



Bond Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 7: April 16, 2024

The following is a record of the Bond Advisory Committee's understanding of the comments made during this committee meeting. Clarifications and corrections should be directed to TurneyM@issaquah.wednet.edu or EngelsL@issaquah.wednet.edu before the next committee meeting on April 30, 2024.

- I. Welcome and Land Acknowledgement
- II. Opening and Outcomes
 - A. Processing
 - 1. What is the information you have received? What are the takeaways?
 - 2. Summary sheets - How were they developed? What do they tell us?
 - 3. A place to test ideas
 - 4. Reminder of charter and role of committee members to provide an informed proposal to Superintendent
 - a. You are the representatives of your community and provide that link from those you represent to this committee
 - b. Today the group will look conceptually at what your priorities are as a parent, educator, etc. to make sure those initiatives move forward
 - B. 4/2 Meeting Minutes – approved without changes
 - C. Objectives
 - 1. Utilize our priorities to review scenarios
 - 2. Develop consensus around a scenario so that at the next meeting, the group can settle on a scenario to recommend to the Superintendent
- III. What We Heard
 - A. Bond considerations – revisiting questions from last week
 - 1. Can a pool be added to the next new high school?
 - a. This would delay the project significantly and add the burden of operations and maintenance of the facility to the district. One of the scenarios that you'll consider tonight includes a collaboration between the district and City of Issaquah for a pool expansion, which would allow the district to utilize it more, particularly at secondary schools.
 - 2. Field lights
 - a. Allow the district to offer spaces to the community, generating revenue, which help pay for themselves in long run.

- B. Numbers – how much does the initiative and modernization work cost?
1. All safety upgrades (access, fire, cameras, vestibules, perimeter security): \$45.4 million
 2. Special Services, Accessibility & Inclusion upgrades: \$26.3 million
 3. Athletics & Activities (including Pool collaboration): \$39.6 million
 4. Early Learning Options: \$20 million
 5. Innovative space/CTE remodeling: \$78.7 million
 6. New High School (with current resources): \$138.7 million
 7. Clean Buildings Act: \$140.3 million
 8. Building Modernization: \$200.4 million
 9. Total: \$689.4 million
- C. Your priorities
1. Recap from last week's meeting activity
 2. Recap from individual survey
 3. Synthesized summary of committee's priorities
 - a. Building maintenance, critical repairs, and Clean Buildings Act
 - b. Safety & security
 - c. Build a new high school
 - d. Career opportunity in HS/MS
 - e. Special Services – Accessibility & inclusion
 - f. Secondary innovation
 - g. Athletics & activities
 - h. Provide consistency across schools
 4. Used these priorities to develop the initial example scenarios (A, B, C)
 - a. Scenario A is the scenario based on what was presented last week
 5. Does the group agree with this summary?
 - a. Committee member comment: Special Services & inclusion – we should add the term “well-being” because that is important to focus on, and it addresses many categories
 - b. Committee member comment: Provide consistency across schools – the critical repairs, weren't we trying to provide consistency in what we're doing? But I'm interpreting this as that's a lower priority, as shown on this list.
 - o The district is embedding consistency in what needs to be done in terms of maintenance and safety & security. Not every building will have the same needs, but the proposals would take care of what each building needs.
 - c. Committee member question: What is secondary innovation?
 - o Conversations around what we could do if we have a new high school facility, specific programs, configure the space to have innovative programs. Somewhat in a CTE (Career and Technical Education)

o This refers to the presentation given by Lisa Neighbours and Julia Bamba. How the facility aligns with the ability to provide innovative programs

- o Early learning and equity are not included in this list.

o Different sets of data were obtained from the dot exercise and from the survey. This is good feedback to keep in mind as we continue our discussions.

- o It is becoming clear that this phrase needs to be considered differently and perhaps be rephrased in more of an equity lens

o Currently, Liberty has smaller CTE spaces than the other high schools. Issaquah and Skyline have the space, if the new high school comes online, to renovate their spaces. Liberty doesn't have as much existing space available so it would need more space. The new high school won't draw many students from Liberty, so it won't free up space there.

