**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION**
**OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**
**SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

**April 11, 2018**

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session at 5:30 p.m. at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on April 6, 2018, and published in *The Register-Guard* on April 11, 2018.

**ROLL CALL**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**
Eileen Nittler, Chair
Alicia Hays, Vice Chair
Anne Marie Levis
Judy Newman
Evangelina Sundgrenz
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

**STAFF:**
Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent of Schools
Charis McGaughy, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
Kerry Delf, Associate Director of Communications
Brooke Wagner, Director of Elementary Education
BJ Blake, Director of Secondary Education
Cheryl Linder, Director of Educational Support Services
Cydney Vandercar, Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Services
Christine Nesbit, In-House Counsel
Harlan Coats, Director of Facilities Management
Steve Menachemson, Director of Technology
Lisa Fjordbeck, Executive Assistant / Board Secretary
Monica Brown, SSD Business Manager

**MEDIA:** KRVM.

**OTHER:** Maggie Simich, Patinkin Research Institute.

## I. WORK SESSION

1. Planning and Development Decision for ECCO

Chair Nittler called the work session to order at 5:31 p.m.

Dr. Balderas provided background on Early College and Career Options (ECCO) located at the Lane Community College (LCC). His hope was to work out the contract for ECCO to stay at LCC for another year; the lease would cost more than in the past. Dr. Balderas explained it was a nice facility, but there were some concerns in regards to housing the program at LCC. LCC had been a fantastic partner and the district wanted to continue to honor the contract and ensure they met both LCC and the district's needs. The goal was to find a new location by 2019-2020. Dr. Balderas explained ECCO served multiple types of students; for example, some students needed flexibility for childcare; others may have heavy deficiencies in terms of credits, or may face trauma in their life.

Dr. Balderas explained that when he first arrived to the district in 2015, ECCO was an 11th and 12th grade program. Since then, ECCO had expanded to 10th grade. The ultimate goal of ECCO was to eventually offer a 9th through 12th grade program. The district wanted a true, comprehensive alternative education program. In addition, Dr. Balderas noted the district strove to introduce a middle level program in the future, to meet students with a variety of needs.

Dr. Balderas covered potential site options for ECCO. He noted cost was a factor in relocating ECCO. The district would move the program to a district-owned property, so it would not sign another lease or purchase a property. Dr. Balderas said one option was the renovation of Bailey Hill. The site was close to Churchill High School. The school was built in 1954 on 5.5 acres.

Ms. Sundgrenz clarified it was where the Natives' Program was housed. She wondered if it would be located with the Natives' Program. Dr. Balderas said if ECCO moved to Bailey Hill, the district would look at relocating the Natives' Program. Ms. McGaughy showed the board where the location of the Natives' Program was at Bailey Hill on a map. She explained the building did not meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements because there was a slope issue, so the outdoor hallway would need to be leveled. There were also quads within the building from the 1970s for flexible space. Ms. McGaughy added the EWEB River Science program was also located at Bailey Hill, as well as the Eugene-Springfield Youth Symphony Orchestra. Ms. Walston asked if they paid rent. Dr. Balderas said no, because it was a partnership between the entities and they offered after school programs for 4J students. Ms. Sundgrenz verified that all three programs would need to be relocated with the district. Dr. Balderas responded yes.

Dr. Balderas said pros of the Bailey Hill site included: it was district owned, it was accessible, it had a gym and cafeteria, and public transportation was about 0.3 miles away. Cons included: it was not centrally located, there were not Career Technical Education (CTE) spaces, and current programs would need to be relocated.

Ms. Levis asked about the accessibility upgrades. Dr. Balderas said $1.9 million would go into ADA accessibility for the upper wing.

Dr. Balderas said another option was Willard School. The site was more centrally located, and the building was around 35,000 square feet. The site overall was bigger as well, at 10 acres. The projected cost to remodel, based on the 2019-2020 timeframe, would be close to $6.5 million. Contractors would go to the studs and completely reframe the building. A new building would cost about $30 million. Regardless, if the district looked to keep the building, Willard

would need a new roof because of water damage. Pros included: Willard was a 4J property, it was accessible, and more centrally located. Cons included: the building was in poor condition, there was no CTE space, and the district would need another location for items currently stored there.

Dr. Balderas said the third site was at the district office at Monroe Street, behind the main building. He explained the district owned the property all the way to the river front. Projecting out for 2020, it could cost roughly $15 million to build a new, 35,000 square foot building. Dr. Balderas explained the space was tighter than the other two school sites. The great thing about the other two sites was that the district could slowly add on to the school to augment the current sites, creating a true college and career hub model. Dr. Balderas recommended the board hear a presentation on ECCO visioning. He wanted the board to hear the good work ECCO was doing, from ECCO staff and the principal.

Dr. Balderas said they were on a slight time crunch and hoped to have a decision within the next few weeks, but the board could not make a decision in the work session. Mr. Torrey asked what the goal of the work session was that evening. Dr. Balderas said he wanted to prepare the board to provide clear direction and move on the renovation of Bailey Hill at a future regular meeting. Dr. Balderas reiterated it would be a low cost renovation and they could expand on the building. He also wanted comments from board members that evening.

Mr. Torrey had been giving the issue a lot of thought. In his opinion, Bailey Hill was the right choice for a number of reasons. First, it would be an easier plan to implement. Secondly, while Bailey Hill was not in the core of the city, Mr. Torrey was concerned about using Willard for ECCO because it was a premier piece of property and he did not want to renovate the school and then later have to replace it. Mr. Torrey said in terms of proximity, South Eugene High School would be the furthest school impacted by a move to Bailey Hill. Sheldon and North Eugene High School had access points to Bailey Hill via the Beltline. Mr. Torrey said people could get to Bailey Hill very easily. Mr. Torrey noted Maya Treder, ECCO's high school student representative, told the board students really wanted a site where they all could be together. Mr. Torrey said if the improvements were made at Bailey Hill, and then in the future the district decided to expand, the site could still be used for the Chinese immersion school in the future as it grew. For those reasons, Mr. Torrey was a proponent of moving ECCO to Bailey Hill after renovation.

Dr. Balderas added the proximity of Bailey Hill to Churchill High School was a benefit, and would allow collaborations with their CTE program.

Ms. Walston wanted to know why ECCO was leaving LCC. She wondered why the urgency. Dr. Balderas said the urgency was around the limited space and the lack of opportunity for a 9$^{th}$ through 12$^{th}$ grade program there. He explained that within their contract with LCC, there was a stipulation students must be 16 years of age and older and LCC would not be renewing the lease. In addition, Dr. Balderas said the location was very far from some areas, such as Santa Clara. The move would be a mutual benefit, although LCC had been phenomenal partners. Ms. Walston guessed there was a fairly healthy offering of CTE at LCC, and wondered if those classrooms could be replicated at the new ECCO site. She hoped if ECCO ended up at Bailey

Hill, the district could work with LTD to alter the route. At that point, she was not in favor of building at the district office site.

Ms. Sundgrenz asked if there had been discussion with the programs housed at Bailey Hill. Dr. Balderas had been visiting with the Natives' Program, and there would be discussion with the others. He told the board it would be easy to find space for the groups within the district, and the organizations knew Bailey Hill was temporary home. Ms. Sundgrenz was also curious if LTD could expand their service to Bailey Hill.

Chair Nittler wondered if there was space to build shops and other CTE offerings onto the Bailey Hill land. Dr. Balderas said yes, because there was five and a half acres, so it had room to expand. Dr. Balderas said there were currently 125 students at ECCO and the goal was to expand the enrollment to around 250 students. He reiterated the vision was a true alternative program that met kids' needs, because some kids did not flourish at a traditional high school. Chair Nittler was not worried about bussing at that point because high school students had to walk 1.5 miles for school/transit; she did not think .3 mile was terribly long, but if LTD could expand service, that would be great.

Mr. Torrey wondered how many students at ECCO were accessing CTE classes through ECCO, and how large were class sizes. Mr. Torrey added the district had to find a way to provide credit recovery for students who were behind, because if there was not a way to provide that service, those kids would fall through the cracks. Mr. Torrey thought Bailey Hill could also be a site where students from all high schools could access classes on weekends or at night for credit recovery. Many kids would need special support and attention for specific areas.

Dr. Balderas referred to a "twilight school" program. He thought it was part of the programming conversation they could have, to provide different times for students to access curriculum and education. Some kids worked multiple jobs, or had other situations, and needed an alternative mechanism.

Ms. Levis thanked Mr. Torrey for his comments, because she also thought programming was a critical piece of ECCO. The district had great visions of what could be done at LCC and they did a lot, but were not able to accomplish everything they could with ECCO if it were at their own location. She was very supportive of moving ECCO to Bailey Hill. Ms. Levis noted it was much closer to the North Eugene area, which would help some students. Ms. Levis said the district needed to be very frugal; Bailey Hill was a good location, 4J owned the site, and it did not cost too much to renovate the building. She thought the option made the most sense. The district could control own destiny there, and have room to grow.

Ms. Newman agreed, she also liked the Bailey Hill solution. She was originally under the impression ECCO had to leave LCC; there was some appeal to being on campus. Dr. Balderas said ECCO had about a year left to be on campus, but LCC really wanted the space. It was a programming issue; the limit on age of 16 years was problematic for the district. Ms. Newman said Bailey Hill was so close to Churchill High School, she thought there could be an opportunity for CTE growth. The investment would affect more kids.

Ms. Sundgrenz addressed Dr. Balderas, and noted he said some students worked multiple jobs. She wondered if staff could figure out how many students had one or two jobs, or work permits. Dr. Balderas had emailed Lane Workforce and would find out. Ms. Walston clarified the Natives' Program was a 4J program. She asked how many employees worked in the program. Dr. Balderas said there were two employees, and there had generally been only one classroom.

Ms. Hays supported renovation of the Bailey Hill site. Ms. Hays acknowledged that ECCO students were wondering what would happen to the school, but the work session might help answer some questions.

Dr. Balderas said the next step was to review the long term vision for ECCO. Ms. Walston asked when the board would make a decision on the matter. Dr. Balderas said next month.

2. Bond Planning
    a. Receive Information Regarding a Live-Call Survey for Capital Projects and Bond Scenarios

Dr. Balderas said the goal of bond planning was to discuss survey results, and direct staff to identify three bond options: Plans A, B, and C. Staff would return to the board at a future meeting as staff narrowed the frame of possible projects.

Maggie Simich, Patinkin Research Strategies (Patinkin), presented a PowerPoint titled "Eugene 4J School District Bond," which was focused on results from a live-call survey on capital projects and future bond scenarios. Ms. Simich said Patinkin surveyed 400 people within the district, and explained the methodology and defined the terms Patinkin used throughout the report. Patinkin started the survey with a question around school district facilities. They hoped voters would see most of the facilities were in bad conditions. Ms. Simich noted the majority of respondents (54%) indicated buildings were in poor or fair condition, with only 32% responding they were in good or excellent conditions. The intensity around the questions wasn't as strong, so Ms. Simich thought some demographic areas would benefit from additional education around the state of facilities.

Ms. Simich shared benchmarks and explained the demographic trends within the survey. She explained Patinkin liked to see support of 50% or higher, and intensity of support at 40% or higher. Patinkin also liked to see intensity of opposition around 25% or less. There was a cushion to have room for success. Ms. Simich also explained they tested the highest option of a $450 million bond measure, and also tested simulated bond language. She said the $450 million bond measure was supported at 56%. Strong opposition was muted, at only 20% .

Ms. Simich explained base supporters included residents of the North Eugene region; Democratic women; and those between the ages of 18 to 29 years old. Soft supporters included residents of the Sheldon region; Republicans; and individuals with college degrees. Ms. Levis said the one emailed to board members had a different grouping. Ms. Brown said there were revisions, so the old version must have been sent. Ms. Simich continued that those most likely to be undecided on the bond were low propensity voters, as well as Republican and Democratic men who did not currently or formerly have children in the district. She pointed out the majority of subgroups were still voting yes on the bond. It was a positive trend.

Ms. Simich said looking at subgroups, women with a four-year degree or more and renters tended to be most supportive of the bond. They were Demographic breaks Patinkin tended to see in bond measures. Ms. Simich said education throughout is the most pronounced division. She noted Democrats and Republicans were equally supportive at that point, while Independents offered a plurality in favor. Ms. Simich explained the data was all based on party registration on voter file, and the reason why Democrats and Republicans were equal was largely a function of education. Voters in the North and South Eugene regions tended to be most supportive. She said perception of school facilities had a strong impact on the choice. Those who thought schools were in poor or fair condition tended to be far more supportive of bond than those who thought it was in excellent or good condition. Looking at parental status, 58% of those who currently had kids in 4J supported the bond, which was on par to parents who formerly had kids in 4J. Ms. Simich did note that it seemed current parents had price sensitivity.

Ms. Simich explained the three bond price points tested, which were $450 million, $300 million, and $150 million option. Patinkin outlined projects that could be included at each price point. At that point, Patinkin did not think any option should be taken off the table. For all three, the level of opposition was fairly muted, but there was definitely price sensitivity at play. At $450 million, 37% opposed the bond compared to $150 million where that number dropped to 25%.

Ms. Simich said the top testing questions focused on basic repairs, but also on CTE, textbooks, and energy efficiencies. She said 75% or more favored those aspects, with 4 in 10 respondents saying they strongly favored. Ms. Simich said for CTE space, there were higher levels of support when it was referred to as “CTE” rather than “job training.” In addition, Title Nine upgrades were well supported, and it was unusual to see athletics appearing toward the top of the list. Ms. Simich said those upgrades were particularly supported when the question framed the issue in terms of equality and Title IX.

Ms. Simich said projects that tested lower included expanded facilities and specific renovations. She noted the lower tier was relative, because 2/3 or more of respondents still favored those projects. In Patinkin’s opinion, none proposed were necessarily a liability to a bond package. Patinkin also looked at regression modeling, which was a way to look underneath the top line data. According to Patinkin, four items would be drivers of support for the bond. Those included equity upgrades, expansion of special education spaces, critical replacements including North Eugene High School, and needed maintenance and repair on roofs and heating.

Ms. Simich said Patinkin also did an exercise where they looked at two options for North Eugene High School. She explained the two options. A majority thought the building should be replaced, and replacement was most popular in the North Eugene region. Patinkin did a similar exercise with Edison Elementary School. The first option was to repair and renovate. Supporters of renovation thought the building should be preserved for its historic value. The second option was replacement. Supporters of replacement thought it would be safer, more efficient, and at a lower cost. Ms. Simich said the answer was divided, but the intensity of support leaned slightly toward replacing the building.

Ms. Simich shared their message frame; it was like an “elevator speech” to explain why the bond was necessary. Patinkin came to that frame through a series of questions around whether

voters felt each of the descriptions fit the proposed bond. Ms. Simich said 7 out of 10 agreed with the message frame. Two traits needed to be emphasized however, including accountability to tax payers and ensuring students are career or college ready after graduation. The intensity of feelings around those areas were weak. Patinkin also included three negative questions around whether voters felt they could afford the bond, or whether it would put strain on seniors and those living on a fixed income. Some voters were divided over whether it was something they really could afford right now, and also responded that it could lead to more wasteful government spending.

Ms. Simich explained a series of messages were tested around the bond including one around access to modern technology and a second on seismic upgrades and safety/security measures. Another message tested was that the bond would allow the district to create energy efficiencies to save money, and redirect those funds to the classroom. Ms. Simich explained 46% of voters thought those messages were very convincing. She said there were additional language nuances to keep in mind. When discussing basic repairs, it was helpful to compare them to maintenance that voters might do in their own homes. Seismic messaging should focus on the problems in older schools. It was more effective to talk about older schools being rated as vulnerable, and how they would be fixed throughout the course of the bond as opposed to only mentioning building of new schools. Lastly, discussing the need for up to date technology was more effective when talking about the constant advances in technology rather than around equity.

Ms. Simich said by the end of the survey, 6 out of 10 respondents supported the bond. She said it would be important to consolidate soft voters as opposed to persuading undecided voters. There was a 3 point increase in strong support for bond. Lastly, educational outreach folks included Republicans (especially those with a four year degree or more), voters from the Sheldon High School region, voters ages 60 to 69, non-current/former 4J parents, and men with a four year degree or more.

Ms. Levis asked what margin the last district bond passed by. She was concerned by the numbers Ms. Simich shared. Ms. Levis said the district was generally well supported, so she was a little shocked they were not higher. She pointed to a slide discussing the state of schools. She wondered if in Ms. Simich's experience, a 13% number meant people did not understand the state of district schools. Ms. Simich said when considering voters as a whole, most data saw a light intensity of feeling because the population was not spending a lot of time in the facility. Ms. Simich said an educational outreach goal would be to talk to those voters who thought schools needed work, but were unsure about the extent.

Ms. Levis asked if Ms. Simich was concerned about the overall numbers. Ms. Simich responded she thought it was a passable bond at $450 million, but it would require robust outreach efforts. She did think it would be more attainable at lower price points, as there was price sensitivity from voters.

Ms. Newman said the question around state of schools may be difficult to answer because there were some nice, new schools that were very visible, and then there were others that needed a

lot of work. Ms. Simich thought that was valid point, the general population didn't want to pay for improvements if schools were good condition.

Mr. Torrey said in the past, the South Eugene area was most supportive of bonds. He was concerned that the community directly associated with Edison Elementary School needed to come together around a message. While he understood the significance of historical value, the three outside high school areas would not be nearly concerned, and would want to be prudent. He thought the school had to come together and tell the board why they ought to do one option or the other. Mr. Torrey thought they had to do something about Edison Elementary School, but having an internal fight would be counter-productive. Mr. Torrey was also concerned about what was in it for the Churchill region. He did not think the Churchill or Sheldon areas would see a benefit. Mr. Torrey thought there were some arguments for a tremendous amount of growth in the Sheldon region because there was lots of new housing there. His biggest concern was to raise funds to run a campaign to communicate why people should support the bond.

Ms. Levis said North Eugene High School was the biggest ticket item. The cost would be between $150 to 170 million. At the lowest price point, it would be the whole bond and at the middle, the project would be a big chunk. Ms. Levis clarified North Eugene High School showed up in regression modeling as something that drove intensity of feeling, and asked Ms. Simich to explain the regression modeling. She wondered if it was actually something that would drive a negative or positive vote. She wanted to weigh cost benefit.

Ms. Simich said North Eugene High School was a lower testing item overall, especially when compared to other basic items. The regression modeling was another way to look at data, to use a holistic approach. It allowed them to look at the data in variety of ways, and at what was happening underneath data. For example, those who highly supported replacement of North Eugene High School were far more likely to vote yes for the bond. She clarified it did not mean items that tested well with regression modeling had to be included in the bond.

Ms. Levis noted those supporting replacement of North Eugene High School were a high amount of low propensity voters, meaning those who did not vote a lot. For example, ages 18 to 29 were in the strong yes column but they did not vote as much. Ms. Simich explained the people Patinkin talked to did vote. She explained high propensity and low propensity. Low propensity was taken out because it was largely correlated with age. Those who had been on the voter roll for longer would have been more likely to vote in the past ten elections, whereas folks who were 30 years old may have had less chances to vote in the past.

Ms. Sundgrenz was concerned about the robust outreach effort the district needed to do and the short timeline. Ms. Newman asked if the district had information around where the survey takers lived. She explained if she were not on the school board, she might not know much about other area schools. Ms. Simich said 21% of respondents were in the Churchill region, 19% in the North Eugene region, 33% in the Sheldon region, and 27% in the South Eugene region.

Dr. Balderas went over past bond success rates. Ms. Levis said the district always had strong support so she was surprised by the low intensity of support. She was not surprised by the South Eugene versus North Eugene area trend because there had been a lot of engagement with North Eugene High School with the past bond.

Ms. Newman understood the data presented, but struggled with the statement, "by the end of survey, around 4 in 10 or more [respondents] continued to be concerned" about the bond. Ms. Simich said 44% responded the bond was something they could not afford; 50% said it would put a strain on seniors or those on a fixed income. The data equated to 4 in 10 people or more being concerned about the effects of the bond. She added 48% said they could afford the bond, and 36% said it would not put a strain on seniors or those on a fixed income.

