

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

INTRODUCTION

The Long Range Facilities & Capital Bond Committee (LRF) was formed to look at all existing facilities in the Port Angeles School District and provide the superintendent with a long range facilities recommendation designed to meet the needs of the students for the next 10 to 30 years or more. The committee was made up of 23 members who represented the community, teachers, community arts, school administrators, parents, students, City of P.A., Clallam County, Peninsula College, architects and engineers and a school board member. The committee was approved February 12, 2007. A list of the committee members has been attached (Attachment A).

The Port Angeles School District requested detailed proposals and statements of qualifications for architectural/engineering services and long range planning consulting services to assist in the development of two reports, a facilities condition report and long range facilities plan, and a demographic study and long range enrollment report. Copies of both RFP's are attached (attachments B and C).

The LRF Committee assigned a sub committee to hear consultant presentations on the request for proposals and bring a recommendation back to the full committee. The firm of BLRB Architects was selected to assist with the facilities condition report and long range facilities plan. John Fotheringham and Keith Bigelow were selected for the demographics study and long range enrollment projection.

The consulting team conducted an evaluation of the District's existing facilities, using OSPI's building condition evaluation forms, which establishes a numerical score for each facility. The score reflects building and site facilities in terms of their construction components. The functionality and ability to meet educational program needs at each facility was determined through meetings with District staff and analyzing the areas in the context of the educational goals of the District. The team has also identified remedial action to existing facilities to evaluate costs of renovation, modernization or replacement. All of this combined data provided the basis on which to determine District facility needs and estimate construction costs.

The Demographic and Enrollment Projection report showed the Port Angeles School District is affected, not only by the social and economic forces in the surrounding community, but also by the county, state and national conditions. Based upon review and compilation of available population data, the team developed a demographic cross-section and population profile of the community. Analysis was then made of the District's enrollment history since 2003, developing the data necessary to calculate projected enrollments through 2014. Collected data suggests there will be a continued slight decrease in student enrollment over the next five to six years, across all educational levels.

A cost analysis was completed on the proposals in order to prioritize the scenarios recommended to the board. An RFQ for a underwriting and investment banking service

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

was issued. A sub committee interviewed the respondents and recommended D.A. Davidson & Co. to be the District's finance council.

A facilities master plan has been developed for the superintendent and the school board. It recommends three scenarios' that have been prioritized by the committee.

COMMITTEE PURPOSE

The committee looked at existing facilities to provide the superintendent and the school board with a long range facilities recommendation designed to meet the needs of students for the next 10 to 30 years or more. The committee will recommend what excess property is to be sold as surplus and what is to be kept.

FACILITY GOALS

With input from the LRF committee and the community, a set of facility goals or attributes were developed. The list consisted of 31 items. They include the following in an un-prioritized order:

- A) Timeless Character
- B) Secure Environment
- C) Acoustical Quality
- D) Supports Collaboration
- E) Secure Site
- F) Inter-Communication System
- G) Equity Between Facilities
- H) Planned for Growth
- I) Technology
- J) Project/Hands on Experience Capability
- K) Indoor Air Quality
- L) Quality Electric Lighting
- M) Green (sustainable) in Practice and Education
- N) Welcoming Exterior
- O) Connection to Exterior Environment
- P) Technology Throughout
- Q) Integrate Arts and Culture into Environment
- R) Efficient Environmental Systems
- S) Design for Facility Changes
- T) Data and Voice Communication System Quality
- U) Site Handicap Accessibility
- V) Tutorial Space
- W) Itinerant Staff Support Spaces and Offices
- X) Prepared for Extended School Year
- Y) Both Cafeteria Space and Gym Space Provided
- Z) Classroom Layout Flexibility
- AA) Emergency Preparedness
- BB) Zone for Community Use
- CC) Supports Special Needs

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

- DD) Supports Young Child Needs
- EE) Convenient Toilet Facilities

STUDY AND SURVEY OF ALL DISTRICT BUILDINGS

In August, 2007, the architectural team began to conduct physical assessments of each school and support facility site. The field investigations were performed by the architects and their engineering team including structural, civil, hazardous materials consultants, mechanical, and electrical engineers (“A/E team”). In addition to the OSPI requirements for facility assessment, the design team also evaluated site conditions for each building including site access and driveways, parking areas, play fields, play equipment, and landscaping. The intent of these assessments were two-fold: 1) to provide the necessary condition evaluation of the existing facilities to comply with the OSPI Study and Survey requirements, and 2) to provide a more diverse, comprehensive needs assessment for each campus and each of the buildings.

