



**2022-2023 MCC Governing Board
Capital Facilities Committee
December 14, 2022 6:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

All Committee members were present: *in-person:* Rasheq Rahman – Chair; Melanie Sletten; Bill Glikbarg
 virtual: Kristina Groennings

Other Board members present: Barbara Zamora-Appel; Charlotte Loving; Ari Ghasemian

MCC Staff present: Evan Braff, Acting Executive Director; Joe McGovern, Facilities Manager;
Ashok Karra, Comptroller; Holly Novak, Executive Assistant; Jennifer
Garrett, Technical Director; Catherine Nesbitt

Guests: Kambiz Agazi (Director, Fairfax County Office of Environmental & Energy
Coordination); John Morrill (Division Director); Pouneh E. Ghasemian;
Suha Rahman

CONVENE MEETING

MCC Governing Board Vice-Chair Rahman convened a meeting of the Capital Facilities Committee of the Governing Board of the McLean Community Center on December 14, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was open to the public attending in-person. Vice-Chair Rahman made a courtesy announcement that the meeting is being audio-recorded.

ADOPT AGENDA No changes were requested to the proposed Agenda; it was adopted by acclamation.

E.V. / SOLAR PRESENTATION: DISCUSSING ENERGY OPTIONS FOR MCC BUILDING

John Morrell and Kambiz Agazi were introduced to explain the county’s ideas and energy options for MCC building regarding EV charging and solar. Acting Executive Director Braff elaborated: Since the main issue is whether the county would be able to provide any financing for EV charging stations on-site, it would be helpful to understand where we are with EV and solar and some of the work you all have done (overview of the general program; current progress and priorities).

Thank you for having us. No formal presentation; tonight’s purpose is conversation and Q & A. Though we are not as familiar with the long-term needs and vision for MCC, we are familiar with Fairfax County resources and policies.

Background: In 2018, Fairfax Co. BOS adopted the “Operational Energy Strategy” (this plan is on the county website). It was later updated in 2021 to include some additional and more aggressive goals. It is operational in nature – it looks at county operations. It is not the community-wide plan that was recently adopted; it is the operational plan. This BOS policy was adopted after a period of public comment. Key elements of interest to MCC: ***Fleet electrification target (including Connector bus fleet & county vehicles) –goal is to convert the county fleet over to EV (battery or plug-in/hybrid non-carbon emitting vehicles) by 2035.** That target is the biggest driver for EV infrastructure initiative- a plan to support the electrification. We prioritize sites around the county based upon our fleet electrification needs. MCC is on the list for sites to receive EV charging.

***Fairfax County has aggressive energy efficiency and renewable energy targets.** “Renewable” in our area is largely solar. Our energy efficiency relates to the efficiency of the buildings. We have a forward game plan: several facilities are on the list to receive solar – county facilities; FCPA or housing facilities; FCPS.

That’s a general overview of this policy. There is more to it – including other elements like “zero-waste.” These priorities are set by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

Q & A:

***assurance that the policy is actually \$\$ funded \$\$**

Question: There must be funding associated with the policy to support it. Has BOS done that?

Yes. BOS to-date has contributed roughly \$35M since 2018 for a wide variety of projects (10 focus areas of projects). All streetlights in the county will be LED. The policy includes funding for all focus areas (including EV and solar).

***linking the county's broader sustainability goals into MCC strategic plan**

Question by Chair Rahman: We are working on eventually adopting a strategic plan for MCC. A key pillar is sustainability and many issues referenced here apply; but more broadly, we're interested in all initiatives. We should study the county's policy and make sure we are considering that in MCC's strategic plan.

***how locations are decided**

Is there a model for where EV's should be sited based on usage -both from county vehicles and it being a good location for the public?

Clarification by Kambiz Agazi: As part of the Operational Energy Strategy, the policy for EV's is very clear by the BOS: we are looking at every opportunity to open up the charging to the public. Except for restricted access areas (such as police, fire & rescue facilities), all charging stations being installed are open to the public and to county vehicles (punching a code) and county employees using their own private vehicles (personal credit card swipe).

***incentives for private businesses**

Question: Does the plan have any incentives for private businesses to develop EV charging?

That's a great point: not the Operational Energy Strategy – because we can't rely on the private sector for county vehicles. We have a large public safety fleet and must be able to install charging at various locations around the county that may not be convenient for a business or perhaps is not a high traffic area. It would be hard to attract a large commercial entity to come in and install charging where there is not a lot of demand. But the BOS does offer some incentives: they have been waiving permit fees. We are beginning to develop a program to work with HOA's – providing technical assistance and reimbursement grants and waiving permit fees to help with adoption of electric vehicles. Many large businesses (Trader Joe's; Walmart) are putting in charging stations because they realize the public demand and there is an obvious market for it.

***a feasibility study needs to be done first (EV charging at MCC & solar)**

Clarification by Acting Executive Director Braff: As additional context – something highly recommended is a feasibility study. Exploring EV and solar options at McLean Community Center is a good idea; but before we think about that, there needs to be a feasibility study done on both of those. Question by Chair Rahman: I'd like to hear about your timeline of a feasibility study at our location? For our Capital Facilities Committee, how do we approach this problem the right way?

MCC is on the EV list but it doesn't mean that we will get to you this year or next year. Top priority is for county fleet electrification. And we are going to open it up to the public (helps to incentivize the public and helps with range anxiety). **Where EV charging stations will first go are ideal locations to be able to charge the county fleet.**

RestonCC & MCC fall in a 'gray area' – while there is a library and good synergy here, MCC is probably not going to be at the top of the list for the next couple of years. But we will eventually get to you. **There could be a way to move you closer to the top - it would have to be a discussion with Supervisor Foust (who actually included MCC on the list) – asking to have it considered being moved closer to the top of the installation list.**

For every facility being considered, we first do a preliminary assessment of the site (is it a viable candidate, in relation to county facilities & other office buildings nearby?) MCC is on the list – it's just a matter of prioritization. After conducting the assessment and determining that MCC is a viable candidate (that you have enough parking) then we can consider this site. We always conduct a feasibility study of every site to provide planners with costs and options.

Summary by Acting Executive Director Braff: The county indicated that they could pick up the cost of the feasibility study for EV stations and MCC would pick up the costs for the solar feasibility study. In discussion we had with the county, they were going to explore that with us. We would have to make a motion on it.

***proposal: county paying entirely for EV charging infrastructure ... and MCC paying for solar**

Question: If the studies indicate MCC is a good candidate, would the county then foot the bill for them?

Yes (we had an internal staff discussion): **We believe that for both of the community centers, it's very appropriate for the county to pick up the bill for EV charging installation because a lot of county residents (taxpayers) are also going to be using these charging stations.** And we want to encourage it. In terms of solar, your facility is in a special tax district and your building would be the recipient of the benefits of the solar. **We came to the consideration that if MCC picks up the bill for the solar, the county will pick up the bill for EV's.**

***viability of MCC'S roof is a consideration for installing solar**

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: The reason we want to a feasibility study for MCC is because we're not sure we have enough bandwidth on the roof to construct solar. The county also asked MCC to provide the last three months of electric bills - to check on the return on investment. If little ROI, there may also be some other options to explore – for example, building a solar 'carport' canopy structure in MCC parking lot. **Let's make sure we have all the information so the Governing Board can make the best-informed decision. It seems fair for the county pick up the cost and feasibility study on EV and MCC would pick up the cost and feasibility study on solar.**

***continuing concern about public perception about EV charging stations at MCC**

Question: I like EV charging, but I don't want us to get caught in a major legal battle -converting MCC facility into a 'gas station.'

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: That will be part of the feasibility study: asking county legal to weigh in. But ultimately, it's the BOS decision as to whether they want EV charging at this site. Tonight is the first time discussing this in-depth although EV charging has been listed as a priority in MCC's budget every year. Another important point is that Fairfax County BOS wouldn't be considering this if they hadn't already fully vetted it (this plan has already undergone thorough legal review).

