Commitment, Excellence, Community

SCHOOL BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION
AGENDA
Monday, January 27, 2014 7:00 p.m.
Pleasant Hill Community Center

1.0 CALL TO ORDER
The meeting of the Pleasant Hill School Board was called to order by Chair Oldham at 7:00 pm in accordance with the public notice of the meeting. Other Board members in attendance were Vice Chair, Kevin Parrish; Wylda Cafferata; Barbara Orre; and Curt Offenbacher. Others in attendance were Tony Scuro, Superintendent; Caroline Passerotti, Business Manager; Devery Stoneberg, Elementary Principal; Randy Fisher, High School Principal; Thad Holub, High School Assistant Principal; and Conner Baker, Student Representative.

Barbara Orre read the District’s Mission Statement aloud.

2.0 INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE.
Bruce Patterson; Paul Smith; Steve Cafferata; Gary Shearer; Scott Rose, DLR Group; Matthew Bryson; Tom Christian; Michelle Allen; Rusty Rexius; Thad Starr; Josh and Jodi Vahala; Eliza Hammond; Mr. and Mrs. Compton; Scott Chambers; Alan Matthews; Elaine Weiss; Tom Weiss; Dana Parrish; John Vahala; Darlene Baker; Wayne Hazel; Amy Burbee; and members of the High School Student Council were in attendance.

The Student Council President, on behalf of Student Council, thanked the Board Members for their service and provided coffee and cupcakes made by the school’s Cupcake for a Cause Club. John Oldham thanked the audience for attendance and the Student Council.

3.0 ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA.
No additions or deletions to the agenda were made.

4.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of the December 16, 2013 Board Meeting (Exhibit 1314-40) were approved by consensus as distributed.
Minutes of the January 13, 2014 Board Meeting (Exhibit 1314-46) were approved by consensus as distributed.
5.0 WORK SESSION TOPIC

5.1 Educational Facilities Master Plan (Exhibit 1314-44).

Tony Scurto provided an overview of the work done to date:

- 2009-10 - The initial Facility Team assessed and analyzed buildings to create a Master Educational Facility Plan. Trent School had recently closed, and the future of that property was addressed.
- 2011-12 - The Facility Team continued its work, and the Project Solution Group, from the Willamette Education Service District, provided a Building Assessment.
- 2012-13 - The District contracted with the DLR Group, and the Facility Team expanded to 36 members.
- Winter/Spring 2013 – The Facility Team met five times. A Physical Building Assessment was conducted by the DLR Group; Educational Planning meetings with PHES and PHHS staff were held; student and staff surveys were distributed; and a Grade Configuration workshop was held.
- Summer/Fall 2013 - The Facility Team attended District events to inform the community of progress on the Educational Facility Plan and seek feedback/input. The Team learned there was strong support for the Facility Plan from respondents. The options that tested well were a second gym at PHHS and expansion of the kitchen at PHES. It was noted the responding group represented community members who were closely associated with the schools.

The Facility Team identified the following goals for the project: improved safety and security; renovation of worn facilities; improved energy efficiency; optimal learning environments for students to prepare them for today’s world; separation of middle-schoolers from high-schoolers; improved vehicular circulation on the site (separation of buses and cars, an additional entry point and eased congestion); adequate kitchen facilities to prepare healthy student meals; improved technology for better learning; ease overcrowding at the elementary school by moving 6th grade to the high school and adding more classes at the elementary school.

Superintendent Scurto referred to the initial “Core Issues” handout provided by the Facilities Team identifying projects and associated costs totaling $19,022,000. After soliciting feedback from the community, the Facility Team revised the plan and reduced the project total to $17,655,000.

Mr. Scurto explained the Board is charged with deliberating on the proposal developed by the Facility Team and choosing to accept the proposal as presented or make changes. Subsequent to and contingent upon that Board decision, the Board would then choose to adopt a mechanism for funding, i.e., a bond and a time frame for pursuing the bond.

Board Chair Oldham opened the floor to Board discussion. Board Member Parrish expressed concern that the 10% contingency on new construction and 15% contingency on remodeled items built into the proposal was inadequate, recommending instead that a 15% contingency on both be adopted.

Mr. Parrish also asked for details regarding the new gymnasium in the plan. Scott Rose from DLR Group clarified that the new auxiliary gym would be 6,600 sq. ft., accommodate 120 spectators on
three rows of fixed bleachers, and offer a high school regulation size court. Mr. Rose added doubling the seating capacity to 240 occupants would require an additional 700 sq. ft.

Mr. Parrish thanked the Facility Team for their work, explained he attended the majority of meetings and heard the community input. He advised the Board the high points of community concern had been included in the Facility Team Plan as presented.

Board Member Offenbacher expressed concern regarding the line item for the kitchen. He stated that while a new facility is desired, he felt $785,000 for that facility was excessive. He was also concerned that the new facility would require increased staffing and result in higher costs to the District. Student Board Representative Conner Baker added the concession stand run from the current roll out cart would be run out of the new kitchen facility as well making it a multi-use area.

Mr. Baker asked how much enrollment growth the Facility Team Proposal anticipated. DLR Group’s Scott Rose responded the current enrollment from 6th – 12th grade is 530 students. This plan would accommodate approximately 600 students based on 75% utilization. Mr. Rose also explained the plan sizes electrical and mechanical infrastructure for additional growth if desired at a later time.

Board Member Cafferata commented she was pleased to see the stage area was kept in the final proposal made to the Board.

Commenting on Mr. Offenbacher’s concern, Mr. Parrish added the District is currently serving “freezer foods.” He said a new facility would give the district the opportunity to cook from scratch and utilize opportunities we don’t now have. Superintendent Scurto added the current facility is strapped for storage space. The Proposal accommodates a walk in freezer and walk in refrigerator. Mr. Offenbacher reiterated his concern that with this space, additional staffing would be required.

Ms. Cafferata reminded the Board in previous years a large cadre of volunteers cooked and served food. Board Member Orre added that the lunch program participation has increased, as has its associated funding, which is why the District has been able to add personnel without taking away budget.

Curt Offenbacher explained he has reviewed tax rates related to bonded debt since 2003 and noted the tax rate has varied up to $2.82 per $1,000, with assessed valuation increases of 3% per year. He said the tax rate has not been stable and while the District would prefer to hold to a stable rate, that has not been successful over the last 10 years. Business Manager Passerotti provided the Board a handout showing tax rates since 2000. She explained that multiple factors affect that rate and agreed it does vary tremendously. She noted that a 3% increase in assessed values is the base assumption in the scenarios provided to the Board. Curt Offenbacher stated the Board should proceed with caution as the uniform tax rate has not occurred in the past 10 years and volatility concerns him. He encouraged the Board to be thoughtful about trying to even the proposed rate.

Mr. Offenbacher asked Scott Rose from DLR Group whether demolition costs for both high school wings were included and whether the cost of the Proposal would be reduced if the wings were kept.

---
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Mr. Rose explained the District could see approximately $75,000 to $85,000 in savings per wing if the demolition were excluded from the proposal.

6.0 PUBLIC FORUM – During this portion of the Board Meeting, members of the public were specifically invited to present items of commendation and/or concerns. At the discretion of the Board Chair, further public participation might be allowed at the time specific agenda items are under consideration by the Board (District Policy BDDH).

Board Chair Oldham opened the floor to public comment. Ron Weiss was recognized and commented regarding the kitchen line item in the Proposal. He encouraged the Board to leave the item as is and noted the current lunch program is not stellar. He expressed concern that if the Board does not take advantage of the opportunity to include the kitchen remodel it will be regretted. He noted that staffing is a hurdle to cross but it can be addressed and remedied.

Amy Burbee, Booster President, was recognized and spoke to the new gymnasium line item. She explained the current gym seats 400 and expressed concern that with programs increasing and the school being recognized as the center of the community, a new 120-seat facility seems inadequate. She encouraged the Board to consider building an adequate facility instead of the Facility Team’s proposed 120-seat gym. Responding to a question from the audience, Scott Rose explained that $200,000 would be necessary to add another 120 seats to the gym facility currently proposed.

Dana Parrish was recognized and spoke regarding the kitchen line item. She noted Board Member Offenbacher has volunteered many hours in the current facility and there are currently not enough volunteers. She agreed that the space is needed and with approximately 40% of student population eligible for free and reduced lunches and breakfast, an improved facility with improved offerings would service the students much better.

Paul Smith was recognized and explained he has participated in many bond levies for the District. He said the last bond turned back $400,000 at project completion. He explained that bond rates have never been static. He noted that the issue is the need to include capital improvements in the District’s operating budget and asked why the District has not put an extra $200,000 yearly into Bruce Patterson’s improvement budget. He encouraged the Board to consider a passable rate and expressed concern that the current bottom line is excessive. He added with the current climate, poor investment returns, and unemployment and layoff rates, the Board should consider an attainable goal rather than the proposed amount.

Mr. Smith and asked if the variance of tax rates is a valid concern among the community. Mr. Smith responded that it is, and it is key to identify what the community believes is an ideal number. Mr. Smith said he believes a $13,000,000 bond may be passable.

