



## Board Work Session

### **BEX V Planning**

September 26, 2017, 4:30 pm

Conference Room 2750, John Stanford Center

2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

### Minutes

#### Call to Order

1. Director Rick Burke called the meeting to order at 4:32 pm. Directors Jill Geary, Sue Peters, Scott Pinkham and Lesley Harris were present. Director Betty Patu arrived at 5:32 pm. Associate Superintendent Flip Herndon, Assistant Superintendent JoLynn Berge, Capital Projects & Planning Director Richard Best, Enrollment Planning Director Ashley Davies, K12 Planning Coordinator Becky Asencio, Chief Information Officer John Krull, Associate Superintendent Michael Tolley and Superintendent Larry Nyland staffed the meeting.

#### BEX/BTA Levy History Flip Herndon

1. The meeting began with those in attendance introducing themselves.
2. Dr. Herndon provided a brief overview of the BEX and BTA levies.
  - a. Dr. Herndon stated that Seattle has a long history with fits and starts, but beginning in 1995 there has been a good history and excellent community support. Originally, BEX addressed new and large buildings; BTA addressed systems. The levies alternate from BEX to BTA. Costs have increased over the years, especially in 2013 and 2016, because of increased construction costs in Seattle. BTA continually addresses the backlog of maintenance and repair to avoid creating a need to replace the whole building.
  - b. Timeline – The BEX V Capital Levy is scheduled to go before Seattle voters in February 2019. This had been considered the best time to go on the ballot because it is not buried in the November primary ballot. In response to Director Harris' question about the wisdom of choosing February when the city has many levies, Dr. Herndon stated that it has been a topic of conversation and it is an important thing to keep in mind. If the district story is presented well, the community understands and will continue to support Seattle Public Schools. Most school districts do avoid the November ballot because of the general election and multiple levies. In response to the consideration of moving the levy to an August ballot, the following comments are summarized:
    - i. If the district chose an August ballot, process would be truncated and create a challenge to get public feedback in the summer.
    - ii. The Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Levy is coupled with the BTA Levy and an August levy would affect it.
    - iii. A failure to pass would not provide an adequate amount of time to bring to the voters again. The next election is in November.

- iv. Currently a programmatic environment impact statement consultant is being hired to do an assessment, a process which requires a year. This has been based on a January/February timeline.
- c. Board Questions & Discussion:
  - i. In response to Director Peters concern over the competing budgets between the city and the district, Stephen Nielsen stated there is dialogue taking place with the city; staff to staff, there have been having preliminary discussions. The city has affirmed that they want to be supportive of the district. The city asks and the districts asks are different, and these differences will be communicated to the voters.
  - ii. It was also noted that any change in the Washington State policy can disrupt the levy process

### **BEX V Capital Levy Process/Preparations**

1. Overview/Considerations - Richard Best
  - a. Richard Best read Policy 6901, Capital Levy Planning, stating that this policy has been used as the standards for BEX V planning.
2. Facilities Condition Assessment - Richard Best
  - a. Richard Best reported on the Facilities condition assessment used for setting priorities of needs and the life cycle method used in addressing maintenance needs. The criteria used for ranking every school and support facility was explained.
  - b. Mr. Best stated that the Meng report reviews the educational adequacy for the assessment while Bassetti does it for building and the impact on modernization or the rebuild. Gretchen DeDecker evaluates the playgrounds.
  - c. Director Geary expressed concern that she did not see anything for the Eckstein and Roosevelt area. Dr. Herndon stated that in regard to middle schools, there are a number that are in worse condition than Eckstein and that this assessment was on condition and not capacity.
  - d. Director Burke was answered affirmatively when he asked if there would be a new facilities master plan in 2018.
3. Enrollment Projections - Ashley Davies
  - a. Ashley Davies reviewed the enrollment projection slides, demonstrating the growth, which has happened every year, at not quite 1000 students per year; this year the growth was 250 students. Enrollment planning performs continual analysis, updating projections every summer.
  - b. Ms. Davies stated that Seattle Public Schools' growth has not been mirrored in the school numbers. Enrollment Planning has been building a partnership with the city; having numerous discussions with them to bring greater perspective and data to the table. Dr. Nyland stated it is difficult to ascertain the number of students that are housed in apartments.
  - c. Director Burke stated it is important that the district communicate to the public and that they know there is a partnership with city. There needs to be transparency to build trust. His preference is that we support the implementation of impact fees on land developments.
4. Capacity Analysis - Becky Asencio
  - a. Ms. Asencio reviewed the capacity analysis slides.

