

Meeting Notes

Project: Newberg School District Bond Planning
Date: November 12, 2019
Subject: Bond Development Committee Meeting

Introductory Remarks

This is the third meeting of Newberg School District’s Bond Development Committee. Karina Ruiz with BRIC Architecture reviewed the meeting objectives, including:

- Brief review of feedback collected at the last Committee meeting.
- Public polling update, focusing on price point sensitivity and bond timing.
- “Build a Bond Package” group exercise.

Brief Review of Feedback from Last Committee Meeting

A summary document listing feedback collected during the last Committee meeting was recently distributed to all members via email. Karina asked the Committee if there were any questions, comments or additions to the list. Attending committee members did not have any changes to the document.

Preliminary Polling Results

- Patinkin Research Strategies / Wright Public Affairs recently conducted a telephone poll of 400 registered, likely November 2020 voters in the Newberg School District. Interviews were conducted November 6-10, 2019.
- Initial results on bond timing and price sensitivity were shared with the Committee. Karina noted that a more detailed overview of results will be presented at the next Committee meeting.
- An initial test of hypothetical ballot language had a slim majority of voters supporting a \$150 million bond. This was an “out of the gate” question that did not include a price per \$1,000. It is used to gauge voters’ initial reaction.
- The survey revealed comparable levels of support in May vs. November. The District should continue to prepare for a May bond, though it should leave its options open in case future polling suggests a need to pivot to November.
- The exploration of potential packages demonstrates clear price sensitivity within the district. Support hovers at around one-half for a \$135 M bond and falls to around four-in-10 at the \$150 M

and \$170 M levels regardless of the election date. Support for a lower bond (\$120 M) is robust, regardless of the election.

A few committee members had questions and/or comments following the presentation of the preliminary polling results, as summarized below:

- *How typical are Newberg's polling results compared with those of similar districts?* Newberg's level of support is fairly similar to what is seen with comparable districts this early in the process. Ideally, pollsters would like to see preliminary levels of support in the mid-50th percentile (minimum). It is an encouraging sign that there did not appear to be highly-divisive issues that "tanked" the bond. Top community priorities appear to be safety and security and maintenance.
- *Is there a double majority requirement if the District opts to hold the bond election in May?* No, Oregon no longer has this requirement for May elections. Only a simple majority is required to pass a bond regardless of the timing of the election.
- *What was the size of Sherwood School District's recent bond?* Sherwood School District passed a bond for \$247.5 M.
- *Has the District settled on a bond amount?* No, this has not yet been decided, though preliminary polling suggests that the District is most likely to be successful with a bond in the range of \$120-135 M, particularly if the cost per thousand is under \$1. The District continues to work with Piper Jaffray on different scenarios for structuring the bond.

Build a Bond Package Exercise

Karina Ruiz presented an overview of potential bond projects based on priorities from the Long Range Facilities Plan as well as Committee feedback from previous meetings. Some committee members had questions and/or comments preceding or following the group exercise, as summarized below:

- *Are the construction projects priced with the assumption that the District would pay prevailing wage for labor costs?* Yes, this would be a requirement.
- *If new District Administrative Offices were funded under the bond, would this space be constructed as part of Edwards or as a separate building?* This is not yet determined.
- Newberg School Board member Bob Woodruff expressed concern over administrative staff working in a 100-year-old, unreinforced masonry building. He would like to find a way to repurpose the historic building for an alternate use.
- *If Dundee was designed as a K-8 school, would this require the District to rethink their current middle school model?* Not necessarily, as a K-8 building can be designed to maintain a high degree of separation between the elementary and middle school grades. This is not yet determined.
- *Would the proposed 350-student Dundee Elementary replacement be designed to be expandable in the future as enrollment increases (e.g. larger core spaces)?* The cost shown for this project does not reflect an expandable design with larger core areas. If the District decides to design Dundee with larger core areas to accommodate future expansion, this would increase the project budget.
- *Would one of the covered play projects at the elementary level be removed if the District opts to replace Dundee?* Yes, if the District were to replace Dundee, the cost of one of the elementary

covered play structures could be reduced from the total amount shown.

- *Could new turf fields generate enough rental income to offset a portion of their initial cost?* New turf fields could potentially generate a small amount of income for the District, but not nearly enough to pay for the field(s).
- *How many students are currently enrolled at Dundee Elementary?* Approximately 280 students are currently enrolled at Dundee Elementary.
- *Which field at the middle school level would become turf?* The turf field would be a multiuse playing field, typically the football field.

The Committee divided into groups to create a \$135 M bond package with “top priority” projects. In selecting projects, Committee members were asked to consider building conditions, educational adequacy needs, parity considerations, and the Committee’s guiding principles. The “Tier I” package generated by each group is shown in the table on the following page:

TIER I PROJECTS						
PROJECT	ROM COST	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5
Edwards Cafeteria Addition	\$ 5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000
Edwards Expansion: Classrooms, Cafeteria and Community / Mental Health Spaces	\$ 13,365,222		\$ 13,365,222	\$ 13,365,222		\$ 13,365,222
District Office at Edwards	\$ 13,700,448					
Modernization of Edwards Elementary (upgrades to existing facility)	\$ 248,316			\$ 248,316		\$ 248,316
Edwards Pick-up/Drop-off Lanes Reconfiguration	\$ 674,160			\$ 674,160		
Dundee Replacement with New 350-Student Elementary	\$ 34,300,000	\$ 34,300,000	\$ 34,300,000	\$ 34,300,000		\$ 34,300,000
Dundee Replacement with New 550-Student K-8 School	\$ 53,679,990				\$ 53,679,990	
Security Vestibules at Every School	\$ 1,942,704	\$ 1,942,704		\$ 1,942,704		\$ 1,942,704
New Synthetic Turf Fields at NHS (Baseball, Softball and Multiuse)	\$ 3,798,892	\$ 3,798,892		\$ 3,798,892		
New Synthetic Turf Field at MVMS	\$ 3,230,350				\$ 3,230,350	
New Synthetic Turf Field at CVMS	\$ 3,230,350				\$ 3,230,350	
Replacement of Existing Turf football field at NHS	\$ 1,389,051		\$ 1,389,051	\$ 1,389,051		
Construction of Covered Play Structures (2k SF each) at Four (4) Elementary Schools	\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544		\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544
Construction of Covered Play Structures (4k SF each) at both Middle Schools	\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544		\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544	\$ 1,168,544
PE Facilities Improvements at NHS	\$ 21,255,703	\$ 21,255,703	\$ 21,255,703			
PE Facilities Improvements at one (1) Middle School	\$ 6,202,272					\$ 6,202,272
CTE/STEAM Improvements at Newberg HS	\$ 18,900,000	\$ 18,900,000	\$ 18,900,000	\$ 18,900,000	\$ 18,900,000	\$ 18,900,000
NHS Greenhouse Classroom	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000		\$ 900,000		
CTE/STEAM Improvements at Middle and Elementary Schools	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
Kitchen Upgrades	\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	
Maintenance Improvements: \$16.5 M out of total need of \$61M	\$ 16,500,000	\$ 16,500,000	\$ 16,500,000	\$ 16,500,000		\$ 16,500,000
Maintenance Improvements: \$20M out of total need of \$61M	\$ 20,000,000				\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000
Catalyst Expansion	\$ 8,700,000	\$ 8,700,000		\$ 8,700,000	\$ 8,700,000	\$ 8,700,000
Generator at Every School and District Office	\$ 1,736,501		\$ 1,736,501	\$ 1,736,501	\$ 1,736,501	\$ 1,736,501
Technology Upgrades	\$ 2,500,000		\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000		
Expand Dual Language Program by Two Classrooms	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000				
Early Childhood Education Enhancements	\$ 1,100,000			\$ 1,100,000		\$ 1,100,000
Health Clinic Access at NHS	\$ 1,300,000			\$ 1,300,000		\$ 1,300,000
21st Century Learning Upgrades	\$ 8,400,000		\$ 8,400,000	\$ 8,400,000	\$ 8,400,000	
Science Lab Upgrades at NHS	\$ 5,700,000	\$ 5,700,000		\$ 5,700,000	\$ 5,700,000	
Resiliency Upgrades (new buildings only)	\$ 1,900,000			\$ 1,900,000		\$ 1,900,000
Special Education Enhancements	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000		\$ 2,400,000
Total:		\$ 128,034,387	\$ 130,046,477	\$ 137,441,934	\$ 135,264,279	\$ 140,232,103

Groups designated the following projects as potential “Tier II” selections, if additional funding were available (up to \$150 M total).

Group 1

- Kitchen upgrades
- Generator at every school and district office

- Technology upgrades
- 21st Century learning upgrades
- Resiliency upgrades (new buildings only)

Group 2

- New synthetic turf field at MVMS
- Catalyst expansion
- Health clinic access at NHS

Group 3

- District Office at Edwards

Group 4

- District Office at Edwards
- Technology Upgrades

Group 5

- New synthetic turf field at CVMS
- Kitchen upgrades
- 21st Century Learning Upgrades

Karina then asked Committee members to vote for their favorite bond package using a sticky dot. Group 3's bond package received the most votes (8 votes), followed by Group 4 (6 votes). The bond packages developed by Group 1 and Group 5 each received four (4) votes. The bond package developed by Group 2 received zero votes.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.

These meeting notes are a record. If there are any errors and/or omissions in the foregoing notes, please advise our office immediately; otherwise these notes will be considered correct and complete as written.

Submitted by

Elisa Warner, Associate
BRIC Architecture, Inc.