The Architect/Engineering team also welcomed the inclusion of the District maintenance and grounds staff in the building evaluation process. The District’s staff provided the design team with building improvement lists for each building and was present with the design team at each building inspection walk-through. The District’s staff was instrumental in providing insight into the existing condition of the buildings and the necessary long-term care and repair of the building systems.

Major concerns district-wide included fire detection and protection, handicap access, plumbing systems, heating and ventilations systems, electrical, roofing, window and door thermal performance, flooring, ceilings, parking and paving, emergency vehicle access, separate car and bus arrival and site security. Attached is the study and survey with building evaluation scores (attachment D), as well as, a facility deficiency list (attachment E) for all district buildings.

EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY

Following the building condition evaluations, the architects met with staff from each of the schools to discuss and document the “educational adequacy” needs for each of the buildings. Staff was asked to voluntarily participate and provide comments and input regarding student learning environments and their work environment. Additional comments were also gathered from staff that either could not attend or elected to provide follow-up comments after the meetings.

The architects met with each building principal to talk in depth about their respective building and campus needs and to review the staff facility recommendation. Attached is the space allocation summary that identifies spaces that should be considered for future or modernized facilities (attachment F).

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY

Clallam County population grew significantly in the 1970's at nearly a 5% annual rate. Since then growth has been substantially slower than the state as a whole. The proportion of the population 65 years of age and over has grown steadily over the past 25 years and now comprises nearly one quarter of the total. Conversely, the proportion of the population between 5 and 19 years (school age) has declined steadily. This segment of the population totaled 11,701 in 1980 and is estimated to be only 12,247 now, 27 years later. The population of school age residents in Clallam County has declined by about 260 students since 2000. Births in Clallam County declined steadily from a high in 1980 of 894 to the late 1990's when they began to level out at about 600 births per year. Birthrates have also declined drastically since 1980, dropping from 17.3 per thousand residents in 1980 to 9.1 per thousand in 2002 and 2004. This is a result of the higher population of residents beyond the childbearing years and smaller family sizes.. Deaths in the county now exceed births by about 200 per year. In 1980, there were 894 births and 491 deaths in Clallam County; in 2005, there were 617 births and 826 deaths. Washington State Office of Financial Management estimates that in 2007 there will be 207 more deaths in Clallam County than births, the largest discrepancy in any county in the state. The growth in Clallam County population is primarily due to the migration of new residents to the area.

Since the 1970s, growth in the city of Port Angeles has been slow, generally at a rate of less than one half of one percent per year. Clallam County estimates the annual growth rate for the city will be .34% through 2025, whereas the City of Port Angeles is using a somewhat higher growth rate of .9% per year over the next twenty years. The Port Angeles UGA, however, is forecast to increase in population by 1.0 to 1.5% per year.

Currently growth within the city limits is restricted for several reasons. First, there are only a few large (five acres or more) parcels of land within the city and urban growth area that could be developed. At the same time, the city cannot expand eastward, where growth is likely to occur, as the city and county have an agreement in place that assures the city will not annex any of the eastern part of the Port Angeles UGA for eight years. The purpose of this agreement is to allow the county time to recoup its investment for sewers extended to that area. Lastly, current building standards within the city do not allow construction of buildings over thirty feet in height in many zones. This restricts new multi-family housing to three stories, at most, and thereby limits the number of units that can be constructed on any one site within the city. Until the eight-year agreement concludes or the height restrictions are revised, growth in the city proper is limited. The existing infrastructure, i.e. sewers and water, are not a restriction to future development. There is more than adequate water supply to service the entire UGA, and the infrastructure is in place to deliver the water. Primary sewer lines have been installed in the western section of the UGA, and as noted above, sewers are currently being extended to the eastern section. There is considerable potential for housing development, outside the City, but within the Port Angeles UGA. With extensions of sewers to the eastern part of the UGA, higher density zoning is anticipated. This will allow and encourage the

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

creation of new lots and will, over time, result in added population in the Port Angeles area. The portion of the Port Angeles UGA outside the city on the eastern side and to a lesser extent, the western side, is only lightly developed and has potential for substantial growth. The full demographic report has been attached (attachment G).

