

Central Linn School District  
32433 Hwy 228, Halsey

School Board Work Session  
Central Linn High School

On November 21, 2016, Chairman Penrod called the work session to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the cafeteria of the high school.

**Board Members Present:** Parker Leigh, Mark Penrod, David Goracke, Chris Wyne, George Frasier, Rebekah Schneider, Eric Gerber

**Employees Present:** Brian Gardner, Susan Beaudin, Celeste Van Cleave, Joni Wixom

**Others –** Katie Cheney, Ken Lorensen, Cheryl Haworth, Eldon Albertson

Prior to his update on the Brownsville property, Superintendent Gardner had the Board view a video clip on Monolithic Dome Schools. These dome shaped buildings can withstand most manmade and severe weather disasters and are economic to build. It was noted local Jefferson School District was researching a dome school and Yamhill-Carlton School District is using this method for their new gym.

**Brownsville Update –** Superintendent Gardner recapped that he had met with Samaritan Health and Willamette Neighborhood Housing and they appear to be anxious about working together. Next step is to meet with both parties with some representation from the school board to see what could be developed. Board members David Goracke, George Frasier and Mark Penrod volunteered to attend such a meeting. Examples could be a health facility and maybe some senior apartments mixed with families, leaving the community garden, and using the gym as a community health facility.

**Survey –** Mr. Gardner reported he had mailed a survey regarding the district's facilities and possible future bond to every voter that voted in the last election. Each precinct received the same survey only on different color paper. This was done to assist in processing the data received. Mr. Gardner distributed a summary of the survey results and explained the format reflected several comments that continually surfaced. He cautioned the Board that the survey should not be considered a random sampling and incomplete as the results were only from those voters that chose to participate by answering the survey.

#### **Group Process**

Board members commented on the survey results as follows: voters need more information about maintenance; they want detailed plans and costs; asking for a lower bond amount; need more information on lower costs; voters don't understand state financing and funding maintenance; need plan for elementary building; clarify separation of students; and when commenting on a new sports complex – "complex" was a very misleading word that assumed it was a new facility when it was only a new track.

We need to dispel certain myths and ask ourselves what is the message if we are coming back again for more or the same amount. We need to get our message out better but hard to ask

for the same amount or more, given the defeat. It's imperative we get something done to keep functioning. If we go again should we borrow the money to get the hard costs and then ask the questions on another survey? Should we expand on where our maintenance funds come from; that self-funding major repairs means cutting staff and programs?

The Board questioned how large is the portion of the elementary roof that is leaking and can no longer be repaired; and, can it be replaced without ruining the integrity of the building? Joni Wixom answered, the spot is about 125' long and 10' wide. It would cost approximately \$42,000 to replace the windows on that side which is the part of the roof that leaks. The worst is surrounding the library where it comes up through the middle. Mr. Gardner stated perhaps we could do solely that part of the roof but the remainder of the roof would still need to be addressed. The skylights are very steep and no one wants to get up there to address the leaks. It is a worn-out tectum roof that has been repaired repeatedly for years.

Superintendent Gardner asked for direction from the Board. He stated that he did have a firm coming to assess the elementary building and provide detailed costs for repairs. We could consider any of the five options we looked at last winter and/or the dome shaped schools. All of that takes time and money; where do you want the focus? Further, he asked about a detailed plan. Are we going to be able to conclude an airtight plan for the elementary school by May? If not, what are we going to tell the voters? Regarding separation of students, do we know, is the concern for all students on one campus or that voters want to keep the elementary building? How detailed of a maintenance plan do voters want to see? We have a three-year maintenance plan. Are we referring to systems lifespan/replacement or the day-to-day maintenance operation?

As one option, the Board suggested looking ahead to the five and ten years' plans like systems, paint, etc. Look at a hybrid, costs associated with a replacement of the high school and a repair of the elementary that brings the costs down. This would address the costs, separation, and tells Halsey what will happen to the building. Another option could be a dome school. It appears to be very durable construction, reasonable costs and seismic resistant.

The deadline to apply for state OSCIM monies is January; similar period to last year. The election filing date is March 16, 2017. Superintendent Gardner stated it may be possible the pre-bond architectural work-up for a dome school would cost half if we were to share with Jefferson School District. It was the consensus of the Board to cost out both a conventional building and a dome school. For the December Board meeting the Board would like the costs on the repair of the elementary school; more information on dome schools; list of local places we could go look at dome schools; and conventional building costs per sq. ft. Mr. Gardner cautioned that all that information may not be available to us in three weeks' time.

There was further discussion on options for the elementary building. A K-12 school ignores the City of Halsey but Samaritan Health did a tour of the elementary and was thinking it might work for senior housing and care facilities. Samaritan commented with the Brownsville property the classrooms would likely be torn down.

A plan is needed for the elementary that addresses the K-12 separation but doesn't preclude from adding onto the high school. Mr. Gardner questioned are we trying to force this into a May election or something else? The Board is concerned about existing facilities and moving forward as we have been working on the Brownsville property now for two years.

The Board questioned if we borrow money for a roof on the elementary and then pass a bond may we pay it off with bond money? Yes, if you state that in the bond measure description. We need a cost list itemized but if costs come in high then what? If we give up the K-12, we lose operational costs savings and the option of a possible district charter school. The ideal model would be to look at being expandable. Mr. Gardner suggested if we self-fund at 30 years it is \$57,000 a year, per million dollars, so if we had operational savings of \$200,000 maybe it is a hybrid if we could add K-5 and pay with operational savings.

Adjourn

With no further discussion, Chairman Penrod adjourned the work session at approximately 8:10 p.m.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan Beaudin, Board Secretary



\_\_\_\_\_  
C. Mark Penrod, Chairman

12-12-16

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved