

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District



Task Force Meeting #3 – Summary April 30, 2019

Attendees

Task Force

- Adam Chambers
- Tyson Cornett
- Kyle Hardtke
- Karen Harris
- Rick Hendricks
- Pete Hochstatter
- Matthew Kasatberg
- 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
- Meaghan McClure, EnviroIssues, Notetaker

Meeting Purpose

- Review and discuss revised concepts for project pathway in light of state and local circumstances
- Identify preliminary preferred concept(s)
- Give advice and guidance to Hainline on further development of preliminary preferred concept(s)

Welcome and Background

Penny Mabie, Facilitator, welcomed the group and commenced the meeting on time. Penny explained that as the third of four meetings, she was anticipating more great progress.

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District Superintendent Laurie Dent, Ph.D., welcomed the Task Force and reviewed the purpose of the meeting. She emphasized the desire to support current and future students while continuing the legacy of Sumner High School with a recommendation to the School Board.

Laurie described how exciting it was seeing Task Force members being greeted by students and the school mascot, Sparty, on their way to the meeting room. She continued to explain how Sparty represents the school spirit shared by students, teaching staff and the larger community around the school and is part of the legacy to carry forward with the Task Force's work. Laurie shared about the Eli Hill Program and how the Task Force's work is already igniting positive energy. She thanked the Task

Force members for its great thinking. Laurie reviewed next steps for the work of the Task Force, including a final meeting on May 14, followed by two public meetings on May 28 and 29 and on June 18, a presentation to the School Board of the recommendation of the path forward for modernization and expansion of Sumner High School.

Penny led introductions of the Task Force members, Hainline representatives and reviewed ground rules and agenda. She reviewed feedback from the April 16 meeting and noted the Task Force was indicating a preference for a two part approach: to build new now as an Initial Phase, consistent with the 2016 Bond goals, and to build on the Initial Phase with a Master Plan for full, future build out over time, all aimed at minimizing renovations.

Questions from Last Meeting

Matt Guilanians, Hainline, and Bang Parkinson, Chief Financial Officer, Sumner School District were introduced and provided answers to questions from the last meeting.

Regarding typical sizes of school campuses, Matt explained that because Sumner is a suburban area, he looked for examples of similar high schools with similar size of student body populations. He noted that Sumner High School is in the middle of several other schools of similar population; the High School's acreage is sufficient.

Task Force Members Discussion

- How much area was gained by the purchase of the additional parcels near the campus?
 - About 2 acres.

Matt Guilanians also provided information on whether the re-tooled concept presented to the Board in November of 2018 lost teaching spaces compared to the as-bid design. He noted the re-tooled concept included 30,000 total square feet less than the as-bid design. He showed a teaching station summary of the High School project that shows that the number of teaching stations remained roughly the same from the as-bid design through the re-tooled concept.

Bang Parkinson, School District CFO, introduced that she would be responding to a question from the Task Force relating to potential, future bond funding associated with potential, future buildout of components of a Master Plan. Her presentation was based upon information and preliminary analysis (incorporated as part of the April 16 slide deck) prepared by Mark Prussing, CPA, Financial Advisory Services with Educational Services District No. 112. Bang noted the Task Force had asked for an estimate of what the tax rate would be, assuming a hypothetical, future bond authorization of \$150 million. Bang briefly reviewed the process for bond planning which includes the District's Board, District Administration, a Community Committee, and the Finance Team, including the District's CFO, bond counsel, financial advisor, and underwriter. As the assessed value increases, debt capacity for a district increases as well. Bang noted that the assessed valuation increase of 5% and 4% analyzed in the tax rate analysis prepared by Mark Prussing was a conservative projection compared to the current assessed value increase of 12.37%. With the assumptions analyzed, the example tax rate increase would be \$.67 per \$1,000 assessed value per month in 2020. For a \$300,000 home value, approximately the average home value in the District, the cost of the hypothetical bond amount of \$150 million would be \$201 per year

or \$16.75 per month in 2020 as shown on the slides. Bang emphasized that the tax rates are merely estimates. Actual rates may vary and will depend on various factors such as the interest rates set when the bonds are sold, principal payment schedule, and the change in the District's assessed value over time.

Task Force Members Discussion

- Does the school district currently have that bonding capacity? And is the School Board interested in contemplating this additional bonding strategy?
 - Yes, the District has the capacity. Rick Hendricks and Deb Norris, both School Board members, replied that, while they don't speak for the whole School Board, they thought the board would be supportive if the Task Force recommended it. Deb requested that the Task Force members attend Board meetings after the recommendation is made.
 - A suggestion was made that Task Force members would like to receive email reminders about when Board meetings are scheduled for.

Agenda Discussion

Penny introduced Matt Guilanians and Chuck Hartung to present revised concepts.

Matt explained that Hainline is using the nomenclature of Initial Phase and the Master Plan which implements the Initial Phase and includes future buildout of school facilities and improvements over time under a Master Plan to describe the approach of the Concepts. Matt identified core, priority elements of a project, consistent with the 2016 Bond goals, set forth under the Initial Phase of each Concept, including: commons, classrooms (target 16 – 20), kitchen, library (learning resource center), and improved circulation while the structure of the old building remains.

Matt went on to note that taking the Task Force's preference from the last meeting, which is to build new, creates increased value to provide increased capacity to serve the students. By positioning the expansion westerly of the existing school building, the total estimated new building area would be approximately 63,390 sq. ft. including a target of 16 to 20 new classrooms. A small satellite administrative office would be included in the new building. Additional program considerations beyond the Initial Phase would be part of future development as generally reflected by the Master Plan.

Chuck then proceeded to present the Initial Phase and Master Plan for each revised Concept. To orient the Task Force members, Chuck reviewed the preliminary Concepts presented at the April 16 Task Force meeting in relationship the change of circumstances since passage of the bond: to the location and uses of the existing buildings and facilities on the High School campus, the age and condition of the buildings, location and complexities of site utilities, and the recently acquired parcels to the north along Mason Street and to the west on Wood Avenue.

Task Force Members Discussion

- Is the remaining parcel that the District doesn't own yet going to be a problem under the Master Plan?
 - Your question may be answered after viewing the concepts, and yes, it is a factor.
 - The District is currently in conversations with the owner of the house.

Chuck noted that the Task Force members supported focusing on the westerly side of the campus; therefore, the three revised Concepts are consistent with that preference.

Hybrid West Central Concept

The first concept was the Hybrid West Central Concept. Chuck presented two different Initial Phases for this concept. He noted that in this concept the Commons would be located behind the gym and would be central to the existing facility. This would mean tearing down the oldest part of the existing building to replace it with a new Commons. This would eventually become the link to a westerly two-story classroom wing. In order to create an adequate connection from the new building to the existing school, improvements are needed to the east-west corridor. The second option (Plan 2), is to demolish less of the existing area north of the gym, thereby keeping the existing arts and drama areas. In either solution the band room would need to be relocated. Both options have challenges. One potential solution is to create an interim band room in the LRC area of the existing building. The Master Plan reflects the Performing Arts Center (PAC) being retained in its current location although it could be remodeled. A new entry to the existing PAC could be built and the east face of the PAC could be refaced when the remaining portion of the existing school was demolished. In this Hybrid West Concept, the new building becomes part of the old building. One factor to consider is that connecting new electrical services and systems to existing infrastructure could potentially create issues.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Which of these plans has less phasing?
 - There is less disruption in the Hybrid West Central Initial Phase (Plan 2) because fewer existing spaces are being demolished in the center of the school.
- What about structures currently existing that could be barriers to building and staging, such as the barn?
 - Those are small components we aren't looking at closely yet as we are only in the conceptual stage.
 - The barn has been demolished, and half of the greenhouse has been removed on the Washington Street side of the school.

Chuck continued and reviewed the advantages and challenges. He emphasized the complexity of integrating the new and existing structures and added that this option could take budget away from the new structure in the Initial Phase.

Proximal West Concept

Chuck explained this concept retained close proximity to the existing building. It includes improving the corridors and possibly relocating the band room in the Initial Phase. Instead of the new Commons being in the middle of the structure, it is located in the area of the existing parking lot west of the gym, with a new kitchen to the north. The new classrooms would be west of the new Commons. Currently, there is a fire lane that runs west of the gym, above an underground power line. The new building location in the

Initial Phase seeks to avoid interfering with the power line in order to minimize revising existing utilities. Chuck noted that the new building and the existing school building cannot have two electrical services. In this concept, in contrast to the the Hybrid Concept, the new building would have a new state-of-the-art electrical system and the old building would keep its separate electrical system with some updates as may be necessary. The Master Plan for the Proximal West Concept shows a future, additional two-story classroom wing to be built to the west. The Career Technical Education (CTE) program would be located where the pool is located, or the CTE wing could be located west of the tennis courts. Parking would be both to the east and west. Overall, the main academic campus moves to the area west of the existing gym.