COMMUNITY FORUM

A community forum was held at the Port Angeles Senior Center, in the winter of 2008, to discuss the facilities assessment, the educational adequacy of the buildings and the school enrollment projections. A presentation was given by BLRB Architects, followed by a question and answer period. The meeting was well attended by the community. School construction procedures that had minimal impact on learning during construction was one item of discussion.

CONCEPT DESIGN WORKSHOPS

Design workshops were held at PAHS, Stevens, Franklin and Hamilton. The committee and building's staff were asked to participate in a site review and building design exercise. All the building components that make up a school were cut to scale and placed on the respective properties. Concepts were created for modernization of existing buildings, as well as, new construction.

The concepts showed that a more compact new high school could be built on the existing site to the east of the present school. This would require phase demolition and construction. The buildings would have a common spline that would run north-south. There is room at both Hamilton and Franklin to build a school on their current playgrounds. Stevens does have a buildable site but the contours of the land add challenges to locate a middle school size facility on this property.

Concepts were developed for every facility in the district including Monroe and Fairview. Stevens and Roosevelt were both studied as sites for a middle school or an elementary school. A concept that added another section to Jefferson was developed as well as adding several classrooms to Dry Creek. Attached are the concept site plans for all facilities (attachment H).

COST MODELING OF CONCEPT DESIGNS

BLRB Architects had the cost modeling done by the Robinson Company. Models were developed for the modernizations and/or new construction for all the district facilities. Included in these costs were structural modifications, asbestos abatement, building demolition, sitework, portable relocation and new construction. The costs were developed based on current construction pricing (**2008 dollars**). Associated project costs were added

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

(A&E fees, permits, required utility upgrades, etc.) to develop a total cost for each project.

FACILITY CAPACITY SCENARIO MATRIX

The demographic study and the district's enrollment projections indicated the committee should design the facilities around a K-12 student population of 4,100. Of that, 2,050 students in grades K-6, 700 students in grades 7-8 and 1,350 students in grades 9-12. Scenarios were developed that would house the district's students. Fifteen scenarios using district facilities accomplished this goal.

Scenarios that located the Port Angeles High School and a middle school on the same site were considered. It was determined that there is not enough acreage at any facility to support the facilities as well as the practice fields needed for the sports programs. Moving the HS to the Stevens site was also looked at. The buildable site is not big enough to accommodate all the needs of a High School.

Within each scenario was a cost for both modernization and new construction of the school facilities, a total student capacity and a maximum project construction cost. All projected costs are in **2008** dollars. A list of the scenarios is located in the appendix.

FACILITY CONCEPT COMPARISONS

To help facilitate a reduction in the number of scenarios, an 80-point concept comparison was developed to rate all district facilities. They were scored by the building principals and a sub group of the facilities committee. The comparison included:

- Education Program Support
- Potential Longevity
- Construction Costs
- Operational Cost /Efficiency
- Expandability
- School Population Proximity
- Disruption of Education During Construction
- Affect on Neighbors
- Safety and Security Issues

The building concepts scored as follows:

Elementary Schools

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| • Dry Creek Addition | 68 points | \$284 per square foot |
| • Franklin Modernization | 43 points | \$251 per square foot |
| • Franklin Replacement | 59 points | \$303 per square foot |
| • Hamilton Modernization | 47 points | \$237 per square foot |
| • Hamilton Replacement | 69 points | \$292 per square foot |

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

• Jefferson Addition	61 points	\$315 per square foot
• Roosevelt Elem Mod	54 points	\$230 per square foot
based on 74,439 square feet that currently exists. \$303 per square foot based on an average size 3-section elementary		
• Monroe Replacement	72 points	\$292 per square foot
• Fairview Modernization	60 points	\$281 per square foot
• Fairview Replacement	69 points	\$302 per square foot
• Elementary at Stevens site	69 points	\$295 per square foot