Board Member Parrish said that while everyone has a preferred amount, the $17,655,000 was reached after soliciting school and community involvement and consulting with experts from DLR Group to complete an assessment to insure the proposal has a strong basis. Superintendent Scurto responded to Mr. Smith saying that approximately $200,000 was placed in the maintenance budget this year and the
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District incurred more cost than that. He agreed with Mr. Smith saying the funding is a program versus building decision.

Mr. Rick Faber was recognized and spoke to enrollment projections. He expressed concern that if open enrollment ends it could result in student population trickling down and subsequent income reduction. He asked the Board if they have considered that scenario. He also queried as to the extra 120 open enrollment students and asked whether additional facilities would be required if those students didn’t exist. He asked how that issue would be addressed with the community within the bond campaign.

Superintendent Scurto responded that open enrollment assessment is difficult as the District has always accepted transfers and has a strong outside group that has bolstered numbers. He explained with a graying population the District is assuming another bubble of move-in students around 5th-6th grade. He said over the next 10 years the District is planning for a little over 1,000 students and that includes transfer students. Mr. Scurto said the District anticipates current open enrollment students will remain.

Jodi Vahala was recognized and expressed concern about moving the 6th grade to the high school in the proposal. Superintendent Scurto said it would alleviate the overcrowding issue in the current K-6 buildings. Mr. Scurto noted educationally, the curriculum changes between 5th and 6th grades and the 8th and 9th grades. Tony Scurto explained the proposal includes moving those students only if there is a physical separation of space between them and 9th-12th grades. Ms. Vahala responded that was the same justification given for moving the 7th grade up in the past and that transition was poor. Conner Baker, Student Representative, noted that in the Facility Team Proposal the wings would be configured with a separation of space. He also noted that moving the 6th grade up would allow the District to offer students who are excelling more opportunities. Mr. Scurto explained if the bond does not pass, the 6th grade would be left as it currently is with a need for alternatives to overcrowding.

Gary Shearer was recognized and said as the community is accustomed to paying the current tax rate he believes if a proposal is made that does not substantially alter that the District has a good chance of success.

Board Member Parrish asked the audience if there was support for the Facility Team Proposal as presented. By headcount, approximately one-third of audience supported the proposal.

Curt Offenbacher told the audience the bond rate to fund the Proposal at hand would average $2.20 per $1,000 of assessed value. The current bond rate is $1.65; however, if you average rates over the last 10 years, it has been $2.25 per $1,000. Mr. Parrish added the proposal is for a 20-year bond. Business Manager Passerotti said that the District felt this term was the most fiscally responsible one.

Responding to a question from the Tom Christian, Mr. Parrish clarified the list was presented in its entirety by the committee rather than as optional line items.

Matthew Bryson was recognized and explained he participated on the Facilities Team, is a District parent and an alumni. He stated he supported the proposal as it will have value for many generations to come.
Mr. Paul Smith was recognized and added if the list was prioritized as the bids come in, some of the line items can drop off. Scott Rose from DLR group explained the proposal is inclusive as each line item has connected lines to others. He said that with projects being bid separately from largest to smallest and the District would constantly be reassessing the budget.

Mr. Don Richardson was recognized and asked if the proposal has 6th graders being moved to the High School, why the District is also proposing adding 4 Elementary classrooms to accommodate those same students. Ms. Darlene Baker interjected that the 6th grade is currently in portable classrooms now, in a hallway commons area and two classes are in the library. Mr. Scurto noted that independent of this Proposal, the building requires breathing room.

Board Member Offenbacher asked regarding the Technology Reserve. He noted the Board approved $200,000 in reserve this fiscal year and likely another $200,000 next. He asked how that affects the $700,000 within the proposal. Mr. Scurto replied the $200,000 is used for wireless capacity and infrastructure and other devices, noting that currently we have approximately one device for every three students.

Mr. Cafferata was recognized and asked how the Facility Team Proposal addressed campus security. Mr. Rose, DLR Group, replied the proposal alters the elementary front walk to avoid “snatch and grab” security concerns. It adds a full elementary phone and intercom system, emergency notification system, and Voice Over IP (VOIP); encloses the high school campus; and installs camera systems and an exterior door card lock system. The Facility Team Proposal does not include a full exterior fence. Mr. Rose explained they felt that was sufficient security.

With no additional comments Board Chair Oldham closed the floor to the public.