- a. This largely appears consistent with our discussions. Many of us around the room have water bottles. The cost for the water bottle filling stations is only a drop in the bucket, so I would make a plea that we fund this if possible. I didn't hear any opposition to this.
- b. If the land for Transportation is not included, are we scrapping the idea for electric buses?
 - o From the District standpoint, it is important. Right now, Transportation is very squeezed. When we move to electric buses, will need more room just for the charging infrastructure and will also need reserve buses. Also, if we add a new school, we would need more buses and a station located where it makes sense for them to have shorter routes. Not having this would make it tougher for the district to run electric buses.
- c. Last time, we heard a plea for the Issaquah Stadium and parking garage and a question of whether it would still be needed if we build new high school. I have the same question for the Liberty high school CTE addition – are there permutations of how those projects could come together so we wouldn't have to say yes or no to all of them?
 - o With a new high school, and schools operating at an optimum level of capacity, there are potentially fewer individuals attending events, so the stadium expansion may not need to happen. Expansion at Liberty gets that school to where the other schools are at, getting at the consistency aspect.
- d. Land for Transportation: even setting aside electric buses, a new high school will create more routes, which will require more buses. At one point, the School Board was contemplating offering transportation for students to attend CTE programs at other schools. Similarly to the water bottle filling stations, it is not a large cost and a high need.
 - o Yes, it would be difficult to offer those choices if we didn't have more buses.
- e. Follow-up question: would we want some of the transportation to be centralized and would it make sense to temporarily use the 17th elementary school site for that, and push this to a future bond?
 - o Not sure if the land use permit would allow open parking of buses.

IV. Scenarios - Three possibilities to start the conversation

- A. Scenario A – \$689.4 million, including project management costs
 - 1. Addresses all recommended building stewardship needs, including the Clean Buildings Act & Modernization
 - 2. Improves Safety & Security
 - 3. Builds a new high school to help relieve overcrowding
 - 4. Provides Innovative Learning through access to CTE
 - 5. Supports accessible, inclusive Learning
 - 6. Supports Athletics & Activities
 - 7. Expands access to Early Learning
 - 8. Provides partnership funds to help expand community pool for secondary athletics
- B. Scenario B - \$650.2 million, including project management costs

1. Addresses prioritized building stewardship needs, including the Clean Buildings Act & Modernization
2. Improves Safety & Security
3. Builds a new high school to help relieve overcrowding
4. Provides Innovative Learning through access to CTE
5. Supports Accessible Inclusive Learning
6. Supports Athletics & Activities
7. Expands access to Early Learning
8. Provides partnership funds to help expand community pool for secondary athletics
9. Provides access to water bottle filling stations
10. Property Acquisition for transportation expansion & infrastructure
11. Reductions from Scenario A
 - a. \$29.3 million – Admin building modernization and some safety items identified for potential future bond/levy
 - b. \$10.6 million - Modified amount for gender inclusive restrooms; prioritizing secondary schools over elementary schools (existing areas could be utilized at lower cost)
 - c. \$1.8 million – Combined and refined playground and accessibility projects
 - d. \$786,862 – Athletic field renovations refined after review of priority projects
12. Added to Scenario A
 - a. \$2 million – Land for Transportation expansion & infrastructure
 - b. \$1.4 million – Water bottle filling stations
13. Questions?
 - a. Committee member question: Clarify that accessible and safe playground spaces – this is not actually reducing the scope, but a deeper analysis showed overlap of scope?
 - o Yes, we may have had accessible playgrounds and updating the playground as two separate line items, and we could instead achieve those scopes together
 - b. Committee member question: Early learning options – does that cover the total need?
 - o \$20 million is included in scenarios A and B as an allowance to look for space in the south end of the district. It is a round number, less precise than some of the other costs, but the cost is at the top end of what the district thinks it would take to put in an Early Learning Center in the south end.
 - c. Committee member comment: For all of the items we’re proposing putting off now, they will just continue to get more expensive.
 - d. Committee member question: Is there a scenario where we’re considering a lower innovation and CTE amount? Those are big ticket items which could impact our ability to get this bond passed.
- C. Scenario C – \$626.8 million, including project management costs

1. Addresses prioritized building stewardship needs including the Clean Buildings Act & Modernization
 2. Improves Safety & Security
 3. Builds a new high school that relieves overcrowding
 4. Provides Innovative Learning through access to CTE
 5. Supports Accessible Inclusive Learning
 6. Supports Athletics & Activities
 7. Provides partnership funds to help expand community pool for secondary athletics
 8. Reductions from Scenario A and Scenario B
 - a. \$29.3 million – Admin building modernization and some safety items identified for potential future bond/levy
 - b. \$10.6 million - Modified amount for gender inclusive restrooms; prioritizing secondary schools over elementary schools (existing areas could be utilized at lower cost)
 - c. \$1.8 million – Combined and refined playground and accessibility projects
 - d. \$786,862 – Athletic field renovations refined after review of priority projects
 - e. \$20 million – Early Learning Center options
 - f. \$2 million – land for Transportation expansion & infrastructure
 - g. \$1.4 million – Water bottle filling stations
- D. Scenario Tax estimates (based on \$1 million assessed value home)
1. Scenario A estimated increase of: \$323 annually/\$27 monthly
 2. Scenario B estimated increase of: \$300 annually/\$25 monthly
 3. Scenario C estimated increase of: \$290 annually/\$24 monthly
- E. Questions
1. Committee member comment/question: The amount paid per month is not significant when looked at this way. When the bond is put into the voting pamphlet, how will it be listed?
 - a. The district needs to list an estimated tax rate and the total amount of the bond authorization.
 2. Committee member comment/question: I'm curious where the tax estimates are from. The previous numbers from Piper Sandler were different.
 - a. The Piper Sandler numbers used an estimated increase in the home value to reflect an estimated rate. The estimate used here is simply a comparison of the current rate of 3.13 and the difference between that and a rate of 3.42, 3.43, and 3.45 using the example of a home that is assessed at \$1,000,000.
 3. Committee member question: What is the current tax rate? What is it increasing from?
 - a. In a simplified sense, \$3130 is the annual tax prior to this increase based on a \$3.13 tax rate.
 4. Committee member question: When putting an item aside for a future bond/levy, is there a maximum percent you can do that for?
 - a. We went through each item line by line to identify items for a future bond. For example, we looked at all of the cameras in the district to see which ones

