



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

From	Elisa Warner	Date	January 12, 2017
Project	SKSD LRFP	Project No.	14026
Subject	SKSD LRFP Task Force		

Process Discussion

- The subcommittee chairs held a debrief session following the first subcommittee meetings. One change in format will be that questions and consensus items will be written on flip charts during the subcommittee discussions. Certain questions will be placed in a “parking lot” category, where they will be tabled until a future meeting.
- Mike Wolfe reviewed the meeting schedule with the Task Force. It will be important for the subcommittees to stay on task in order to complete the process and develop recommendations for the Board by March. The Task Force members are encouraged to attend the March School Board meeting when the recommendations are presented.

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: Building Condition and Maintenance Needs

- The Subcommittee reviewed the minutes from the first meeting for accuracy and completeness. There were no comments or changes.
- The District’s school buildings receive high intensity use, based on the number of students served. Systems are operating for extended periods; fans run continuously throughout the occupied day. The District must invest in very durable furniture, equipment and systems have to withstand this degree of use.
- Information on Seismic Tier II evaluations and improvements will be presented to the Subcommittee at a future meeting.
- Intercom bell/clock systems will be discussed in the context of the Technology Plan when Bob Silva presents at the meeting on January 19th.

- Joel Smallwood discussed the District’s building condition and maintenance needs, referring to a spreadsheet showing 5 and 10-year capital improvement needs at each school. On the building condition spreadsheet, an “x” does not necessarily indicate that *everything* will be replaced – the specific type and degree of improvements will vary by school, based on local conditions.
- Joel Smallwood led the Subcommittee through the proposed building condition improvements at the following schools:
 - Morningside Elementary
 - Scott Elementary
 - Kalapuya Elementary
 - Judson Middle School
 - McNary High School

Subcommittee members were encouraged to familiarize themselves with the building condition needs of other schools by reviewing the school profile sheets (Tab D), as well as projects noted in the Capital Improvement Plan (Tab E).

- Joel Smallwood led a discussion regarding the condition of the District’s older administrative and support facilities, including:
 - Central Services
 - Central Kitchen/Nutrition Services
 - Paulus Administration Building
 - Reprographics
 - Student Services
 - Technology Information Services (TIS)
 - Transportation
- Many of the District’s admin and support facilities are severely inadequate. In most cases, renovation/expansion would be prohibitively expensive due to asbestos, seismic code issues, and/or constrained sites.
- Subcommittee members discussed the feasibility of consolidating activities currently held in older admin/support buildings (e.g. Paulus, Reprographics, and Student Services). Although the buildings are aged, there may be substantial land value – particularly Paulus and Reprographics, due to their proximity to Willamette University. The District could consolidate functions in a single building (or campus) at a much lower land value. This would result in cost savings extending over several years.
- It is important to note that not *all* facilities should necessarily be consolidated; certain programs are operating effectively at their current locations and would be costly to relocate (e.g. Central Services, Central Kitchen/Nutrition Services).
- Additionally, there are several repurposed support buildings owned by the District. Many of these are school buildings that were closed and repurposed as other educational facilities or support facilities.

Questions by the Subcommittee Members:

- **Do the capacity figures on the map include portables?** The capacity figures on the map *do* include portable classrooms.
- **What was the methodology for the assessments?** The building condition assessments were conducted by DOWA-IBI Group. An architect visited each facility to conduct a visual assessment. The reports were also informed by the District's construction records and maintenance logs. Maintenance staff completed written questionnaires regarding the condition of building components and systems. School principals were also interviewed regarding the educational adequacy of the school buildings.
- **Why are some items completed under the 2008 bond listed on the 10 year list?** Some items will need to be addressed every 10 years (e.g. exterior seal). Also, in some cases, there are multiple projects per category. For example, a mark under the "HVAC" category could refer to a wide range of improvements, including updated HVAC controls, boiler replacement, adding ventilation to a kiln room, etc. The HVAC improvements that occurred in 2008 may have been an entirely different project than what is proposed on the 10-year plan.
- **Why are mechanical and plumbing issues concentrated in the 5-year plan?** All equipment has a lifespan. In certain buildings, equipment may not have quite reached the end of its lifespan when the 2008 bond passed. Many of the HVAC items listed in the 5-year plan are controls upgrades. Some buildings are still operating with individual thermostats on walls. DDC (direct digital controls) systems monitor conditions throughout the building, and allow customized scheduling for increased energy efficiency. Custodians are able to adjust temperature by room, and easily troubleshoot the source of any problems. There are huge efficiencies gained with these upgrades. Some of the plumbing upgrades refer to replacement of galvanized piping.
- **As a new facility, why is Kalapuya's gym listed as slightly undersized?** Kalapuya was designed nearly 10 years ago. P.E. requirements have changed over time. The introduction of H.B. 3141 will further impact P.E. spatial needs due to increased P.E. activity requirements for elementary and middle school students. Still, Kalapuya's gym is just barely undersized, based on the District's current (2017) benchmarks (within 10%). Current enrollment levels are also a factor.
- **What is the District's policy on replacing portables?** The Enrollment/Capacity subcommittee is focusing on this issue. This is an area where the Task Force will likely make recommendations to the School Board. In the past, the District has not replaced aging portables based on a specific timeline. The District would prefer not to add portables, but sometimes portables are preferable to boundary changes (which can be difficult and emotional to implement). Although not ideal, portables are a cost-efficient and fast way to add capacity.
- **Is real estate a limiting factor when considering the feasibility of expanding?** The Enrollment/Capacity subcommittee is considering this issue. For example, schools like McKinley and Candalaria are very landlocked; expansion would not be feasible at these sites.
- **What is the total cost of all improvements listed in the 5 and 10-year plans?** Some preliminary cost estimates have been developed by the District. The total estimated cost of all 5 and 10-year improvements (not including seismic or intercom/clocks/bells) is \$60M. These are construction estimates (2017 dollars – not escalated).

- **How much is allocated annually for maintenance? What about items that will need to be addressed in the next budget cycle (prior to a possible future bond election)?** 2016-17 labor and materials totaled approximately \$7.2M out of general fund. The annual maintenance budget keeps existing systems operational, and funds preventative maintenance to allow systems to reach their life expectancy. However, many of these items are now at the end of their life expectancy. There are not enough funds in the annual maintenance budget to replace major systems, etc.
- **How much of the \$7.2 M (general fund) will apply to items on the 5 & 10-year lists?** None of the listed projects are able to be funded by operational funds. Maintenance items were excluded from the lists.
- **In the last bond, was their discussion about increasing the deferred maintenance fund?** The Deferred and Preventative Maintenance Fund was created to account for specific multi-year projects for deferred and preventative maintenance. Funding for these projects are from the General Fund. \$2.5 million is allocated per year. School construction bond funds cannot be spent on general maintenance. It is important to note that maintenance dollars compete with classroom dollars. The Board decided to implement an annual \$2.5 M maintenance fund to prevent deferred maintenance from creeping up. The 2008 bond consisted largely of repair and renovation work.
- **Can some of the bond be reserved for maintenance? Can the Task Force suggest increasing the annual maintenance budget as one of the recommendations?** Bond funds must be used for capital costs (not ongoing maintenance). However, the Task Force could recommend that the School Board increase the annual allocation for building maintenance (currently \$2.5M).
- **Is there research documenting the impact of the workplace environment on building users (e.g. productivity, job satisfaction, etc.)?** There are studies documenting the effects of environmental conditions (lighting, temp, etc.) on building users.
- **If the District were to expand McNary HS, could additional land be acquired?** At McNary HS, land to the east might be considered as a potential option.
- **In some cases, will the District consider expanding a facility by adding a 2nd story?** Opportunities for vertical expansion will be considered, where feasible.
- **Does the District have money to purchase land, or would this be part of a bond?** The District does not have money in the operational funds to purchase land.
- **What would be the potential savings of consolidating admin/support buildings (from improved efficiencies, etc.)?** This has not been specifically calculated; however, the savings would be substantial. The LRFP process included interviews with representatives from each admin/support building. Nearly all the staff members consulted felt strongly that consolidation would allow programs to operate more effectively and efficiently. Also, consolidation would result in reduced maintenance costs, as the District would be freed from maintaining several older, deteriorating, inefficient facilities that would otherwise require expensive repairs and seismic upgrades in the near future.
- **What about energy-efficient upgrades?** Efficiency upgrades are an important item to consider. With new construction, this would be part of the design process. The degree of savings would depend upon the types of upgrades, etc. General information (not specific to the District) on the savings potential associated with certain energy upgrades will be distributed at a future meeting.
- **The District performed energy audits for Senate bill 1149. What is the status of this?** The District has received approximately \$9M (reimbursement) to fund energy conservation projects over recent

