

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District



Task Force Meeting #2 – Summary April 16, 2019

Attendees

Task Force

- Adam Chambers
- Tyson Cornett
- Kyle Hardtke
- Karen Harris
- Rick Hendricks
- Pete Hochstatter
- Matthew Kastberg
- Barbara Kiliz
- Kassie Meath
- Deb Norris
- Jason Olson
- Tom Osborne
- Troy Powers
- Brad Sayre
- Seth Sherwood
- Paul Smith
- Grant Sulham
- Ryan Turley

District and Consultants

- Laurie Dent, Ph.D., Sumner Bonney Lake School District Superintendent
- Matt Guilanians, Hainline
- Chuck Hartung, Hainline
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, facilitator
- Iris Picat, EnviroIssues, notetaker

Meeting Purpose

- Develop deeper understanding of planning context given changed circumstances
- Review and discuss early concepts for project pathway
- Provide input and advice to Hainline on concepts and further development

Welcome and Background

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District Superintendent, Laurie Dent, Ph.D., welcomed the Task Force and reminded them of their goal to support Sumner High School's legacy and to make a formal recommendation for a path forward.

Penny Mabie, facilitator, led introductions of the Task Force members and the Hainline representatives present and reviewed the ground rules and agenda. Penny reminded the Task Force that the goal of this meeting was to get feedback from the Task Force members on the proposed concepts in light of state and local circumstances so that Hainline could develop these concepts further and incorporate Task Force input.

Penny noted that there were several questions from the last meeting that were responded to in the summary, others were answered in an FAQ document to be shared with the Task Force and the public and others would be answered during the meeting.

Penny also clarified that the pool building was approximately 17,000 sq. ft. and that annual maintenance and operations cost is approximately \$135,000. She also responded to another question from the previous meeting about the timeline for the bond. There is a requirement for the District to use 85% of the proceeds within three years from the date of issuance of the bonds. If this amount is not expended, the earnings are capped at the yield rate of the time that the bonds were issued. A portion of the bonds were issued on December 28, 2017 and any bond proceeds not used by December 28, 2020 by that date may not be invested at a yield higher than the yield on the 2017 issued bonds (*i.e.*, 2.286076%).

which was 2.8676%.

Penny noted a request from a member to receive Task Force member emails to allow communications between members and that she had inquired via email of Task Force members if they were amenable to having their information shared. After asking if any members present did not want their information shared, Penny stated a roster of Task Force members who agreed to share their email contact information will be provided.

Additional Background Information

Matt Guilanians, Hainline, and Chuck Hartung, Hainline, provided background information on the existing school condition, the as-bid design, and a re-tooled concept. Matt noted that the as-bid design was the only design to be fully developed, the re-tooled was only conceptual.

Matt reviewed the existing school description and condition, including floor plans, key site elements and site utility locations. He noted that the boundaries of the project when it went to bid are different than they are currently as properties were acquired after the bond was passed. Matt also noted that the classrooms are spread out throughout the building.

Many portions of the building are quite old and there have been multiple miscellaneous additions and remodels. The band room was originally built in 1954 and modernized in 1985. The main school building was built in 1958, the pool in 1969, the arts and music classrooms in 1981, the special education and day care center in 1985, and the gym and Career Technical Education center (CTE) in 1992.

Existing floor plans cover 189,350 sq. ft. and accommodate 71 teaching stations, including the eight existing portables. Teaching stations are identified as those areas where learning is taking place. Matt stated that the goal is to replace the existing portables. The expectation isn't that all teachers will have one place they can teach at all day, there is still expected to be some movement, but less so than today as all the spaces are currently at 90%+ utilization. Matt also noted that the existing commons area is smaller than many other school commons area.

Matt noted that the pool is outdated, the facility generally lacks visual appeal and the existing utility systems are requiring increased maintenance. The utility services are especially complex

on the eastern side of the property so if the recommendation includes construction in that area, there will be more utility aspects to contend with.

Some current key utility elements to consider:

- A gas meter that feeds the pool
- A mechanical chiller bank on the south side of the pool
- A fire protection riser room
- Two Intermediate distribution frames (IDF)
- Several electrical rooms
- A boiler room

There are no areas in the facility without some mechanical/electrical considerations.

As-bid Design

- The overall design demolished the easterly single-story classrooms and replaced them with a three-story classroom building.
- A new commons area was placed in the courtyard and expanded into the existing building, with the second-floor library covering a portion of it.
- The existing band room was demolished and moved into a larger space.
- The kitchen was demolished and turned into an entry area to/from the buses.
- The pool was removed, and the tennis courts were expanded.
- Other miscellaneous system upgrades and improvements were also included.

