



Facilities Planning Task Force

May 4, 2017
3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Welcome

Co-Chair and Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Steve Clarke welcomed everyone. Today's meeting will include some additional information for task force members, followed by small group work to begin processing all of the information received thus far. Co-Chair and Executive Administrator on Special Assignment Rob McElroy noted that at last week's meeting there was information presented that demonstrated the connection between the last facilities planning task force and this one. At that meeting, task force member and consultant Doug Nichols also talked about the prior work that had been done to assess the physical condition of the schools.

Review/Approve April 27, 2017 Minutes

Rob asked that a few minutes be spent reviewing last week's meeting minutes. A motion was made by Parkview Elementary Principal Mylo Allen to approve the minutes as written. Task force member Patrick Brown seconded that motion and there was a unanimous vote to approve.

Respond to Inquiry Questions/Issues Raised by Task Force Members

Rob directed everyone to the inquiry question that is contained at the end of the April 27 meeting minutes. A task force member asked how long it would take to build a school from scratch (i.e. a 15th elementary school on the north side) versus rebuilding an existing school on site. Executive Director of Capital Projects and School Facilities Ron Cowan answered that the time frame is about the same, 24-30 months. Ron distributed an example of a past functional adequacy assessment so the task force members could see what is taken into consideration when determining "functional adequacy".

Prototype – New Elementary School

Rob shared the model of a prototype elementary school we consider when building a new elementary school. This is sometimes called a 3-section school as the model would have 3 classes of each grade level. In addition to those 18 classrooms, other classroom spaces would be constructed for music, world language, special education resource, preschool and special programs. Elementary schools would also have a library, main office, gym, cafeteria, stage, other office and collaboration spaces, play structure, field and covered play area, parking, drop-off/pick-up areas. A question was raised about if this prototype model has been vetted with everyone. Ron answered that this model came from the 2006 bond, and Steve added that each time a new school is constructed there is refinement of the model. Executive Director of Communications and Community Relations Tanya Rowe noted that there is a deep level of discussion with elementary principals as we talk about programming and how it varies from

school to school and how to fit in programs (i.e. preschool, Promise K). Rob shared some challenges and limitations with 1-2 section schools. While not everyone would agree, most elementary school leadership has endorsed this prototype model as both efficient and a good school size for delivery of a comprehensive elementary education for our kids.

Rob shared that each school community goes through an “education specifications” process to customize each school design and structure during the planning process. This prototype model is a starting point. School sites also influence the size of schools we can build.

Analysis of the 6 Identified Elementary Schools

Steve referenced the presentation that Doug Nichols is about to share. He noted that some of the presentation slides show City of Bellingham parks properties, and there is a potential for some partnering with the City on how the park space could be used.

Doug Nichols began his presentation and noted that he used the Wade King footprint as a prototype as a test fit. He showed slides for each of the 6 elementary schools that determine whether a new 3 section school can be built on site while students are attending in the existing school. Ron noted that building adjacent to the current school is beneficial in many ways for students and their learning (interacting with contractors, watching construction, etc.). These are conceptual drawings only. A committee member asked what the allowance is for parking. Ron answered that there is a code, but acknowledged that most schools never seem to have enough parking. This is another example of something that would be discussed with the school community during the planning phase. Another question was asked regarding whether we would need to have an agreement in place with the city regarding park land prior to adding the school to the next bond? Steve answered that, if the city property is needed in order to keep students in the existing school, it may be determined that the 15th elementary would be needed as a swing space. There was discussion about advantages and disadvantages of students remaining in the existing building while the new building is built. Rob added that it appears at the current time there are 2 or 3 schools that could be built while students are attending without City property.

Prioritize Identified Schools for 2018 Bond Measure Using Consideration Factors/Criteria

Rob asked that groups of 4-5 use the below criteria to do some initial brainstorming in order to rank the 6 schools (as well as the 15th elementary) to determine which schools should be prioritized when thinking about the next bond measure:

- Condition/Functionality
- Capacity/Enrollment
- Location Relative to Growth
- Build on Site with Kids or Not
- Other

The small groups then shared their draft rankings, along with the reasons used to determine those rankings. Some observations were then made after those presentations. The same small groups pulled together for a few more minutes to discuss whether any changes should be made based on the explanations of the other groups, and also what additional information would be helpful to know prior to making a decision. The groups each then made a quick summary, and there were

some changes in the draft rankings. Information that would be helpful to the groups/individuals when processing further would be:

- More information on the City of Bellingham's parks.
- Estimated dollar amounts for the projects.
- How many schools would be recommended to be included on the bond?
- More information on boundaries with the city.
- Can special programs be moved to accommodate for growth that has occurred?
- When would school #15 be open if it were given priority to be built first?
- What is the cost for building adjacent to a school while in operation as opposed to relocating students during construction?

School Walk-Throughs

Rob had offered a 4-hour field trip for task force members in order to tour the 6 elementary schools on Saturday, May 6. Only 4 task force members indicated that they were available, so Rob will work with principals to find some days/times when the school would be accessible for the task force members.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

*Next Meeting: May 11, 2017 3:00-5:00
Central Services Office*