

2024 Bond Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes #3 October 10, 2024, 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Karshner Center – 309 4th St NE Puyallup, WA 98372

Members:

Present: Stefania Appia, Ellen Aronson, Ethan Barker, Sari Burnett, David Cerio, Rachel Collins, Jennifer Corp, Ed Crow, Cheryl Cummings, Brian Devereux, Kimberlee Gerstmann, Sarah Gillispie, Ryan Hahn, Debie Haworth, Greg Heath, Luke Heath, Bob Horton, Shawn Hu, John Huson, Justin Jones, Alyssa LaBrash, Brady Martin, Anthony Mason, Mike McCanna, Chhunla McKeever, Mitzi McMahan, Rae McNally, Jim Meyerhoff, Karen Mool, Bernard Odhiambo, Vincent Pecchia, Kinsey Pitsinger, David Powers, Michael Sanchez, Sam Sharpe (alternate for Jason Smith), Shannon Sullivan, Dave Sunich, Q Swazer, Julie Thompson, Larry Vandenberg, Laura Wade-Jensen, Wendy Wright

Absent: Jessica Archer-Rucshner, Karl Gill, Julie Hunter, Michele Jangula, Jessica Ryan, Rebecca Williams

Meeting Documents

Oct. 10, 2024, BAC Meeting Agenda
Oct. 10, 2024, BAC Mtg. #3 PowerPoint
How Do Committees Support Bond Project Selections?
Region 2/3 Project Worksheet

Welcome Back

Brady Martin, director of capital projects, welcomed the committee, and introduced School Board President Joseph Romero.

President Romero thanked the capital team for accommodating all community members that were interested in serving on the Bond Advisory Committee. He was part of the 2019 BAC and had an opportunity to understand the needs of the district. The role of the district and especially the board is to be transparent about the needs. The 2019 BAC was excited to put forth a package that may be like the one this committee compiles. The target date for a bond initiative is Feb. 2025. He greatly appreciates the members' participation and time.

The agenda was reviewed.

Meeting Norms, Charter, Parking Lot Reminder

The meeting norms were reviewed. They will be displayed on the tables at every meeting.

The BAC Charter was reviewed.

The QR Code used to ask questions in the "Parking Lot" is on the table tent card. Questions will be answered during the meeting. Comment cards are also available.

BAC Meeting Roadmap

The next [Patron Tour](#) is Nov. 5. The BAC has two remaining meetings, Region 3 information will be discussed on Oct. 24, the recommendation will be finalized at the Nov. 7 meeting, presented to the board as a report on Nov. 18, and recommended for consideration on Dec. 9.

How do committees support bond project selection

Brady shared that at the last meeting, several members asked for additional information and context about the process of choosing projects for a bond. Input and information are collected from the CFAC recommendation, the Study and Survey, Capital Facilities Plan, SCUT recommendation, the past BAC recommendation, and various other sources. The resources provide information needed to comprise long and short-term plans and identify the projects being presented to this committee to consider costs, prioritize, and present a bond recommendation to the board.

Once the bond passes, a design advisory team will be formed for each bond school. The teams are comprised of architectural and engineering teams, community members, and district staff who will review educational specifications and begin developing designs of the building. This leads to construction. Once construction is complete, the district will apply for state match funds. The Bond Oversight Committee is responsible for making project recommendations, based on CFAC project recommendations, to fund with the state match money.

If you have questions, please use the Parking Lot QR code or a comment card.

Meeting 2 Bond Overview

Brady reviewed information shared at Meeting #2 regarding Region 1 schools and the projects at ERHS, GVJH, and Elementary #24. Growth will take place within and outside the district boundaries. It will need to be decided how that may affect the district and what projects will best address capacity issues and needs.

Meeting 2 Minutes

The Meeting #2 minutes were approved as written.

The instructions to access the Teams Channel were reviewed. If you are having issues, please contact us.

Meeting #2 Exit Survey Responses

The Meeting #2 Exit Survey Responses were reviewed and can be found in the [Meeting #2 BAC Teams folder](#).

The Project Costs Hypothetical Toolbox Wrap-up spreadsheet are the results of the group exercise from the last meeting. The exercise was conducted to familiarize members on how projects would be scored and gauge the group's understanding of information provided. Results were reviewed and can be found on slide 15 of the PPT.

