Michelle L. Johnstone Superintendent

Tami Montague Director of Fiscal Services

Kevin Montague Facilities Director

Tim Larson Athletic Director

Committee Members

Rich McFarland Chair

Bill Blair

Matt Forsberg

Vonnie Good

Sheila Myers

Gary Suderman

Andrea Wilcoxon

Glen Miller

Jerry Boudreaux

Marilyn Essex

Jonathon Schrock

Secretary Kate Hall

Dallas School District 111 SW Ash Street Dallas OR 97338

> 503.623.5594 ph. 503.623.5597 fax

Agenda Citizens Oversight Committee May 15, 2017 Dallas High School Forum 6:00 p.m.

- 1.0 Welcome
- 2.0 Approval of Minutes April 17, 2017
- 3.0 Tour of DHS
 - **3.1** Shop
 - 3.2 Foods Room
 - 3.3 Other potential CTE pathways areas (Tim Ray/Steve Spencer)
- 4.0 Project Updates
 - **4.1** Financial
 - **4.2** MPR's
 - 4.3 Seismic Additional Grants4.3.1 Whitworth Gym Seismic \$700k
 - **4.4** Facilities Assessment Grant \$20k
- 5.0 Public Input
- 6.0 Next Meeting June 19, 2017 at DHS
- 7.0 Adjourn

Minutes Citizens Oversight Committee April 17, 2017 District Office Board Room 6:00 pm

Present: Rich McFarland, Vonnie Good, Jerry Boudreaux, Glen Miller, Kevin Montague, Tim Larson, Gary Suderman, Tami Montague, Michelle Johnstone

Guests: Gordon Gentry, Seth Arnesen, Shawn Hall

1.0 Welcome

2.0 Approval of Minutes – A motion was made by Gary Suderman to approve the minutes as presented. The motion received a second by Jerry Boudreaux and passed unanimously.

3.0 Project Updates

- 3.1 **Financial** \$187,000.00 was spent in March bringing the total expenditures to \$4,404,610.00. We will begin to encumber more and be ahead of target as soon as we sign contracts for the bond projects.
- 3.2 MPR bids Today was the last day of the protest period. We will prepare the notice to award tomorrow. Included in the board packet are the bid results for all three projects. Whitworth was awarded to 2KG Contractors, Inc. and will be completed in one summer (2017) and the contract included the alternate #1, which is part of the district "Privacy for All" project. (Included in "Privacy for All" is higher stall walls and gapless doors.) The total cost of the project will include only approximately \$500,000.00 in bond dollars as the majority of the work will fall within the scope of the seismic upgrades in which we received a \$1.49million grant to complete.

When the district applied for the grant it was assumed roof work would be included. Since we had not yet received the grant when we began roof work throughout the district, the Whitworth roof was included in the overall roofing project. Therefore, in order to not disturb the new roof, the seismic work must be done from the inside of the building which creates a domino effect of required work. Some items within the school were grandfathered in as acceptable. However, once renovations begin those items must be brought up to code. An example is the student coat hooks in the hallways. While we have been written up by our insurance company and fire marshal (coat hooks are a fire hazard and against code) they have not pushed the upgrade because that is how the building was designed. Once work begins in the hallways and the coat hooks are removed,

we are required to replace them with locker-type cubbies to meet current fire code and insurance requirements. Although the district did want to make the upgrades previously, the cost made it prohibitive. However, with the grant it can be accomplished.

To help keep the costs of all three projects down, it was decided to pull certain items from the bids. These include; roofing, HVAC and kitchen appliances. Since all three of the projects will have similar and/or identical items, it makes sense for the district to purchase them directly for manufacturer and model uniformity. Additionally, there would be a realized savings by purchasing in quantity and avoiding the markup from the general contractor to the district. Kitchen, HVAC and necessary roofing materials will be purchased by the district and is estimated to cost between \$500,000.00 and \$750,000.00. The installation will be completed by the contractors and that cost is included in their bids.

