

## School Capacity & Utilization Task Force

Meeting Minutes #7

January 11, 2024, 5:00-7:00 p.m.

Kessler Center – 1501 39<sup>th</sup> Ave SW Puyallup, WA 98373

### Members:

**Present:** Cynthia Balzarini, Ayden Berg, Brian Devereux, Maria Finley, Jacob Gavre, David Ham, Chris Harris, Debbie Haworth, Nicole Helgeson, Bob Horton, Julie Hunter, John Huson, Michele Jangula, Richard Lasso, Brady Martin, Daniel Martinez, Michael McCanna, Ashley McClaran, Rae McNally, Karen Mool, Jiquanda Nelson, Amy Schweim, Victoria Treffry

**Absent:** Sarah Emily Aunspach, LaShawnda Baldwin, Lauralee Chamberlain, Ed Crow, Greg Farias, Brian Fosnick, Myra Josey, Laura Marcoe, Vince Pecchia, Shelby Rice, Jenna Slott, Rebecca Williams, Wendy Wright

**Guests:** Rebecca Hutchinson and David Mount, Mahlum Architects

### Meeting Documents

Jan. 11, Mtg. #7, SCUT Agenda

Jan. 11, Mtg. #7, SCUT PPT

Mahlum Architects SCUT PPT

Nov. 30 Mtg. #6, SCUT Meeting Minutes

### Welcome/Introduction

Brady welcomed the task force and reviewed the agenda.

David Mount and Becky Hutchinson, Mahlum Architects, will be presenting information about Puyallup High School's (PHS) master plan and its building utilization and capacity.

Ashley McClaran and Cynthia Balzarini, OAC, will review the group activity results from the last meeting and lead the group in a new activity.

The Nov. 30 meeting minutes were approved and will be posted on the MS TEAMS School Capacity and Utilization Task Force page.

### Recap Meeting #6

The Meeting # 6 learning targets and survey results were reviewed. Survey responses can be found on slide 9 of the PPT.

### Learning targets for Meeting #7

The learning targets for meeting #7 were reviewed.

- Why is a master plan needed for Puyallup High School?
- How would changes to a building utilization rate impact a building's capacity?
- Explore solutions for capacity issues in region 3

### Group Activity Region 3 Recap

Ashley McClaran, OAC, invited the members to take part in a group activity. A Region 3 Recap Exercise Spreadsheet was on each table listing Region 3 schools in the left column and challenges of the schools listed across the top row. The task force was asked to use the BCA Stack Rank of all PSD Facilities and SCUT Elementary and Secondary Student Capacity Numbers in Region 3 spreadsheets from the resource binder, and PPT slide 15 “Featured Programs in Region 3” listing programs that affect capacity at all grade levels. The task force was asked to put a check mark in each “challenge” box on their exercise sheet that applied to Region 3 schools with the goal of each member having a cheat sheet.

Members were invited to report their observations:

1. Capacity in Region 3 isn't as big of an issue compared to Region 1.
2. Walker HS is unique; the entire school is program specific.
3. There are a lot of program specific sites in Region 3.
4. PHS is going to have capacity issues and all other Region 3 schools feed into it. The lower grades may be fine, but PHS will have capacity issues, especially if grade reconfiguration is implemented.
5. EJH only has one program listed, a resource classroom, other schools have multiple special programs.
6. Older buildings are built under different educational specifications and may not have spaces to support certain special programs. This can pose a challenge if you must move a program, a school may not have the right number of restrooms, sink heights, etc.

Brady asked the members to remember the information as it will be discussed at future meetings.

### Region 3 PHS Master Planning by Mahlum

Becky Hutchinson and David Mount, Mahlum Architects, have been working with Brady, Brian and other district staff to understand the current status of PHS and the potential of the campus to accommodate grade reconfiguration with a capacity for 2,400 students and to explain why it is relevant to the conversations they have been having.

PHS is the oldest high school in the district and has had a lot of changes over the years. It is also the smallest high school campus with 15 acres, the most geographically diverse, and pulls from all four municipalities.