Ms. Levis asked about price sensitivity. Ms. Simich said based on Patinkin's expertise, all proposed bond options were viable if there were resources available for outreach and education. She said the $150 million option came closest to meeting all three of Patinkin's measures of viability. Dropping from $450 million to $300 million, the bond gained current parents, Democrats without a college degree, and younger voters without a college degree. Between $300 million to $150, the bond gained those under between 18 and 29, young men, young republicans, and renters.

Mr. Torrey wondered if Ms. Simich had a sense of the current situation based on the political standpoint in a November 2018 election versus a November 2014 election. His sense was the community had never been as intense about certain things as they were right now, and he was convinced that members of the Independent and Democratic parties would come out in droves. Mr. Torrey was unsure about the Republican community. Ms. Simich said Patinkin had seen in many places that 2018 would be a higher turnout than typically expected of an off year election. If that was the case, and a higher number of Democrats were voting and a higher number of Republicans were staying home, it could change dynamics. She said the partisan dynamic in the district was not typical, because a high number of Republicans were in support of the bond, so it was tricky to know how that would play out. Mr. Torrey wondered what percentage of Democrats would support the bond. Ms. Simich responded 58%.

Dr. Balderas provided a document with percentages from each region. Ms. Hays thanked Ms. Simich for the presentation. She said the board did not have data from a previous election where they did this work, so they could not compare past survey results to the current one. She said the bond was a big deal and now there was a new tool for them to use. Ms. Hays wanted the board to reiterate timelines, as they were coming up quickly.

Ms. Newman asked if Bailey Hill was remodeled for ECCO, would it be discussed in the bond Dr. Balderas said the project would rely on a different fund. Ms. Levis wanted to discuss opposition and how that might affect the bond number chosen. She noted the district recently introduced a new draft schedule, and received a lot of interaction from public. She wondered if a change like could skew negativity if it came up around the same time as the bond. Ms. Simich said in their experience, it was based on how organized opposition was. She said often people scaled their support down; soft supporters likely would not move into the strong opposition category. If there was organized opposition, it might be worth doing another survey closer to the

bond. Ms. Simich noted current district parents were a smaller percentage of voters. Most voters were not likely touched by district politics.

Ms. Levis said the biggest items were replacing schools, which were generally some of the most popular projects, but they did not come in at the first tier. Ms. Simich said the board could frame school replacement in terms of top testing items. For example, when replacing a school, the district would also create energy efficiencies, seismic upgrades, security upgrades, and CTE spaces. Ms. Simich saw districts with lower numbers who were successful. Chair Nittler asked if those district passed bonds. Ms. Simich said yes, they saw districts start with overall numbers in 40s and then educate the electorate to pass the bond.

Ms. Newman agreed new schools could include many priority projects. She wondered if a new elementary school was priced at $53.5 million included early childhood classrooms. Dr. Balderas would need to ask staff, but thought they would look at whole classroom space to determine estimated prices.

Ms. Levis was struggling a little bit because the biggest ticket items, specifically North Eugene High School, didn't have top ratings. Replacement of North Eugene High School was around 35% strongly favorable. She added they were critical projects. Ms. Simich said none were liability projects, although there were questions of fitting projects into a dollar amount. Sometimes there were projects that had to be done whether they were a top ticket item or not, and that was where some education around choices could help. She said assuming the more popular projects were also being done within the bigger projects, they would be more successful.

Ms. Hays thanked people who filled out surveys because they were about 20 minutes. The board took a brief break.

b. Review the list of Phase I and Phase II Projects for Long Range Master Plan

Dr. Balderas provided background on the 2012 Facilities Master Plan. Dr. Balderas explained the district hired Mahlum Architects to update the long range facilities plan (LRFP). Dr. Balderas said the district had submitted matching grant proposals, and if the upcoming bond passed, the district was eligible for $8 million dollars in matching funds from the state. He explained the district had to turn in its LRFP by May 17, 2018. Chair Nittler asked if the bond needed to be of a certain dollar amount. Ms. Brown said the $8 million 4J was eligible for was based on district size, at the bond ranges the board was considering.

Dr. Balderas provided a timeline for the bond, ranging from April 18, 2018 to August 17, 2018. He said the goal of the evening was for the board to discuss where they currently were at. Ms. Walston asked how specific the LRFP had to be on projects in the grant application. Ms. Brown said there was some wiggle room, but the district was setting a vision for at least a ten year period. The district had essentially completed the first phase of the 2012 Plan. The 2012 update had planned to do three bond sales to continue improvements. Now, the district needed to do another LRFP update for another ten year period. Ms. Brown explained staff was asking the board to reaffirm some of its initial goals. The board did not need to pick a bond amount that

evening, but she wanted them to hone in on the overall priority and vision of projects. No decisions would be made during a work session, but discussion would provide general notions around where they were going and would give direction to staff to bring strategies forward. Ms. Brown said before picking projects, solidifying planning goals and then narrowing the focus would be helpful.

