

Community Bond Advisory Committee Meeting #7 August 6, 2024

CBAC Members

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

CLSD Staff

- Present: Candace Pelt, Celeste Van Cleave, Dena Crowell

Board Member Liaisons to CBAC

- Present: David Karo, Parker Leigh

Consultant Team:

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

On August 6, 2024, the Community Bond Advisory Committee (CBAC) convened. The meeting began with a review of the day's agenda and the Board's goals for the pre-bond process, as well as providing a brief recap of previous CBAC meetings.

Updated Bond Financial Modeling

Ms. Hibbert presented a chart on Central Linn SD Bond Tax Rate Projections, along with tax rates for twelve neighboring districts provided by D.A. Davidson. It was noted that only Central Linn and Scio School Districts among the twelve do not currently have a bond. Bond options reviewed were for 10 year and 20 year for projects and fund sizes ranged from \$6 million up to \$30 million, along with their respective bond rates. (See website CBAC #7 Presentation for details.)

Updated Project Options and Costs

Mr. Wilson walked CBAC members through several options centered on Central Linn Jr/Sr High, with smaller upgrades for Central Linn Elementary School. Each plan included essential system improvements, such as a security vestibule, electrical upgrades, a code-compliant fire system, water service upgrade, and a full roof replacement, except for the seismically renovated sections. *The estimated cost for these system upgrades: \$10,510,669*

The Level 1 presentation included all the previously discussed system upgrades, the CTE completion, locker room hallway upgrades, a new entrance from the 400 wing to the main building that avoids passing through the gym, main restroom upgrades, a south wing expansion, and kitchen equipment upgrades. *The estimated cost for Level 1, including system upgrades: \$17,686,947*

The Level 2 presentation built upon Level 1 by adding upgrades to the west classroom wing, a locker room remodel, north restroom renovations, and a kitchen remodel. *The estimated cost for Level 2, including system and Level 1 upgrades: \$24,657,698.*

The Level 3 presentation further expanded on Level 1 and Level 2 by proposing a kitchen expansion/relocation, office relocation, the addition of a student center, and the relocation/addition of a new locker room with an expanded hallway. The estimated cost for Level 3, including system, Level 2, and Level 3 upgrades: \$33,160,160.

Elementary Upgrades: Installation of a security vestibule, remodel and expansion of the main bathroom and kitchen, addition of a PreK/Kindergarten bathroom, creation of ADA-accessible entrances, upgrades to finishes and fixtures, and roof replacement excluding seismically renovated areas. *The estimated cost for these system upgrades: \$7,378,397*

Discussion of Draft Recommendations

Ms. Hibbert asked CBAC members for their insights on community preferences. The feedback highlighted that the community is cautious about large expenditures due to past trust issues with the district. There is a clear preference for smaller, manageable costs that provide visible, immediate improvements rather than an ambitious plan that might not succeed. Although trust in the administration has improved somewhat, historical failures of bonds due to previous poor leadership have left the community wary.

Previous bond attempts were led by the district, but the current plan, led by the committee, is well-detailed and aims to build trust.

Activity and Commitment to Decision

CBAC members were asked to prioritize their top choices for elementary upgrades by placing dots next to them. The cost estimates for the upgrades were: Roof replacement \$1.8 million, security vestibule \$88,000, kitchen \$371,000, window replacement \$490,000, PreK/Kindergarten bathroom \$306,000, and storm drainage \$52,000. The committee's input was taken into account when evaluating the costs for CLES upgrades within the three options provided.

Small Option: Level 1 for CLHS upgrades at \$17.7 million, along with CLES upgrades at \$3.1 million (minus \$6 million OSCIM Grant) = \$14.8 million

Middle Option: Level 2 for CLHS upgrades at \$24.6 million, along with CLES upgrades at \$4.8 million (minus \$6 million OSCIM Grant) = \$23.4 million

Big Option: Level 3 for CLHS upgrades at \$33.2 million, along with all CLES upgrades at \$7.4 million (minus \$6 million OSCIM Grant) = \$34.5 million

Ms. Hibbert informed the CBAC members that two draft recommendations—one with a higher cost and one with a lower cost—will be tested to gauge community response. There may be strategic adjustments based on the bond duration. The district will collaborate with a communications consultant to develop a plan for sharing these recommendations after the board is briefed. The committee was then asked to provide a “Fist to Five” assessment on moving forward with the small and big options for board recommendation. The responses were: 5 (4 members), 4 (4 members), 3 (4 members), 2 (1 member), and 0 (none).

Following a discussion on members' votes, it was suggested to recommend the middle option and the big option to the board, both on 20-year terms; to simplify the message to the community. The committee was asked again to provide a “Fist to Five” assessment on the new recommendation. The responses were: 5 (5 members), 4 (4 members), 3 (1 member), and 2-1-0 (all none).

The benefits of proceeding with the bond include giving the community the chance to choose their preferred option, investing in the futures of both our children and the community, and keeping both campuses actively occupied. However, potential barriers include the cost to voters, effective communication, and ensuring clarity about what each option entails when sharing information. Suggestions on communication: listen to hear and not to respond, create talking points, building tours, virtual tours, groups listening sessions, open houses, and to be consistent in our messaging.

Next Steps

Ms. Hibbert asked the committee who would volunteer to join Mr. Linhart in presenting the two draft recommendations at the August 12th school board meeting. Sue Frasier, Jerry Lachenbruch, and Johnna Neal volunteered.