could be replaced later on. It was a detailed approach, looking at specific items.

5. Committee member question: Thinking about LED lighting, can we break that one out based on its lifetime?
 - a. Part of the complication for this item is that this is part of required compliance within the near-term timeline of the Clean Buildings Act. If we don't upgrade the lighting, we likely won't meet the timeline of the CBA. HVAC and lighting are the top ways to bring down the Energy Use Intensity of the facilities.
6. Committee member question: If we propose a \$650 million bond, we're only authorized to collect that amount. If everybody's home value increases, wouldn't the tax rate go down?
 - a. One of the variables is attempting to estimate how much assessed value will go up each year. The goal is to keep the rate consistent as the assessed value is adjusted. In year 4, if the assessed value of a home goes up, the rate does fall. But for the projections, we target a consistent tax rate. It is correct that the district could only collect the total dollar amount that was authorized in the bond measure.
7. Committee member question: Are these numbers conservative then?
 - a. Over the last 20 years, the average increase in assessed value has been about 8% and this was projected at 5%, which would have been a more conservative approach.
8. Committee member question: Did you look at revenue generation or operational savings for any of these items?
 - a. Only in the general sense. We know that LED lighting is a big investment up front that saves in operational costs. We don't have the operating cost projections of the packages. The field lighting is a definite revenue generator, which returns money to the district.
9. Committee member question: I'm curious if we are limited to only one package? Could the committee discuss two options that we put forth to the public: one bond package for the Clean Buildings Act, and a second bond package with the other items, so we're not putting all our eggs in one basket?
 - a. Is it possible, yes, and it is worth a conversation about whether it is a good idea.
10. Committee member question: For families with children in elementary schools, the bond scenarios seem to be very secondary-heavy. How do we frame this for the entire community? Could there be a scenario where we promise all the security and clean buildings are happening at every school and consider reducing the secondary investment?
11. Committee member comment: Puget Sound Energy offers incentive programs for HVAC upgrades and controls, so the district will get incentives toward the project cost, possibly 30-50%.
12. We just discussed the minimal tax impacts between scenarios A, B, and C. How do we discuss how the work that we've done is conveyed to the community?
 - a. As the committee develops their recommendation to the superintendent, many of these comments are related to how we frame the messaging and create graphics that explain the bond and the process.

13. Committee member comment/question: Pool expansion collaboration is by no means finalized on the city's side. If it's approved in the bond but isn't taken up by the city, what would happen?
 - a. The resolution will delineate how the funds can be used. It won't say exactly \$10 million for a pool, but perhaps more broadly as "investment in athletics," for example. It could potentially be used for other athletics investments. The board could repurpose it for other items in the bond, or the board could apply it to items for a future bond/levy.
14. Committee member question: Is that the same for the Early Learning Center?
 - a. If we can't find something that fits the need, could utilize those funds for future bond/levy items or anything else related to early learning, or something that they believe brings value to the district.
15. Committee member question: Financing cost and underwriter's fees – is that rolled into the cost of the bond?
 - a. District has an amount of debt that it can acquire. That is part of the process of selling the bonds. District receives the amount it needs to complete the project. The fees don't lessen the amount the district has to work with.