Summary by the Governing Board Chair:

1. First, it's not a competition because people have the ability to go anywhere they want to charge their EV.
2. Secondly, as a benefit to MCC, we have two very old vehicles (OFC vans) that will soon be upgraded to electric vehicles – so that is a need.
3. Also, there has always been this conversation - for 3-4 years it has been a placeholder in MCC budget to say that MCC is committed to having this done. The presentation we had a few years ago said that MCC will not be paying for charging stations. That has always been the case. Therefore, MCC is not competing – we are simply providing an additional service to the community. In time, more residents will have EV's. This is an opportunity for parents waiting for their child in classes at MCC to charge their vehicle while waiting. They are not getting it for free (they must pay for it). County school buses will soon be changing to EV. There is a need for government vehicles to have charging stations to charge batteries rapidly. My point is that MCC will never be competing with gas stations in the private sector – this is government. I believe we are all committed to having EV charging in the future – maybe yet five years down the road.
4. Regarding solar panels – we have a much bigger issue with the roof: we have patched it up, but there is still an issue. So, the feasibility study may also help us figure out the issue with the roof.

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: **I also think the feasibility study on the roof (whether or not we can do solar panels) will help facilitate community understanding. We can explain whether we are able to install solar on the roof or put the issue to rest by explaining why we can't.**

***transportation electrification offers important public health benefits**

Comment by Mr. Morrell: Regarding public concerns, one reason the county has included such a strong emphasis on transportation electrification is because there are very strong public health benefits from eliminating gasoline, diesel transportation fumes... greenhouse gases. And it's especially critical for the electric buses. The fact that the county is providing this service and making it available to the public is because it's in the public interest because of the public health benefits. I think that's where private industry will give us (government) a pass.

***Is EV charging revenue-generating for MCC?**



Question: If we get EV chargers five years from now, would any of that revenue come to MCC? Or would it go to the county?

Explanation by Kambiz Agazi: The rates are set by the BOS; we very carefully reviewed as to what the costs were to the county. There are several different costs: cost of electricity + maintenance of the equipment by the manufacturers + networking fees. We set a rate that was a fair market rate and could recoup a majority of our costs: \$.30/kilowatt hour. We researched all the different groups and governments that are charging to arrive at a fair price.

***EV charging is authorized for local governments by the General Assembly (Commonwealth of Virginia)**

Fairfax County is NOT in competition with anyone; this is the legal right given by the Virginia General Assembly for local governments to provide charging at their facilities. MCC is a BOS-owned facility. MCC is in a special tax district but the county can decide to put charging stations here. We put EV charging stations at Sully CC, Lorton CC, and the county will continue to do so.

***availability of EV charging encourages broader public adoption of electric vehicles**

The reason why we open it up to the public and the public pays a fair market rate is because we want to promote electric vehicle adoption. The public has been asking for this. We provide public access to the charging stations where feasible.

***good partnerships with utility companies (now and in the future)**

We have a good partnership with Dominion Energy Virginia; they are also getting into EV charging. Their model is very different than the county and is complimentary. Dominion Energy Virginia is very happy to have Fairfax Co. in the game because we are an alternative to what they are doing. We are promoting their program because it's different than our program; their program may make sense to some communities. There are many partnerships now.

***MCC as an ideal geographic location for EV charging**

Question by Chair Rahman: Given the issue of "range" for electric vehicles, given that MCC is near a large thoroughfare where we could be a good host site for county vehicles, would that make us a higher priority? And MCC has a lot of space in our parking lot?

Explanation by Kambiz Agazi: It's a joint review for prioritization – Dept. of Vehicle Services is the lead agency for looking at fleet electrification futures. It's hard to look more than 1 or 2 years ahead because we don't know when we're going to be replacing vehicles until about an 18-month period. About 18 months out, we have a good sense of the need for charging at a few facilities that need charging and don't have it. That's how the prioritization works. It's not that we are overlooking MCC, but in realizing that MCC and the library are together – we will do the feasibility for the whole areas. We want to make it as user-friendly as possible at our county facilities.

***required amount of county vehicles on-site to warrant MCC as a charging location**

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: Knowing Dept. Vehicle Services – and if they are considering adding electric vehicles, the concern would be the amount of county vehicles we want to have here. For them to make that investment and move MCC up on the priority the list, the county would want at least 45 to 50 vehicles on-site. That would be an issue for big events and capacity in our parking lot. MCC's occupancy is based on parking spaces.