Middle Schools

• Stevens Modernization	37 points	\$286 per square foot
• Stevens Replacement	60 points	\$302 per square foot
• Roosevelt Modernization	67 points	\$266 per square foot
• New Middle School at PAHS Site	58 points	\$232 per square foot

High Schools

• New PAHS, Mod Auditorium	64 points	\$287 per square foot
• New PAHS, Mod Auditorium & Gym	58 points	\$295 per square foot
• Lincoln HS Modernization	53 points	\$281 per square foot

It must be noted that modernizations rarely touch construction below the concrete slabs. Sewer and water lines, electrical conduits, low voltage and pneumatic lines that are under the slab often are not touched. There were concerns that modernization would not go far enough on many of the District's aged buildings. The breakdown for the scoring has been attached (attachment I).

Revised District Scenarios

After much discussion, the committee revised and reduced the number of scenarios to three. The committee ranked the new scenarios one through three, and listed the advantages, disadvantages and surplus property of each proposal. A more detailed cost analysis was completed on these three scenarios. All costs are in 2008 dollars.

Scenario 1) Capacity 4,100 Maximum Cost \$192.56 M

- Elementary Schools
 - Add two classrooms to Dry Creek
 - Add one section to Jefferson
 - New elementary at the Stevens site
 - New elementary at the Monroe site
- Middle School
 - Modernize Roosevelt

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

- High Schools
Modernize/Replace PAHS
No changes to Lincoln HS

Advantages

- Well distributed elementary schools for east-west populations.
- Synergy between Roosevelt Middle school and Monroe elementary.
- Maintain only six sites- keep the Fairview property.
- Sell two large properties and three small properties.
- Special Education classes would remain on the same campus.
- Quality athletic field on the east side of the district.
- Excess land at Fairview and Stevens for future expansion.
- Least expensive of the three proposals.
- Two new elementary schools.
- Stevens' site accommodates an elementary school better than a middle school.

Disadvantages

- Need to move middle school again.
- Possible traffic issues at Roosevelt/Monroe campus.

Surplus Property

- Franklin
- Hamilton
- Mt Pleasant
- Donahue
- Portions of Stevens

Scenario 2) Capacity 4,100 Maximum Cost \$194.61 M

- Elementary Schools
Add two classrooms to Dry Creek
Add one section to Jefferson
New elementary at the Stevens site
New elementary at the Fairview site
- Middle School
Modernize Roosevelt
- High Schools
Modernize/Replace PAHS
No changes to Lincoln HS

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

Advantages

- Sell two large properties and three small properties.
- Quality athletic field on the east side of the district at Roosevelt Middle school.
- Excess land at Roosevelt and Stevens for future expansion.
- Two new elementary schools.
- Stevens' site accommodates an elementary school better than a middle school.

Disadvantages

- Need to move middle school again.
- Need to move special education programs again.
- Students will be bussed from core of PA to Fairview.
- Maintain seven active sites.
- Emergency Services would have further to travel to get to Fairview, where special education programs would be located.

Surplus Property

- Franklin
- Hamilton
- Mt Pleasant
- Donahue
- Portions of Stevens

Scenario 3) Capacity 4,100 Maximum Cost \$197.95 M

- Elementary Schools
 - Add two classrooms to Dry Creek
 - Add one section to Jefferson
 - New elementary at the Hamilton site
 - Modernize Roosevelt as an elementary
- Middle School
 - Replace Stevens
- High Schools
 - Modernize/Replace PAHS
 - No changes to Lincoln HS

Advantages

- Well distributed elementary schools for east-west populations.
- Quality athletic field on the east side of the district at Roosevelt Elementary school.
- No need to move special education programs again.
- No need to move middle school again.

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

Disadvantages

- Sell only one large property and three small properties.
- Maintain seven active sites.
- Most expensive of the three proposals.
- Only one new elementary school.
- Roosevelt as an elementary would be inefficient due to the square foot per student ratio.
- While occupied, there would be construction at three sites- Stevens, Roosevelt and Hamilton.

Surplus Property

- Franklin
- Mt Pleasant
- Donahue
- Portions of Stevens

STATE MATCH

In the winter of 2008, OSPI estimated that the district would receive approximately \$33.5 M in state matching money. K-6 is estimated at \$8.7 M, 7-8 is estimated at 7.1 M and 9-12 is estimated at 17.7 M. One must keep in mind that this is an estimate and not a guarantee.