Chuck explained advantages and challenges. This concept is generally simpler than the Hybrid West Central Concept, with little or no demolition in the Initial Phase. There would be no need to change the electrical system in the existing building to interconnect. This concept creates a more visible new school appearance in the Initial Phase than the Hybrid West Central Concept. All new building footage is a net add to the total school area. Challenges are that construction may be disruptive to existing day care and special education programs, which may be able to be mitigated by relocation to portables. Also, the existing parking area west of the gym will require relocation. The design challenge is to minimize impacts to avoid making temporary improvements which add to the cost of a project. In the buildout of the Master Plan, more phasing complexity will be encountered due to adjacent building and interconnection of the PAC and Gym to the new school.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Why isn't the concept pushed all the way to Main street?
 - In this concept, the administration offices are added later.
 - To make it visually appealing in the Initial Phase requires later demolition of the external finishes in the Master Plan which seems to be wasteful of time and budget.
- How would the systems transition between buildings?
 - Once the existing school building was demolished, everything would feed off the new. In the build out of the Master Plan, the existing system is replaced, and what remains is a fully new system.
 - In this scenario, you have less disruption to students and end up with more parking.
- With phased construction, how many years will the students be subjected to the phasing?
 - Approximately a year and a half to build the Initial Phase. Full buildout under a Master Plan would depend on when additional funding became available and the facilities to be constructed.
 - You mentioned that we're going to see a more attractive facility in the Initial Phase. When the public sees the more attractive facility, they will have a positive taste in their mouth and might have more support for the Master Plan once they understand how the money was used in the Initial Plan.
 - The priority of a new administration area was not included in the Initial Phase, and since the administration area remains in the existing building, the main school entrance would also remain there. In the buildout of the Proximal Master Plan Concept, the new entrance with administration offices moves to the west and faces south to Main Street. The outcome could be a more visible and impressive frontage.

- Safety is an issue and a large space could be hard to monitor. The courtyard in proximity of the Commons seems better but may be not our best use of money to undo work later. There is safety factored in designing the courtyard leading to the building.
- Pushing the Commons up to Main Street would require the team to think about maintaining connectivity during the phasing from the Initial Phase to buildout under a Master Plan.
- How about a courtyard behind the school near the bus loop? When you drive down Main Street, you can see that is where students congregate before and after school. Where are the students going to congregate with the bus loop behind the building?
 - The design team considered how Main Street was south facing so sun exposure would be a key element in the courtyard being in front.
 - If students are dropped off in the rear of the school in the Proximal West Concept, the courtyard seems to be leftover greenspace. These elements can change later once the architect moves to a design phase.
- If the existing administration areas are small offices, suggest cutting some program space from the classrooms and building a cornerstone around administration, classrooms and Commons.

Distal West Concept

Chuck introduced the Distal West Concept noting there were two versions of the Initial Phase, a primary layout and an alternate layout. The primary layout of this concept locates the Commons further west, just off the existing parking area. The classroom wings would be further west in the current green space. A canopy, or perhaps enclosed canopy, would connect the new building with the existing school. The canopy would have to be open where it crosses the fire lane. A portion of the existing parking can remain with new parking in the northwest corner.

In the Distal West Alternate Concept, a concept explored based upon comments from the April 16 Task Force meeting, the classroom wing is further north with kitchen and Commons near the tennis courts. The Commons isn't central in this layout. Chuck stated that the team didn't develop a Master Plan Concept for this alternate layout because the layout doesn't seem strong.