With thorough discussion concluded, Vice-Chair Rahman asked if the committee was ready to vote on a MOTION.

MOTION: To request that MCC staff (Executive Director; Joe McGovern, Ashok Karra) investigate with the county the development of a feasibility study for: 1. EV charging facilities at MCC and... 2. possible solar on the roof of MCC.

Approved by a vote of four:

Rasheq Rahman, Kristina Groennings, Melanie Sletten, Bill Glikbarg – all voting "AYE."

Kambiz Agazi and John Morrell expressed excitement and said the county is happy to work with MCC regarding zoning to make it as user-friendly as possible in all county facilities.

MCC ROOF - UPDATE

**presentation by Joe McGovern*

Background: This section of roof repair started six months ago. Overall, it went well; however, they got to the end of what they were contracted to do and we were still getting some water inside the building. They stayed on-site for an additional three weeks. We commend them for this: they re-roofed; pulled sections up that weren't in the contract;

replaced one of the roof drains (which solved a huge portion of what was still an issue). But we were still getting water coming in around the interior brick pillar near DuVal Studio.

We engaged a roof engineer from the county. He met with us and we showed him pictures the contractor took as work was being done. Since that meeting, we have had no rain inside the building! One time there was a small quarter-sized drip. So, while we may have solved most of the problem, we aren't sure because it was also in the transition from summer to fall where driving rainstorms and enormous volumes of rain had stopped. We are still engaging the engineer. The roofer will suggest an idea that he thinks might solve this, but he needs the engineer to sign-off on it. It's not a huge fix; we're still going forward, but it is largely done.

Clarification by Acting Executive Director Braff: The hard part is because it involves a brick column = you can't get in there to look at it without disrupting the structure. That is the challenge – they worked hard to try to figure out how to get in there. Sometimes such 'creative' structures end up causing problems trying to examine it.

We talked about this when CFC originally approved it: the challenge with that section of the roof is literally where three sections of the renovation tied together. I feel good about the repair; but we are not done with it. They are now going forward to re-build the bulkhead to look new again. Hopefully, we've solved it. The forthcoming snow will be interesting to find out. My sense is it is more the wind-driven storms: we don't think it's coming straight through the roof. Rather, we think it might be blowing rain in behind the concrete panels on the side of the building. They have really taken stuff apart to try to figure this out. Those concrete panels were not in the scope of this repair... but water will find where it wants to go!

Question: If the issue has not been fixed, when snow comes, it's probably going seep-in somewhere and it may show up again. It stopped, but it was coincidence because the roofer was here at end of summer when the rain had also stopped. We've had plenty of rainstorms and have seen a little bit of water coming in recently – so the repair is not perfect. But it hasn't been a problem when it has rained for 8 hours, so we are still trying to figure it out. The whole bulkhead that was presenting the problem has been ripped out (that's why we're re-building); but the challenge is that we are not having the same intensity of rain since the repair.

Question: Were there cost over-runs? Do we have to approve more money?

No. They did not charge us for the 3 weeks they were here after that. If the county engineer thinks we should investigate something further, it might just be the cost of exploration (time & materials to open stuff up; put it back together) – there may be some additional costs. It's not necessarily something that needs to be re-done or fixed. It is wildly different [for the better]– we had large problems; now it is just a one-by-one square foot drip. Something that small is challenging to find out where it is coming from. It may be coming from somewhere else - almost certainly coming from outside the area where we re-roofed! But we don't know where. It drives me crazy!

The Alden Theater – fly tower smoke hatch replacements: (tallest part of the roof; over ½ of theater stage area). We've had an intermittent leak in the mid-stage area for a while; it's not every time it rains and not related to intensity of rain. A roofer identified the issue as one of the smoke hatches (put in big spaces that have tall ceilings - in the event of a fire, they open up and it vents the smoke so the audience can get out). He sent a quote to replace one smoke hatch – these smoke hatches are original to the building (50 years old). If one is failing, others are also likely to fail soon. Similar to discussion one year ago – part of the biggest cost is the crane. In paying for the crane, it is better to do three smoke hatch replacements rather than one – especially given the age of these parts. Other consideration: the other rectangle in the middle is the air handler HVAC unit. There are four big penetrations in this roof area and three of them we will be messing with– so it just makes sense to re-roof that section as well.