7.0  ACTION ITEMS

7.1  Educational Facilities Master Plan (Exhibit 1314-44)

The Board deliberated on the Facility Master Plan proposal, with Board Chair Oldham asking how to address the gym size concern, noting current seating in the main high school gym is 500-600. The proposed gym would have seating of 120, and the proposal would increase by another $200,000 to double that seating. Mr. Parrish, speaking as a Facility Team Member said the Team did not anticipate this being a new main gym. Board Member Parrish relayed the gym facility in the proposal was for extra physical education class space and small community use, but it was not intended for main games. Booster President Amy Burbee asked why a new main gym was not included, as many schools Pleasant Hill travels to have new facilities. Mr. Parrish answered it was cost prohibitive to the Facility Team. Scott Chambers added that procuring private funding might be an option if a full new gym facility should be an identified need.

Mr. Parrish expressed concern that a 10% contingency is light and he would prefer a 15% across the board contingency in the proposal. Curt Offenbacher noted that a 3% annual inflation rate is also included in the proposal.
Student Representative Conner Baker asked the capacity of the Junior High Gym comparing its use to the new facility. Bruce Patterson advised it holds more than 200.

Community member Matt Bryson asked the Board if the intent was to replace the old gym and renovate the locker rooms or if a new locker facility was included as well. Board Member Parrish explained the new space was to be used as an auxiliary gym and current locker facilities would be remodeled but remain. Board Member Orre also commented that the Facility Team intended the additional smaller gymnasium to be used for classroom space as well. Ms. Orre, speaking to the audience, said she hears the community saying they want an updated gym. The Facility Team Proposal does not include that, but perhaps it could be evaluated as a new initiative in the future. Superintendent Scurto agreed that the proposal was for auxiliary space. Mr. Scurto encouraged the Board to take the lesson learned from the elementary gym construction as an opportunity this time to provide for adequate gym space.

Scott Rose from the DLR Group added that to build a new 9,400 sq. ft. gym with locker and/or team rooms would add an estimate $2.8 to $3 million to the proposal amount.

Board Member Cafferata noted the Board should get back to what is needed, rather than wanted. She reminded them the committee pared down the proposal to what was needed for the community and did so with much forethought. Mr. Rose added that the Proposal as it stands does not include potential grant funding available, interest earnings on the bond, or other smaller revenue sources which might assist in offsetting costs.

Responding to a question from John Oldham, Kevin Parrish said he would feel comfortable asking for $18.4 million to cover an increase in contingency and an increase in gymnasium square footage. Community Member Darrell Shoemaker commented that while the Facility Team has spoken repeatedly to community use of the new gymnasium facility, in practice, new school facilities are not encouraged to be used by the community and when they are, the use is substantially restricted. He said this is frustrating for the community.

Mr. Rose responded that the placement of the proposed new gym facility allowed it to be locked off and isolated mechanically from the rest of the school, which would encourage community usage. Community Member Gary Shearer added that if 6th – 8th grade is located at the high school a new physical education facility would be needed. Community Member John Vahala noted that any new facility should have a maintenance free exterior and added the $300 cost per square foot seemed high for a new gymnasium.

Kevin Parrish moved that the Pleasant Hill School District adopt the Long Range Facility Committee’s recommendation to build a new facility as specified in the Core Issues – Revised document with an adjustment to the proposal amount to increase it to $18,400,000 to increase the contingency to 15% across the board and double the current gymnasium seating.

There was no second to the motion.
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Wylda Cafferata said $17,655,000 is a high amount that she doesn’t want to exceed. Barbara Orre agreed and said the Facility Committee came up with that amount after much thought. John Oldham noted he is comfortable increasing the amount to $18,000,000. Curt Offenbacher noted the committee had shrunk common space due to cost issues, and the Board is now increasing gymnasiuam space. Kevin Parrish, on behalf of the Facility Team, said the committee considered the gymnasiuam an educational space and believed it was a need.

**John Oldham moved that the Pleasant Hill School Board accept the Facility Master Plan to build a new facility as specified in the Core Issues – Revised document with an adjustment to the proposal amount of a $300,000 increase to add $200,000 toward seating in the new gymnasium and $100,000 toward a contingency increase. Wylda Cafferata seconded the motion. The Board passed the motion unanimously.**

Board Chair Oldham said the motion should be backed up by a decision on how to fund the proposal and as a Bond has been discussed, the Board must decide which of May 2014, November 2014 or May 2015, is the appropriate timing for the election.

Kevin Parrish reminded the Board that Scott Rose of DLR Group stated the May election has a better chance of success.