The build out of Distal West Master Plan removes the canopy after the Initial Phase and builds academic and administrative space in the area between the Initial Phase building and the portions of the existing building that were shown to remain. These include the Gym and PAC. A long central enclosed east-west circulation spine is created by this concept. The PAC and Gym could be remodeled, or as also shown, an additional new main gym could be constructed. The Distal West Master Plan concept also shows the potential for location for a new pool. To reach 600+ parking stalls reduces the green space in the western area of the site. Going three stories for the classroom area would allow more green space area to remain. Tennis courts would extend to the west. Chuck explained the advantages. It is the least complex concept. There is little or no demolition to the existing building in the Initial Phase. This concept retains part of the parking lot in the front of the school in the initial phase. Chuck continued to present the challenges: the phasing and logistic will be more complex where the Master Plan buildout integrates with portions of the existing school.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Have you thought about any vertical parking garages? The space we're discussing seems to be valuable real estate.
 - Typically, we wouldn't spend budget on expensive vertical parking. In these schemes, the parking seems to fit.
- Do you see a second story library over-looking the commons working well? Would it be similar to Bonney Lake High School?
 - The Commons could work well as a two-story structure with a library. The team would try to do something different than Bonney Lake High School.
- In the Distal West Concept, the softball (green space) is in the Initial Phase and then it is relocated. It doesn't seem like there is a huge net loss of green space in these plans.
 - No, it isn't a huge net loss, but it does get tight.
- In the Distal West Master Plan, if you asked the students what would be more disruptive, walking further between classes would be more of an issue than construction noise. Remember they have 5-minute passing periods.
- With build out of the Master Plan, you would have to build a covered walkway through the construction zones. The team would build in additional mitigation costs to make it safe.
- Have there been studies of future projected growth of the school?
 - Yes, and all these revised concepts were based on the assumption that the student body will cap at 1,830 students. We haven't planned for more than that.
- Of the 18 new classrooms, how many would be in the new wing?
 - Likely there would be at least 12 new classrooms.
 - There will be more classrooms in the new building.

Penny asked the Task Force Members to indicate their thoughts on their first, second and third preferences based upon the three Concepts. She did a round table check-in. Preference was indicated for the Proximal Concept.

Penny asked Matt to discuss potential project schedule options. Matt explained three potential schedules: Three scenarios were discussed: run a bond in 2020, in parallel to construction of the Initial Phase; run a bond during construction, when the community sees construction occurring; or run a bond after opening and occupying the building.

He noted that the sample schedules assumed standard design-bid-build delivery method, but said it wasn't a judgment on whether one delivery method is better than the other. He estimated about a year for design and construction of approximately 18 months.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- How do you complete construction in the Initial Phase not knowing if the Master Plan will happen?
 - We don't want to design it all, then see the bond not pass.
 - Need to consider if the plan requires additional sizing to pull in all the services at accurate times.
- If the bond doesn't pass, the outcome would be a waste.

- The simplest option is building a new school with expandable capabilities.
- Would this schedule allow the same architectural firm to complete the project?
 - You could keep with the same architect between both the Initial Phase and the build out of the Master Plan. The downside to a new architect would be adding in the time to introduce them to the project history and background of the phases.
- Families will be concerned with their children being in a construction zone for several years. Can the construction time be decreased? What about families who don't have kids that will go to this school? People don't want to vote for a bond just a few years apart from another. What about the growing population in the Tehaleh development? Will there be a need for a high school out there?
 - About half of the population of Tehaleh will be in the Orting School District, and the other half in Sumner-Bonney Lake. At the present time, student generation from growth within the current boundaries of the Sumner-Bonney Lake School District within Tehaleh will only produce a quarter to a third of a new high school.
 - I'm in agreement that it is difficult to strategize messaging to voters.
 - The community had the energy and support to rebuild the Lakeridge Middle School. Sumner High School was built in 1954 and has been "band-aided" for several years.
 - Transportation between a new pool and various schools sharing it would be an issue.
- What is the cost of the new school and square footage?
 - That depends on the scheme.
- Will the School District be building a new stadium?
 - No, the assumption is that all programs will continue to use the one in town.
- Is the School District considering new boundaries?
 - No, we just went through one of the biggest boundary changes in history of the District. We aren't planning at this time future boundary changes.
- I was on the bond and levy committee. The people of Sumner voted on the Bonney Lake High School. When people understand that there is a need somewhere nearby, because we are one community, they will not be short-sighted and will support this.
- It is obvious that there is concern that this will happen in phases. Do we get stuck in Phase 1 forever? It is going to take a good marketing job to convince the public. People will miss the information online and meetings. However this is promoted, it has to connect with the diversity in the community. It can't be hidden, and our time should be spent with extra effort given to ensure that it is packaged in a promotional way. It must be sold right.

