

Minutes

PROJECT

LOSD 2025 Bond Development Committee Meeting

MEETING SUBJECT

Meeting #3

DATE

2024-12-03

LOCATION

Forest Hills Elementary School Library

TIME

4:30-6:00 pm

ATTENDEES (Present in Bold)

Guy Benn

Brian Bills

Andrew Burt

Courtney Clements

Charlie Crandall

Ryan Durrett

Daniel Gareau

Debbie Hansen

Michael Harrison

Jennifer Hertert

Stuart Ketzler

Jennie Knapp

Mary Kay Larson

Sarah Lavoie

Beatrice Madden

Midorie Padin

Erin Quandt

Ally Reif

Jennifer Schiele

Jennifer Self

John Sperry

Rebecca Stuecker

Chandra Vallely

Tony Vandenberg

Patrick Walsh

Jon Wollmuth

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees

This is a record of the December 3rd Bond Development Committee Meeting.

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Cost Estimates, Project List Updates, and Supporting Scope Information
- Small Group Workshop: Bond Package Brainstorming
- Share Findings
- Next Steps

Cost Estimate Background Information

Rebecca presented the background information regarding cost estimates in response to questions that have been asked since the last meeting (see attached)

Project List Updates

Rebecca walked through the changes made to the Project Lists based on the previous meeting's conversations and direction:

- Palisades and Uplands infrastructure costs have been taken out of the "Invest in Resilient Schools" estimates. The costs for those upgrades are already included in the renovation costs for Palisades and Uplands, and because the previous meeting's conversation indicated they are likely to be included in a bond package, their infrastructure costs can be removed from the "Invest in Resilient Schools" Category. (Forest Hills, Lake Grove, and District administrative buildings have already been removed from this category).
- Various projects in the "Invest in Resilient Schools" category have moved to the "Wellness and Recreation" category.
- There are two pricing options for Lake Grove and Forest Hills, with and without commons.
- The renovation scope at Uplands has been reduced.

Discussion that followed:

- Since escalation is included in the soft costs and Lake Grove is the larger and more expensive school, would it reduce the cost for Lake Grove to be constructed first?
 - The difference would be negligible. The Lake Grove site is more complex and will take more time to design. It has two other functions occurring on the property: the transportation facility and the maintenance facility. Both of those parcels will need to be assessed (possibly remediated) and those functions (staff offices and district vehicle and curriculum storage) need to move prior to the school being built.
 - The design for Lake Grove can occur earlier while those assessments are taking place.
- What is the value of the commons and why is it in the District's Elementary Ed. Spec.? We need to know that before making a decision about how the next two elementary schools should be designed.
 - The commons would be the place for student dining which gives teachers greater flexibility and use of their classroom during that time. This has been identified in the Educational Adequacy interviews with staff at all of the other elementary schools that this is a need.
 - At River Grove the commons is used for staff development and training after school hours, as well as district-wide events and meetings.
 - The commons would be the place for the aftercare program at that school, freeing up the gym for other programs. The commons at River Grove is used by the aftercare program and was designed to include a small storage area for their supplies.
 - The commons is also the place for school performances and is connected to the stage. The other elementary schools either don't have a stage or have one connected to the gym.
- What is the difference between half and full-gym options?
 - Any new elementary school would be designed with a full gym the same size as River Grove's (with the motorized bleachers). This is large enough to fit a full court and is fine for middle/high practices but does not have the spectator seating and run-off distances associated with a high school or middle school competition gym.
 - The options for the commons design include the potential for the commons to double as an *additional* half or full-court gym space. There is a high demand for gym space in the district. The commons at River Grove would be equivalent to the "half-court" size, although it is not designed for basketball. A half-court design would not be used for basketball practice by older grades but could be useful for a group like Little Hoopers.

Supporting Scope Information

Based on feedback from the previous meeting, supporting documents were provided to the committee that give greater detail to the project costs:

- The full list of projects in the “Invest in Resilient Schools” category and their construction costs (do not include soft costs and escalation) were provided to the committee (see attached).
- The full list of projects in the “Promote Wellness & Recreation” category and their construction costs (do not include soft costs and escalation) were provided to the committee (see attached).