Recommendation: The air handler is on infrastructure – it sits on top of steel. **MCC staff recommends if we are going to replace the three smoke hatches and open up these three roof penetrations – then we need to re-do the roof.** The roof section is only 748 sq. ft of roof – half of it is all the penetrations. It's 15 years old, so it's not due

to be replaced; but again, the cost is with the repairs upcoming we're already paying for. Different cost options were shown. **Staff recommendation is to do all three smoke hatches and the roof; adding 10% contingency.** One thing we don't know: there are specific smoke hatches for areas like theaters that have sound dampening. We don't have the model number specified yet; but the manufacturer is correct for the equipment order.

Details about costs: The quote is about \$20K – that price is for one smoke hatch + crane. It only goes up \$15K for adding two more smoke hatches. Our point is that we are going to have to do the other two at some point in time. Jennifer Garrett explained that the dampers are pneumatic with fusible links which can be outdated and hard to repair. The modern versions are similar but are brought up to modern technology. Eventually over time the weather seals don't function anymore and they have to be replaced. We have been looking at replacing these in FY26 budget; but now we need to do it sooner.

Costs: 1 smoke hatch = \$19,950 + 10% margin (\$21,945)
3 smoke hatches = \$34,950 + 10% margin (\$38,445)
Roof + 1 smoke hatch = \$61,765 + 10% margin (\$67,941)
Roof + 3 smoke hatches = \$75,765 + 10% margin (\$83,341)

When you do the roof and 3 smoke hatches it is considerably cheaper – you get two more smoke hatches for less than \$15K difference. The smoke hatches themselves are not intrinsically expensive; it's the mobilization... the crane... they will do everything in one entire job.

Question to Comptroller Karra: Are there any budget parameters?

We will have to ask DMB for funding. If EV charging stations are on hold and we don't spend that, then we will have the money to use that. But if we carry this over to next year, then the EV charging stations would go to the following year. This is an immediate project that is required, so we can explain to DMB that this needs to be replaced and we will move some of the EV stuff to a future year.

Request to get a second estimate; seek a second vendor:

Question by the Governing Board Chair: This is based on one opinion. Did you seek quotes from other vendors? No. I would like to see another quote because it is always good to have a second opinion on those things.

Timing of this repair in relation to performance season:

Question by the Governing Board Chair: What about appropriate timing: How urgent is this?

Clarification by Jennifer Garrett: We have had damage to several pieces of our soft goods (water on them resulted in stains). Several pieces of lighting gear with electronics have had water damage.

Question: Does it also include the fixing of the indoors (because this is roof and outside)?

The ceiling is a concrete slab painted black. There is no apparent damage to interior of the concrete slab on the inside part of the roof – eventually, that painting can be done at a future time when other things are painted in the theater.

Question: So you are saying that the reasons why we should consider this is: age of the equipment and they could fail.

The reason we are doing this is because they are failing – we are getting incoming water through the smoke hatches.

Question: That is the business case to me as to why you are doing this. But when you get a second quote, how long would it be until you can do the repair?

It will be about a 3-week job; but we will have to find about 3-week window in The Alden Theatre schedule - coordinating with the contractor's availability and having the crane on-site (for one day).

Repeated request to get a second estimate: *Question: Are there other county-approved vendors?*

I don't believe so, but I will look into it. It doesn't mean that we can't get a quote from them but it almost certainly means that it's not going to be less than this. There may be only one county-approved contractor. The smoke hatches are industry standards; there is only one type of smoke hatch equipment.

Clarification by Acting Executive Director Braff: We can find out if there are other contractors, but I'm not aware. Sometimes the county has only decided to use one particular vendor – we will have to ask that question.

Concern about roof damage because of the leaking smoke hatches:

Question: Is there nothing else that is affected by this issue?

It's literally a smoke hatch problem – the roof is not damaged. Joe's feeling is that the roof is 15 years old and doesn't have to be replaced. But because they will be up there replacing the three smoke hatches (penetrations into the roof) – while all this is happening, we should at the same time replace the small area of roof area around those smoke hatches while they are on-site.

Question: Why replace the roof now?

Because they will have to do some re-roofing when they take the smoke hatches out and are patching – it doesn't always go well. If the roof were only 5 years old, we would keep it. But we are at 15 years on the roof now which is close to the natural life of the roof – so this is a smart recommendation. We are at that point where, if we had them come in and do the roof two years later (with crane, labor), it may end up being more expensive. We are trying to figure out a way to be cost-effective in this current moment.

Question: Does the whole smoke hatch group need to be replaced?

Yes – it's one entire piece but there are three. When we looked at them very closely in 2014 they were starting to get dry rot around gasketing, but we felt we could extend the life. There was no established industry lifespan on these units. But they also haven't been invented and in use for very long (less than 60 years)! The gasketing is starting to rot; they allow leaves & debris to filter in. Water leakage problem is coming from the center stage smoke hatch. They are very hard to open and shut; manual opening was very tough; the fusible link would probably still work in a fire condition (though doubtful). We have been researching this for a while and decided to put them into the FY25/FY26 budget. But now we need to act sooner.

Timing and scheduling of the repair:

Comment by Vice-Chair Rahman: One idea is to make a MOTION now asking staff to get a second quote and then we will have to make another MOTION at the January Governing Board meeting to spend the money – we could promote it there.

Clarification by Joe McGovern: They probably could start at that point; but it would push it back another two months. Because of how county Purchasing happens, it may happen in the summer anyway. But we need to move on it quickly to get it into Purchasing; and then there is the supply chain delays.

Due diligence to seek a second quote:

Opinion expressed by the Governing Board Chair: I think it is due diligence to get a second quote.

Clarification by Jennifer Garrett: I understand. But if it makes you feel any better, I called the manufacturer to get the list price on the four different models. The price differential between the single and three units is exactly in line with the what the manufacturer is charging for the actual components. We know that a big crane will be required (as has been added to other jobs) and that will add costs.

Clarification by Joe McGovern: Vendors who are on county contract have already been vetted by the county – they are on the county list because they produced the lowest costs among the possible groups.

Response by Acting Executive Director Braff: We will go back and see if there are other county-approved contractors. If there are none, then we can let CFC know.

Recommendation by Vice-Chair Rahman: We can schedule to sort this out in the January Regular Board meeting.

Opinion expressed: I think we go with replacing all three smoke hatches (not just one). That's the right decision.

Summary by Vice-Chair Rahman: There is general agreement to proceed with replacing all three smoke hatches. We will inquire if there is another vendor to seek a second quote from (on the county's approved list) and then the entire board will vote on it at the January Regular Meeting.



ADA ACCOMMODATIONS - OLD FIREHOUSE CENTER (OFC)

Chair Rahman reiterated the priority of improving ADA compliance at OFC. Public comments have been received from SPARC participants making specific recommendations to upgrade OFC facility for accessibility by all members of the community. The OFC building is a key resource as a historical presence in McLean. It is used daily by disabled adults as well as students in the afterschool program. It is a strategic venue for rentals and large-scale events for the teen population. OFC is staffed by exceptional youth programming specialists who love our local youth demographic and are committed to their positive development and happiness. Acting Executive Director Braff has been working on this upon direction from the board at FY24 budget conversation. He also was shocked by \$630K (Fairfax Co. estimate) to re-do the two OFC bathrooms and make the entrance door ADA-accessible. Chris Leonard and Evan Braff talked through this a couple of weeks ago.

RECOMMENDATION: Vice-Chair Rahman will DRAFT a letter to Chris Leonard to ask if we can have a discussion about what types of contributions the county could make to pick up some of those costs. Have some conversation to find out if perhaps there is some latitude and flexibility - to go ½ with us.