Penny generally discussed what will be included in a Task Force report. The four Task Force meetings will be the process and that will be shaped into final recommendations. We need to determine what is going to be in those recommendations and what do we need to do between this meeting and our next meeting.

Penny noted that at the April 16 meeting, it seemed that Task Force was supportive of modernizing and expanding in phases, and to retain most of the existing building in the interim between phases. She asked if there was any disagreement from members with that statement. *None was expressed.*

Penny discussed that the Task Force will want to consider whether to include a pool, a new gym, and a new PAC. She asked if the Task Force wanted to discuss those now or wait until further refinements of the preferred westerly concept are presented at the next meeting?

Discussion by Task Force Members

- It doesn't make sense to dump money into either of these.
 - Facilitator clarified that these considerations are for the Master Plan.
- Suggest a new, larger gym, updated PAC and a new pool.
- Sometimes we can't have everything everywhere. We don't need a new PAC as much because we just built a new one at Bonney Lake.
- It isn't just the high school kids using these spaces, I have elementary school kids who use it. The community will support the bond to build it.
 - Just build a whole new school.
- Does the Master Plan include the \$45 million budget?
 - The \$45 million budget is for the Initial Phase. Separate, additional funding is necessary to complete build out over time of the Master Plan.
- I think we should go all in and continue the legacy of Sumner High School.
- In the Auburn School District, Auburn and Riverside high schools share facilities successfully.
- Retain and modernize the gym and take potential out of the aquatic facility.

We should vote on this question.

- Penny shared that she was not in favor of voting, emphasizing the goal of the Task Force is to reach consensus. She clarified that consensus, for the Task Force, is defined as "I agree, and I can live with this choice. It may not be my first choice, but I will support this as the choice of the Task Force." Penny suggested maybe the Task Force could let the design and budget decide on the PAC, since there wasn't clear consensus. She noted that there was support for recommending a new gym. She asked the group if it was ok to keep it in for now.

The Task Force indicated a preference to recommend a new gym.

- Penny clarified that this is just a recommendation, reminding the Task Force that a decision isn't going to be made by this group. She asked if all members agreed with including the aquatic facility in the Master Plan.

The Task Force indicated a preference to include the aquatic facility in a Master Plan.

- How do you decide when to run a bond?
 - Collective wisdom says never run a bond in a major election year. We're looking at February 2020 and February 2021. There could be other things out on the ballot.
- If we went out with the bond in 2020 and people didn't have the appetite, if it failed could we go out with it after construction of the Initial Phase?
 - That could be a strategy, but we have to approach this with the idea that we're going to win.

Penny noted the Task Force could include in their recommendations a preference for one of the three timing approaches to fund build out over time under a Master Plan: (i) in parallel with the Initial Phase,

(ii) after commencement of construction of the Initial Phase, or (iii) after construction of the Initial Phase is completed.

- Suggest sooner rather than later.
 - In 2020 with the levy.
- If this is our recommendation, let's engage with experts to inform our strategy for timing. Condense and get it going.
 - It has to be sold honestly.
- We have to get out sooner than later. Let's look for cost saving measures.
- Look also out for other needs in the District if proposing another bond.

Penny checked with the group to see if there was objection to a recommendation of running another bond as soon as reasonably possible relating to building under a Master Plan.

The Task Force supported recommending running a bond as soon as possible associated with additional building under the Master Plan.

Penny asked if there are other considerations the Task Force might want to include in their recommendations.

- Design-bid-build might be easy to understand, and other delivery methods might be more complicated, but they should still be considered.
- We should recommend build as high as possible and as often as we can.
 - From an engineers' perspective and thinking about the financial constraints, suggest designing a rectangular building. It will be easier to sell a new building without all the bells and whistles.

Penny asked if the group wanted to include two additional considerations – consider alternate delivery methods and consider three-story construction.

The Task Force supported recommending those two considerations.

Penny invited the Task Force to attend public meetings at the end May.

Laurie thanked the Task Force for their continued engagement with the review, study, and evaluation process and said she looked forward to welcoming them back to Sumner in a couple of weeks.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.