

Community Bond Advisory Committee  
Meeting #7  
Tuesday, February 17, 2026  
Scappoose School District

---

CBAC members present: Kendall Williams, Beth Rajski, Josh Komp, Vance Chauncey, David Wasylenko, Monica Ahlers, Lindsay Elder, Lucy McCoy, George Dunkel, Jeff Howard, Vanessa Lao, Triison Meza, Joanna Wagner, Jarrett Trtek, Jennifer Jones, KaraLyn DeWalt, and Darlene Marquardt.

CBAC members absent: Megan Hallstone, Russ Picket, Charlene Bassine, Robert Kessi, Jennifer N Herrick, Penelope Smith, and Anton Oehlert.

SSD Board of Directors present: Summer Stutsman-Hoag and Christine Schillereff.

SSD staff support present: Tim Porter, Paje Stelling, Adam Strachan, Jerimy Kelley, Darla Meeuwsen, and Julie Hinkle.

Others present: Cassie Hibbert, Patrick Linhart, Wenaha Group, and Kyle Laier, Assist Education Services.

---

Cassie Hibbert of Wenaha Group called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

The committee work remains on schedule, with January–March focused on identifying priorities and draft recommendations. Community feedback is planned for April-June, and a Board decision is anticipated in August regarding a potential November election measure. Hibbert provided a recap from the January CBAC meeting. The CBAC reviewed progress toward a potential November 2026 bond measure, reaffirming the timeline to draft recommendations in March, gather community feedback in the spring, and present a final recommendation to the Board.

The committee revisited its definition of consensus and emphasized the need to balance district needs, community priorities, and affordability. An update was provided on a seismic grant application for Grant Watts Elementary. The committee also reviewed feedback from the January meeting, which identified replacement of the middle school as the highest priority, with interest in new construction rather than renovation, and a lower level of investment at other schools.

The committee explored four middle school scenarios based on grade configuration (grades 6–8 versus 7–8) and site location (current middle school site versus the high school site). Discussion highlighted key trade-offs, including cost differences, site impacts, and educational programming opportunities. A 6–8 model was noted to align with common practice and provide expanded elective opportunities and stronger program continuity, while a 7–8 model would be less capital costs for construction. Locating the school at the current middle school site was generally seen as less expensive and less disruptive, while maintaining a distinct middle school identity; however,

it may limit access to shared resources. Locating the school at the high school site could increase access to Career and Technical Education (CTE), shared staff, and advanced coursework, but would require significant site reconfiguration, including relocation of athletic fields and facilities, and would result in higher overall costs.

Through small-group discussions, members identified the pros and cons of each site option. Benefits of the current middle school site included lower cost, use of existing facilities, such as the annex gym, less disruption to other district sites, and the maintenance of a separate middle school environment. Challenges included proximity to the highway, potential construction disruption, and fewer shared program opportunities. Benefits of the high school site included opportunities for shared staff and programs, increased student access to electives and CTE, and potential operational efficiencies. Challenges included higher costs, significant impacts to athletic fields and existing facilities, traffic and site constraints, and concerns about maintaining a distinct middle school identity.

The committee also participated in a “Two Perspectives” exercise to consider potential bond packages from different community viewpoints. “Alice” represented a voter more supportive of investment in schools, while “Bob” represented a more cost-conscious voter. Groups developed sample bond packages reflecting these perspectives. “Bob” scenarios generally focused on essential improvements such as roofs, safety, and HVAC systems, use of a lower-cost middle school option at the current site, shorter bond terms, and total costs well below the previous bond proposal, often in the range of approximately \$70–100 million or phased over multiple bonds. “Alice” scenarios included broader investments in facilities, including additional upgrades across schools and, in some cases, a larger middle school option, while still considering affordability and often targeting totals below or near the previous bond amount. Across both perspectives, common themes included prioritizing the middle school project, addressing critical maintenance needs, maintaining fiscal responsibility, and recognizing the importance of clear communication and community trust in developing a successful bond proposal.

The committee emphasized the importance of aligning future recommendations with community priorities, clearly communicating project scope and tax impacts, and continuing to refine options to develop bond packages that balance need, cost, and voter support.

Kyle explained that feedback has been influenced by participants’ prior experiences, and particularly the previous bond measure, which shaped assumptions about acceptable cost levels. He emphasized the need to revisit and test those assumptions by developing clearer, more defined bond package options.

Between meetings, the team will use the group’s input to create several potential package scenarios and obtain estimated bond rates with support from Piper Sandler. These options will then be included in a poll to gauge current support. Results from that polling will be presented at the next meeting to help inform future decisions.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Announcements:

Future meeting schedule

- **CBAC #8:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026
- **CBAC #9:** Tuesday, July 21, 2026