

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District



Task Force Meeting #4 – Summary May 14, 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
- Troy Powers
- Brad Sayre
- Seth Sherwood
- Paul Smith
- Grant Sulham

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

- Review and discuss updated concepts for project pathway
- Identify recommended concept(s)
- Review draft recommendations narrative
- Discuss and finalize recommendations in light of state and local circumstances
- Prepare for public meetings

Welcome and Background

Sumner-Bonney Lake School District Superintendent, Laurie Dent, Ph.D., welcomed the Task Force and reiterated the importance of the legacy that the Task Force is creating. Students and staff created and signed a large thank you card for the Task Force to let them know how much they appreciate the work that is being done. Laurie also thanked the Sumner Mayor, Bill Pugh, who was in attendance.

Penny Mabie, Facilitator, welcomed the group and commenced the meeting on time. Penny reviewed the agenda and asked if Task Force members would be able and willing to stay an extra half an hour just in case there was a need for extra time to review the material. A couple of members voiced that they would not be able to do so.

Penny reviewed ground rules, the purpose of the meeting and stated that Matt Guilanians and Chuck Hartung, Hainline, had refined concepts to share with the Task Force. The Task Force members would need to solidify their recommendations for a path forward for Sumner High School project.

Penny went over the expectations listed at the first meeting and reminded Task Force members that the last one, “contract and construction oversight,” was not one of the Task Force goals. She asked the group whether all other expectations had been met through the process? There was consensus from the group that they had been met.

Background and context

Matt reviewed the timeline for getting to the recommendation.

In the first Task Force meeting on March 26, an orientation of the project and process was provided, including priority elements of the bond goals and constraints on the project. Circumstances since the bond’s passage had changed, including an overheated construction market; there was more complexity to the design than anticipated; the project phasing plan was very complex and too long; and there were City requirements for frontage improvements that had been unknown when the process was started. Because of these and other circumstances, the District only received one bidder and the bid was much higher than anticipated.

In the second Task Force meeting on April 16, Hainline presented concepts in a broad context, including East, Central and West plans. The Task Force reached consensus to recommend constructing to the west and to remodel as little as possible.

In the third meeting on April 30, Hainline presented three concepts to the west and the Task Force leaned towards the proximal concept plan.

In the fourth, and last meeting, on May 14, Task Force members were asked to review two Proximal Concepts and one Distal Concept to propose a final recommendation.

In the Initial Phase, there are several priority elements (2016 bond goals) including: new classrooms, commons/cafeteria, kitchen and library (Learning Resource Center), and improved circulation which would be built with the 2016 bond funds. The new building square footage target is between 60-70,000 sq. ft.

Under the Master Plan, construction would include new additional classrooms, support services, the arts, music and drama spaces, a relocated softball field, and potential facilities.

Final concepts review

Chuck stated that this project is a complex challenge and reminded Task Force members that the design process is an evolution and the goal for this group is to set the groundwork for the

design. Chuck indicated that Task Force members had communicated a preference towards the proximal concept design at the last meeting and that at this meeting they would propose a final recommendation for the School Board. He stated it was important that their recommendations be grounded in the best information at hand so that they can be understood and supported by the Task Force members and others in the future.

At the last meeting, Hainline had presented the Proximal 1 and Distal 1 concepts, which Chuck briefly reviewed to provide a basis for the previously stated preference and the updates to be presented at this meeting.

Proximal 1

In the Initial Phase, the Proximal 1 Concept improved circulation along the main east-west spine, and the new commons area and new classrooms were moved to the west.

In the Master Plan, construction would take place around the Initial Phase buildings. The Career Technical Education (CTE) would move to the north, additional classrooms and administrative buildings would move just west of the gym and the band would stay near the performing arts center (PAC) and gym. Parking would expand to the far west and the softball field would move to the east.

Distal 1

In the Initial Phase of the Distal 1 Concept, the focus was also on the East-West circulation path. The existing school moved out further to the west and the softball field moved to the east to expand parking.

In the Master Plan, additional wings would be included out west and the CTE would move north.

Chuck then presented three refined concepts, two that updated the Proximal Concept and one that updated the Distal Concept.

Proximal 2

The Proximal 2 Concept had minor changes from the Proximal 1 Concept. It would have an East-West corridor circulation spine, but rotate the commons area so the E/W circulation was along the south edge of the commons rather than through it. It would build new two-story classrooms just to the west of the new commons. This concept proposes leaving the existing E/W school corridors “as is” except removing any lockers or other existing moveable obstructions. It would require remodeling / improving the far west end of the corridor at the existing day care area near the new building. There is major electrical infrastructure located adjacent to the E/W corridor in the existing building that would be very expensive to relocate.

In the Master Plan, the planning would be developed around the Initial Phase and would continue a focus on the East-West spine. CTE and additional classrooms would be built to the west of the tennis courts, a new PAC entry from the north could be created at the existing PAC to allow entrance from the bus drop-off.

Another Master Plan option in this same concept would be to locate the CTE and FFA spaces where the existing tennis courts are and move the tennis courts. Yet another option would be to move the CTE and FFA spaces to where the existing pool is located, especially if a new pool is built.

Considerations for this plan:

- Creates a new and visible “new school building” in the Initial Phase
- Retains parking in the Initial Phase
- Provides adjacency to existing school in Initial Phase
- Retains softball field and green space in the west
- Commits existing location of PAC and gym as anchor points
- Bifurcates site athletic facilities and locates school in center of the site
- Commons façade built in Initial Phase will require a remodel in the Master Plan phase
- The Master Plan phase becomes more complex due to construction proximity to existing school
- Proximity to the existing school could also disturb daycare

Proximal 3

The Proximal 3 Concept has the same Initial Phase construction with the commons area in the parking lot and new classrooms built out to the west. Potentially a three-story classroom could be built instead of two stories. The Master Plan buildout would locate the additional classrooms and administration to the west in lieu of in front of the commons.

In the Master Plan, there could be a possible gym remodel to the east.

Considerations for this plan:

- Builds three-story classroom wing to save some green space
- Administrative space is moved out to the west instead of in front of the commons area, which removes the need to remodel the commons façade in the Master Plan
- The softball field is moved to the northeast
- The west parking lot is expanded

Distal 2

The Distal 2 Concept is an evolution of the Distal 1 Concept.

In the Initial Phase, the classroom wing would move to the west of the parking area, with a canopy connection to the existing school, and the commons would move west of the new classroom wing. The parking lot would remain accessible. Distance to the new classrooms from the gym would be about the same as the current distance from the gym to the existing classrooms to the east.

In the Master Plan, the new commons area would become the center of the school in this westerly plan. The CTE and FFA spaces would be located to the north, other services and additional classrooms would move to the east of the new commons area, and the athletic area would all be in the east. The gym could remain as is or be remodeled. The PAC would remain in the same place and could be connected to the East-West spine.

Considerations for this plan:

- Allows school to be more prominent on site and not obstructed by the gym
- Provides more flexibility in Master Plan build out
- Provides potential for relocation of the PAC and gym
- There would be less disturbance to existing building and ongoing education
- Simpler construction staging
- Initially, the commons area would be more remote
- The plan retains parking west of the gym
- Moves school mass to the west, creating an academic section and an athletic section
- School drop-off would be further away from the entrance
- There would be more distance between the parking lot and the school but not substantially

Matt noted that was a preference for the Proximal Concept and wanted to make some additional comments to ensure that the Task Force's recommendations were grounded in due diligence evaluation.

Matt discussed the assumption that the distance from the parking lot to the new classrooms would make a large time difference. He also noted that the Distal 2 Concept provided more flexibility. It retained the entry courtyard, a nice gathering space, there could be a drop-off for the early learning center (ELC) and daycare out west, and it would not create as much disturbance to the students of the existing school during construction. It allows more flexibility in the design and an easier site for construction work and staging.

Penny opened up the discussion and asked Task Force members to articulate what was driving their initial preference towards the Proximal Concept.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- As a community member, I would be embarrassed if we built a satellite commons area and cafeteria in the middle of a field and did not get additional funding for the Master Plan.
 - It is a risk, but it may be worth it.
- We need to have more confidence that the bond will pass, and I am reluctant to lean on a second bond. I would change my vote to the Distal plan in an instant if it was less risky to wait for more funding.
- The Distal plan is nice. The Proximal plan gives you expansion capabilities. The Distal plan is taking as much real estate as possible because it won't get rid of the parking lot. If we need to add another classroom wing later on, we would be very limited to do so because of how spread out it is. In the Proximal Concept, we can expand better and show that we are thinking about the future.
- I like the Distal in this situation. If in the worst case scenario we can only build three-story classrooms with the current funds, they remain close to academic spaces and are only further from the athletic spaces. It would meet the requirement of the bond to have new classrooms.
- When talking about travel time, we need to consider students stopping at the bathroom and their locker between classes. Students don't move quickly between classes. Students will be late or say they need to go to the restroom when they first get into class. That is why my preference is for the Proximal Concept.
- After the last meeting, I reflected on the different concepts and started leaning towards the Distal one. Specifically, the construction impact and flexibility are better in the Distal concept. But if the bond doesn't pass, then the Distal Concept is odd.
- If we end up only building the Initial Phase and not the Master Plan, won't we end up with current classrooms on one end, and new classrooms on the other end?
 - We would be building 16-20 new classrooms to the west and others would remain where they are.
- If we build the Distal Concept, there would be less impact on the students in the Initial Phase, but we would be building all around the new classrooms in the Master Plan. Only the first phase is very removed from the students.
 - All concepts create some disturbance to the students in the Master Plan buildout.
- Something we haven't discussed much is how the students get to class from the bus drop-off. The school front is on Main Street. If the bus drop-off is by the tennis courts, it isn't close to the classrooms.
- I like the Distal Concept and would change my vote to it. However, regarding travel time between classes, with the "finger piers" that are three-stories tall, the students could need to go all the way down and then back up another three-story finger. In the proximal plan, there are parts of the LRC / Commons building that seem oddly placed,

leaving lots of corners. A rectangular building would be better, I would prefer less corners.

- We are only throwing blocks on a site map; the architect will finalize the design which very likely will consolidate the layout for cost and energy efficiency reasons.
- We create a satellite with the Distal concept, but it only works if we're all committed to the full buildout. If not, it doesn't make sense to spend the funds that we already have. At the last meeting, it was stated that Sumner was very supportive when Bonney Lake was built as they got something out of it. What would Bonney Lake get out of this so they will be supportive? Neither of the plans really work unless we are all in.
- Disturbance to students keeps being brought up but students are very resilient. Construction companies do a great job of keeping safe access and minimizing disruption. I don't think that is a consideration we need to keep bringing up. Noise becomes white noise after a while.
 - That is true, but we do need to keep day care in mind. It needs special consideration due to naps, special needs, etc.
- The timeline of the bond could take a year and a half. There will be a lag time where we don't know if we will have funds for the Master Plan when building a satellite from the Distal Plan.
 - We could know as early as next February, if that's when the bond measure gets put on the ballot.
- Kassie, what do you need the most in the initial phase?
 - A new cafeteria and commons area are critical. Science classrooms and LRC are also important. We have identified core areas that impact all students not just special groups.
- Sumner High School can be a very busy place during athletic events. I am concerned that with the pool sharing a parking with events going on in the stadium, there won't be enough parking space. I can support both plans; I like the more Distal Concept but have concerns with the pool being located there, although I understand wanting to keep all athletics near each other.
- In the Distal Concept, there would be a lot more parking than we have now so I think it would be better to keep all athletics together.
- On Distal 2, the parking lot and walkway between the buildings is completely open, which is a safety concern. Is there a defined hallway between the existing and new buildings?
 - There is a safety advisory committee that has been meeting. They have noted that there is currently the kind of open space, that does cause safety concerns. Recognizing that, we would limit traffic through that area, and only have it open to fire trucks.
 - Also, there likely would be a covered canopy that will define the path but still remain open. Fencing also makes the perimeter more secure.

- We discussed the Proximal Concept before we had a timeframe of what the next bond would look like so it felt like we made that decision without knowing what the next phase would be. Dealing with the Initial Phase of the Distal plan for a year or so makes more sense than thinking it could be all we had for ten years down the road.
- How does this look for students and safety? Is it realistic to deal with the Distal plan for a year and a half?
 - There are a lot of experts that focus on phasing and the architect will likely seek advice on how best to do so.
- There has been a lot of back and forth between plans. Maybe we should be speaking strategically instead. Is there a way that we can deploy a strategy that mitigates risk between plans? Do we reserve all capital up front, going all in with the Distal plan? This doesn't get constructed tomorrow, it doesn't sit for a year while we decide next steps on bond. From a timing perspective, can it sit in a design phase, permitted alternatively while waiting to know about funding for the Master Plan?
 - There are options with timing. From the Distal standpoint, we could create a T-classroom wing that creates connection with the current school.
- The Distal concept is a great plan but is there a way that we can quickly pivot if the bond doesn't occur?
 - Depends on the appetite for a bond. Design can take 9-12 months so the bond will have been voted on if it goes out as early as it can. The next time is in February. At that time, you still won't be out to bid so you haven't committed construction dollars, only design dollars. If the bond passes, then the design can adjust. If it just barely doesn't pass, there is time to run it again.

Penny noted it was important for the Task Force to understand and acknowledge the assumptions that will underpin the Task Force's recommendations.

- The \$150 million bond planning number is just a rule of thumb. The number hasn't been finalized as there is no firm number on how much the Master Plan would cost. It could still be built in phases. The District used the same hypothetical number when coming up with what a sample bond tax rates could look like. The Task Force recommendation is solely that another bond would be required for the Master Plan, not the underlying budget number.
- The Master Plan is a guide for future development. The Task Force has only been looking at massing blocks and not been talking about specific design considerations (permitting, codes, etc.). Because those details aren't included, the final design may differ from the concepts that the Task Force members have looked at.
- Matt added that the intent is to honor what the Task Force recommends, but plans may need to shift according to requirements from the city, fire department, etc. So it won't look exactly like what the concepts show. The bond number is a very rough order of magnitude estimating.

Discussion by Task Force Members

- The biggest driver for what concept to recommend seems to be the bond timing issue. We cannot have certainty that another bond will pass but we can have high confidence.
- Another bond will pass but timing of it is uncertain. We need to look at the Initial Phase assuming the Master Plan does get built eventually. That is what we are recommending. I like the construction phase in the Distal 2 concept because it is away from the school and I like the Master Plan at the end. The Master Plan will happen eventually but what it will look like will change and can we live with this first initial part?
 - We updated a Distal Concept to find out what the drivers were for your recommendations. You are not required to come up with one specific concept. You could recommend a hybrid if you wanted.
- I don't think we all agree the bond will definitely pass. This school has been built piecemeal in the past, so there is no guarantee.
- In the Distal Concept, if we are building into the fast pitch field, is there money to build a new field? How do we accommodate that facility? Also our parking lot is currently used by residents of Sumner as a street because they think it's a road. Can we fence it in, so it is no longer used as a thoroughfare? Do we have permission to shut gates?
 - The intent is to not disturb the fast pitch field in the Initial Phase. Fields are relatively inexpensive so there could be a new field in the Master Plan.
 - As for the parking lot, we could use plastic candlestick markers to keep general traffic out and still provide access to fire trucks.
- Where do parents go to drop off the day care kids? There needs to be a new loop because the canopy is now in the way of drop-off.
- I like the phasing. It would be frustrating at first, but students will adjust. It will be up to the contractor to figure out how to restripe and make that work.
- A combination between Proximal and Distal is a solution. We could build a little wing that cuts the parking lot and connect the next buildings to the existing school, so it looks more connected.
- The Proximal plan has all the places that need large truck drop-offs in a service loop (PAC, kitchen, etc.). It could be efficient to also have the bus drop off in close proximity.

Recommendations

Penny summarized what she'd heard from the group to confirm where there was consensus.

- Build new construction to the west
- Minimize remodeling to the extent possible
- Initial Phase should include core facilities (2016 bond goals): new classrooms, new library, new commons/cafeteria, associated restrooms and security features, new kitchen, improve circulation
- Request bond funding for future build out of Master Plan

- Think of Master Plan Phase when designing the Initial Phase
- Be cognizant of utilities and most efficient connections
 - Penny noted the utilities item was new as part of the recommendations. The project team had heard the Task Force discuss being mindful of utilities and building systems, as they are a big cost driver and so included this item. There was consensus within the group to include the utilities item in the recommendations.
- Consider using alternative delivery methods, where beneficial
 - A member of the Task Force recommended that if the District had not used an alternative delivery method previously, they should be educated on what the options are.

Master Plan recommendations:

- Build new gym
- Remodel or build new PAC, depending upon budget
- Include aquatic facility (pool)
- Consider three-story structures

Discussion by Task Force Members

- What is the time limit to use the 2016 bond money that we currently have? When does it expire?
 - Requirements on spending relate to financial restrictions. There are limits on how much interest the District can earn on the bond funding over time.
- The bond needs to be done. Is there any way to have it proposed to citizens in February and we wait to start the Initial Phase? The funds we have now become a part of the next bond so that we build all of it together. This would eliminate all phasing and what-ifs.
 - You made that suggestion at the very first Task Force meeting but discussion around the room afterwards showed that the rest of the Task Force wanted to get going on something. I will ask the question again. Is there an appetite in the Task Force to hold on to the initial money instead of proposing two phases?
 - To clarify, if the bond is voted in in February, all that will happen between now and then is design costs. The question is do you want to start spending design dollars now or do you want to wait?
- The confidence in the bond passing is important, in either phases or as a group, it depends on how it is taken to the public. People are very good at promoting these things. It would be nice to have more insight on how you are thinking of promoting this to the public.
 - That will be up to the Board. We agree that it will need to be a very strong bond strategy.

Penny asked the Task Force members what the preference was between spending the 2016 bond funding on the Initial Phase or packaging the money with potential future bond money.

- Some of the money came from Deringer, right? They contributed towards this because they don't have a high school of their own. If we postpone, does that money stay with the District?
 - Yes, that money would remain with the District.
- If we wait and hold the money, it will push this construction out even longer. It makes sense to start the Initial Phase design now and then go for another bond as quickly as possible.
- As a taxpayer, I would want you to show me something before I vote for another bond.
 - The District delivered a lot of projects with the bond money already. Taxpayers have seen movement in other projects.

Penny stated that the overall majority seemed to prefer using the funds now and request another bond as quickly as possible for implementation of the Master Plan. No one objected to that being the Task Force's recommendation.

- What was the cost for a new aquatic facility? I am for it but want people to know how expensive it is.
 - It can go up to \$34-35 million depending on how fancy it is.
 - As a reminder, you can recommend it to the Board but they ultimately decide what will be included in a bond and when.

Penny confirmed that there were no objections to the recommendations or anything additional that should be considered by the School Board.

Discussion by Task Force Members

The discussion turned to which concept to recommend the District pursue.

