

**CENTRAL LINN SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD WORK SESSION  
MARCH 6, 2017**

**ROLL CALL:**

**Board Members – George Frasier, Rebekah Schneiter, Parker Leigh, Mark Penrod, David Goracke, Chris Wyne. Eric Gerber absent.**

**Others: Brian Gardner, Celeste Van Cleave, Eldon Albertson, Ken Lorensen, Melissa Wolff, Charley Wolff, Katie Cheney, Sue Frasier, Cindy Thibedeau, Debie Wyne, Brian Tenbusch, Jordan Parrish, Don Anderson, Cheryl Haworth and others.**

**BROWNSVILLE UPDATE:**

**Superintendent Gardner read an email from Willamette Neighborhood Housing that indicated they would be exploring new development ideas for the site as the additional property (gym site) would now be included in any sale. They will be looking at multiple options for maximizing the whole site (with a potential for both single family and multi-family units). They have received the legal descriptions from the surveyor (for the divided parcel) and they are currently working on supplying the legal description for the combined site. They hope to have a rough development scenario and schedule of project milestones in time for the April school board meeting.**

**FACILITY/BOND DISCUSSION**

**The Board was assigned the task of contacting 50 patrons each from their seven (7) district zones to discuss the different options being brought forth regarding the construction of a new school(s). The total number of patrons contacted were 91. There were 5 categories: Option 1 – Rebuild elementary school; build new (dome) high school and track/football field (6 votes); Option 2 – Build new K-12 (dome) school on high school site and bus barn on current elementary site (32 votes); Option 3 – Build new K-5 (dome) school on elementary site and new grades 6-12 (dome) school on high school site and track/football field (41 votes); Option 4 – Patrons prefer a maintenance bond or conventional construction (6 votes); and Option 5 – Patron would vote “no” on any bond option ( 5 votes).**

**There was a large discussion on the anecdotal information from patrons. Some patrons were concerned or commented about: the physical separation of elementary and high school students on same campus; economics of dome design vs. conventional construction; doing away with the Halsey site; use some of the existing facilities; and the feeling people who voted for Option 3 would not vote “yes” for Option 2.**

**Superintendent Gardner stated the staff has been clear regarding their first choice being a new K-12 school but it doesn’t make sense if it won’t pass a vote; it’s a community decision. Question was raised if the Board should pursue a survey and suggested Portland State University as an option. Mr. Gardner commented it is difficult to gain viable survey results in smaller areas or communities.**

**There was one Board member who voiced concern for waiting until the November Election to take a bond to the voters; that construction and bond costs will only increase. Some Board members felt the May Election was too soon; we need more information and more time to inform the community.**

The option of a maintenance bond was discussed. Patrons wanted to know there would be a maintenance schedule for new buildings so as not to end up where we are now. With Option 3 we lose the higher operational savings that could be used for maintenance. If we choose Option 1 to remodel the elementary that opens us up for other structural issues and tax dollars are for education not construction. Superintendent Gardner stated we already are addressing maintenance with re-negotiating the classified contract to have all facility technicians do maintenance and tracking maintenance projects in School Dude. Even with a new school there will need to be capital improvements. The last architect report (1996) listed numerous issues that were not addressed with the last capital improvement bond. Bitterness over the Brownsville bond and squandering then closing the building. Superintendent Gardner used tire analogy in regards to useful building lifespan. We can't use bond dollars for a reserve fund because bond proceeds must be spent within three (3) years. A maintenance plan needs to be in put in place. Option 2 yields the highest return for dollars to use for maintenance.

There was Board consensus to pursue Option 3. Superintendent Gardner indicated the first step would be to find an architect and address the scope. A full-service architect could also serve as project manager to be paid after bond passing. The second step is to pull in stakeholders and address what is necessary in a new building. Key Bank can open a bank account for the bond committee then once the Board makes the decision to pursue, the bond committee files with the state. The design is staff based and the political action committee is community based. Mr. Gardner expressed suspicion of survey marketing that it didn't address over the fence conversations; community members are trusted more than staff. He indicated there would need to be a training process with Option 3 for staff as their first choice was Option 2.

The Board Chair recessed the work session at approximately 7:19 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Patron, Katie Cheney, addressed the Board and stated this information needed to get out to the community and a committee couldn't do it all, that it needed to come from the school board. Folks don't trust community members as much as they trust school board members. Pushing the vote to November allows more time to get information out. Board Chair stated last May a decision was made and wanted voters to go along with it. This time we are taking a different approach. Mr. Gardner stated we need to bring the community into the discussion and be open minded to what is said. The only true survey we have done was anecdotal. You need to choose a direction and start conversation at community meetings.

Chairman Penrod adjourned the work session at approximately 7:50 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Celeste Van Cleave, Business Manager

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
C. Mark Penrod, Board Chair

3-13-17  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved