



Dull Olson Weekes - IBI Group Architects, Inc.  
907 SW Stark Street  
Portland OR 97205 USA  
tel 503 226 6950  
fax 503 273 9192

## SKSD LRFP Task Force

### Meeting Minutes

|                |                      |                    |                   |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| <b>From</b>    | Elisa Warner         | <b>Date</b>        | December 19, 2016 |
| <b>Project</b> | SKSD LRFP            | <b>Project No.</b> | 14026             |
| <b>Subject</b> | SKSD LRFP Task Force |                    |                   |

### Objectives

Superintendent Christy Perry welcomed the members of the Salem-Keizer Long Range Facilities Task Force, and summarized the objectives for the meeting, including:

- Discuss history of past bond work within the District
- Revisit the roles of the Task Force members
- Subcommittee work (Enrollment Growth and School/Support Building Needs)

### Overview of Past Bond Work (1992, 1998, and 2008)

Mary Paulson, Chief of Staff for Salem-Keizer School District, led the Task Force through a review of the District's three (3) most recent general obligation bonds.

#### 1992 - \$96 Million

Salem-Keizer School District passed a \$96 million bond in 1992. The bond funded construction of six (6) new schools for a total cost of \$58.6 million. These schools included Clear Lake, Yoshikai, Crossler, Houck, Leslie, and Stephens. Approximately \$37.4 million was allocated to renovations and additions at existing schools, as well as the purchase of 14 new portable classrooms.

#### 1998 - \$177.8 Million

Salem-Keizer School District passed a \$177.8 million bond in 1998. The bond funded construction of 10 new schools for a total cost of \$111.3 million. These schools included Forest Ridge, Hallman, Hammond, Harritt, Lamb, Lee, Miller, Weddle, Claggett Creek, and West Salem High School. Approximately \$66.5 million was allocated to the construction of half-sized gyms at seven (7) middle schools, construction of Roberts High School, purchase of 26 portable classrooms, an addition at Harritt, and renovation/repair work at other District schools.

#### 2008 - \$242.1 Million

Salem-Keizer School District passed a \$242.1 million bond in 2008. The bond funded construction of four (4) new schools for a total cost of \$122.4 million. These schools included Battle Creek, Chavez, Kayapuya, and

Straub Middle School. Approximately \$119.7 million was allocated to renovations and additions at existing schools, as well as the purchase of 22 new portable classrooms.

Several projects identified for inclusion in the 2008 bond were trimmed to maintain a bond size that was consistent with community support. These projects included a CTE high school and seven (7) elementary schools (two in Sprague area; one in every other feeder area except West.

Mary Paulson displayed a chart showing the actual and projected levy rates for outstanding general obligation bonds from 2002 – 2030.

### The “why” behind the Work of the Task Force

- This Task Force represents the next step of the Long Range Facilities Planning process. Staff have compiled considerable data on school building needs and conditions; this information will now be shared with the Task Force, so that the Task Force can process the information and make recommendations to the Salem-Keizer School Board. Although each subcommittee will generate recommendations, the Task Force as a whole will integrate the recommendations into a cohesive document.
- Following the work of the Task Force, the District will contract with a public opinion research firm to assess the feasibility of passing a bond based on public polling. This process will help determine the level of community support for specific improvements.

### Questions by the Task Force Members:

- **In 2008, what was the rate that was added?** This information was not immediately available, but can be provided at a future Task Force meeting.
- **How has inflation impacted costs over time, particularly since 2008? What are the added costs due to compliance issues?** This information was not immediately available, but can be provided at a future Task Force meeting.
- **Typically, how does the District approach community polling? What is the methodology?** The polling process targets registered and active voters. It is a professional, statistically valid survey conducted by a qualified and experienced consulting firm.

### Subcommittee Work

Task Force members divided into two (2) subcommittees to conduct focused discussions on building condition and enrollment/capacity needs by school. The highlights of the subcommittee discussions are summarized below.

## Building Condition Subcommittee

### Topic: School Safety and Security

The Building Condition Subcommittee will focus on building condition issues, including school safety and security, seismic, educational adequacy, career technical education, administrative and support facilities. Tonight's discussion addresses safety and security needs and goals for Salem Keizer schools.

Mary Paulson introduced John VanDreal, Director of Safety and Risk Management Services for Salem-Keizer School District. John presented an overview of the proposed safety and security upgrades outlined in the District's Long Range Facilities Plan. The objective of the proposed safety improvements is to provide conditions that promote the physical and psychological safety of students, employees, and community members. Psychological safety refers to a sense of well-being that allows the brain to work in an optimal manner (e.g. build relationships, be creative, etc.). When students are fearful, it impedes brain functioning, initiating a fight, freeze or flight response. This is counterproductive from an educational perspective.

The proposed security recommendations reflect Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, industry standards, and expert recommendations. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) is based on the belief that the design and layout of a school building and site can effectively reduce the likelihood of criminal activity, thereby improving student safety. CPTED emphasizes unobtrusive security approaches, such as natural surveillance, target hardening and territorial reinforcement to protect the safety of students, staff and community members. The proposed security improvements to Salem-Keizer schools are summarized below:

- *Interior Upgrades* will include relocation of front offices at 17 schools for improved supervision of main entries, allowing staff to intercept visitors. An additional 17 schools will receive improvements to enhance natural surveillance of the entry (e.g. enlarged windows). These upgrades will allow staff to quickly initiate lockdowns in the event of a security incident. Other improvements include the addition of escape routes, elimination of hiding places, creation of sally-port entry doors, and redesign of restrooms for improved supervision of sink areas.
- *Surveillance Technology* (internal and external cameras) will be incorporated to improve supervision of buildings and sites, and improve response times during emergency situation. High resolution, Internet-connected cameras with intercoms will be provided at all school entries. The District would like to provide approximately one (1) camera for every 25 students (on average), though this will vary based building layouts. The 1:25 camera/student ratio is consistent with security practices by comparable districts. Cameras are an effective means of promoting accountability and creating a positive school climate. Communications systems will be equipped with InformaCast, a non-proprietary emergency notification system that enables the District to quickly notify staff, emergency personnel, parents, and/or other contacts of emergency situations and developments.
- *Electronic Building Access* will be provided at all buildings district-wide. These systems will improve lockdown procedures, emergency communications, and bell schedules. This will require retrofitting 53 schools and seven (7) support facilities. The District will purchase a non-proprietary system that

does not obligate the District to a specific vendor, and allows in-house staff to service the equipment. The new system will also work with existing systems, allowing the District to upgrade schools over time.

- *Exterior Upgrades* will be implemented, including incorporation of barriers, signage, perimeter fencing, pathways/entrances, landscaping to improve wayfinding, eliminate hiding spots and promote visibility of school sites. Bollards will be strategically placed to prevent vehicles from colliding with a building.
- *Lighting Upgrades* will be incorporated to more effectively illuminate certain outdoor areas (preventing graffiti and vandalism). The District will also convert all exterior lighting to LED bulbs.

#### Questions by the Subcommittee Members:

- **Do the proposed safety improvements encompass both people and property?** Yes, people and property were considered with developing the list of proposed security upgrades.
- **Some students say they don't feel safe when school feels like a prison. With security upgrades, when do you reach that point?** CPTED principles aspire to balance welcoming and secure design features. CPTED assessments recognize that hospitality is an important factor when identifying potential security upgrades. Whenever possible, security improvements are seamlessly integrated. For example, natural surveillance through transparency, combined with discreet camera placement, create school buildings that are easily supervised through unobtrusive measures. The District is *not* considering metal detectors, which is typically what students think of when they say they do not want a school that feels like a prison.
- **How would camera systems be protected from hacking?** The District takes student privacy very seriously. This question will be addressed by Bob Silva, Director of Technology, at a future meeting. Bob will discuss the District's procedures for protecting sensitive data. There is a strong marriage between TIS and Security. Currently, approximately half of the District's surveillance cameras are connected via the web.
- **Who monitors the current security cameras?** The cameras are not monitored in real-time, with the exception of main entry cameras. Existing surveillance cameras are mainly used to pull up video footage following incidents of graffiti, vandalism, inappropriate bus activity, etc., for disciplinary action. The District does not have a central monitoring station. The District would like to ensure that law enforcement have quick access to school cameras in the event on an emergency.
- **What about legal issues associated with camera use? Some parents may not want their students monitored. Are the District's surveillance practice subject to state law?** Cameras have been in use in Salem Keizer schools for a while now, without controversy. Proper data security measures are in place. People adjust to new security procedures over time, and perceptions change. For example, when the District started locking all exterior doors, requiring all parents and visitors to check-in, some parents were initially annoyed. However, the culture has changed significantly – now, parents complain if they are able to enter a school *without* being questioned by staff. When new security practices are employed, there may be a push-back initially, but then it quickly becomes standard practice.

- **Is data available showing the effects of the proposed security interventions in real world settings (before and after)?** There are data sets showing the impact of certain security measures on school discipline rates. There are also climate studies on natural surveillance points.
- **If schools move entirely to a VOIP system, is there a backup plan for occasions when the Internet goes down?** Bob Silva can address this question at a future meeting. Statistically, schools are more likely to experience service interruptions on a landline than an internet connection. The District has also improved schools' radio systems considerably – these may also be used as a back-up communications system in the event of an emergency. Cell phones offer another option. A number of school still have some landlines (in addition to VOIP), that will be retained for emergency communications.
- **Will the District provide badge access be for staff only, or will students also have badges? Would card access systems be utilized at exterior doors only, or also at interior doors?** The present goal is to offer badges to staff only. However, the system will have expansion capabilities, if the District decided to extend badge access to students in the future. While there is an emphasis on first covering exterior doors, the District would like to eventually cover many interior doors as well. Some high schools within the District already have badge access to select interior doors.
- **Regarding the proposed main office relocations, how will these be accomplished at schools with problematic layouts (e.g. Highland)?** Some schools will not be feasible candidates for office relocations. Unique approaches may be used at different buildings. Committee members discussed conditions at McNary as an example of a school where improving transparency via interior windows may be more feasible than relocating the office. The District will assess the feasibility of different options.
- **Has the District viewed CPTED principles through a cultural lens? What research has been conducted in this area?** Staff are not aware of any literature or research examining cultural implications of CPTED in a school environment. Staff will research this and report back at a future Task Force meeting.
- **Are the security improvements intended to limit lawsuits or protect kids?** They are intended to protect students, staff, community and property. The main goal is to protect the psychological safety of kids and provide optimal conditions for learning.
- **Will the District add motion detection equipment to school sites?** This type of equipment has been installed at select support buildings; at these sites, security personnel are notified if a certain perimeter is breached after hours. Motion detection systems might be added to select school sites in the future; however, implementation is cost prohibitive on a large scale, as the equipment is very expensive.