The construction history and the acquisition of new parcels near the PHS campus were reviewed. Mahlum is using the PHS campus' current layout with the addition of the six new portables that will be added to the site in the summer of 2024 in their example this evening.

The questions that will be addressed:

1. What is a Master Plan?
2. What is a building utilization rate?
3. What is the current vs potential capacity of PHS?
4. What is the timeline for those capacity increases?

A master plan is planning for the future of the campus while considering many variables. District goals and objectives are considered as well as planning parameters and what the PHS campus might look like with grade reconfiguration, alternative program options, and added parking. A phased construction timeline must be planned.

Becky shared current enrollment together with the projected enrollment numbers for PHS four and eight years out. Capacity numbers, both permanent capacity and with portables, at each of the time increments were reviewed. The current capacity with portables is just shy of meeting the level of service standard for current enrollment by 21 students. Four years out, with the addition of the six portables, the school will be under its maximum capacity, but in eight years, PHS will not have enough capacity.

Building utilization as well as class size are two levers that can be adjusted to solve the problem of meeting projection needs without adding new teaching space. The term utilization is the amount of time a teaching space is used each day. Class size is the number of students per teaching station. A teaching station, for purposes of calculating capacity, is any room or space that can host an educational setting with a minimum of 600 square feet. The assumptions that are being used for the capacity numbers are based on an average of 30 students per teaching station. The 83% utilization rate is based, on average, each teaching station utilized for classroom instruction five of six periods each day. PHS currently has 60 teaching spaces, not including the six future portables. Once the six portables are added, PHS will meet its utilization until about six years out when projected enrollment surpasses utilization. One of the two levers could be adjusted, either the utilization or the number of students in each classroom could be increased.

Brian shared that class size is part of the PEA Collective Bargaining Agreement and invited Bob Horton, PEA president to explain.

Bob Horton explained the PEA Collective Bargaining Agreement addresses class size, but the district does not have a class size cap. The district has an average class size goal at certain grade levels. If a classroom goes over that, it's called a class size trigger and teachers are paid a stipend for every semester that they're over. Small class sizes are important so teachers can meet students' educational and social/emotional needs.

David Mount stated that he would be sharing the studies Mahlem has done for PHS and what the master plan might look like. The purpose of the master plan is to have a longer-term vision for the campus. PHS was chosen as a study for grade reconfiguration because it's the smallest campus and would present the greatest challenges out of the three high schools.

Schemes A and B proposed master plan campus designs with phasing were reviewed. Both include multiple phases with about five or six years of continuous building to complete construction while maintaining school operation. The goal is to add enough building capacity and parking to bring ninth grade to the school.

The earliest viable date for running a bond is 2025. If the bond passed and construction took place, the earliest ninth graders would attend PHS is in 2029.

### Region 3 Solutions & Challenges

Ashley stated that to date, the task force has reviewed the challenges at each region. Tonight, the group activity will be to review solutions that were discussed for Regions 1 - 3. The purpose of the exercise is to gain an understanding of the thoughts and questions of these solutions based on the information presented thus far. Sheets of paper, one titled for each solution, were posted around the room with a column for the solutions'

“Challenges” and a column for “Positive Impacts”. Each member was invited to write comments on Post-it notes and place them in the appropriate “Challenges” and “Positive Impacts” column for each solution.

After completion, Ashley read the posted notes. She then asked each member to place three dots on the solutions they felt represented the best-case scenarios based on the challenges and positive impacts. The solutions that received the most dots were Grade Reconfiguration ES/JH and Grade Reconfiguration JH/HS. Ashley and Cynthia will prepare the results to be presented at the next meeting.

### Closing

Brady invited the members to use the QR code in the PPT to answer the exit questions before leaving.

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

### Next Meeting

Meeting #8

January 25, 2024, 5:00 - 7:00 p.m.

Kessler Center – 1501 39<sup>th</sup> Ave SW, Puyallup, WA 9837