We have also asked for quotes from Johnson Controls to tie the new HVAC equipment into our current Metasys program, rather than having them be a subcontractor for the project. Continuing to work directly with the district will save that additional mark up.

Special recognition was given to Seth Arnesen (Maintenance / Owner's Rep – WW) and Gordon Gentry (Maintenance / HVAC Specialist / Owner's Rep – Lyle & OHE). They worked together to make sure Whitworth was ready for necessary abatement as well as new carpet in the library. Seth coordinated with DHS 1st period PE classes and had a full crew of students who came and helped move boxes and furniture out of the library. It took less than 45 minutes to have the space completely empty and ready for the abatement crew. Other building engineers and staff also helped getting other areas ready for abatement to begin at 12 noon on Thursday.

Abatement areas included; library, all front offices, staff lounge, back-stage areas, speech classroom and storage areas.

Gordon and Seth worked together throughout that project and coordinated project completion. The library was ready for carpet installation the Tuesday morning of spring break. They further made sure everything was back to the various spaces in the building and reset for classes to begin by 8:00 Monday morning.

The Oakdale project had four bidders with the project awarded to Andy Medcalf Construction with the contract in the amount of \$2.8 million. The proposal is a little over the anticipated budget. However, we don't expect any problems with the overall project.

Lyle bids came in lower with the same four general contractors bidding. The low

bidder was 2KG Contractors, Inc. at \$2.06 million with only 7/10 of 1% difference between the high and low bids.

There had been some concern from the contractors, during the bid walks, over having both projects bid the same day and during spring break which is why the bid dates were changed. It worked in our favor as it seems pencils were sharpened between the Oakdale bid opening and the Lyle bid opening. While both Oakdale and Whitworth are higher than expected, the three projects combined are very close to our budget estimate.

- 3.3 **Seismic Bid** Due to the timing of the seismic grant and the bid for Whitworth to be completed in just one summer rather than two, there will need to be some adjustments made with the timing of the second issuance of the bond funds. Tami is speaking with the bonding agent to work out the details, but is confident the adjustment will potentially save, rather than cost the district money, overall. If necessary, we would be requesting the second issuance in January 2018 rather than April. Those few months will likely only have an effect on when paperwork must be processed.
 - **3.3.1 Privacy for All / Whitworth** With all the work on the three elementary schools we will also be able to complete some of the "Privacy for All" recommendations. Whitworth should be complete and Oakdale and Lyle will be very close. Overall, we are very happy with where we are and what we will be able to complete with these three projects.
- Radon Test Results We have tested all buildings in the district. All of the test results came back under the EPA guidelines of 4.0 pCi/L. There were 5 rooms that were above 3 pCi/L and airflows were adjusted to bring 20% outside air. For the couple of rooms that were above 2 pCi/L, airflows were adjusted to 15% outside air. Gordon was able to make those adjustments at each location from his office via the Metasys program.

We will re-evaluate those classrooms next fall. Radon testing guidelines indicate testing is to take place between November and March, when buildings are continually occupied and would create the most possible exposure. Kate will forward the link to the district page which has the radon test results. Jolene Guzman, from the Itemizer-Observer, will be writing an article next week.

3.5 **Drainage** – The booster club is working together with a committee to put in a turf football field. They are working on raising funds to pay for all of the drainage and dirt work inside the track area (the football field). That leaves only the areas outside of the track and from Ash to Miller for the COC to consider. The cost for that part is estimated at \$400k. Michelle is working with the city to see if they will be willing to help out with some of that cost. The City, District and engineers

all met together to discuss design. The field will not be raised, the project is only to get the water off of the field.

The turf committee must ensure they design the drainage to accept the connection and handle the flow from outside the football field and it all must route out to the city connection. Additionally, the committee must make certain there is no initial cost to the school district for the drainage, dirt work, turf field and other associated expenses for that project. The booster club is raising funds for the initial installation of the turf field. All costs (after installation) for regular maintenance, repair/replacement will become the responsibility of the school district.

Concerning the maintenance differential between artificial field and natural grass, artificial fields are always more costly on a long term annualized basis. While the distributors will argue the fact that there are no mowing or fertilizing costs; artificial fields must be replaced every several years which necessitates putting funds aside annually to pay for the high cost of replacement. Additional specialized equipment must also be purchased for regular maintenance. Disposal fees for the turf and base are currently estimated at \$100k since it is considered hazardous waste. Corvallis will be replacing their field very soon as the current gmax testing is unfavorable. They have had their field for 12 years. Warranties expire after eight years.

The Gresham-Barlow School District just paid approximately \$1.3million for turf replacement alone. West Salem just installed a black turf field for \$800k (black, while it retains a lot of heat, is a less expensive field color). Central School District is budgeting \$1million for the replacement of their field. The company, Field Turf, indicates the cost is only \$320k. There was question as to why the quote from Field Turf is so much lower than what other districts say they costs are. One reason is that the \$320k does not include any of the required specialized equipment, drainage and ground work costs, shock pads, disposal fees and other soft costs.

Previous drainage project estimates included an option which focused on getting water off of the field. That original estimate was approximately \$425k and did not include design to accommodate an artificial turf or sand cap field. The original estimates also do not include a sub-base that would support multiple turf replacements. Updated estimates with those options are being prepared by the engineer.

Kevin Montague, facilities director, provided assurance the department will support whatever decision is made as long as everything is done correctly ahead of time, including drainage, sub-base, etc. He also noted that typically a sub-base can only support three fields. When it is time for the fourth replacement, the base

will also need to be redone. Also, in order to confirm costs, Kevin will contact Gresham-Barlow to determine what costs were included in the \$1.3million they spent.

Gary Suderman expressed is opposition to the project. While he agrees artificial turf looks good, he is opposed to the high annual costs (money set aside for replacement) and additional required equipment purchases. He also mentioned concern over sanitation, high reporting of injuries and reference to even the NFL returning to natural grass fields. Vonnie Good agreed with Gary's comments but did note that an artificial field, if installed as such, could support use year-around.

The charge of the COC at this point is only concerning the drainage from outside the track to the City lines. Because the booster club will be addressing from the track to inside the football fields, there should be enough money in the budget to complete the outside portion.

4.0 OSHA Walk-through update – We have developed a good relationship with the fire marshal and other building officials but we had not yet done so with OSHA. It was decided, with all the many projects going on this summer, it would be a good idea to reach out to them. So, we contacted the local OSHA office to arrange for a voluntary inspection.

Voluntary inspections afford the district a window of time where we are exempt from official OSHA inspections/citations and give us an opportunity to identify areas which need addressed and the things we are doing correctly.

The inspections took place at Dallas High School, LaCreole Middle School and Whitworth Elementary. Overall, the inspector found the district to be in compliance with OSHA regulations. There were some minor infractions such as; door clearance, breaker panels being blocked and machine guards. There were also some storage and safety concerns in some of the DLC rooms.

The majority of items brought to our attention can be quickly and easily remedied. A few items will need further discussion on how to proceed, specifically in the DLC areas.

Overall, though, the inspector was very impressed with what we do and was pleased to have the district reach out. Vonnie Good also commended the facilities department for being pro-active in requesting a voluntary inspection. It is a very useful tool. Seth Arnesen, who accompanied the inspector, also appreciated the experience. He had taken advantage of the voluntary inspections at his previous place of employment and found it extremely useful at that time, just as he did here.

Special Ed facility challenges – The SpEd department has a unique set of challenges. The safety committee has also had concerns and is helping to look for solutions as two

out of three injuries reported are from SpEd classrooms. A single staff member received 14 separate injuries from one student. Today a teacher was severely kicked by a student who was attempting to leave the blow-out area.