years. The District is through the Tier 1 projects (5-7 year payback). All improvements were implemented in school facilities (funds cannot be used for admin/support buildings).

- **If District admin/support buildings were replaced and/or consolidated, would this occur on current sites or at new locations?** Both options would be considered. The buildings themselves are not high-value buildings; however, the property could be valuable in some cases. For example, Paulus and Reprographics are located near Willamette University.
- **If money were no object, what would be the ideal approach for providing admin and support services? Would it be preferable to have all departments on one campus?** Consolidation would be ideal. There are significant operational efficiencies to be gained. Staff spend a lot of time driving back and forth between different sites.

Enrollment/Capacity Subcommittee

Topic: Overview of Capacity Needs by School Type and Feeder

The Enrollment/Capacity Subcommittee reviewed the minutes from the first meeting for accuracy and completeness. There were no comments or changes.

The Subcommittee continued their discussion of the growth and capacity needs of each school within the district. Subcommittee members referred to the list of schools with undersized core areas, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums and libraries. 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:

McNary Feeder Schools

- Clear Lake Elementary: Core infrastructure is adequate, no changes except to add portables.
- Cummings Elementary: Cummings was designed as a walking school. Core infrastructure is solid however the cafeteria is undersized, it is red. The population is stable.
- Forest Ridge Elementary: The population is stable. This site has no portables. No changes needed.
- Gubser Elementary: The gym and cafeteria are small, and portables will be needed. Recommend building an addition with four (4) classrooms, gym and cafeteria.
- Keizer Elementary: Keizer is situated on 10 acres. It is currently overcapacity and has many needs: the gym and library are undersized, and it does not have a cafeteria. Keizer ES currently houses a District ELL program; this adds to the overcrowding. Enrollment growth is projected. Expand the core infrastructure by building an addition with cafeteria/kitchen and four (4) classrooms.
- Kennedy Elementary: Stable enrollment and is at 87% capacity. Kennedy has seven (7) portable classrooms and the cafeteria is undersized. An apartment complex was built last summer; the boundary was placed through the middle of the complex.
- Weddle Elementary: Newer school, built in 2001 with no portables. Enrollment is at 112% of capacity. A boundary change could alleviate overcrowding at this site.
- Claggett Creek Middle School: Adequate capacity presently, but enrollment projections indicate high enrollment growth in the next five (5) years.
- Whiteaker Middle School: Adequate capacity – no changes.

- McNary High School: The high school is landlocked and is the 2nd largest high school with continued growth projected. The subcommittee discussed the possibility of building an addition with 20 classrooms, but this is dependent upon land acquisition. If the facility was expanded, the parking lot and athletic fields would need to be reconfigured. The subcommittee believes that the community would prefer a larger high school over dividing McNary into two schools. One possible approach would be to change school boundaries at the elementary level so students are funneled into another high school.