The same exercise will be completed at this meeting for Region 2.

Question of the Week

Responses to last week's Question of the Week were reviewed. A Question of the Week will be posted on the [Bond Advisory Committee Questions and Answers webpage](#) as part of the district's community engagement plan. Flyers with the QR code will be handed out at community events. Question of the Week responses begin on slide 10 of the PPT.

Q: What platform is the Question of the Week put out on?

A: Parent Square, family newsletters, Foundation for Our Future website, Facebook and Foundations for Our Future social media sites, and LinkedIn.

Meeting #3 Learning Targets

The learning targets were reviewed:

1. Understand anticipated enrollment
2. Understand anticipated community growth
3. Understand CFAC identified projects and costs

CFAC Project Recommendations

Brady reviewed the Estimated Bond Projects Costs table. The projects were identified by the 2021 CFAC and list the estimated costs of full master plan build out based on the midpoint of construction.

Region 2 Community

Brian shared that Region 2 is on the west side of Meridian on South Hill and includes Rogers HS, Ballou and Stahl JHs, and Woodland, Zeiger, Firgrove, Dessie Evans, Carson, and Brouillet elementary schools.

At the last meeting Region 1 was discussed and it was offered to arrange tours of schools to anyone interested, or they could participate in a Patron Tour. No one expressed interest, but the offer is still extended.

The Sunrise Master Plan in the Region 1 community is still being built out, two master plan areas in Region 2 (Silver Creek and Gem Heights) building happened 20-30 years ago. There is active residential construction in Region 2, but nothing compared to Region 1. The 2015 bond addressed growth in Region 2 by building Dessie Evans Elementary, replacing and building a larger Firgrove Elementary, and building an addition at Ballou Junior High and Stahl Junior High. Much of the growth has been addressed but the goal is to eliminate portables and provide students with classrooms in a permanent building.

The Rogers HS Capacity Forecast through 2031-32 was reviewed. RHS currently has a permanent building capacity deficit of 384 (without portables) and will be greater through 2032. There are currently 15 portable classrooms at the school with plans of adding three more. It is projected to have 1,858 students enrolled at RHS in the 2031-32 school year with a 538-building capacity deficit. It is expected that the 2031-32 school year will be the high point of enrollment through 2034-35.

The Alternative Program Trends Chart was reviewed which includes enrollment from the Puyallup Online Academy (POA), P4, full-time running start, Puyallup Open Doors (POD) and enrollment at

the four high schools from 2013-2023. There is an increased enrollment in the alternative programs at the high school level. The blue line at the top represents the enrollment at the four permanent high school buildings. Enrollment projections at the high schools assume a similar level of participation in alternative programs that exist today. Enrollment could be less if participation in alternative programs continues to increase.

Q: Do we know why running start enrollment dropped during COVID?

A: Cheryl Cummings, data processor at PHS, reports on running start students. Pierce College conducted online instruction during COVID, and students did attend college online. Ed Crow, ERHS principal, commented that all three high schools have seen a high increase in AP enrollment as well as College in High School. Students can attend school, get college credit, and participate socially. This may be why running start numbers are lower.

Brian commented that these factors don't exist at the elementary and junior high levels, resulting in more variable and higher uncertainty for high school enrollment projections. Projection numbers one-year out are more accurate than five or ten years out.

Region 2 Project Overviews

Brady shared that Rogers High School is located on a large 44-acre open site. The current building and site improvements do not meet the program needs for classroom space, athletics, or core facilities (admin, special ed, ...). Consolidation of the buildings for safety reasons is a major goal. Construction needs to be done on an incremental basis to maintain a high-quality program for students. Many building systems are at or near the end of their useful life. Some buildings are eligible for state match modernization funding. Phase 1 of the work would primarily address the need for program space and portable replacement. Life cycle systems improvements will be addressed with 2024 levy funds until major modernization funding is secured.

The Master Plan Phase 1 proposes to build additions to accommodate 1,800 students. The work will include, construction of multi-story additions connecting the separate buildings on the site and expansion of the gym and performing arts spaces. The project will include improvements to special ed spaces construction of tennis courts, and parking improvements. Phase 2 includes major modernization of the existing buildings.