Kevin has been trying to help from a facilities standpoint, looking at what can be done with designs, necessary equipment, storage and accesses to help prevent injuries. He shared standards for seclusion rooms. Based on those standards, we do not have any in the district. During site visits at five buildings, in two locations he happened to arrive when a child was in crisis and out of control (classes were not in session during the other three visits). Our facilities are not designed to handle these kinds of situations.

While SpEd classrooms are not on the bond list, Kevin suggest we consider them. In addition to safe space/crisis/blow-out areas, there are health/sanitation/privacy concerns. For example, there is no sanitary area for students who require feeding tubes/bottle feeding or to address choking-aspiration concerns. There is limited space to allow for privacy/dignity for diaper/clothing changes. Currently, all of these activities frequently happen all in the same area at the same time. At Lyle, the principal's office is the only safe space/crisis/blow-out area for students.

The issues were brought to Kevin's attention when the fire marshal noted a locked classroom door at Oakdale, which was against fire code. When Kevin went to investigate he found the reason the door was locked was to keep students from "escaping" the safe space/crisis/blow-out areas. The fire marshal would allow a door with a 10-15 second delay, but that option comes with a door alarm, which could create other issues. Additionally, ODE requires <u>no</u> delay on door openers in such spaces.

Every month there are at least three or four injury reports presented at the Safety Committee meetings which are directly related to SpEd. No decisions are requested today. Kevin would just like the committee to consider the possibility of adding the creation of SpEd spaces (restrooms, storage and classroom reconfiguration) to the bond list and will ask for a recommendation at a later date.

The SpEd student population has increased exponentially in Dallas. We've worked hard to help staff be successful in their jobs, and we would like to continue in that vein by providing appropriate spaces for them to help these children.

Gary Suderman shared information from the Kiplinger Report regarding the overall state of the population. He emphasized the need to fix our aging buildings and equipment and the importance of a quality CTE program and to consider those costs, weighing them against the costs of drainage for an artificial turf field. He pointed out that a quality education will help students succeed and get jobs much more effectively than a new football field.

Public Comment – Jerry Boudreaux congratulated the committee for wisely spending money on new roofs. Four years ago there were over 50 buckets at Oakdale Heights Elementary to catch water from leaks in the roof. This year there was not a single bucket needed in the district.

He also wanted to specifically thank Gordon Gentry and Seth Arnesen for the work they are doing with the current bond/seismic projects. He said the new facilities department is doing a great job! The talk he has heard around town is very positive. He also appreciates seeing the schools working together. A great example of team work is from the recent abatement project at Whitworth Elementary. Seth arranged with two high school PE teachers to have their first period classes go over to Whitworth and move books and furniture. From start to finish, the moving project took less than 45 minutes and the building was ready for the abatement crew.

Steve Spencer mentioned his experience at a chamber luncheon where he spoke of "Dragon Pride". The community is becoming more supportive because they can see the work we do and the pride we take. That is creating more conversations and public interest in supporting the district and our goals.

- **7.0 Next meeting** May 15, 2017 at Dallas High School beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the DHS forum. We will tour the existing shop and foods rooms. The focus will be to see how they fit into the CTE programming.
- **8.0 Adjourn** The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Rich McFarland / Committee Chair	Date	
Kate Hall / Committee Secretary	Date	