Ms. Hays asked if staff had a process for the board to run through. Ms. Brown said they were working through it with board. Ms. Hays wondered if it made sense to discuss whether board members wanted to move a project forward or if they were not interested in a project, to see where there was more weight.

Mr. Torrey had a list of ten priority items, but noted he did not expect board members to agree. He said the board had to move forward quickly. Ms. Hays agreed, either by going through Mr. Torrey's list or talking one by one. Chair Nittler wanted to ensure all questions were answered before getting into that discussion. Ms. Levis wanted to start bigger, and talk about the research before talking about specific projects.

Dr. Balderas said there were four broad areas defined during the last work session on the bond. Ms. Levis said there were lots of ways to go, but she worried that going to exact projects would cause the board to misprocess some of the information. Ms. Walston was disappointed there wasn't a process for the discussion because it created a challenge. She said they were facing really big choices and considering much higher bond numbers. Ms. Walston thought there were things the board needed to figure out, such as money, and what would happen to Yujin Gakuen (YG) and Corridor Elementary Schools, and the Chinese Immersion program. She worried if the board was not clear about some of the programs upfront, it would become mucky later on.

Ms. Newman wanted to be sure there were some projects in every region; it would be easier for her to get a price point first, and then to set priorities. Chair Nittler thought the board should pick projects first, then a price point. She agreed there were outstanding issues like Ms. Walston brought up, and they did not have a good sense of where those programs would end up.

Ms. Brown said planning goals and priorities should be considered; as in, what were the key pieces that needed to be accomplished. Then, they could come to consensus around the concepts of priorities. While the board couldn't vote or decide today, they could agree on messages to look at the ten year horizon through. Ms. Brown said some initial goals were a little too project specific and could be broadened, but one goal she already heard that evening was equity. Ms. Newman clarified the initial planning goals were drafted by staff. Ms. Brown said it was the continuation of prior planning processes.

Ms. Sundgrenz was nervous and wanted to be clear in making sure decisions did not cause any unintended consequences. She still had a lot of questions. Ms. Sundgrenz thought it was important to do something with Edison and Camas Ridge Elementary Schools, but also making sure there was still benefit for every region. She wanted to be good stewards of other peoples' money and go out for a bond that looked at the future.

Ms. Levis said board members could pick the most important goals from the ten outlined by staff; the practice might help them look at the research and potential projects, then consider some of the priorities. Ms. Levis reiterated it was important to sequence projects.

Ms. Newman said there were items she would add to the goal list. Ms. Newman said safe and adequate learning spaces for students was a goal. She would also reframe a few of the goals. Ms. Hays said they should look at the goals, and discuss ones they like, want to add, tweak, remove. Once that was complete, board members could look at how projects related to goals.

Ms. Hays facilitated the discussion. Ms. Walston wondered if pathway models meant CTE. Dr. Balderas said it meant more than CTE; for example, a pathways program could be ECCO or an immersion program. Ms. Walston thought CTE should be on the list specifically. Ms. Walston thought nutrition services was vague. She said again that she thought the district needed to sort out where some programs would be relocated to. Overall, Ms. Walston was okay with the goals.

Ms. Levis thought some goals were too specific. She noted "addressing nutrition services" did not make sense, because it seemed like it needed a bigger goal. Ms. Hays added it should include facilities as well. Ms. Levis wondered if developing online education programs throughout high schools could fall under the pathway model goal. She thought finding different ways to offer classes and educational services in the classroom and online was a better goal. Ms. Brown wondered if the wording should be educational pathways at high school, or educational pathways since the goal was to expand beyond high school.

Mr. Torrey said one goal was a more centralized location for ECCO. More importantly, what would be the replacement for ECCO – he noted ECCO was not currently "early career and college options." He thought the district had to develop a strategy to improve graduation rates such as credit recovery.

Dr. Balderas said ECCO fell under pathways. The district wanted alternative programs and multiple pathways for students to choose from. Chair Nittler clarified the board was not talking about programs necessarily, but facilities instead. Chair Nittler was happy with the goals, but thought some were more like metrics. Ms. Levis said they needed a goal on safety, security, and resiliency. Chair Nittler thought it would be assumed anyway, but it might be appropriate to have a goal of meeting the needs of all students.

Ms. Newman said a goal could be "all spaces are safe, energy efficient, and have built in resiliency." She also thought including a goal on schools with "flexible spaces for instruction and wraparound services to meet the needs of students." Ms. Newman said they had talked a lot about wraparound services, so she wasn't sure if flexible spaces was accurate, but wanted to include a facility goal around that. Ms. Hays said the goal should also include having the ability to expand as opportunities arise.

Ms. Newman asked about the vision for library and performance spaces. Dr. Balderas said it could be put under adequate spaces for programs. Ms. Sundgrenz wanted the goal "spaces are safe, energy efficient, and resilient," to include that spaces "help keep students and staff safe in an emergency." Ms. Sundgrenz also wondered if the district needed a vision for library and

performances spaces. She was unclear on what that goal meant. Ms. Levis would take it out as a goal because she didn't think it was helping the district move forward. Ms. Hays clarified what Ms. Sundgrenz was asking. Ms. Sundgrenz wondered what kind of vision was needed. Ms. Hays wondered if it was an equity issue. Ms. Levis asked to return the item to staff for more clarification.