***Several questions were raised about excessively high dollar amount of the quote:**

Question by the Governing Board Chair: Wait... is that the only option we have? \$650K??

Yes. Acting Executive Director Braff had sticker shock and pushed back on it as well because he was shocked. Construction costs have gone up and up. This is the costs as estimated by the county (not an actual quote). They must re-route plumbing – very expensive. They must have an ADA assessment – it is required for this type of project. Evan Braff trusts this group; but yet the estimate is excessive. Best approach is to go back to Chris Leonard and talk about the excessiveness of it. The county office worked with a contractor (architecture) to get this accurate estimate.

Question: Is there any possibility of getting another contractor to do such assessment? Is that the only option we have?

This is the firm they chose to do the estimate. A second firm will likely come back close to the same number. It was not from a contractor – that was from the county’s building development estimate.

Clarification by Joe McGovern: Ten years ago, we had plans drawn up to do this work; it never happened. We gave those plans to the county (same office who managed the MCC renovation project). They took the plans and worked with the contractor saying: This is the work we want to do - give us a number. It’s not the number we would pay a contractor – we would have contractors come in and bid on that. But in today’s market, this is what they expect the price to be. It is the ballpark number that the county estimates working with one vendor in today’s market.

Opinion of the Governing Board Chair: I don’t think \$650K for two bathrooms and a door makes sense. I would not vote for that from our board because I think it’s excessive. If there is a subsidy that the county can provide, of course, we will entertain it. But it’s excessive. It’s not an urgent matter – you may get contractors that may not part of the government but could potentially bid on this.

Question by Vice-Chair Rahman: Even 50% (\$350K) for two bathrooms and a door still seems excessive. Why not just go into today’s market asking: I need two ADA-compliant bathrooms in that building and a proper door. Just re-bid and compete it out?

Clarification by Acting Executive Director Braff: Bottom line: You must get contractors that are under the county list.

***complexity of this renovation in OFC structure drives up the cost**

There as a general lack of understanding that this commercial bathroom is not like a private home – it is men’s & women’s bathrooms each with 10 stalls, none of which are wheelchair accessible. You must move plumbing and tear up a concrete slab floor to accommodate where you are moving the stalls; that’s where all the costs are.

Executive Director Braff repeated his recommendation for the board to engage Chris Leonard and see if there is a possibility to have the county fund it significantly. I encourage the board not to make a decision tonight. I suggest that you all start the conversation with Chris Leonard about how much the county would subsidize for ADA accommodations at OFC. Once the board gets to the point of making a decision to proceed, it will still take a while to work out that conversation with Chris Leonard. I’m recommending to give Vice-Chair Rahman today the go-ahead to find out from Chris Leonard what kind of subsidy the county would be willing to make towards getting that OFC facility ADA-compliant.



***ADA non-compliance is unfair for SPARC participants who have been long-time users of OFC**

Clarification by Joe McGovern: In that discussion, a very fair point is how long SPARC has been utilizing our facility. We are not compliant to any of those kids. That's a bad look for MCC. And it's a bad look for Fairfax County.

Clarification by Acting Executive Director Braff: I'm agreeing with you all and maybe something happens with costs and other things. But what I'm trying to do is to get it so that you get Chris Leonard engaged. Because I think if Chris is engaged in the process, 1. it may help with costs and 2., he may be able to influence how much the county can contribute - which is something that will be important when you all get to that decision point.

NEXT STEPS: Vice-Chair Rahman will compose a letter to Chris Leonard (requesting board members to submit suggested bullet points). The MCC Governing Board would like to engage in conversation and start the discussion. We want to understand how this is done because the county builds not only new buildings, which they must make ADA compliant for certain uses, but also does renovations for that purpose. Obviously, OFC is a historically-protected building, though the interior is under MCC's purview of what we want to do. There is a way. And while we did do that work 10 years ago, it's unfortunate that we already presented what was proposed 10 years ago (as a reference point of \$350K). We don't necessarily need to need to do what we looked at 10 years ago. We need to now get to a particular set of functionalities: 2 bathrooms, ADA compliant door.