Scenarios with optional projects and costs for RHS were reviewed. The baseline 1,800 student capacity project scenario adds 75,810 sq. ft. with an estimated baseline cost of \$98.6M. The estimated cost includes soft and hard costs construction and are based on a midpoint of construction estimated at Jan 2029. A 4.5% year over year escalation is also included. Expanding the school to a 2,400-student capacity would add an additional 107,363 sq. ft. to the baseline plan and an additional estimated \$112.5M. Estimated costs are 2024 costs without escalation.

It's important to understand why athletics are important and why projects are needed. Information from the 2021 CFAC Athletic Report was shared.

Gymnasiums are teaching spaces and are required by the state. Beginning in the 2014-15 school year, the district allowed ninth graders to participate in sports at the high school level which creates a demand on school space as well. The change was made because most districts in Washington

have a 9-12 grade configuration. It has created pressure points in the school because there are more high school squads and more high school teams. Practices sometimes last until 10:00 p.m.

Comment: Her dad is the RHS JV girls softball teams, and the JV team never has enough and are always getting shoved into the gyms, sharing space with the boys. They never feel they have enough time and are always running late often not leaving until late in the evening. This affects family units and younger siblings.

An aquatic center expansion at RHS was recommended by the 2021 CFAC to be used by all three high schools. Currently, PHS and RHS have pools. ERHS students compete at the RHS pool. The revenues from community use do not offset operational costs, they are very expensive to operate. The pros and cons of the aquatic center expansion can be found on slide 38 of the PPT.

Q. Has done research talking with friends that play water polo. With the number of teams, a regional aquatic center wouldn't be large enough. It would have to be as big as the aquatic center in Federal Way because of the multiple teams that practice and compete.

A: There aren't a lot of pools available in our district, you have RHS, PHS, YMCA and LA Fitness, which aren't competing pools. At the last meeting it was wondered if we could partner with another agency or Pierce County for a combined aquatic center. There is nothing in the works right now.

Q. If the decision were made to not do a regional pool but to build a pool at ERHS, is the pool at RHS adequate to serve the needs of RHS or would it still need improvements?

A. It is adequate, but a modernization project for interior and exterior would be needed.

Q. His kids swam and did water polo. His concern about a regional aquatic center is how do ninth graders get to the pool?

A. This was discussed by CFAC and will need to be addressed, it would be a challenge.

Q. With three pools in the district, couldn't we recoup more revenue because the community would have an opportunity to use it? A. As you can see, the revenue is not covering half of the operational costs. The pool at PHS doesn't meet the athletic needs.

Q. The pools are very inefficient.

A: Agreed. At PHS the pool doesn't meet the program needs, it's too shallow for diving.

Q: The pool at PHS is used one period during the day, it's empty most of the day.

A. It has been discussed opening the pool during the day for open swim to generate more revenue.

Q: In one of our discussions the goal was to have the RHS campus fully enclosed. Is it planned to include the aquatic center in that enclosure?

A. It's not represented on this map, but yes, the goal is to eventually connect the buildings.

The Estimated Costs – RHS table was reviewed listing the optional projects with costs that members may choose to add to the baseline 1,800 student capacity plan. The table includes the square footage each project would add, the 2024 estimated costs that include both soft and hard cost for construction, midpoint construction costs with a 4.5% year over year escalation, the total 4-year escalation, and the 10% bond contingency. The table can be found on slide 43 of the PPT.

Table Discussions

Members were asked to review the RHS informational handouts on their tables, discuss and share thoughts amongst themselves.

Brian explained that the intent of the table exercises is not to use the collected data to create a proposal, it's a way to introduce decision-making processes and tools to make final decisions.

Region 3 Community

Brady explained that he would be sharing some Region 3 information tonight with the discussion continuing at the Oct. 24 meeting.

Region 3 encompasses the valley and North Hill schools: Puyallup HS; Aylen, Kalles, and Edgemont JHs; and Waller Road, Maplewood, Fruitland, Karshner, Stewart, Meeker, Shaw Road, Spinning, Northwood, and Mountain View elementary schools.