Discussion that followed:

- If projects like tennis court repair were moved from the “Infrastructure” list to the “Wellness & Recreation” list does that mean it’s not a high priority to the District?
 - The priority level is based on the life expectancy of the system, not the importance of the program. For some of these projects, the district may find a less costly solution to keep these spaces functioning and keep the program running.
- How else are athletics projects funded?
 - We’ve used construction excise taxes that the District receives for turf field replacements in the past. That funding source has been exhausted.
- Can we have priority levels for the Wellness/Recreation projects? What is the expected life of these spaces? What is the most critical?
 - Yes, we can bring that to the next meeting.
- Clarification: The Construction Costs included in the backup project lists DO NOT include soft costs and escalation. Those multipliers have been added to the Bond Project List page and are specific to the anticipated soft cost and construction completion time of each project; there is not a single percentage that was used across the board.

Small Group Workshop

The committee was divided into four small groups and asked to use the documents at hand to start developing a bond package option totaling \$225M. The following is a summary of each group’s initial findings:

Table Group 1

Include in Bond Package:

- Category 1: Invest in Resilient Schools
- Category 2: Rebuild the oldest Elementary Schools (with a Commons at both rebuilt schools)
- Category 3: Modernize Classrooms to Foster Student Excellence & Success
- Category 4: Empower Learnings
- Category 5: Centralize Student & Teacher Supports
- Category 6: Support Immersion Programs

Total: \$215M

Spend the remaining \$10M with projects that are the highest impact and need in the Wellness & Rec lists. What projects will make the greatest impact, which are nearing end of life. Ex: walking paths at elementary schools are a relatively small cost but will impact many so should be considered in the bond.

Table Group 2

Include in Bond Package:

- Category 1: Invest in Resilient Schools

2025 Bond Development
Lake Oswego School District

- Category 2: Rebuild the oldest Elementary Schools (with a Commons only at Lake Grove)
- Category 3: Modernize Classrooms to Foster Student Excellence & Success
- Category 4: Empower Learnings
- Category 5: Centralize Student & Teacher Supports
- Category 6: Support Immersion Programs
- Category 8: Promote Wellness & Recreation (High School projects only)

Total: \$224.4M

Table Group 3

- Category 1: Invest in Resilient Schools
- Category 2: Rebuild the oldest Elementary Schools (with a Commons only at Lake Grove)
- Category 4: Empower Learnings
- Category 5: Centralize Student & Teacher Supports
- Category 6: Support Immersion Programs

Question about Category 3: What are those spaces? What is the data that connects student success to the need for “adaptable and flexible” STEM spaces? Our group would like more information about the intent of Category 3 before making a recommendation to include it in a bond package.

Table Group 4

- Category 1: Invest in Resilient Schools
- Category 2: Rebuild the oldest Elementary Schools (with a Commons at both rebuilt schools)
- Category 3: Modernize Classrooms to Foster Student Excellence & Success
- Category 4: Empower Learnings
- Category 5: Centralize Student & Teacher Supports
- Category 6: Support Immersion Programs

Total: \$215.5M

We need more information about where to spend the last 9M best. Where are we going to get votes? How do we make the most impact? HS Sports could be the way to do that.

General Discussion:

- For the next meeting, we’d like to have more specific information about what is included in the “Modernize Classrooms” category. How much of that is being spent to renovate the existing LHS building?
- We need to make sure we’re speaking for all schools and all voters. It’s important we impact every school, that all ships rise.
- Please provide materials at least 72 hours for us to review prior to the next meeting.

Committee members received testimony from the following people:
Eric Paulson, President of Pacer Baseball Inc.

Next Meeting:

Meeting #4 December 17th at River Grove Elementary School

2025 Bond Development
Lake Oswego School District

The January 7th meeting is canceled, polling will take place during that time, with results presented to the committee at the January 21st meeting.

Minutes Written By:
Rebecca Stuecker
Principal, Arcadis Architects Inc.

Attachments: Presentation Slides

Meeting Handouts:

Bond Project Lists: Promote Wellness & Recreation,

Bond Project Lists: Invest in Health, Safety, and Infrastructure

Bond Projects for Consideration