

**Attendance:**

69 attendees at start, 59 at end of meeting

**Objectives:**

- Outline the components of a capital bond planning exercise, identify where we are in the overall exercise, and show how we will move forward with the remaining meetings.
- Present assessment data for each learning facility in the district.
- Show how weighting the importance of each will change the overall ranking of facilities within a group.

**1. Intro**

- Review of group norms.
- Please do not copy or screen shot any information to protect privacy of students and teachers; want people to feel free to express their thinking in the moment without worrying about context if it were to be captured and shared online; we also do not want to post anything prematurely
- Review first meeting outcomes and how these will shape the agendas moving forward. Expect to see your questions addressed in upcoming meetings.
- All data will be sent between meetings. Please take the poll later in the meeting to describe how best to reach you with information in hard copy.

**2. Bond planning outline**

- Bond planning is a linear process but can sometimes not go in a straight line. Steps to getting to a recommendation:
  1. Collect data, analyze, then synthesize it.
  2. Develop and apply guiding principles as a group.
  3. Prioritize by always returning to the norms and guiding principles we establish.
  4. Blend everyone's opinions and thoughts.
  5. Build consensus and check against guiding principles.

**3. Facilities Master Plan Data**

- Three components of data to begin our analysis of district facilities:
  1. Building condition  
Systematic inspection and rating on every NSD building structure, system, and component. Ratings for these purposes are reviewed specifically for systems in which replacement extends the useful life of the facility. They are also focused to identify issues with the greatest impact to the user if the system fails, remaining useful life of the components, and efficiencies of the

system.: Walls, roofs, windows, floors, HVAC, major mechanical, life safety, fields, & courts

## 2. Design Capacity

Number of students determined to be an ideal occupancy for the number of instructional program support spaces at the onset of programmatic design of each NSD facility. This number varies by grade level and can vary by facility depending on when the school was designed: number and size of classrooms, associated program support, administrative spaces, circulation.

## 3. Functional Performance

A 36-point systematic inspection and rating on every NSD facility, learning setting and supporting space. Ratings are given based on the flexibility and agility of each facility and the degree to which each serves as an extension of the curriculum by grade level: Learning settings, configuration, community engagement.

## 4. Building Condition

- Every component of every facility has a lifecycle. Ongoing, preventative maintenance and timely replacement a facility will remain within useable condition for an estimated 30 years as a guideline.
- Building improvement projects will typically involve one major building systems, and perhaps upgrades to meet code.
- Modernizations and additions are larger scale improvements to multiple systems also addressing educational programming or efficiency needs.
- Building condition assessments help us avoid making major investment based on assumptions (such as building or component age) alone.
- McKinstry team collects and reviews all available data for facilities including plans, and problem “tickets” submitted by users then follows with a visual inspection of every building system component to determine a building’s overall assessment rating.
- Your home analogy - you weigh the costs of a planned replacement based on the value of the asset.
- NSD Facilities timelines show only the age and “major modernizations” that extend the life of the entire facility. The building condition assessments gives us a refined view of each.
- From the maps we can see that most facilities are in good repair. Those shown here in the “poor” category are typically those that were “on the bubble” in the last bond and now need attention:
  - ES: 7 schools indicate need for investment of multiple systems as indicated by orange color.
  - MS: Leota as an outlier as the other schools have had recent improvements.

- HS: Inglemoor is the outlier here despite some recent improvements as the number of systems needed in a larger facility grows.
- Ranking table showing schools ranked by condition performance showing schools without recent improvements performing worst. Overall, this is balanced by grade level as NSD maintains equally.

## 5. Design Capacity

- As district enrollment changes over time there are a number of ways to seat the population of students depending on the need. We hope that portables can be a temporary solution, but with bond after bond of population growth it's been difficult to get ahead.
- Enrollment patterns are predictable but can vary from year to year based on operations. NSD has several ways to manage both operational and with varying forms of construction projects.
- Population growth is expected in the ES and HS grade levels in the near term.
- Maps show estimated design capacity concerns by school based on enrollment projection for 2030 with Elementary having the highest need especially in the west and north parts of the district.
- A review of the Snohomish Country UGA Boundary shows the possibility for added need for capacity at all grade levels in the north area of the district.

## 6. Functional Performance

- Functional Performance is a new assessment for NSD focused on the flexibility, adaptability of learning environments and their ability to easily support current and forward-thinking models for education curriculum of the district. This is not to say that those with scores indicating lower performance are not teaching with these models. The score only means that educators must do more operationally to make these work in spite of the building configuration.
- Criteria details to be sent; built on NSD education specifications devised to support the NSD 2017-22 Strategic Plan.
- Overview of the scores across the district reveal a strong dependence between score and age of building. This makes sense because curriculum has changed so dramatically since our first schools were built.
  - ES: CS, SV, LW, KE, WH, AH, MS, and SR scores indicate the highest need while FW, CC, FL, KO, MH, WO, WE, HH, and ER come in with slightly better performing scores.
  - MS: with KMS and NSMS both having had major modernizations they naturally show better performance. CPMS < SMS < LMS, and TMS all ranked in the "poor" category.
  - HS: schools in this grade level are either newer or have received more recent modernizations in which a more recent curriculum model was used as

a guideline for design. IHS is the only school at this grade level to receive a “poor” score.

### 7. **Varying Priorities**

- Final table indicates that the ratings you prioritize and will change the list of projects you recommend.
- The data does not change, but the lens with which you view it can. Data is rigorous, but the guiding principles can be fluid for now.

### 8. **Think - Pair - Share** (below are responses pulled from the responses of participants in the breakout discussions)

#### **Q1: What did you take away from the information today?**

- Valuable information.
- Elementary schools seem to be in decline.
- Where the schools are in a scale.
- Try to get maximum utilization from building lifespan.
- Impressed by the level of future planning.
- Too many portables.
- Need multistoried buildings.
- We see to rely on portables to address capacity.
- Need for classroom spaces.
- Not just about building condition.
- This will be difficult to prioritize.

#### **Q2: What does a balanced approach to bond planning mean to you?**

- Addressing schools that have not had significant investment compared to others.
- Equitable investment in as many sites as possible in the “red and orange” especially those who have been there in multiple bond cycles.
- That no single region gets all of the resources.
- Ensuring that we are handling safety needs for example - new HVAC.
- Meeting capacity needs especially at the north end of the district.
- Ensuring equity; looking at the projects through an equity lens
- Listening to different voices and perspectives.
- Growth, equity, education, technology, foresight.

#### **Q3: Should any of these three factors (building condition, capacity, and functional performance) be weighted higher or lower than any others? Why?**

- Student safety and ability to house students must come first then we need to address performance.
- 1. Condition, 2. Capacity and Functional Performance are tied.
- Capacity is more than just student seats - transportation must be considered.
- 50% building condition, 25% capacity, 25% functional performance
- Weight building condition and performance equally and capacity lower. These two related because you cannot learn in a boiling hot/freezing cold room.

**Q4: What factors, if any are to be considered in addition to the three we discussed this evening?**

- What is the bar to level set?
- What projects are hard to pass a bond with?
- What is the plan to reduce/remove portables?
- Location
- Security especially exterior considerations.
- Safe outdoor spaces.
- More daylight.
- What are the real possibilities with older buildings?
- How doe NSD investments stack up against inclusivity targets?
- New buildings have more benefit/energy efficiencies.

9. **Closing**

- Data and summaries will be sent Monday, March 22, 2021.