

## 2024 Bond Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes #5 November 7, 2024, 4:30-7:30 p.m.  
Karshner Center – 309 4<sup>th</sup> St NE Puyallup, WA 98372

### Members:

**Present:** Stefania Appia, Ellen Aronson, Ethan Barker, Sari Burnett, Ed Crow, Cheryl Cummings, Brian Devereux, Kimberlee Gerstmann, Karl Gill, Sarah Gillispie, Ryan Hahn, Debie Haworth, Greg Heath, Anne Hoban for Jason Smith, Bob Horton, Shawn Hu, John Huson, Michele Jangula, Justin Jones, Brady Martin, Anthony Mason, Mike McCanna, Chhunla McKeever, Rae McNally, Jim Meyerhoff, Karen Mool, Bernard Odhiambo, Vincent Pecchia, Michael Sanchez, Jason Smith, Dave Sunich, Q Swazer, Julie Thompson, , Larry Vandeberg, Laura Wade-Jensen, Rebecca Williams, Wendy Wright

**Absent:** Jessica Archer-Rucshner, David Cerio, Rachel Collins, Jennifer Corp, Luke Heath, Julie Hunter, Alyssa LaBrash, Mitzi McMahan, David Powers, Jessica Ryan, Shannon Sullivan

**Guest:** Lisa Wilcox

### Meeting Documents

Nov. 7, 2024, BAC Meeting #5 Agenda  
Nov. 7, 2024, BAC Meeting. #5 PowerPoint  
Oct. 24, 2024, Meeting Minutes

### Welcome Back

Brady Martin, director of capital projects, welcomed the committee to the last BAC meeting. Tonight's task is to finalize a bond recommendation to be presented to the board at the Nov. 15 Board Study Session.

The agenda was reviewed.

### Meeting Norms, Charter, Parking Lot Reminder

The meeting norms were reviewed.

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

This is the last BAC meeting to finalize the recommendation to be presented to the board as a report at the Nov. 15 study session. It will be presented as a first read at the Nov. 18 board meeting and for final recommendation on Dec. 9.

Please consider participating in a [Patron Tour](#). The next tour is Dec. 3.

## Meeting #4 Overview

Brady shared that at Meeting #4, members participated in a project costing exercise listing different bond package scenarios to choose from or create their own. The results were tallied, and the information was used to create the scenarios presented tonight. Highest ranked projects were ERHS 1800 Student Classroom Addition- 21 votes, RHS 18000 Student Classroom Addition – 20 votes, Spinning Elementary Replacement – 20 votes, and the PHS 18000 Student Classroom Addition - 19 votes. The full list of projects with tallies are available in the Meeting #5 folder.

## Meeting #4 Minutes

The Meeting #4 minutes were approved as written.

## 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 were available on each table.

## Review Tax Rates

Brady shared that at the last meeting, there were questions about tax rates, one being what the tax rate of an \$800M bond would be that did not finance part of the levy. The tax rate would increase .85 for a total of \$4.99 per \$1,000 of assessed value. Six years out, it would drop to \$4.12. A standalone \$600M bond, would add .29 (\$4.39) in 2025, climb to \$4.75 by 2029, and drop to \$3.85 in 2031. For every \$50M that is added to an \$800M bond that includes a \$130M rollback of levy it will increase the tax rate roughly \$0.10. Other scenarios that included financing levy rollback money were reviewed. Typically, the district tries to build in a tax "step" when the levy financing drops off to coincide with running a bond every four to six years to keep the tax rate level. The spreadsheet can be found on slide 21 of the PPT.

Brian commented that a lot of information has been shared and invited members to ask questions. Greg Heath, former board member, was invited to share his opinion.

Greg stated that money is important, you must look at and work with tax rates. You look at the compelling need and we have a great go by that Sumner Bonney-Lake SD just passed their bond. There may be a lot of wind in the sails and opportunity to go bigger rather than smaller.

Q: In the first meeting, a gentleman asked about rolling the levies into the bond and what it does as far as interest. If we do an \$800M bond with a levy rollback, what would be the loss in terms of the levy as opposed to the stand alone? Would we be losing money interest wise?

A. We would not be losing money as far as an interest rate standpoint. It would be the aggregate of both totaled together; it would still be the same amount but a bigger tax rate to the community without the rollback. It's hard to get the support of the community when raising the tax rate.

Brian summarized that the district is not borrowing money in advance with a levy, interest rates aren't associated, money is collected periodically over six years annually. When a levy is rolled into a bond, an interest rate is associated with the money. Rolling the levy money into the bond, allows the district to receive money up front, projects to be completed sooner realizing a cost and inflation savings, and state match can be collected earlier.

Brady explained that members will be asked to vote by Fist to Five tonight when making decisions about projects and bond scenarios. A closed fist means “No way”, one “We need to talk about it”, two “I have reservations”, three “I’m okay with it”, four “Sounds good”, and five fingers “Total agreement”. Brady asked the committee to show with a Fist to Five their understanding of the tax rate discussion.

Q: Looking at all the modeling, can we go into more detail about the tax specifics? If we talk about how Sumner averaged it. Maybe we can look at the average for us.

A: Brian stated that in terms of the five-year average, it wouldn’t work well for us, because we just added the Capital Levy. If we averaged the tax rate for the past five years, it would show a tax increase.

Q: With the levy in mind, with nothing changing, what would the starting tax rate be?

A: Brady explained that other factors make up the \$4.14 tax rate: existing bond debt, existing Capital Levy, existing EP&O Levy, and existing Transportation Levy which all affect the rate. The EP&O Levy barely passed in Feb. 2022 and is run every four years. It is a replacement so there is no significant tax rate. If we don’t pass a bond, the tax rate will drop in 2031 because the levy will fall off the list. If the EP&O Levy passes, the tax rate will remain the same.

Q: The EP&O Levy will be up for renewal in 2026, the way that was designed would it be communicated that the tax rate will remain at \$4.14, or would we have to tell people the tax rate is going up in 2026?

A. No, the tax rate would remain the same, it’s a replacement levy.

Q: Is the breakdown of what tax dollars are going to which fund, levies, etc., available?

A: Brian shared that the district was at \$3.33 per \$1,000 of assessed value before the Capital Levy was passed. After it passed, the tax rate increased to \$4.14 and will potentially fall in 2028.

Brady asked the committee to vote by a show of hands if they support an \$800M bond with a levy rollback option to maintain a tax rate at \$4.14. Members supported the option.

Brady reviewed the How do Committees Support Bond Project Selections? Chart. The project selections are based on work done by past Citizens Facility Advisory and Bond Advisory Committees, the School Capacity and Utilization Task Force, information from the Capital Facilities Plan, the Study and Survey, and projects completed with the Capital Levy. The Bond Advisory Committee uses the information to compile a bond package to recommend to the board. Once a bond passes, a Bond Oversight Committee is formed to oversee and review how bond money is spent and chooses which projects will be paid for with state match funds. A Design Advisory Team, comprised of architects, engineers, community members, students, and district staff, is assigned to each project and meets to review ed specs and design buildings. Projects are built and buildings are opened.

### **CFAC Project Recommendations**

Brady reviewed the Estimated Bond Projects Costs Table. The projects were identified by the 2021 CFAC except for the Mt. View replacement project which was recommended by the School Capacity and Utilization Task Force. The estimated costs of full masterplan build out based on the midpoint of construction were listed. It would require a \$1,260,693,500 bond to fund all projects.

## Review Scenarios 1-5

Brady reviewed five bond package scenarios that were compiled from the committee’s input from the last meeting. A schedule roughly showing the timeline of projects and when state match would be collected is at the bottom of each scenario. Projects must be fully funded by the bond, once projects are finished, state match is applied for.

### SCENARIO 1 Current Grade Configuration, 7 Projects

	Cost	State Match Potential	BCA Rating	Capacity Deficit Apex. SY31-32	Addition Information	Notes
# of Projects	7					
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$800.0 M</b>				Tax Rate \$4.14 stays even for 21 years 2025-2046	
Levy Roll Back	\$130.0 M				Refinance \$130M of the already approved \$175M Capital Levy	
Bond	\$670.0 M					
Contingency	\$67.0 M				10% Bond Contingency	
<b>Build Fund 1</b>	<b>\$603.0 M</b>				Project cost adjusted to mid-point construction per shared potential schedule	
ERHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$43.5 M	\$9.6 M	Fair	-523	Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg	\$118.3 M	\$31.7 M	Poor	-711	Building Condition, Program Needs, Site Considerations, Portable Use	
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$85.0 M	\$15.9M	Fair	-538	Program Needs, Program Needs (Safety), Portables Use	
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)	\$88.2 M	\$26.2M	Poor	-110*	Building Condition, Growth, Growth adjustment from local schools	
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)	\$81.4 M	\$25.9 M	Poor	-90	Building Condition, Growth, ( Proximity to other districts which impacts Growth)	
New Elementary 24 (550) Student Model	\$84.8 M	\$20.3 M	n/a	-407*	Growth (*Smaller School with plans for future grade reconfiguration to (9-12) )	
Mt. View Replacement (550 Student)	\$94.1 M	\$28.4 M	Poor	-271	Building Condition, Growth Adjustment from NW	
<b>Project TOTAL</b>	<b>\$595.3 M</b>	<b>\$152.9 M</b>			State match potential collection begins when project reaches 90% Completion.	
Contingency Balance	\$74.7 M				*Includes growth adjustment from local schools	

Project Building Funds 1	2025				2026				2027				2028				2029				2030				2031			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
ERHS 1800 Student CR Addition																												
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg																												
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition																												
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)																												
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)																												
New Elementary 24 (550) Student)																												
Mt. View ES Replacement																												
Life Cycle Projects																												

Q: What was the decision-making process of projects in Scenario 1? Two of the projects were low in the committee’s tally and a couple projects that were high aren’t in the scenario. It would make sense to put all the projects this committee prioritized in a package and put other projects in a different scenario.

A. We tried to maximize the number of projects in each region. The goal has always been to have projects total \$603M and a levy rollback of \$130M for a package totaling \$800M. Projects can be adjusted, but the committee needs to understand what projects have to be completed before others can be done. The total cost of the prioritized projects would be more than \$603M.

## SCENARIO 2 Current Grade Configuration, 7 Projects

	Cost	State Match Potential	BCA Rating	Capacity Deficit Apex. SY31-23	Addition Information	Notes
# of Projects	7					
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$800.0 M</b>				<b>Tax Rate \$4.14 stays even years 2025-2046</b>	
Levy Roll Back	\$130.0 M				Refinance \$130M of the already approved \$175M Capital Levy	
Bond	\$670.0 M					
Contingency	\$67.0 M				10% Bond Contingency	
<b>Build Fund 1</b>	<b>\$603.0 M</b>				<i>Project cost adjusted to mid-point construction per shared potential schedule</i>	
ERHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$43.5 M	\$9.6 M	Fair	-523	Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
ERHS Aux Gym Addition	\$23.9 M	\$4.4 M	n/a			
ERHS Commons Addition	\$10.7 M	\$9.9 M	n/a			
GVJH Addition (200 Student)	\$30.0 M	\$6.4 M	Good	-175	Growth	
New Elementary 24 (730 Student)	\$101.2 M	\$24.3 M	n/a	-407*	Growth (*Assumes no future grade reconfiguration)	
RHS 1800 CR Add	\$85.0 M	\$15.9 M	Fair	-538	Program Needs (Safety), Portables Use	
RHS Dinning\Commons Addition	\$6.9 M	\$9.9 M	n/a			
RHS Science Wing Modernization	\$9.7 M	\$4.9 M	Poor			
RHS Parking Improvements	\$3.0 M		n/a			
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg	\$118.3 M	\$31.7 M	Poor	-711	Building Condition, Program Needs, Site Considerations, Portable Use	
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)	\$88.2 M	\$26.2 M	Poor	-110*	Building Condition, Growth (*Regional) Growth adjustment from local schools	
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)	\$81.4 M	\$25.9 M	Poor	-90	Building Condition, Growth, (Proximity to other districts which impacts Growth)	
<b>Project TOTAL</b>	<b>\$601.8 M</b>	<b>\$151.1 M</b>			<i>State match potential collection begins when project reaches 90% Completion.</i>	
Contingency Balance	\$68.2 M				<i>*includes growth adjustment from local schools</i>	

Project Building Funds 1	2025				2026				2027				2028				2029				2030				2031			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
ERHS 1800 Student\Aux Gym\Commons																												
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg																												
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition, Commons, Sci Modern, Parking																												
New Elementary 24 (730 Student)																												
GVJH Addition (200 Student)																												
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)																												
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)																												
Life Cycle Projects																												

## SCENARIO 3 REGION 1 ERHS 2400 (9-12), RHS 1800 (10-12), PHS 1800 (10-12)

	Cost	State Match Potential	BCA Rating	Capacity Deficit Apex. SY31-32	Addition Information	Notes
# of Projects	7					
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$800.0 M</b>				<b>Tax Rate \$4.14 stays even years 2025-2046</b>	
Levy Roll Back	\$130.0 M				Refinance \$130M of the already approved \$175M Capital Levy	
Bond	\$670.0 M					
Contingency	\$67.0 M				10% Bond Contingency	
<b>Build Fund 1</b>	<b>\$603.0 M</b>				<i>Project cost adjusted to mid-point construction per shared potential schedule</i>	
ERHS 1800 Student CR	\$43.5 M	\$9.6 M	Fair	-523	Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
ERHS 2400 Student CR Add	\$124.6 M	\$29.6 M	n/a		Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
ERHS Aux Gym	\$23.9 M	\$4.4 M	n/a		Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
ERHS Commons Expansion	\$10.7 M	\$9.9 M	n/a		Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs	
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$85.0 M	\$15.9 M	Fair	-538	Program Needs, Program Needs (Safety), Portables Use	
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg	\$118.3 M	\$31.7 M	Poor	-711	Building Condition, Program Needs, Site Considerations, Portable Use	
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)	\$88.2 M	\$26.2 M	Poor	-110*	Building Condition, Growth, Growth adjustment from local schools	
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)	\$81.4 M	\$25.9 M	Poor	-90	Building Condition, Growth, (Proximity to other districts which impacts Growth)	
WHS Addition	\$26.8 M	\$6.4 M	Poor		Program Needs, Portable Use, Site Consideration (* Need Transitional Space Construction)	
<b>Project TOTAL</b>	<b>\$602.4 M</b>	<b>\$150.6 M</b>			<i>State match potential collection begins when project reaches 90% Completion.</i>	
Contingency Balance	\$67.6 M				<i>*includes growth adjustment from local schools</i>	

Project Building Funds 1	2025				2026				2027				2028				2029				2030				2031			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
ERHS 2400 Student, Aux Gym, Commons, Parking																												
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg																												
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition																												
Spinning Replacement (500 Student)																												
Waller Road Elementary Replacement (400 Student)																												
WHS Addition																												
Life Cycle Projects																												

## SCENARIO 4 FOUR 1800 STUDENT COMPREHENSIVE HS (9-12)

	Cost	State Match Potential	BCA Rating	Capacity Deficit Apex. SY31-32	Addition Information	Notes
# of Projects	7					
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$800.0 M</b>					<b>Tax Rate \$4.14 stays even years 2025-2046</b>
Levy Roll Back	\$130.0 M					Refinance \$130M of the already approved \$175M Capital Levy
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$670.0 M</b>					
Contingency	\$67.0 M					10% Bond Contingency
<b>Build Fund 1</b>	<b>\$603.0 M</b>					Project cost adjusted to mid-point construction per shared potential schedule
ERHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$43.5 M	\$9.6 M	Fair	-523		Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$85.0 M	\$15.9 M	Fair	-538		Program Needs, Program Needs (Safety), Portables Use
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg	\$118.3 M	\$31.7 M	Poor	-711		Building Condition, Program Needs, Site Considerations, Portable Use
New 1800 Student High School	\$356.2 M	\$88.7 M	n/a			Needed for Grade Reconfiguration (9-12)
<b>Project TOTAL</b>	<b>\$603.0 M</b>	<b>\$145.9 M</b>				State match potential collection begins when project reaches 90% Completion.
Contingency Balance	\$67.0 M					

Project Building Funds 1	2025				2026				2027				2028				2029				2030				2031			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
ERHS 1800 Student CR Addition																												
PHS 1800 Student CR Add 2nd & 3rd Flr CTE BDLG & New 3 Story CR Bldg																												
RHS 1800 Student CR Addition																												
New High School 1800 Student																												
Life Cycle Projects																												

## SCENARIO 5 THREE 2400 STUDENT COMPREHENSIVE HS (9-12)

	Cost	State Match Potential	BCA Rating	Capacity Deficit Apex. SY31-32	Addition Information	Notes
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$956.4 M</b>					
Levy Roll Back	\$130.0 M					Estimated Tax Rate \$4.45 Increase of roughly .31 cents, 21 years 2025-2046
<b>Bond</b>	<b>\$826.4 M</b>					Refinance \$130M of the already approved \$175M Capital Levy
Contingency	\$82.6 M					10% Bond Contingency
<b>Build Fund 1</b>	<b>\$743.8 M</b>					Project cost adjusted to mid-point construction per shared potential schedule
ERHS 1800 Student CR	\$43.5 M	\$9.6 M	Fair	-523		Growth, Site Consideration, Portable Use, Program Needs
ERHS 2400 Student CR Add	\$124.6 M	\$29.6 M	n/a			Needed for 9-12 Grade Configuration
ERHS Aux Gym	\$23.9 M	\$4.4 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
ERHS Commons Expansion	\$10.7 M	\$9.9 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
RHS 1800 CR Addition	\$85.0 M	\$15.9 M	Fair	-538		Program Needs (Safety), Portables Use
RHS 2400 Student CR Addition	\$134.2 M	\$29.7 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
RHS Aux Gym\ Band\ Choir Addition	\$29.8 M	\$5.0 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
RHS Commons Expansion	\$6.9 M	\$9.9 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
RHS Science Wing Modernization	\$9.7 M	\$4.9 M	Poor			Program Needs, Growth
RHS Parking Improvements	\$3.0 M					Program Needs, Growth
PHS 1800 Student CR Addition	\$118.3 M	\$31.7 M	Poor	-711		Building Condition, Program Needs, Site Considerations, Portable Use
PHS 2400 Student Addition	\$73.8 M	\$16.1 M	n/a			Program Needs, Growth
PHS Gym Replacement\ Keep Aquatics	\$80.4 M	\$28.8 M	Poor			Program Needs, Growth
<b>Project TOTAL</b>	<b>\$743.8 M</b>	<b>\$189.1 M</b>				State match potential collection begins when project reaches 90% Completion.
Contingency Balance	\$82.6 M					

Project Building Funds 1	2025				2026				2027				2028				2029				2030				2031			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
ERHS 2400 Student																												
PHS 2400 Student																												
RHS 2400 Student																												
Life Cycle Projects																												



Brady invited the committee to show by Fist to Five how well they understood and how confident they feel about the scenarios. Most of the members voted with three or more fingers.

## Group Discussions

Brady invited the group to share their thoughts about the scenarios.

- I don't like any of the scenarios, but I can see where you are going with Scenario 1. PHS is in severe need of renovation and restoration, especially the pool. The bulk of the funding of \$800M should be prioritized in Region 3. Can there be a Scenario 6 option to include ERHS - 1800 capacity, RHS – 1800 capacity and all the big projects for PHS to an 1800 capacity, replace library/science building, add the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> stories to the CTE building, replace the gym and pool, modernize the PAC, replace Spinning and Waller Rd. elementary schools which total about \$772M? The other scenarios have a lot of projects in Regions 1 and 2 but Region 3 is often overlooked. All our high schools should be at a performing arts level. Brady shared that once the rollback for the levy is included, the cost of the scenario would be \$968M.
- What if we didn't replace the PHS pool but replaced the gym, and replacing the whole main building and place that in the previous scenario that was shared?

Brady asked if there was consensus to raise the tax rate and have a bond costing more than \$800M. The consensus was not to have a package costing more than \$800M.

Members were asked to create their own scenario options. If the consensus of the room is to run an \$800M bond with \$130M of levy rollback and a 10% contingency, projects must equal \$603M. Most projects in the scenarios would generate approximately \$150M in state match funds.

Brain explained that tonight's goal is to narrow scenarios down to three with one of them being recommended as a package to the board. Scenarios submitted by members will be considered as well.

Comments:

- To lessen the complexity, we should not consider the state match projects and their costs. We need to focus on a project list that equals \$603M.
- What is the likelihood that Spinning and the PHS gym/main building would be condemned before a new building can be completed? If we don't get those things in there now, we may have to build a whole new high school without a plan in place.
- Loved Scenario 5 with grade reconfiguration, but it's too much money. Philosophically feels we should have a middle school configuration. Scenarios 1, 2, and 3 focus too much on high school projects. The community will want more. Likes Scenario 1 which will give us a good opportunity for many of our students to be in good places and keep the tax rate even.
- If we are going to stick with a \$603M budget, looking at Scenario 1, includes projects for Spinning, Waller, and the new elementary. Building conditions and capacity needs are being addressed. You could take a hard look at ERHS and RHS and if you don't want to do that, you can spend the money somewhere else.
- Supports Scenario 3 because it supports all schools. Wants to help everyone as much as we can.
- Proposes just doing basic projects at ERHS, not doing other additions, and putting most of the money in PHS projects, Spinning and Waller Rd.
- Looking at Scenario 3, is it possible to run a smaller bond when the levy ends, build ERHS as 2400, and then run another measure later? Personally, feels Scenario 5 is best.

- In Scenario 5, the bulk of the money is increasing high schools to 2400 capacity. Can one be 2400 and the others 1800 and spend money on other projects?

Brady asked if the committee would like to discuss which scenario they would like to eliminate.

- If you start grade reconfiguration, it will be a political thing, it changes the scenario on how your kids will be educated. Putting this in the mix will be tough. It goes down into a whole lot of boundary changes. If you know how it will be deployed, you will probably say no. we don't have time to educate the public.

Vince commented that the committee must be very strategic with the package. It would be nice to load up with projects in one region, but we must be mindful of how it sits with voters. Voters need to see they will get something out of this bond too. It doesn't matter if there are higher needs in one region. It's also about strategy. We don't want to disrupt everything we've been doing to upset the process and have voters vote no.

