

**Facilities Master Planning Committee Minutes**  
**Keating Elementary**  
**Thursday, April 28, 2016**

**Those Present:**

Scott Rogers, Wenaha Group  
Mark Witty, Superintendent  
Doug Dalton, CFO  
Josey Gaslin, Parent Representative  
Autumn Harrell, Board Member  
Will Benson, Budget Committee  
Kevin Cassidy, Board Chair  
Dan Van Winkle, South Baker

Tony Rudolph, Maintenance  
Kim Mosier, Parent  
Skye Flanagan, Principal  
Norma Nemec, Minutes

**Not present:**

Mike Rudi, Budget Committee

1. Review of Minutes
2. Doug Dalton presented an overview of Keating Elementary
  - a. 5900 Square feet, constructed in 1950's
  - b. Recent Updates:
    - i. New furnace
    - ii. Septic tank
    - iii. Pump and well
    - iv. Flooring (carpet, tile)
    - v. Paint outside
    - vi. Connectivity – internet
    - vii. Roof – no problems – a few patches – needs to be replaced soon
  - c. Work to be planned:
    - i. Windows
    - ii. Doors
    - iii. Water softener
    - iv. Water pressure issues
  - d. 22 – 28 students historically, preschool – 6<sup>th</sup> grade
  - e. Two certified teachers and one para-professional
3. Skye Flanagan, Principal presented information on the facilities (See attachment 1)
  - a. The community involvement in the school is fantastic
  - b. Staff do a great job of teaching to multiple levels
  - c. Mr. Flanagan and Mrs. Shaw took the group on a tour of the facility – pointing out some of the issues on page 2 of attachment 1.
4. Scott Rogers – Wenaha group:
  - a. Summarized handouts (Attachment 2)
    - i. Clarity on assessments – the group has a good overview of facilities. The capacity and instructional element, as well as architectural overview is important
    - ii. Oregon School Capital Improvement Matching Grant Program (Senate Bill 447)
    - iii. Goal – apply for grants and bond program, and funding available for assessments and assistance; \$20,000 for Assessment and \$25,000 for Long Range Facilities Plan. The district will have to add additional funding for the assessment and plan.

- iv. Goal: tuning the scope of services as to what ODE is doing
  - v. Discussion of whether or not to include all buildings in the study – the consensus was to include all buildings in our inventory – including Central – which is not now being used. It is important to look at real estate, not just buildings.
  - vi. Breaking down the plan into the ASTM classifications will give the public pertinent information
  - vii. Information is usually valid for ten (10) years
  - viii. Timeline discussion – suggestion to get architects in to look at the buildings ASAP (before school is out)
  - ix. Stressing the importance of instructional space – not just classrooms themselves along with safety and security of the buildings, ADA, etc. He suggests more than just an engineering approach.
  - x. Scott is comfortable with a company in Boise (LKD Architects) and proposes asking them for a quote and they would have one back as early as next week.
  - xi. It will take several days in district for the architects. They would have something back to the district in June or July.
  - xii. After the report is back to the FMP – then the committee would start looking at options. The FMP would make A, B, C type recommendations to the board. The board would then mold those recommendations and then if they want to move forward, they will put together another committee – that group will look through the options and start tagging what they think is priority. There will be a series of options: good, better, best, then the committee will move forward.
  - xiii. A cost analysis would be one of the next steps after the architectural report is in.
5. Mark asked if the group wanted to move forward with Scott getting some numbers – then the group can look at those numbers, and make a determination if it is reasonable to continue, or if they need to make some adjustments.

Is there any additional information that needs to be included in the report from the architect's (call-outs)?

At a question from Kevin regarding contingencies:

Scott's Process:

- a. Master Budget – high level
  - i. Projected revenue – all monies, energy trust, grants, etc.
  - ii. Administrative (bond sales, project management, etc.)
  - iii. New construction – has smaller contingency – renovations – 5 to 10% contingency
  - iv. There is a delicate balance between building contingencies and cutting out items that need to be included.
  - v. There will always some items left undone

If the board decides not to move on to the community continuity part – the district will still have the information on facilities. BTI and the district are separate entities, so as the message goes out to the community, it is important that we communicate the separateness of those facilities and entities. They are complementary plans, but not the same plan.

Voter demographic – the FMP will not be getting into that piece.

Mark suggests that Scott comes back to the group on May 12 with some costs for an architectural assessment. He asked the group for a consensus on that – consensus reached. There was some discussion as to the timeline for receiving the report.

The group didn't feel like they could make decisions without brainstorming then whittling down their A, B, C . . . wish list.

6. Next Meeting:
  - a. Thursday, May 12, 2016 8:30 – at Baker High School