Ms. Levis wondered if Ms. Walston's concern around programs and buildings was addressed. Ms. Walston said sort of, but the board needed to figure out what to do with the programs before the buildings. Ms. Sundgrenz clarified the immersion program expansions were specifically about the Chinese Immersion programs. Ms. Walston said yes, the district would not co-locate the programs.

Ms. Levis said the goals felt reflective of the projects on the list. Mr. Torrey said immersion programs should be listed as a bullet point under adequate spaces. Chair Nittler asked the board if they were then comfortable talking about a dollar amount or projects. Ms. Levis felt the board could go either way. She felt comfortable talking numbers first, and then deciding priorities. Mr. Torrey thought each member could make a statement and move on from there. Chair Nittler said if a couple priorities were put out, the board could be led in a direction. She wondered if board members were comfortable in deciding their top three priorities. Ms. Hays suggested it would be easier to pick a price point first. Ms. Levis worried if they started talking about projects, they started getting people thinking that's where they would end up with the bond. Ms. Walston was not ready to pick projects either. She wanted to digest all the data she was given that evening, and wanted to be conscious about costs especially because in a little over a year they would have to pass a levy because it meant operating dollars. Ms. Walston wanted to be sensitive with what they were asking from community.

Ms. Sundgrenz thought another work session was needed. Ms. Levis said one was scheduled for April 18, 2018. Ms. Hays heard that some board members ready, and some wanted to think about what they heard. She wondered if it made sense to discuss dollar amounts. The board thought it did.

Chair Nittler wondered if people were comfortable coming out with a starting number and discussing from there, bearing in mind, they were not locked into those numbers. Ms. Hays thought the lowest number bond option was not worth effort – there was so much need, and she did not want to cut the district short. She was surprised by how well $450 million did on the survey, but she wondered if would be deductible from federal taxes and acknowledged there was a lot of unknowns. Ms. Hays was not interested in the short term vision of the bond, but in the greater scope. She was most comfortable with the mid-range bond option.

Mr. Torrey wanted to limit the bond to $375 million. With that in mind, it would be helpful to have staff provide options of costs that would suggest how they would be applied. He wondered if there were options, because the district could spend all $375 million on facility upgrades.

Ms. Newman felt comfortable with a bond in the range of $375 to $400 million. She thought it was economical to build a new school and include upgrades rather than some renovations. Ms.

Newman acknowledged the district would have to work really hard to pass a larger bond, but there were so many needs and she wanted to give a fair shot to address a lot of those.

Ms. Sundgrenz wanted all the bells and whistles but saw it would not be possible, especially if the district wanted to pass the bond. Ms. Sundgrenz felt comfortable at $375 million and worried a little about going higher. Ms. Walston supported a bond around the $370 to $375 million range; although she would love to do all the projects, she did not think it feasible, especially since the school district was not the only taxing entity in town. She was reluctant to go higher.

Ms. Levis hated to see the district leave money on table with over $1 billion of need throughout the district, but she felt more conservative on the campaign than she had felt in the past. She was closer to $300 million. Ms. Levis thought the district needed to be conscious of what was needed, what the community could pay for, and what they couldn't. She did not know if intensity of support would be as high as in the past, and if they lost the bond, it would be extremely hard to recover. Ms. Levis also wanted to be clear the bond was the board's; they would be raising money, putting together a campaign, and having committee. It would be an expensive campaign. She wanted to ensure they made good decisions.

Chair Nittler noted Ms. Simich talked about districts with lower numbers of support passing a bond. Even if the support was not as strong as they wanted, it was consistent across the board. She was optimistic that the board could ask taxpayers to show their passion for schools, more so than in past. Chair Nittler thought the board could push forward with a high number, and if it was polling badly, then lower the bond. Chair Nittler was concerned how a higher bond could affect the upcoming levy. She was also concerned if the district did not build at Kinney, they would need different kinds of conversations about boundary changes. In the long run, it would save taxpayer money by doing replacements, renovations, and energy efficiencies sooner rather than later. She was comfortable with $400 million.

Ms. Hays said there was a core group of board members feeling comfortable with $375 million. Ms. Levis wondered about Mr. Torrey's point about returning to staff, and having them build a scenario or two with at a price point of $375 million. Board members could also have their top projects in mind for discussion.

Dr. Balderas said staff could come back with different models based on $375 million on April 18, 2018. Mr. Torrey asked if there was anything Dr. Balderas needed from board members to help. Dr. Balderas' goal was to take what he heard that evening, and then get to a specific number; some things were more flexible, like curriculum. Ms. Newman asked if it was too open ended. Dr. Balderas responded no. Mr. Torrey said it would be nice to know what trade-offs the board could make. Ms. Newman thought it would helpful to have more staff guidance on options for North Eugene High School. Ms. Sundgrenz agreed.