Community Member Don Richardson told the Board that to garner support from the community and insure success, the Board should decide exactly what they are getting for their money. He said while he is on the Facility Team, even he is unsure of exactly what is being funded. He requested the Board develop a design concept to show the community to further the success of the Bond.

Kevin Parrish asked Mr. Richardson what level of design he thinks is necessary for the community to see, as there are both time and monetary costs to that request. Student Representative Conner Baker recommended using the conceptualization proposed by DLR Group at the previous meeting.

Community Member Rusty Rexius told the Board he believed the recent Fire Department bond failed because the community did not fully understand what they would get for their money rather than the cost of the bond itself. Mr. Rexius said if the Board goes to the community without a specific plan, chances of passing the bond will be slim.

Mr. Parrish said the number of classrooms, facility and infrastructure needs have been identified; only the layout and location on the site remain outstanding.

Ms. Cafferata asked the audience if they believed it would be enough to say two new high school wings and a new auxiliary gymnasium would be enough detail to gain support. Facility Team Member Darlene Baker asked the audience exactly what detail would be sufficient. Mr. Rexius said a site plan and/or a very specific model would be needed. Community Member Shoemaker added he would not vote for the bond as it stands, as he felt he has inadequate information.

Scott Rose from DLR Group said an informational campaign would be key and should include a FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) sheet that explains exactly what the bond would be funding. He
recommended if a model was used, it should be a massing model identifying the potential appearance and concept of what the space would look like as well as stressing the importance of community input via a citizen’s oversight committee.

Responding to a question from Board Chair Oldham, Mr. Rose explained developing a physical model of the structure would cost approximately $4,000 and require three to four weeks. The Board expressed concern that moving in that direction might delay the process of placing the bond on the May ballot.

Community Member Bryson commented on the fine line between too much detail and enough information. He noted via community feedback the fire station bond was not approved as it did not have enough information as to what would be provided for the money. Mr. Bryson suggested a consolidated proposal would be appropriate with emphasis on the citizen’s oversight committee involvement.

Mr. Rose said in addition to identifying key design attributes it might be necessary to provide a graphic interpretation or 3D digital model of the project as well.

Kevin Parrish reminded the Board that the funding for developing the model would be taken from another budget. Wylda Cafferata said it seems the community is not in a place with strong social trust, and should the project be fully designed prior to putting it on the ballot, a May 2015 time frame would be more appropriate. John Oldham agreed and said that may make the project unaffordable as the bond rate may rise. Mr. Rose added that often the community thinks a fully designed project is presumptuous, as the District is presenting a proposal that is no longer dynamic.

Community Member Thad Starr asked Superintendent Scurto if he could estimate how many single people actually saw and returned the surveys. He noted that the majority if not all of that audience were directly involved in the school.

Curt Offenbacher suggested completing a conceptual plan view and elevation drawings which could be key in an informational campaign and then assessing the community pulse three to four weeks into the campaign, which would give the District to the end of February to assess status.

Community Member Don Richardson said it is important to make a strong case to the community identifying why classrooms are needed, why a new cafeteria is needed offering them a full explanation.

Community Member Steve Cafferata noted in his experience passing the Dexter Fire Station Special Levy a model was not used, however the campaign focused on exactly what the money would provide and why that was essential to the community.

Board Chair Oldham turned the discussion to bond election timing asking if the Board thought the community could be rallied by May 2014.
Scott Rose reported the DLR Group had assessed all bonds that went out in Oregon since May of 2009. Nineteen out of 35 or fifty-four percent of bonds on the May ballot passed, while nine out of 30 or 30% of bonds on the November ballot passed in that time period.

Community Member Shoemaker asked why the decision must be made tonight. John Oldham said if the decision supports a May ballot the process must begin immediately. Curt Offenbacher asked what else would be on the local May ballot. Tony Scurto replied he was not aware of any other measures.

Scott Rose added that the design and construction process may be more favorable with a May ballot as the design could be completed in February/March, permits acquired in March/April, construction contractor bids obtained in May, and construction begun as soon as school recesses. With a November election, design could be finished May/June, permits obtained July/August, and construction bids obtained in the fall; however, construction couldn’t really be started before the rain began. Further, more resources would be required because of the need for rain protection and the slower process.

**Kevin Parrish moved to pursue a Bond Election for the Facility Team Proposal in May 2014. Barbara Orre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Board Chair Oldham thanked the Facility Team and the community in attendance.

**8.0 FUTURE BOARD MEETINGS**

- Board Meeting – February 10, 2014, 7:00 p.m., PH Community Center

**9.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER**

**10.0 ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 pm.

Signed: _________________________ on this _____ day of _______________________, 2014

Mr. John Oldham, Chair