The as-bid design included a three-story tall school building. Level one would include the band area, performing arts center, commons and food services. Level two would include science labs, general classrooms and the library. The third floor would include additional science labs and general classrooms.

After the bid came in high, the district and the architect reviewed the bond goals. The goals included:

- Build eight new classrooms to reduce overcrowding
- Add a commons area
- Build a new kitchen and band room
- Remodel the library
- Upgrade restrooms
- Make miscellaneous building improvements and assets protections
- Include required site work

A re-tooled scheme was developed to meet those requirements within a \$45 million construction budget.

Re-tooled Concept

- Pool was removed and a one-story classroom was placed there instead (eight classrooms, mostly a science wing)
- The kitchen was demolished and a new kitchen was located on the east side of the existing commons
- The LRC (learning resource center) was remodeled
- A secure vestibule was created at the entry
- The commons area was reduced in size and was only a one-story structure within the courtyard
- The band area was demolished and enlarged
- Other miscellaneous remodels
 - On the upper level nothing was proposed for remodeling except for additional mechanical space to serve the new spaces

Chuck reviewed the area comparison between the existing floor plan, the as-bid design and the re-tooled concept. The as-bid design added 52,922 sq. ft. for a total facility of 235,272 sq. ft. whereas the re-tooled concept only added 22,650 sq. ft. for a total facility of 206,000 sq. ft. Chuck noted that state guidelines for building sq. ft. area per student falls in line with the as-bid design, although it is a little low for a modern high school.

- Task Force member question: Does 206,000 sq. ft. meet the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) guidelines?
 - 130 sq. ft. per student is a guideline but not a requirement.

Chuck reviewed a comparison of the as-bid design and the re-tooled concept. The as-bid design allocated \$5 million for site work and \$64.6 million for modernization and new elements. The re-tooled concept also allocated \$5 million to site work, \$30 million on modernization elements, and \$8.4 million to new classrooms.

An evaluation of the re-tooled concept indicates, it did meet the bond goals. It also met the goals of reducing the project complexity, simplifying the phasing by not adding classrooms in the middle of the existing school, and making it more attractive to bidders with just one new building.

Chuck noted that bidding and phasing considerations might warrant bidding a new separate building independent of the more complex modernization components. Procurement methods will be studied further depending upon a concept or concepts to be chosen.

The re-tooled concept mostly meets the objective of anticipating future development. Moving classrooms in the pool location is a viable consideration, and the commons area can be adaptable to be turned into the LRC or partial administration space down the road. On the other hand, the kitchen and music locations could impede future development.

Because of the necessary demolition and insertion into the middle of the existing structure, the as-bid design required that many systems be modified or replaced. The re-tooled concept is less intrusive, but still would require modifications to existing systems. In general, a rule of thumb is that if the systems aren't touched, they can generally stay the way they are. If significant changes are made though, they will need to be upgraded, which can be costly.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Does the re-tooled concept include upgrading mechanical concepts for future growth? For example, are there plans to upgrade the chiller and boiler systems?
 - In these concepts, with the kitchen moving, the boiler room was moved back to the existing building but there were no upgrades.
- The original design bid was \$69 million. What was the estimated cost when the project went out to bid?
 - The estimate when the project went out to bid was \$57-58 million, with \$55 million as a target.
- How confident are we in the \$43 million estimate?
 - Because we are providing a lot of room for choices, we think it is doable. For example, some considerations should be how much site work we want to do or what systems we want upgraded. There is more flexibility in the re-tooled concept. The question is what upgrades make sense to be made now?
 - Yes, the budget of the re-tooled concept was recalibrated to the market.
- It is more expensive to modernize an existing facility. Did we look at alternative project delivery methods and at the entire site surface area? Are there options to build a new facility on this site? Maybe the softball field could be relocated to the baseball corner.
 - If you look at the bond planning effort that took place in 2015, the project was modernization and expansion. There was consideration at relocating the softball field to that location, as that area is used for baseball, but it is an available option.
- Who came up with the re-tooled concept?
 - The original design architect, BLRB.
- Why are we spending time on these past concepts?
 - We are going into this level of detail because there was time spent analyzing these concepts in light of state and local circumstances and we want you to have the same background and history we do on what was being considered and the changed circumstances.
- Were alternative delivery methods looked at, such as design-build?
 - No, but alternative delivery methods can be a consideration moving forward.
- I agree with an alternative delivery method approach. If we only got one bidder, they likely knew that they were the only bidder. Was anything done to find out why there wasn't more interest? Is there any marketing we can do now to get more interest?