- b. Director Burke observed that capacity is able to be addressed by changing boundaries or by increasing building capacity.
- c. The K-5 capacity has improved because of the new schools, which have opened.
- d. Mr. Best, in reference to the boundaries for Magnolia and Queen Anne, noted that the school board will make the decision whether the projected boundary will cross 15<sup>th</sup>. If the decision is to not cross 15<sup>th</sup> then there will be surplus capacity in Magnolia and Queen Anne will be over-full.
- e. Mr. Best explained that Enrollment Planning takes the ten-year forecast and five-year projections and overlays it with the boundaries to see if we can change boundaries to solve problem. This has to be done for every service area.
- f. Dr. Herndon added that conversations about program placement occur. All of the pieces play a part.

5. Master Planning – Loren McConachie, Amanda Clausen

- a. Loren McConachie and Amanda Clausen, Bassetti Architects consultants, presented the BEX V Master Plan.
- b. Director Harris asked if it was possible to construct a new building on site without moving population across town. Ms. Klausen responded that the Mercer site was too tight and therefore keeping the students on site is not feasible.
- c. Mr. McConachie stated that in each site, the projects are analyzed and it is determined if the students are able to stay on site. Staff met with the custodian and the principal for their input. Community outreach will occur in the next steps.
- d. Mr. Best remarked that in the BTA IV process, in looking at conditions, if a facility was very high on the report, the needs might not be addressed if the facility was slated for substantial renovations in BEX V.
- e. The community engagement tool will be used in the capacity phase of BEX V planning. Dr. Herndon clarified that today's presentation is dealing with the assessment phase.
- f. The master plan is a superficial dive, according to Mr. McConachie. It changes with community input where it is very possible to receive information that changes the approach.
- g. As an example, Mr. Best stated that the soil conditions of Alki Elementary's site, a liquefaction zone, precludes building on another part of that site. Thus, that option will not be included as one of the master plan options for the public to consider. The master plan is used for gathering important data.
- h. Dr. Harris asked about the status of Memorial Stadium plans. Dr. Herndon stated that there will be a meeting this Friday to get some preliminary cost information to see if a high school there is even viable.
- i. The list of projects under consideration for BEX V came from the Facilities Condition Assessment document developed in 2014 and posted since 2015; there are also capacity projects under consideration. Staff develops a menu of choices from which the school board chooses. The budget the board determines will affect how many projects there will be. The projects shown in today's presentation is a preliminary list, which will follow with a financial analysis.

6. Technology – John Krull

- a. John Krull provided a brief overview of the technology needs. He stated that there are three categories addressed:
  - i. School, technology, Operations and support
  - ii. Academic and Business Operations
  - iii. Technology Infrastructure

- b. Technology is asking \$250,000.
- c. Technology is in the very preliminary planning phase and more details will be presented later. Seventy percent of their budget comes out of BTA for staffing.
- d. Director Peters expressed a concern that technology is like a gerbil wheel where the district never really catches up to current technology. She asked that the amount spent be on student assessment be provided.
- e. Dr. Harris expressed uneasiness over the quality of the district's on-line learning, stating that she hoped it will be better than our current school texts.

7. Academics – Michael Tolley

- a. Michael Tolley provided a brief overview of the academic aspects to be addressed in BEX V:
  - i. Athletic fields and exterior lights
  - ii. Student assessment system licenses
  - iii. Special Education program modifications
  - iv. Core 24 graduation requirements
  - v. Program placement
- b. The board voiced an interest in:
  - i. Project costs
  - ii. Interim siting plans
  - iii. Community engagement plans

**Adjourn**

This meeting adjourned at 6:40 pm.