The PHS Capacity Forecast through 2031-32 was reviewed. There is currently a 458-student capacity deficit at PHS partially due to the closing of the Library/Science building and it's projected for a potential 711-capacity deficit through 2031-32 with enrollment projected to be 1,973 students. This is an uncertain number as forecasts in the future are less accurate and an 1,800 capacity is being recommended to mitigate the risk of overbuilding. There is a high potential that a few portables would be needed if permanent space is built to an 1,800-student capacity . We don't want to spend money to overbuild when funds can be used for other projects and the board approved educational specifications are to build PHS at an 1,800 capacity.

The PHS needs statement was reviewed. Puyallup High School is located on a small urban site in downtown Puyallup. The current building and site improvements do not meet the program needs for classroom space, athletics, or core facilities (admin, special ed, commons, library ...). The lack of both parking and athletics fields are a major issue at PHS. Consolidation of the buildings for safety reasons is a major goal. Construction needs to be done on an incremental basis to maintain a high-quality program for students. Many building systems are at or near the end of their useful life. Some buildings are eligible for state match modernization funding.

The Master Plan Phase 1 proposes to build an addition to accommodate 1,800 students and replacement of several outdated buildings. The work will include; construction of the 2nd and 3rd floors of the CTE building, a new 3-story to replace the library/Science building and replace portables. Phase 2 includes a new gym/Pool building. Phase 3 would include the Main building and Performing Arts Center with an expansion of the commons. Phase 4 would include the relocation of the tennis courts adding two addition, field relocation and improvements, and parking improvements.

Scenarios with optional projects and costs for PHS were reviewed. The baseline 1,800 student capacity project scenario adds 92,029 sq. ft. with an estimated baseline 2024 cost of \$106.7M. Expanding the school to a 2,400-student capacity to accommodate grades 9-12 would require the baseline plan to be built, full replacement of the main building (\$190M), and building a 58,610 sq. ft. addition (\$61.9M).

The Estimated Costs – PHS table listing the square footage each project would add, the 2024 estimated costs include both soft and hard cost for Construction, midpoint construction costs with a 4.5% year over year escalation, the total 4-year escalation, and the 10% bond contingency can be found on slide 61 of the PPT.

Q: Is the 2,400-capacity expansion only possible if we do the complete main building replacement?

A: That is correct.

Q: Was reading about how they are going to do a trial of closing the road, how does the pilot project affect the plans? If they decide the road can't be closed, does it impede things?

A: The designs show leaving the 7th St NW open. If the road is permanently closed, it provides an opportunity for back and forth across the field and provides more connectivity between the two buildings.

Q: It is important to close the road for safety. You don't need a gun when you get those kids in a crosswalk. That road needs to close.

A: There's additional work and studies going on. The scenario sketches show that the footprints of the buildings will fit on the property, but for security, closing the road would provide connectivity between the spaces. When construction on the CTE building begins, students will be housed in portables, the pedestrian traffic will increase.

Q: This is a much different school than the others we've looked at. There aren't sidewalks and crosswalks outside of the campus, is that part of the plan? It's an urban campus with a lot of safety risks. Will the work trigger sidewalk, crosswalk, and site improvements?

A: There will be a lot of work done around the buildings, sidewalks, landscaping, crosswalks, signalization, stormwater, and parking improvements.

Q: The CTE building has a full auto shop and full professional kitchen. When construction to that building is being done, those programs won't be able to operate, correct?

A: Yes, considerations and plans will be made.

Q: Are there drawings that connect the gym? You will still have to open doors.

A: The plans are sketches and buildings can be connected. This will be part of the discussion during the design process. The sketches presented are plans that fit our current ed specs for an 1,800-school model.

Q: Is there an added complication if the building is labeled historic?

A: The building is not labeled historic.

The complication with any building in the valley is the liquefaction of the soil conditions. From a structural standpoint, the bedrock is roughly 100 ft deep. A lot of the costs will be reinforcing some of the existing floors and foundations of the building.

Brady stated that this summer, the health dept. required upgrading the main drain in the PHS pool. The soil conditions had to be tested, the ground water level is at five feet, the pool is 10 ft deep, meaning water would be around the pool. Consultants advised not to drain the pool as not enough weight could be used to balance it, and it would pop out of the ground. Drilling wells around the building and extracting water out of the ground 24/7 was considered, but it was advised that would cause the building to settle, up to two feet. It was decided to plug the main drain and circulate the water through the gutters around the top of the pool allowing the health dept. requirements to be met. If the pool is upgraded, an above ground pool will have to be installed with seismic and other upgrades made.

Q: The PAC is old and is gorgeous with a lot of architectural features, is there any way to preserve some of that?

A: Yes, we know it's beautiful and want to preserve it, but it will take a lot of work because of the structural reinforcement that needs to be done to the building.

Q: What are you going to do with the students during construction?

A: In all scenarios, the baseline must be built, the Library/Science building replaced, and the 2nd and 3rd floors added to the CTE building to get the rest of the science classrooms to meet core programming, the rest are options. Once the baseline work is complete, there will be room for students, and they can move into that during construction.

Q: If you do the gym and pool, aren't you going to need to move it to where the athletic complex is going to be because you must have a gym and pool?

A: We can separate the buildings, keep the aquatic center going, the gym would have to come down, and an athletic tent would be installed while the gym is being built.

Q: Are we looking at one school year for the existing main building for Phase 3 to be built?

A: It will be more than a year's worth of work.

Q: It will take a while to get permits to tear down the building, what can be done to streamline the permit process? As a voter, the community will wonder why it's taking so long. That doesn't reflect well.

A: District staff meets with the city on a regular basis and have shared the plans. We can only go so far because funding isn't secured. Drawings can't be submitted until a bond passes. We can only keep the city informed. The district submitted a master plan to the city in 2008 but was never fully approved. Brady is part of a Permit Review Committee that provides feedback to the city to help streamline processes.

Q: Does the full replacement of the main building include a new PAC?

A: The PAC would be built larger and would meet our ed specs.

Group Share Out

Members were invited to review and discuss the RHS and PHS project options at their tables and share out what projects they favor.

- Our table favors the 9-12 model. It will solidify the path of the other options. It makes the decision process a bit easier.
- From the big picture, the baseline is an important value to the district. We need to provide ample classrooms. Trying to go through the other options, which have merit and have historical value, but the price tag doesn't align with the voters. Want to be careful how it's communicated. The whole replacement (PHS) is a need, but not sure it's a critical need.
- Had a discussion and would like to not kill trees. Talked about what the community will think, and what the price tag will be with full replacement. It's an older building (PHS), it could qualify for historic registry, we need to be sensitive of that. Taking the pool away is a hot topic, trying to decide the most strategic package, but don't have an answer.
- The focus has been on classrooms at the three comprehensive schools, this will be a good sell to the voters. If it's understood, currently, we are asking for funds to make changes, but when we design, we may add some of the other options. It is a better sell if we focus on classroom space.
- Agreed to replace the gym and aquatics. The pool is a huge component of PHS. Also to replace the whole main building. It will be a hard sell; we will have to be strategic in our final decisions. From a person that lives in the valley, this school needs to be replaced almost in

full. The school is behind the other two schools, it needs a lot of love, you don't do that by piecemeal. It will take a lot longer and cost a lot more money if you do that.

- Agreed with the replacement. Three generations of her family have attended PHS, and it would be sad. They talked about incorporating some of the nostalgia of the old building into the new, but it would be expensive to piecemeal it.

Brady explained that when the design advisory teams begin meeting, the fun is that you get to bring the community and staff together and hear the nostalgia part. Those things do get incorporated. The biggest challenge right now is to communicate the need and get support. PHS is the toughest sell.

Comment: I don't think it's the toughest sell, it's the most necessary sell. Of all the projects on the list, this school needs it the most. At one point, the people in the valley funded the schools on the hill, it's time people in the valley get a taste of the pie.

Brady invited members to participate in the Patron Tour. Please let us know if you would like to see a school outside of the tour. The next Patron Tour is Nov. 5 and will be touring PHS.

Please complete the exit survey. We appreciate the feedback. The master plan drawings will be in the binders at the next meeting. Thank you for your time tonight.

Closing

Next Meeting

October 24, 2024 – 5:00-7:00 p.m.

Karshner Center – 309 4th St NE Puyallup, WA 98372

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.