CAPITAL PROJECTS FINANCING

Bonds are the primary method used by Washington school districts to finance the local share of the capital projects. With a bond, the cash is generated up front, payments can be spread over time and the districts have some control over taxpayer impacts.

Total project costs were developed for each of the Priority One and Two projects as well as the itemized needs for the twelve years. The costs were developed based on current construction pricing and were escalated based on projections for construction pricing and the schedule for each project.

The District's finance counsel, D.A. Davidson and Company, was invited to the January 2009 FAC meeting to present the current status of the District's outstanding debt, debt capacity, election history, and financing options for future bond and levy measures. The committee wished to examine a "traditional approach" for capital improvement measures that involved the sale of bonds and a "non-traditional approach" involving the use of capital improvement levies in conjunction with, or without, future bond measures. The financial presentation was intended to assist the committee in determining a reasonable time frame for the facility improvements and to examine the resulting tax rates for completing the District's long-range plan utilizing either the "traditional" or "non-traditional" approach. A traditional capital improvement bond(s) were identified as the best option. A cash flow analysis was done with a single bond issue approach for

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

priorities 1 and 2. This was found to not meet bonding capacity requirements so a two bond approach was explored and fine tuned.

A two bond approach was chosen to keep the outstanding debt to 5% or less. Voter approved bonds can not exceed 5% of the county's assessed value. The committee recommends that a bond for the replacement of the Port Angeles High School on its current site as the first priority. This will probably necessitate the replacement of the Maintenance Facility or relocation to another School District site such as the closed Fairview Elementary School. Monroe Elementary School, also currently closed, should be demolished and a playfield constructed. Monroe and Roosevelt share the same site.

The priority for the second bond would be the modernization or replacement of the elementary and middle schools. This will provide Port Angeles School District with (4) 515 student elementary schools and (1) 700 student middle school.

With the passing of the first bond, work on design of the Port Angeles High School would begin immediately, as would demo of the old Monroe building. Design of the PAHS would take two years followed by a three year of construction. Construction of playfields at the Monroe site, estimated to take three months, would happen during the start of the construction of the PAHS.

With the passing of the second bond, design work would start for the additions to Jefferson and Dry Creek, as well as the new Monroe elementary. Construction on those three projects would start the following summer, with Jefferson and Dry Creek additions completed in one year and Monroe in two. The Roosevelt modernization design would start as construction of Monroe began. When the new Monroe elementary was finished, students could move from Roosevelt elementary to the new facility and the construction to modernize Roosevelt elementary to Roosevelt middle school would start. Design for the new elementary school at the Stevens site would begin after construction of the additions at Jefferson and Dry Creek were completed. Construction of the new school would begin two years later. When the modernization of Roosevelt is complete, the students would be moved from Stevens middle school to Roosevelt. The demolition of the old Stevens school would begin, and the completion of the elementary school would take one more year. With the completion of the new Stevens elementary school, Franklin and Hamilton schools could be closed and the property sold as surplus. A timeline is located in the appendix.

SUMMARY

In general, all school and District support facilities have been well maintained, however Hamilton Elementary School, Franklin Elementary School, Stevens Middle School and Port Angeles High School are reaching the end of their serviceable life. The delivery of educational services at these schools is compromised by building configuration, old infrastructure and changes in educational practices. The cost of major modernization that will not remedy significant issues is determined to be very close to the cost of replacement. Enrollment projections suggest that there is no longer a need for five

Long Range Facility & Capital Bond Committee Report

operating elementary schools. Consolidation to four is needed to minimize operational cost and provide effective educational delivery.

The sale of surplus property should be considered for schools that are no longer needed. However, the portion of the Port Angeles urban growth area outside the city on the eastern side is only lightly developed and has potential for substantial growth. The committee recommends that the Fairview property be held onto and not sold as surplus.

The committee recommends running two bonds approximately five years apart. The replacement of the Port Angeles High School on its current site and the demolition of the Monroe school are recommended for the first bond. New three-section elementary schools at the Monroe and Stevens sites, additions to Dry Creek and Jefferson to bring them to three-section schools, as well as modernization of Roosevelt Middle school, is recommended as the second bond.