Dr. Balderas wondered how board members felt about renovation or rebuild, as it would create a big variance in costs. Chair Nittler thought it would be nice to see both models. Ms. Levis said the research showed people wanted something better for North Eugene High School but they were not specifically saying it had to be a rebuild. Dr. Balderas would have staff build models for both options. Ms. Newman would support renovation if the district could do something

meaningful to really upgrade North Eugene High School, like ensure there was flexible space for CTE.

Mr. Torrey said he would not support a remodel but would support new school for Edison Elementary. He wondered where Edison Elementary School kids would go, which led him to question of Camas Ridge Elementary School. He was not in favor of building a facility to house kids for only one year. Mr. Torrey said the district could incorporate historical elements into the design of a new facility. Ms. Newman wondered what needs of YG were. Ms. Walston said the Silver Lee Building was on the west side of North Eugene High School and it housed the YG and Corridor kids. It would be torn down and the new North Eugene High School would take its place. She believed they owed it to those students to make a decision.

Dr. Balderas said next steps included staff creating models based on scenarios of $360 to $375 million based on board input and Patinkin research. Staff would create two different scenarios for North Eugene High School. Then, they would see where the numbers came out. Ms. Walston advocated having a work session after the meeting on April 18, 2018 due to the community forum; it was not a long board meeting as it was a light agenda. Chair Nittler noted a work session would be scheduled.

Ms. Hays wondered if the board would pick an option at the next session. Ms. Levis thought they would narrow down options and each make a preference, since they could not officially make a decision in a work session. Mr. Torrey asked for staff to give its report to the board a few days before meeting, if possible.

3. Discuss Parameters for Community Forum scheduled for April 18

Chair Nittler explained the format for the upcoming community forum. She said there would be three stations with two board members at each. Then, board members would change stations after a certain amount of time. Leadership pulled out common themes, such as concerns about the high school start and end times, or transportation, especially in regards to older children watching their younger siblings.

Chair Nittler and Ms. Delf worked out how to organize the common issues. At each station, the board explained what they were doing, and then would leave space for comments and questions and dialogue. Each table would also have a staff member present. Chair Nittler said a second draft schedule would not be created by then, they were only hearing feedback and answering questions around the first draft.

Ms. Hays said it would be important to remind people why the district took the change on. Dr. Balderas said he would reiterate it was because of instructional equity; so all students have the same amount of instructional time in school, and also to meet state mandates.

Mr. Torrey was happy the district was not coming up with another proposal until after talking to the public. Ms. Newman asked what would follow the process. Chair Nittler said the district would bring a second draft. Dr. Balderas said his goal was to do another community forum to have people weigh in on the second version, and maybe write another draft if needed.

Ms. Walston said was trying to think of how the emotion and dynamic in the room would be on April 18, 2018. She wondered what expectation they were setting for the community, and she wondered how they would address people who said the change affected them personally. Ms. Walston also wondered how they would end the session to ensure the board learned something and people felt heard. Chair Nittler said that was important, she would work on a plan. Ms. Walston said heard most of their complaints but the board could not offer much so she worried people would still walk away frustrated.

Mr. Torrey wondered how long the board needed to spend on items the following meeting, and if there were information items they could shift to another meeting. It would be helpful to determine about how much time they would give people to speak during the regular meeting ahead of time.

Ms. Levis felt it was good to have a round table discussion and have people get information but she was not comfortable trying to defend the schedule, explain it, and give reasoning behind it. She thought there would be a focus of individuals coming to board members to lobby. Ms. Levis became uncomfortable when she knew what the issues were and had heard the complaints, but could only listen without providing a real solution or response. She was unsure how the forum would make people feel better, and she had originally thought some changes would be presented during the forum.

Ms. Newman also had thought changes would be introduced. She said there had been hundreds of emails and there was some strong support for that they were trying to accomplish, but also strong concerns that fell into themes. The board was committed to take some of those things and improve upon them, with the caveat they could not compromise their original goal.

Ms. Hays said if something was off the table, to tell the public it was off the table. For example, there was no way she would support a 4:00 p.m. end time for high school. To introduce the forum, Dr. Balderas would speak to the changes staff was making, such as the high school start/end time, and moving prep time around. Mr. Torrey thought it was important to reiterate they were united in ensuring there was equitable educational seat time across district; it would be consistent no matter the schedule. He added there were creative ways district staff could look at transportation, and wondered when staff would be able to present an update to the board. Dr. Balderas would provide a timeline in the Friday update.

Ms. Hays said public comment usually ended with board responses; she wondered if they wanted to end the session with a 90 second response. People wanted that option. Ms. Levis added she wanted Dr. Balderas to be clear the board was not there to explain or change the schedule.

Ms. Hays said the forum would be in a world café style, with a staff person at each place. The first minute of activity would be what was heard from the previous group, so that everyone got the same knowledge throughout the room. There would be chart papers and pens to make comments and marks. The activity did not only include talking, it also involved taking notes.

Ms. Newman wondered if the board should invite high school representatives. Ms. Hays said leadership wanted to pair them up, so they moved around as well.

Ms. Nittler adjourned the work session at 8:39 p.m.

*(Recorded by Marina Brassfield)*

| | |
|---|---|
| _____ | _____ |
| Dr. Gustavo Balderas | Eileen Nittler |
| District Clerk | Board Chair |