F. Let's Test It – small group discussion around example bond scenarios

V. Break

VI. Discussion of Scenarios

A. Group observations – Menti poll

1. What do you like about Scenario A?
 - a. Committee member answers: Comprehensive, covers everything, lofty, complete, expensive, all-inclusive, synergy with ISD needs, equity, forward-thinking
2. What would you like to see added to Scenario A?
 - a. Committee member answers: Nothing, water bottle filling station, inspector to monitor project expenditures, change CTE to career opportunities, transportation land
3. What would you like to see removed from Scenario A?
 - a. Committee member answers: Athletic upgrades, consolidation for playground, solar panels, gender inclusive restrooms
4. What do you like about Scenario B?
 - a. Committee member answers: Thoughtful, other considerations, expensive, supports what's only necessary, 650 is a manageable number, middle expense scenario, includes water bottles
5. What would you like to see added to Scenario B?
 - a. Committee member answers: Nothing, expand gender inclusive restrooms at all levels, early learning support
6. What would you like to see removed from Scenario B?
 - a. Committee member answers: Nothing, remodels at high schools, water bottles, gender inclusive
7. What do you like about Scenario C?
 - a. Committee member answers: Nothing; low price tag, bare minimum

8. What would you like to see added to Scenario C?
 - a. Water fill, early learning, gender inclusive restrooms, transportation
 9. What would you like to see removed from Scenario C?
 - a. Committee member answers: Athletic upgrades, nothing, restrooms
 10. Which scenario speaks to you the most?
 - a. Initial results: Close tie between A and B, with B slightly ahead; poll based on input from table group representatives only
- B. Group reactions to this result
1. Committee member: Surprise about the ranking – would be interesting to see if every person in the group filled out what their preference was, what would the data show?
 2. Committee member observation: For me, the preferred bond versus what is most likely to pass are two different questions
 3. Committee member observation: gender inclusive restrooms was a popular item either to remove or to add on. It is more than a simple facilities question, with more “baggage” to it. Whichever way we proceed, the message to the public would need to be thoughtful because it is clear there is a diversity of opinions within this group. This message can help or hurt more so than the dollars behind it.
 - a. Likely the district needs to have more conversations around restrooms that support everyone
 4. Committee member: Where did the idea for inclusive restrooms come from?
 - a. This is an issue the district has been discussing for a number of years. We want to make sure we are in a position to address it once they determine when and how to get it done. It was also discussed in the equity and inclusion presentation.
 5. Committee member: We would need a plan as to what this actually looks like to share with people, whichever side politically they may be on. Is it a single stall with a sink? Is it an open room with many fixtures?
 6. Based on the conversations, are we suggesting to add water bottle filling stations and Transportation expansion to Scenario A?
 - a. For the purposes of this poll, assume it is the way it is written but we will continue to refine the scenario – our work is not done.
 7. Committee member: Considering the financial setting of the bond – inflation, and people feeling tighter financially – the tax impacts weren’t that different between the options. If we dropped the bond package down to \$450M it might make more of a difference as to whether or not people would vote for it. There is also the question of risk – there are a lot of things that we need, and a few that we want. If we put them all together and voters don’t approve the bond, we lose everything. If we put out two bond measures and create good messaging around both, and make each attractive, maybe only one gets approved. But only one of those will get more expensive when we get back to those.
 8. Committee member: We’re not going to get what we don’t ask for – an observation looking at the history of the bonds. When those did fail, they were scaled and brought back again, and passed. If we present our lowest option and it fails, how do we scale that one back?
 - a. \$650 million also is a similar cost to Tacoma’s recently passed bond

9. Committee member: Revisiting the difference between scenarios A and B – it wasn't huge. In scenario A, there are a lot of reasons to vote for something whereas if you scale it back you might lose those.
 10. Committee member: The last time we failed a bond (in 1998), the district later passed it by making the bond bigger. It's important to have something for everyone. Since people will only vote for what they want, or not vote for what they don't want – splitting the bond is a dangerous move. Regarding messaging: the district isn't allowed to promote a bond, but volunteer organizations can advocate on its behalf. It is a great way to get involved, as a volunteer or donor. Messaging to the community will be extremely important.
 11. Committee member: Having two bonds would make both equally unlikely to pass. One bond is very important. By splitting the bond, there are fewer reasons for people to vote for either of them. They are less likely to be so against one item in the bond that they would vote it down.
 12. Committee member: What about people who have kids in private schools now who might not vote?
 13. Committee member: We need to make sure that the parts of the bond focused on the community like the pool and early learning center are highlighted. The district has fewer voters with kids enrolled in the schools than in 2016. Is there any research on passing 2 bonds vs. 1 bond? We would like to see the available history on that.
 - a. In 2022 levy, 70% of the voters within the district boundary did not have kids enrolled in the schools
 - b. It is also worth noting that ISD's high schools pick up a lot of students who were enrolled in private schools for K-8
 14. Committee member: There was clear detailing regarding modernization of the buildings. Is it possible to do this on inclusivity and gender inclusive restrooms?
 15. Committee member: Scenarios have the colored buckets and the priorities list, identify those in relation to the district initiative buckets
 - C. Menti poll from the entire group demonstrates scenario B is the preferred approach
- VII. What's Next?
- VIII. Closing
- A. Reminder: talk to peers and community, get their feedback, so the group can benefit from your ambassadorship
 - B. Exit Ticket