- It is likely the bidder did know they were the only bidder. Overall, what we heard is that the project was complex and the phasing timeline created a long construction period.
- Looking back, due to the complexity of the job, it may have been a good project for General Contractor/Construction Manager (GCCM) approach but if we provide a more friendly project that is more attractive, it will attract more bidders.
- When the original bid went out, the project construction budget was \$55 million and now we are talking about a budget of \$45 million.
 - Money has already been expended on architect fees, engineering fees, surveying, consultant fees, new portables that have been moved in for use during construction, ongoing cost for interim portables, ed specs, permitting fees, etc.
 - There are also calculations regarding the State match (school construction assistance program) that impact the budget.
- Can we see the engineer's \$55 million estimate? It will help me understand how everything was priced out.
 - **Action item:** Provide Task Force with the original engineer's estimate.
- The project is tailored perfectly for the GCCM delivery process and makes it more attractive because the risk is a shared responsibility and the cost goes down.
 - Part of the recommendation may be to consider alternative delivery methods.
 - From the contractor perspective, if there is a choice between an alternative delivery method versus a hard bid, they will always pick the GCCM option. That being said, the concept that this delivery method saves cost is not something we have observed in the market. There is usually a 10% premium for GCCM projects. On the other hand, there is more of a concern about claims with a hard bid.
- In the goals slide in the PowerPoint, could you discuss what specific areas of learning or programming were expanded and which were removed? What goals were not accomplished in the re-tooled design?
 - There is less square footage in the re-tooled concept because the commons area is smaller. The number of classrooms stay the same and instead of being completely rebuilt, only some are built, and others are remodeled.
 - The science needs were met because new classrooms were built, there was a new kitchen and commons area but not much was done to the CTE building. The re-tooled concept kept status quo for some programs, such as the Future Farmers of America (FFA).
- If the pool is demolished and classrooms are built in that space, why keep them to only a one-story building? If we go that route, we should plan to build up higher.
 - We are not advocating for the re-tooled concept. We are showing what the concept was, what sacrifices were made and what was considered.

- A three-story building can be considered.

Hainline Master Plan Concepts

Chuck explained that Hainline was also tasked by the District with exploring, studying and evaluating options for expansion and modernization that could be done now within the budget and that could fit into a future plan. Hainline focused on three spatial areas: East, Central and West. The East concept is what the as-bid scheme primarily focused on and proposes to demolish, build and remodel school elements. The Central concepts are more closely aligned with the re-tooled concept and propose to build mostly new and include some demolition and remodeling. The West concepts propose to build out to the west and remove some elements from the east.

Chuck went into additional detail for each of the concepts, using bubble diagrams fit to the site to help show where elements could go. These only show area planning and don't go into design details or specific room or system locations.

East Concept

This concept is based on the as-bid design with a two or three-story classroom building, approximately 20,000 sq. ft. per floor. It may be all that can be afforded in the initial phase, although the budget may be able to accommodate adding on a music room or a smaller commons area. Placing the building in this location would encounter all the same complexities and phasing problems of the as-bid design. It requires the modification and/or replacement of existing systems.

Overall this concept is very complex with multiple phasing and a lot of disruption to the school. From a land use standpoint, it forms an east anchor for future remodeling and/or replacement taking place towards the center. Potentially an aquatic and sport elements could be provided to the west.

Center Concept 1

This concept derives from the re-tooled concept. It replaces the pool, changes the band room, widens the corridor and creates a new kitchen area in the middle of the facility. If the recommendation is to keep the pool, we could build initial classrooms over the tennis courts instead so that the pool does not need to be replaced initially. In the long-term plan, the classrooms would already be built so the focus would be to remodel the Performing Arts Center (PAC), move the CTE and create new administrative and commons areas. The initial phase is not complicated but over time it also has a phasing issue.

Center Concept 2

The second center concept provides choices. It builds a new two-story classroom building where the pool is located and connects to other buildings via a corridor. The kitchen is moved

out to the west and the commons area is built over the existing one-story building to center-west instead of building a new one in the courtyard.

West 1 Concept

This concept provides a lot of choices. It proposes to tear off the central portion and move it to the west, including the administrative area and the classrooms. It would leave the other existing buildings as they are to reduce disruption for an active school. Contractors would need to take up a portion of the baseball field for staging and parking. To build most of the new school, we would need to get a new bond down the road. In the long-term, this concept would create a new high school that would be between 230,000-250,000 sq. ft. This concept is a fairly clean concept.

