 Claire Noakes, President, CCPTA

Can you have equity without transparency?

2



We don't think so.

ALL stakeholders need to be informed of the sum total of needs, AND need to be informed that there is not enough money to meet all the needs.

Otherwise, anyone with a first mover advantage can secure funding for *wants* - leaving others with unaddressed *needs*. That's not equity.

What this Resolution Isn't Addressing

...whether schools have enough money to educate students

...whether teachers are paid enough

...whether all identified maintenance needs are urgent

...whether taxes should be raised or lowered

...whether schools receive adequate funding overall from local, state, or federal sources

...whether schools are spending too much or too little on debt service

Background

2023-2024

- APS publishes the first Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA)
- CCPTA alerts APS of \$323.25M of projected expenses that are not accounted for in draft CIP
- APS staff dismiss concerns, stating that expenses can be covered by operating budget
- SB passes CIP with \$302.4M for Long Range Renovations and Major Infrastructure projects of \$120.2M
- 12/14/23 SB prohibits staff from looking at non-capital options

2025

- APS updates the FCA, reflecting that there are now \$598.05M (up from \$448M), which far exceeds the 120.2M set aside
- SB receives Feasibility Study estimates that total between \$373.9M - \$707M, which exceeds the \$302.4M set aside
- SB CIP direction asks to go back to the drawing board to see what they can get for \$255-\$300M for Long Range Renovations
- 10/23/25 APS Adopted a Climate Action Resolution

2026

- APS does not have a dashboard for total building needs, priorities, and completed projects
- APS is projecting to have \$7M in MC/MM funding leftover in FY 2026, despite current needs
- The Superintendent will propose a new CIP for FY 2027-2036 in May, and the SB will pass it in June.

Failure to Plan is Planning to Fail

5

TJ as a case study

On November 1, 2007, the SB paused the planning process for one of the three BLPC processes, because the money ran out. The SB had made promises to overhaul Thomas Jefferson Middle School, but that promise was put on hold.

There was no foundational plan for how to evaluate capital investments. So then new elementary capacity became the SB priority. Then Montessori became the new SB priority.

Nineteen years later, TJ is still waiting.



Potential Variables

6

New 1% Sales Tax?

HB 334/SB 66 would permit localities to collect a 1% sales tax for school buildings. Although neither bill was sent to the Governor, the language was added to the Senate's budget and is likely to be included in the final budget. The Governor could veto it as a line item, but it has some bipartisan support and it provides a local option referendum.



Enrollment or Revenue Changes?

APS five-year projection for 2030-31 indicates APS anticipates a division wide decline in growth of -0.8%

Commercial vacancy rate is increasing.

School Consolidations or Program Changes / Moves?

VA Code 22.1-79 requires SBs to have a consolidation policy. The SB could also develop a policy on options programs (like their boundary policy for neighborhood schools).

We need a dynamic plan that expresses priorities and the factors that support decision making, not a rigid plan based on any one moment in time.

Costs

Basic Project
Maintenance

Total \$591,086,381

Adds: \$76,875,372

Total: \$667,961,753

Adds: \$78,700,825

Total: \$746,662,578

Adds: 118,900,000

Total: \$865,562,578

Adds: \$283,1000,000

Total: \$1,148,662,578

Scenario Options

A: "Basic": \$591,086,381

All projected maintenance needs identified by the consultant at all 41 facilities

B - "Three Better Schools": \$667,961,753

Includes Scenario A less redundant costs. Adds modest renovations to both **Swanson and Thomas Jefferson** within the stated budget of \$150 million; the **MPSA** remodeling is done at \$50 million

C - "School Board's Choice": \$746,662,578

Includes Scenario B less redundant costs. Adds modest renovations at the lowest budgeted amount of \$35 million for each of the **three elementary schools**.

D: "Top 6 Makeovers" \$865,562,578

Includes Scenario C plus renovations at **the lowest Feasibility Study option for each of three elementary and both middle schools**; the **MPSA** remodeling is done at \$50 million.

E "Shiny New Capacity" \$1,148,662,578

Allows for **maximum renovations** of all five schools identified in the Feasibility Studies and the Legacy Career Center, and includes consultant-identified maintenance at the remainder of facilities, less redundant costs.

What this Resolution asks

- 1. APS identify other possible sources of financing besides County bond capacity, and how these alternatives would be paid for out of the operating budget.**
- 2. APS identify what maintenance projects will not be funded in the next 10 year CIP window.**
- 3. The County consider delaying provision of debt capacity to APS, until APS provides the list requested in Resolution 2.**
- 4. APS develop a framework, consistent with its Climate Action Resolution, with rationales, on how it prioritized items for deferred maintenance and for funding.**
- 5. The Civic Federation will not support any bond referenda until APS makes meaningful progress on Resolutions 2 & 4.**