Bond Projects Financial Report	Apr 2014-Jun 2016		2016-17											2016-17	2016-17		A	All Yrs Combined	
RESOURCES (Through Phase III Energy Projects)	Prior Yrs	ال	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16		Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17		Mar-17	Apr-17	Total YR 3		Total Actual	Projected	Total Actual + Projected
Interest	\$ 58,284	4 *	5,032 \$	5,167	\$ 4,797	\$	5,327 \$	4,878	\$ 4,998	\$ 5,511	\$ 4,8	4,878 \$	5,628 \$	5,718	\$ 51,934	\$	110,218 \$	42,000	\$ 152,218
State Grants	ક	•									\$ 9,3	9,340			\$ 9,340	\$	9,340		\$ 9,340
Energy Incentives															\$	\$	-		\$
Seismic Grant (\$1,492,900)	6															s	•		+
Bond Proceeds	\$ 9,696,340	0													\$	\$	9,696,340		\$ 9,696,340
TOTAL RESOURCES	\$ 9,754,623	\$	5,032	5,167	\$ 4,797	\$	5,327 \$	4,878	\$ 4,998	\$ 5,511	\$ 14,218	218 \$	5,628	\$ 5,718	\$ 61,274	\$	9,815,897 \$	42,000	\$ 9,857,897
REQUIREMENTS																Total	Fotal Expended	Encumbered/ Contracted	Total Enc + Exp
000 - General Bond Management	\$ 241,492	\$	9,523 \$	30,938	\$ 9,523	↔	(7,574)	9,524	\$ 15,541	\$ 14,881	\$ 14,900	\$ 006	17,372 \$	3 15,116	\$ 129,744	&	371,237 \$	56,403	\$ 427,640
200 - Parking Lots & Grounds (SubCat = Landscape, Irrigation, Drainage, Concrete, Fencing)			₩	16,849	\$ 21,532			37	\$ 923	\$ 3,408		49	2,130 \$	3 1,723	\$ 46,564	& &	46,564 \$	5,616	\$ 52,181
300/400 - Energy Projects (SubCat = Windows, Electrical, HVAC/Boilers, Technology)	\$ 277,665	2	\$	3,500	990'2 \$	€	31,582		\$ 834			4	20,754 \$	1,262	\$ 64,998	↔	342,663 \$	100,887	\$ 443,550
500 - Roofing & Envelope, Ancillary Bldgs (SubCat = Windows, Athletic Complex, Siding, Gutters)	\$ 2,166,135	\$	107,540 \$	237,830	\$ 217,447	\$	30,983 \$	(1,953)	\$ 1,013			\$	\$ (7.76,1)	33,054	\$ 623,937	\$ 2	2,790,072 \$	188,865	\$ 2,978,938
600 - Interior Repairs & Renovation (SubCat = Flooring, Paint, Interior Remodel)															↔	€	1		
700 - Health & Safety (SubCat = Seismic Grant, Survey, Access Controls, Cameras)						\$ 19	19,659 \$	2,838		\$ 24,000		\$	1,994 \$	92,106	\$ 140,597	\$ 2	140,597 \$	15,928	\$ 156,525
800 - Plumbing (SubCat = Restroom Privacy, Re-piping)	\$ 89,505	S.	€9	2,461	\$ 7,950	s	12,765 \$	29,299	\$ 6,345	\$ 12,375	\$ 18,360	\$ 098	510 \$	16,680	\$ 106,744	8	196,249 \$	59,652	\$ 255,901
900 - New Construction (SubCat = MPRs, CTE, Kitchen)	\$ 280,320	0	€	26,199	\$ 20,968	\$	47,572 \$	10,340	\$ 70,382	\$ 74,349	\$	234 \$	146,805 \$	3 46,183	\$ 443,032	\$	723,352 \$	355,889	\$ 1,079,241
TOTAL REQUIREMENTS	\$ 3,055,117	\$	117,063 \$	317,777	\$ 284,485	\$	134,988 \$	50,048	\$ 95,037	\$ 129,013	\$ 33,494	\$	187,588 \$	3 206,124	\$ 1,555,618	\$	4,610,735 \$	783,240	\$ 5,393,975
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$ 6,699,506	و																	\$ 4,463,922

D		% Spend
Dona Series 2013 (First Issuance)	Amonnt	Down
of 36 months	24	%2'99
Par Amount 6	9,696,340	
Actual Expenditures to Date	\$ 4,610,735	47.55%
Committed/Contracted/Encumbered	783,240	8.08%
TOTAL Spent/Committed	5,393,975	22.63%
	6,464,226	%29.99
* 85% of Issuance must be "substantially" Spent/Committed by		
April 2018	(1,070,251)	_