Junction City School District--Long-Range Facility Planning

Workshop 4– REFINING

Oct. 28, 2015

NOTES

AGENDA
- ➢ Recap of Plan
- ➢ Survey Results
- ➢ Voter information
- ➢ Committee's Recommendation to the Board
- ➢ Next Steps

The workshop started off with DLR Group going through a series of slides (attached) that outline the facilities plan as it currently stands, incorporating the Committee's feedback from Workshop 3: the replacement of Laurel Elementary on property adjacent to Oaklea Middle and the first phase of a replacement of Junction City High School: new classroom addition to the west wing, replacing classes in the 1930s east wing building. Preliminary costs for all projects were given as follows:

New Laurel Elementary	$ 24,680,000
Junction City High School Phase 1	$ 7,800,000
Physical Needs	$ 6,800,000
Total Proposed Bond Amount	$ 39,280,000

Next the results of the recent School District facilities survey were reviewed. The district received 216 completed surveys, either on-line or paper. A few observations from the responses were:

- Most who took the survey had been in JCSD Schools in the past year
- Junction City High School polled slightly better than Laurel Elementary
- Participants were motivated by possible state assistance funding
- Participants were not as motivated by keeping the tax impact under $2/thousand

Then the Committee was asked if the results should change the Facilities Plan they are recommending to the School Board. What ensued was a very engaged conversation either regarding the polling results or what they wanted to convey to the Junction City community. The committee almost unanimously agreed to stick to the proposed plan and each shared their viewpoints (as listed below):

Large Group Comments:
- Question: Are the football field bleachers included? No
- On Future polls—add an "unsure" box
- Security and improving safety a concern
- Provide data on how the physical environment improves learning
- People will be concerned about size of bond—need to be specific on improvements to be made
- Maintenance % of budget? Informing people about where district spends money
- People don't do tours
- Give information on how we will care for what we will build
- Communications Plan to rest of community
- Reach people that don't have kids in school

DLR Group

Workshop 4– REFINING

Oct. 28, 2015

- Hearing that it is too expensive?
- Pictures, links, blogs: must let people know [dire] need
- Let people know what we're doing to keep costs down
- Fiscally sound projects "lean with durable"
- Talk about how we will court local dollars—local contractors
- Community forum—let's talk
- High school resonates well. Understand the need for phasing but this could push the high school 10-20 years out—can't wait that long.
- Tightening down costs
- Education of community in general
- Need to explain operating funds from state
- Telling our story succinctly
- This is timely
- Emphasis on maintenance done all along ("more than mowing lawns")
- Communication with community
- Detail pushed out
- Refine numbers, tighten scope
- Yes on Laurel, JCHS Phase 1, be more specific on facility needs
- Needs to be less than $2/thousand
- Cost is huge
- Show how this is minimal with fire tax rolling off
- Show how we have already trimmed into multiple plans
- Don't think comparison to other districts will resonate

The Committee was then presented with information regarding the proposed facilities plan's tax impact to the community. It is estimated that for Junction City tax payers, the rate would be 5.7 cents/$1,000 of assessed value/million for a 20-year debt. For example, $10 million bond would cost a taxpayer with a $200,000 home $114/year (ESTIMATED).

Then information regarding voters in the Junction City School District and Lane County were given (register voters and percentage of likely turnout).

Next Steps:
The Facilities Committee's work and current in-progress facilities plan will be presented to the School Board at the Nov. 23rd as a Progress Report.

DLR Group