North Feeder Schools

- Auburn Elementary: Core infrastructure is very stressed - 700 plus students and the population is continuing to grow. The gym, cafeteria and library all are undersized. There are six (6) portables on site. Inadequate parking for staff and parents. The adjacent land is now part of the National Park System and currently cannot be sold or swapped. This is an example of school that may be a candidate for replacement at a different site (with the current building repurposed).
- Englewood Elementary: This elementary school sits on 1.9 acres and is over 100 years old. Although the structure is functionally obsolete, the community is very committed to continuing the history of the building. The school is at 86% capacity with one (1) end of life portable.
- Eyre Elementary: Eyre is currently at 99% capacity with six (6) portables. The gym and cafeteria are undersized. Construction of an addition with a cafeteria/kitchen, gym expansion, and eight (8) classrooms is recommended (removing current portables).
- Four Corners Elementary: All core areas are undersized. The site is 10.5 acres; this could be a candidate for replacement.
- Grant Elementary: The cafeteria is undersized with no possible expansion options (due to the small site). The school is on 2.65 acres and there is no available land. There is no room for portables at this site. The parking lot is undersized with approximately 10 spaces.
- Highland Elementary: Constructed in 1910, Highland was recently seismically upgraded. It sits on a little over 2 acres and is included in the, "land swap", with the City of Salem (gaining 4.88 acres). Highland, like Englewood, is functionally obsolete, yet has a rich history and is beloved by the community.
- Miller Elementary: Miller is a newer school, built in 2000. It is currently at 110% of capacity. There are no portables on site. The site is nearly 10 acres.
- Houck Middle School: The cafeteria and the library are undersized. End of life portables need replacement.
- Parrish Middle School: The library is undersized, but the core infrastructure is sound. This site, because of its proximity to North, could conceivably become part of North High School's campus in the future (if Parrish were relocated).
- North High School: North is currently at 99% capacity including 10 portables. North is generally undersized. The site has 21 acres; by today's standards, 40 acres is desirable. The gym and cafeteria are undersized. Of the 10 portables, eight (8) will soon be at end of life.

South Feeder Schools

- Bush Elementary: Stable enrollment with no core infrastructure issues.

- Candalaria Elementary: Land locked and on heavily sloped site. PSU predicts a decline in population. Candalaria is at 111% capacity and the cafeteria is undersized. Consider school boundary changes to alleviate overcrowding.
- Lee Elementary: Lee is at 66% capacity is the most underutilized school in our district. Currently housing the Literacy Squared Program.
- McKinley Elementary: Built in 1915, McKinley is at 98% capacity. The land around the school is not included in the “land swap” with the City of Salem, so there is no room for expansion.
- Morningside Elementary: Adequate capacity – no changes. Available land is located across the street.
- Pringle Elementary: Pringle sits on 9.4 acres. The gym and cafeteria are undersized. An addition is recommended.
- Judson Middle School: Move gym from yellow to red.
- Leslie Middle School: The cafeteria and library are undersized. Leslie may be a good candidate for school boundary changes to balance enrollment.
- South High School: The site is landlocked and is at 105% capacity. The cafeteria and library are undersized. Howard Street Charter School is currently housed at South Salem HS. The pool needs to be removed.

Questions by the Subcommittee Members:

- **Can the subcommittee receive a revised copy of the core capacity report that includes all schools (including “green” schools where core capacity is currently sufficient)?** The Appendix of the LRFPP lists the core capacity status of every school in the district. Although not color-coded, the spreadsheet state which schools meet (or do not meet) the SF goals.
- **Should boundary adjustments be considered to more evenly distribute students where an overcrowded school is located near a school that is under capacity? For example: Kennedy/Gubser; Claggett Creek/Whiteaker; and Lee/Pringle?** School boundary changes are one of the potential options that may be considered by the District to alleviate overcrowding at select sites. It is important to note that each core capacity assessment is based on current school enrollment; if enrollment levels shift, this could potentially turn a "green" school into a "yellow" school. School boundary changes have reverberating effects that spread across multiple schools within a feeder; there are many factors to consider. This topic should be revisited at a future meeting, once the Subcommittee has discussed the enrollment/capacity needs across all schools and feeders.
- **Did PSU’s enrollment projections consider future developments and buildable land within the school boundary areas?** PSU utilized a robust methodology that considered a range of variables. The District will consult with PSU to obtain a more detailed description of their approach in developing the enrollment projections. This will be shared with the subcommittee at a future meeting.

Task Force Subcommittees Reconvene / Additional Items

- The Subcommittees reconvened to share the highlights of their discussions.
- Upcoming Task Force meeting dates include January 19, 26, and February 9.

The meeting concluded at 8:05 p.m.