- Scenario 3 has ERHS built to a 2400 capacity. GVJH is across the parking lot, the ninth graders are already almost there.
- From a high school principal perspective, he's all for 1800 student high schools, not so much the 2400 model. There are other issues like when having an assembly, 2400 students can't be all together. Feels we need to go to 9-12 grade configuration by building a fourth high school.
- Is it possible to vote for what we are closest to, the scenario that most members may support? Brian stated that the order that projects go in can be adjusted. On Scenario 1, you could recommend that a project be moved to the top, but otherwise, please create new scenarios.
- Has reservations hearing everyone's scenarios for the high schools. How are you going to sell packages to community members who may have a preschooler going to Spinning? Feels like we are focusing too much on high schools.
- Scenario 4 addresses high schools. Since we are trying to get to a 9-12 configuration but building to 2400 isn't the answer, he favors Scenario 4 and then run another bond and use state match funds to cover the projects.
- Wants to propose to eliminate Scenario 5. Doesn't feel increasing the tax rate is not a good move.

Brady invited the committee to vote their support of eliminating Scenario 5. It was voted to eliminate Scenario 5 by 31 to 2. Thirty-three voting members were in attendance requiring 17 votes for a majority.

The alternate scenarios submitted by members were collected and reviewed.

- Recommends we don't consider a 9-12 configuration at all and proposes to eliminate all scenarios with those projects which would eliminate Scenarios 3 and 4.
- Is ready to vote but likes Scenario 3. Can we just remove the ERHS 2400 student addition?
- I understand that there's not enough time to educate the community about grade reconfiguration. Why hasn't it been brought up in CFAC or other committees in the past?
- It's been a topic for years. It comes down to cost and the community hasn't been philosophically ready for it.
- As a student in Bethel SD, he experienced a 9-12 configuration. It was too crowded. He would like to see the 1800 expansion and then expand to 2400 later.



Members were invited to vote to eliminate Scenarios 3 and 4 which include projects to build high schools to a 2400 student capacity. The vote to eliminate Scenarios 3 and 4 passed with 25 members supporting and 8 against.

It was motioned to eliminate Alternate Scenario 6C because it is exclusive to high school projects. It was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Brian stated that the committee is ready to vote on which scenarios are favored and choose the top three. Each member will be allowed to vote for one scenario.

- Looking at Scenarios 1 and 2, we don't want to be lopsided in one region, but we also don't want to ignore Region 3. If we do, Region 3's needs will only be greater on the next bond. Scenario 2 doesn't represent Region 3 as much. Brady explained that the other needs can be taken care of with state match projects.

Brian commented that growth projects have been under voted by the committee and he is concerned of not having enough capacity in the future. The high school projects are being supported. Conditions are a real thing, and the need is huge but be mindful that growth needs must be addressed.

- We are talking about growth and some of that growth would be from taking kids in from other districts. Are we required to do that?

Brian stated that we are anticipating and planning for growth that's going to happen in our boundaries not from other districts.

### **Vote on Recommendation**

Brian invited the members to indicate by Fist to Five if they support voting on the remaining scenarios. The members approved.

Vince motioned that the committee stop taking new scenarios at 7:52 p.m. The motion was approved.

The remaining scenarios were reviewed. Scenario amounts are the total project costs and do not include levy rollback or contingency dollars.

Scenario 1 – \$595.3M

Scenario 2 – \$601.8M

Alternate Scenario 6B Revised - \$554.4M

Alternate Scenario 6D – \$572.7M

Alternate Scenario 6E - \$600M

Alternate Scenario 6F Revised – \$590.9M

Alternate Scenario 6K - \$588M

Alternate Scenario 6L - \$608.4M

Members wrote their top two scenario choices on a piece of paper, the papers were collected, and votes were tallied. Once the top three scenarios were identified, members voted for their favored scenario.

Final three scenarios:

Scenario 1 – 24 votes

Scenario 6L - 7 votes

Scenario 6F Revised – 2 votes

Scenario 1 will be recommended to the board at the Nov. 18 board meeting and for final acceptance at the Dec. 9 meeting.

### **Closing**

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.