- For sentimentality reasons, I want to keep a piece of the old high school
- The Proximal Concept provides better space for future growth
- The Distal Concept provides better future growth and is most cost effective. With the satellite, everything can be built new
- It is like asking to pick our dream house, but we only have enough to build a master bath, where do we want to put it? I would defer to folks who work at the school now to direct the most efficient use of this space. To me, it may be the Proximal Concept.
- Pros and cons exist in both concepts. Pros in Distal are that it is cheaper and ends up building a whole new system in the future. Does the Sumner High School need a whole

new building? Although the current building meets the needs of students and it is being well taken care of, a new building is needed. Do you waste money by doing Proximal to tie into the old systems? I hate wasting money. Is it harder to have Distal in the Initial Phase? Yes, because we would need to put administrative staff out there for safety concerns and may be harder for students to get there. If we can build a whole new school though, it seems like the way to go.

Penny summarized what she was hearing in the room.

- There is a desire for a new school
- The Distal Concept is preferred as it is most cost-effective
- There are concerns about the separation distance between the old and the new in the Distal Concept, including safety concerns, and the new building being stranded if the bond doesn't pass
- There is lots of optimism that the community will support a new high school and confidence that a new bond will pass
- There should be flexibility on the approach and timing of design and construction depending on what happens with the bond
- The District needs to be strategic in seeking the bond and demonstrating how the funds from the first bond are being spent

Discussion by Task Force Members

- Our solution should be based on if the additional bond didn't pass. A solution might be to implement the Distal Concept but include a better connection to the current school.
- We need to remember that the difference between the Distal and Proximal Concepts is only about 120 feet.
 - It is important that when something starts getting built, the Task Force members aren't strongly against anything that is being done.
- As a builder, I have built seven schools. The Distal Concept is the better proposal as construction is taking place away from everything and the parking lot can still be accessed. There is still value while construction is taking place.
 - Would you feel super disappointed if the District decided on the Proximal Concept?
- The group fully supported building to the west and building new. They agreed that if Proximal makes more sense in the design phase, then that is fine.
- Both the Distal and Proximal Concepts work, depending on what the bond outcome is. Flexibility is important.
- We could recommend going with the Proximal Concept with the assumption that if the bond passes, we switch to the Distal concept.

- We can't predict the future. Overall, I prefer the Distal Concept, the Proximal Concept is safer. How it plays out depends on the design phase and what the architect creates.
- If the bond doesn't pass in February, what is the next time the bond can go out?
 - A bond could go also go out in April.
- I think we can simply recommend building to the west. 120 feet this way and 50 feet that way are small changes and can be decided on in the design phase.
- In the design phase, I hope the architect doesn't feel constrained by our recommendation. This is just guidance but if Proximal or Distal makes more sense, they should make decisions accordingly.

The Task Force agreed with the recommendation that the Distal Concept is preferred, as long as flexibility is built in, so that the Task Force's concerns about safety and "stranding the new building" if the new bond doesn't pass are addressed in the design.

Public Meetings

Penny noted the Task Force's work is done and will not meet any more. However, there are two upcoming public meetings where the District will be presenting the Task Force's recommendations to the community. The District would like Task Force members to attend one or both of those meetings. Members will have a special nametag identifying them as Task Force members and are encouraged to talk about the process they went through and how they came to this recommendation and help sow the seeds for a bond measure.

- How many can make it to one of the meetings?
 - The majority of the Task Force members raised their hand.
- You will have the recommendation in your hands by the time these meetings take place. The District will listen to public input and then the recommendation, along with community input, will go to school board on June 19.
- If you are so inclined, it would be great if two or three of you could provide public comments about your support for these recommendations at the board meeting.

Laurie thanked the Task Force for their hard work on behalf of the Sumner High School and the District. She invited the Task Force members outside to see the Sumner School marching band, which played two pieces for the group. The meeting adjourned on time at 10:00 a.m.