

Community Bond Advisory Committee Meeting #3 March 19, 2024

CBAC Members

- Present: Jerry Lachenbruch, Will Rodenhuis, Glenda Seiders, Jen Durringer, Jo Lyne Walton, Garrett Leabo, Johnna Neal, Sarah Curtis, Wendi Farris, Sue Frasier, Lauri Archer, Reed Anderson
- Absent: Steve Carothers, Chad Schrock, American Legion, Randy Raschein

CLSD Staff

- Present: Candace Pelt, Celeste Van Cleave, Dena Crowell, James Shannon, Rachel Hampton

Board Member Liaisons to CBAC

- Present: David Karo, Parker Leigh

Consultant Team:

- Present: Cassie Hibbert and Patrick Linhart, Wenaha Group, and Curt Wilson, Wilson Architecture

On March 19, 2024, the Community Bond Advisory Committee (CBAC) convened. The meeting began with Cassie Hibbert, Wenaha Group, reviewing CBAC member roles, the committee's Ground Rules, and the committee's Pre-Bond Timeline.

Ground Rules Reviewed

Briefly reviewed ground rules for new attendees. Ms. Hibbert reminded members that as a committee we will have one conversation, without offshoots of separate conversations and defined what consensus means stating that by giving consensus we agree that we will not all agree 100% of the time; by agreeing means "I can live with it and I can support it". The expectation is that we can wrap around an idea that we can support.

Adopt Community Bond Advisory Committee Charge

After reviewing the Community Bond Advisory Charge, the committee gave consensus to adopt the CBAC charge.

Bond Process

Ms. Hibbert presented the committee with a VENN Diagram that explains the CBAC process. By taking the needs of the district with the needs of the community, and how much the community can afford, to determine how to present a successful bond recommendation. Committee members then discuss what they've been hearing from the public on the bond process thus far.

Site Tour Debrief

The committee discussed what they saw when participating in the February 27th Site Tours. Some items members noted included: CLHS electrical is frightening; entrance safety at both buildings is needed; CLHS layout is not effective and has too many nooks/crannies; CLHS building is depressing; CLES new floors look great compared against the new floors; CLHS heat improvements have been great

but passing areas are cold; and the appreciation of the district working towards better interior/exterior conditions of the past two years.

Facility Assessment Executive Summary

Patrick Linhart, Wenaha Group, presented a slideshow presentation on the Facility Assessment, which is a requirement for the OSCIM Grant. As part of the assessment, staff feedback was gathered and main buildings assessed. The State of Oregon will use OSCIM applications as a means for the state to gather information on state needs in order to create funding resources.

What the Facilities Assessment measures:

The Facilities Assessment creates a snapshot of current building conditions, measures deficiencies in building systems, and provides standardized data to inform ODE of current statewide conditions. The assessment does not include information regarding enrollment, facility capacity or curriculum/programs, and does not prioritize projects.

Curt Wilson, Wilson Architecture, reviewed the Facility Assessment Executive Summary and how to calculate the Facility Condition Index (FCI); physical condition budget total in relation to the replacement budget to create a measurement of a Good, Fair, Poor and Critical FCI. Mr. Wilson presented floor plans of both the elementary and Jr/Sr high campuses. The elementary was rated with a 25.9% FCI (Poor) rating and the Jr/Sr high was rated a 39.0% FCI (Critical) rating.

Items noted within the assessment included:

Central Linn Elementary Needs: Secure main entry, improved security systems; mechanical is operating at or beyond service life; lack of classroom ventilation; kitchen area is not designed for full meal prep; no bathrooms in Kinder/First Grade location; accessibility issues at exterior exit stairs; excess water in crawl space/drainage; and playground drainage.

Central Linn Jr/Sr High Needs: Visual supervision is difficult with building layout; no interior hallways connecting classrooms; no lobby security; spray on roof system is difficult to repair and slippery; original single pane/non-thermal windows; asbestos flooring; restrooms need accessibility upgrades; mechanical equipment, electrical and water/sanitation pipes has exceeded useful life; classroom ventilation; original materials and surfaces are worn and tired looking.

Athletic Facilities:

Wendi Farris, Interim Athletic Director/Vice Principal, present on athletic facility needs and shared that the gymnasium is the highlight of the school but emphasizing the need to upgrade the cafetorium which is cramped, with poor airflow during performances; locker rooms are not functional; sound systems in the gym and stadium need to be upgraded; lack of a referee room; poor restroom locations; gym is a constant walkthrough location which is disruptive to class time and tracks in mud from outside; no high school soccer field located on campus and the lack of a junior high soccer field.

Replacement Versus Remodel

Ms. Hibbert continued the conversations by discussing the differences between replacing versus remodeling and concluded by informing committee members of next month's CBAC agenda. In April, D.A. Davidson will join the CBAC committee to discuss general obligation bonds with and work on simulation numbers to determine how to calculate assessed value and talk about priorities. To determine the needs of the community, we talked about sharing a mass mailer with a QR code and sharing that in local papers and on the website.

Ms. Hibbert asked committee members to make an active effort to talk with community members about community needs.