West 2 Concept

The second West concept also provides choices. It moves everything further west to avoid all impacts on existing school function during construction by moving the new school far west and keeping everything else where it is now. The contractor would need to use the pool and west wing for staging. Parking would move to the area between the existing school and sport facilities and the softball field would move to the east.

Chuck reiterated the process for the Task Force and gave a broad timeline overview. Currently, the Task Force members need to analyze the various concepts, then make a recommendation, which the Superintendent will bring to the School Board in June. The Board will adopt or modify it and then an architect will finalize the design. Construction could begin in approximately summer 2020 but it depends on the recommendation as it will guide the building and bidding timeframe. Generally, spring is a good time to go to bid.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Does the bond money available support a master plan/Does the bond allow for new construction?
 - The bond doesn't limit the method used to achieve the goals.
- What is the appetite within the community to approve another bond specifically for the pool? It is something we should consider.
 - That is not a question we can answer.
- There is a piece of land that we haven't discussed using in the northeast corner.
 - That space is currently used for track facilities.
 - Are the softball and football seasons different? If so, could we combine the uses to one space?
 - Track is at the same time as the softball season.
- If we build a two-story classroom building, can it be extended as needed?
 - Yes, whether it is a corridor that connects the buildings or the building itself gets extended, it would be up to the architect.

- The current schedule concept is for a design-bid-build method, is that correct?
 - Yes, consideration can be given to other delivery methods.
- What are you doing with the property that was bought across from the school?
 - The original plan was to house the Eli Hill program at this off-site property. The Board will need to decide what to do with that site, while keeping the cost to remodel the building to bring it up to code in mind. The use of that facility is still under discussion.
- All the concepts call for a two-story building versus a three-story building. Is there a major difference in cost going from two to three stories?
 - From the use perspective, a two-story building is more friendly for students, but we are open to the idea of a three-story building.
- Would a height variance be needed for a three-story building?
 - A variance would be needed or the City of Sumner height ordinance would need changing.
 - The City of Sumner recently passed an ordinance increasing building heights to the east of the school site.
- Someone at the District said that the available land footprint for the number of students is one of the smallest footprints in the County or State, is this true? Are we putting more in a box than any other school in Washington State?
 - **Action item:** Hainline will research.
- We should be preparing ourselves to build up and to keep the greenery. I would like all construction to be new.
- Students have limited time between classes so it would be better to keep the classrooms together, especially in a three-story building. The flow must be considered.
 - In West 1 concept, there is a corridor between classrooms, either two-story or three-story, depending on the building height. We are not designing the building though, the architect will. We are focused on site use.
- Looking at the West 1 concept, it seems to reduce the number of exterior doors, which is a concern for me. In the West 2 concept, can the athletic facility in the northwest corner be moved to the east side? That way there would be parking available for basketball games, for example. This layout of where uses are placed is not very good.
 - Yes, the architect could likely flip it.
- I love the West 2 concept, but I am concerned that the building is too expensive. We would only be able to build a quarter of the building with the amount of money we have available.
 - We need about 1500 sq. ft. for science classrooms and 1200 sq. ft. for regular classrooms (these square footages include preparation areas and circulation spaces). If we build eight science classrooms and thirteen regular classrooms, that would take up about 15,000 sq. ft. We should be able to deliver 21 new classrooms, a commons area, a library and new kitchen within budget, including other site considerations. This could be an option for a first phase.

- Perhaps we could survey homeowners to see what they're willing to approve and if they would be willing to wait for an entirely new building all at once. If we did choose to build brand new, what would financing an additional \$100 million add to each homeowner?
 - **Action item:** The District will follow-up with bond financing information for the next meeting.
- What is the timeline to get a bond out?
 - It takes time, we would need to strategize about when we would want to run it.
- Why do you not show a footprint for phase 1, with a little patching to get you through, instead of only the long-term goal?
 - This is the second Task Force meeting and we didn't want to show you our biases. We want your input before we develop the concepts further, but we will show phase 1 footprint options and future phases at our next meeting.
- I think we should keep the gym; the PAC wouldn't need to be touched. We know we need to do something for the CTE, and we can look at options for it. You are reusing a lot of existing facilities in the West 1 concept and as you go west you can start planning for the future. If we have \$45 million left to spend, we can discuss what we can build for that.
 - Yes, that is one thing to consider when deciding where we want to anchor elements. Another consideration is to put the pretty elements on Main Street and the elements you don't want to see in the back, up north. This is not a bond requirement but is a consideration.
- In your opinion, what is the best bang for the buck?
 - We looked at the maintenance facility, and remodel timeframes, and can see the difficulty maintenance folks have with the existing building. We need to look at how much we would like to spend there.
 - I think that building 20 new classrooms, a commons area and a library is our best approach. We wouldn't spend any on the old school and can give internal programs, such as the FAA, room to spread out in the old building.
- I like those ideas as well. We need to come up with a plan that builds the first piece now. We can leave the administrative building where it is now. There are pressing needs for classroom space. We could move them to the CTE space and move CTE to the west.
 - If we went that route, we would need to demolish the pool in the first phase. We could almost accomplish the same thing by moving the commons to the west.
- What I like about building new is that it will save costs and it will provide a better product. Plus, in the short term, there is less impact on the kids as there won't be as much of a need to leave existing facilities through construction. The North Thurston High School went through that experience, and it was drastic and it severely impacted students.
 - That is a good construction consideration. In addition, the gym would be a good noise breaker from construction to the west.
- I am not a proponent for wasting good money. We should look at moving in the direction of moving to the west. For whatever construction we do, we should assume that other

elements will be added on as bond money becomes available. We should also spend whatever is necessary to make existing facilities functional in the interim.

- By demolishing the pool, we are taking away a program. Once we take it away, people will get used to not having it and it will be unlikely to be replaced down the road. We should move parking to the west and not remove a program that can get replaced later with another bond.
 - That is a good consideration to keep in mind.
- Seems like going west is the right direction to go. If the Task Force comes up with a real gem, it will make it easier to ask for another bond. I think the pool is a no brainer and it needs to go as quickly as possible for maintenance of facility. It is a gross facility and not that gem. To be able to use that space another way is a responsible thing for us to do. I think we ought to spend as little as possible on elements to the east for the administrative type area that should go away in the future.
- There will be heartburn in the community about tearing down a 60-year-old building. I am not sure how to address it but a lot of people felt like it was a long-term investment when they voted it in. It will be difficult to say that it no longer belongs in this space. Is there a hybrid solution that would make a bond easier to pass?
 - That is definitely something that we should consider. That building is getting to the end of its design life but if there is an emotional attachment to it, we should be aware and keep that in mind.
- Currently, when schools pass bonds it is for buildings that can last 50 years.
- The easiest place to build is north of the softball field; it is the easiest place to gut. We want a building that looks like a high school. We can keep the PAC and gym and discuss future plans for the pool. During construction, it will be good for the community to see a center piece being built. Community will then have a better appetite for another bond if there is a very clear change. For ease of cost and implementation, I would like this area to be considered. I am a proponent for the pool and for new construction.
 - There is one remaining parcel north of the softball field that is not owned by the District.
- I think building an anchor is the best way to go.
- If you compare the use of the gym to the pool, the gym is used a lot more than the pool. It may not be worth the political fight to demolish the pool, but it may not be a logical decision to keep it.

Summary of Task Force Takeaways

Penny summarized the main takeaways to make sure that the group was on the same page. The majority of Task Force members indicated that:

- There is a preference to look at building new instead of remodeling.
- There is support to build something new with the money available now, and phasing for the future. The goal is to have a good master plan.

At least one member was not in favor of this. The member would prefer for all athletics to be on one side and all new construction on the other, to go out for another bond, and to get it all done at once.

Task Force members further commented with other Task Force members responding:

- What does a whole new high school cost?
 - A whole new high school costs about \$175 million. An aquatic center costs about \$20 million.
 - There is no sense in not using the money now in addition to starting the bond process now so that funds are ready when the first phase is done.
- In the last meeting I asked about whether we need to adhere to the dollar amount in the bond or the romantic side of what was being voted on to get built. The bond was passed with 66%. If the amount asked for had been higher, it would likely still have gotten passed.
 - We need to stick to the goal of the Task Force to come up with a recommendation on how to use the funds available.
- I like the idea of saving the PAC, saving the gym and the pool and moving construction to the west. The School District has done a really good job at building schools and saved money in our last projects. The District had thought it would take years to buy up the land around this school.
- Laurie Dent, Superintendent, reminded the group that the decision to run another bond rests with the school board. She suggested checking in with the school board members to see if they want to pursue going to the west because they make the final decision.

Penny wrapped up the meeting by noting that Hainline will be focusing on the Westerly concepts unless anyone had any objections. Nobody objected in the room. Task Force members were encouraged to send an email if they have an East or Center preference that they would also like Hainline to explore further.

Action Items

- The District will research how much it would cost homeowners to run a \$150 million bond.
- Hainline will research footprints of comparable schools in the County and State.
- The Task Force will be provided with the final pre-bid engineer's estimate.

The next Task Force meeting is on April 30, 2019.

The meeting was adjourned.