Comment by Joe McGovern: Just to be clear – that's all this \$650K is. There aren't many options here – the bathroom is the existing size. Literally, it is: How do we make this work in the footprint that is already there? The doors are the front entrance doors. The bathrooms are only a connecting project. There is no question it would be cheaper if you built it from scratch – but it's a renovation of a structure that it already exists!

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: I think for tonight's purposes I'm recommending the following: It is in this board's interest to engage Chris Leonard to see what type of subsidy the county is willing to contribute to this. Because if it is a significant subsidy, right now at the current price, it could help. The current price is too much! But if there is a substantial subsidy, maybe it is something that you all are willing to do.

Recommendation by a Board member: I make a MOTION that we do exactly what Evan Braff has suggested:

MOTION: This committee gives Vice-Chair Rahman the ability to write a letter and engage with Chris Leonard, Deputy County Executive, in regards to discussions about the county and their ability to subsidize some of the funding for ADA accessibility that is needed at Old Firehouse Center.

Approved by a vote of 4:

Rasheq Rahman, Bill Glikbarg, Melanie Sletten, Kristina Groennings – all voting "AYE."

Vice-Chair Rahman asked the board members to submit relevant points to make in the letter for a broader scope: asking what monies the county has available, what funding programs may be out there, including federal funding? Because we want to do this, but we want to make sure we are doing it in a fiscally-responsible manner.

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: At some point, we can ask the SPARC folks to come in and engage with the process; but I think the starting place is with Chris Leonard. \$650K is a lot; but I also think: if you are a kid in a wheelchair and you want to go to OFC, I'm not necessarily sure if you would feel 100% welcome there. When I was president of our HOA, our pool wasn't accessible. There was a lot of discussion about making that accessible and it was a big sticker shock about putting in a walk-in ramp. But we had a discussion as a community about: **What is the spirit of what we are trying to do here? I think one of the cornerstones that you all have been great about is making sure everyone is included. I agree that the sticker price is excessive and maybe there are ways we could get there; but I'm looking more at the spirit of what we want this Center to be about.**



Suggested approaches and bullet points:

1. *Comment by Vice-Chair Rahman:* We are interested, we want to learn, and we want to do it the right way.
2. *Comment by Joe McGovern:* Fairfax County loves that MCC has been doing SPARC at OFC for years – so help us out!
Comment by Vice-Chair Rahman: I would be happy to engage with SPARC if they want to do a letter supporting that.
3. *Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff:* I do think the reason I'm asking you all to engage Chris Leonard is because there is a county ADA fund.
4. We have a commitment to ADA and equity for the community, but are seeking better options: *clarification by the Governing Board Chair:* I just want to reiterate that we're committed to it; it's just the high price is too high. It's not taking us away from the commitment we have to it; it's just that we're looking at different options.

***suggestion to seek goodwill large donations from local company to support this important renovation**

Comment by Jennifer Garrett: It also seems like it could be an opportunity for a goodwill gesture by a company based in McLean – to have naming rights to that important renovation at OFC.

Recommendation by Board member Melanie Sletten: That's a great idea and Friends of MCC likes to support big projects and make larger contributions, so that might be a possibility too. We should approach them.

Comment by Vice-Chair Rahman: Which is why I want to get that \$number\$ right: \$650K may be the number but I don't understand that number right now.

Summary by Acting Executive Director Braff: That's why we wanted to start this discussion tonight - to get a better understanding of it and start planting some seeds.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Kohlenberger: To Joe McGovern's memory, about 10 years ago, we spent \$500K to do two single stalls in this building. I remember feeling like you expressed: How is that even possible?

Comment by Joe McGovern: We've done multiple repairs in this building – the one they did upstairs was so expensive because there were air handlers and they are always five times what you think it will be! When we did this renovation, the only rooms we "added" were restrooms! We had to have an additional 12 stalls in the women's restroom. It's no joke – it's a calculation.

Comment by Acting Executive Director Braff: At Sully Community Center, the amount of bathrooms we had to add in there to be ADA-compliant was crazy – we had to add 12 stalls in men's and 12 stalls in women's restrooms. Which impacted space for classrooms and programs!

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Rahman thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted – Holly Novak, Executive Assistant