Building condition needs will be discussed by the Building Condition Subcommittee during the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>.

## Enrollment/Capacity Subcommittee

### Topic: Overview of Capacity Needs by School Type and Feeder

The Enrollment/Capacity Subcommittee discussed the growth and capacity needs of each school within the McKay feeder. Mike Wolfe distributed a list of schools with undersized core areas, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums and libraries. The list was color coded, with slightly undersized core areas (within 10%) shaded yellow, and fully undersized core areas shaded red. The group was encouraged to make recommendations on a school-by-school basis, based on the unique needs and conditions identified at each site. The subcommittee's initial thoughts and recommendations are listed below:

- **Chavez Elementary:** Projected enrollment is fairly stable. Core infrastructure is generally adequate, with the exception of the gym (slightly undersized but within 10% of target). There is not room for portables at this site.
- **Hallman Elementary:** Hallman was designed as a walking school; consequently, there is limited onsite parking. Move Hallman's gym from yellow to red. Is there the possibility that boundary changes could ease overcrowding at this site?
- **Hammond Elementary:** Adequate capacity – no changes.
- **Hayesville Elementary:** Cafeteria and gym are undersized (move gym from yellow to red).
- **Hoover Elementary:** Hoover is on a large site with an adjacent park. Replace end-of-life portable classrooms. Expand gym, cafeteria, and library.
- **Lamb Elementary:** Enrollment is fairly stable. Enrollment adjustments could occur via boundary changes. No changes.
- **Scott Elementary:** Add 10 classrooms and remove portables. Expand gym and add a cafeteria.
- **Swegle Elementary:** Expand core infrastructure (gym, library and cafeteria) and replace end-of-life portables.
- **Washington Elementary:** Expand cafeteria and replace end-of-life portables.
- **Yoshikai Elementary:** Yoshikai was designed with future expansion in mind. Gym is slightly undersized, but will remain "yellow" for now.
- **Waldo Middle School:** Move Waldo's gym from yellow to red.
- **Stephens Middle School:** Replace end-of-life portables. Expand cafeteria and library.
- **McKay High School:** All core infrastructure is undersized for the current student population, and enrollment will continue to increase over the next 10 years. The subcommittee discussed the possibility of adding a 44 classroom addition (replacing current portables and adding classrooms to meet the projected enrollment increase. However, some subcommittee members were concerned about the resulting size of the high school. A 7<sup>th</sup> high school might be a better option to alleviate overcrowding, and keep existing high schools reasonably sized.

#### Questions by the Subcommittee Members:

- **How were the target sizes of the core areas identified?** These targets were based on industry trends and recently constructed Salem Keizer school buildings. The elementary and middle school targets referenced the District's most recent Educational Specifications. The target gym size does

not reflect the implementation of increased P.E. requirements for elementary and middle school students under H.B. 3141.

- **Can Subcommittee members receive a copy of the boundary map as a handout?** Yes, this can be provided, though it may be difficult to read.
- **Why does Hayesville show a projected enrollment dip?** The District will ask PSU to provide additional information.
- **What is the cost of adding a portable classroom?** Adding a new portable costs approximately \$350,000 (two classrooms).
- **It would be helpful to have a cost analysis comparing the cost of a new addition, new portable and relocated portable.** This information was not immediately available, but can be provided at a future Task Force meeting. It is also important to factor in the cost of maintaining a portable.
- **How long does it take to build a new high school?** A minimum of three years. If the District passed a bond in 2017, the earliest the high school could open is 2020-21.
- **What is the cost to expand all “red” items under core infrastructure?** This total was not immediately available, but can be provided at a future Task Force meeting.
- **What land is available for a potential high school site?** A specific site has not yet been determined.
- **McKay is the largest feeder. If one of the elementary schools changed to another feeder, would this help alleviate overcrowding at McKay?** Most of the existing high schools are at or near capacity. If a 7<sup>th</sup> high school is added, the feeders would be adjusted accordingly.

#### **Task Force Subcommittees Reconvene / Additional Items**

- The Subcommittees reconvened to share the highlights of their discussions.
- Task Force members expressed interest in touring select District schools. The District will organize a few tours in January. The tours may be scheduled separately from the Task Force meetings. Participation would be encouraged, but optional. Virtual tours are another option.
- The Task Force website is online. Mary Paulson will send email the link to the Task Force members.
- Upcoming Task Force meeting dates include January 12, 19, 26, and February 9.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.