

SUMMER PLANNING SESSION MINUTES

2/A Summer Planning Work Session of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 27, 2018.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Zach Bessett called the Springfield Board of Education Summer Planning Session to order in the Board Room at the District Administration Center at 4:02 p.m.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Zach Bessett, Tony Jobanek, Dr. Emilio Hernandez and Michelle Webber. Board Member absent was Laurie Adams.

District staff and community members identified included Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky, David Collins, Brett Yancey, Jeff Michna, Jenna McCulley, Brian Megert, Whitney McKinley, Suzy Price, Judy Bowden, Anne Goff, Mike Eyster, John DeWenter, Sally Storm, Chris Reiersgaard, Alekzander Ames, Linda Whadon and Marina Brassfield.

2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

Zach Bessett welcomed Board members. Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky provided an overview of the agenda. There were no changes.

Mr. Smolnisky noted some topics may take a while to work through, such as the working agreements between the Board and Superintendent and the District Goals. He added that the documents did not need to be finalized that evening.

3. BOARD WORKING AGREEMENTS

Mr. Smolnisky directed Board members to the document entitled *Board and Superintendent Working Agreements*.

Mr. Smolnisky explained the purpose of reviewing the working agreements. The agreement focused on how the Board and Superintendent would work together, communicate with one another, and communicate with the greater community. It cleared up expectations and procedures, and also included information on evaluations.

Mr. Smolnisky noted it was important to discuss the agreement at that meeting, because it was a new academic year and it had been a couple years since the document had been considered. There were three relatively new Board members and Mr. Smolnisky wanted to provide them a chance to review the agreement. Additionally, Mr. Smolnisky wanted to position the District to hire an excellent new Superintendent; all applicants would want to see agreements, like the one reviewed, in place. If questions were asked which couldn't be answered that evening, staff would conduct research and provide information at a future meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part A, Purpose of Agreements. He wondered if there were any concerns. In the second sentence of Part A, Mr. Bessett wanted to see the wording "cohesive leadership team," instead of "leadership team." Mr. Smolnisky asked what "cohesive" meant to the Board. Mr. Bessett wanted to ensure the Board didn't have a separate agenda from the District.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part B, the Board Job Description and Relationship with Superintendent. He explained Part B discussed the 12 main responsibilities of Board members. Mr. Bessett wondered if Part B was meant to be more of a general outline for Board responsibilities, or if there needed to be a certain timeline of frequency, such as quarterly or annually. Mr. Smolnisky thought the Board could look at tasks whenever needed, but some tasks, such as Item Number 9, would be done on an annual basis.

Mr. Jobanek asked what had historically been done for a Board Retreat. Mr. Yancey said prior Board's had gone a few different directions. The Board used to do an all-day annual retreat; however, the last four years, they opted to do four quarterly planning sessions instead. Mr. Bessett wanted to change Item Number 9 to reflect quarterly planning sessions.

Ms. Webber asked about consistency in communication between the board, staff, and the public. Ms. McCulley said the District tried different iterations of outreach, but nothing was in place. Ms. Webber wondered if some type of monthly or quarterly newsletter could be posted on the District website so the public could access updates and District successes. Mr. Smolnisky noted the minutes of Board meetings were posted online; he wondered what type of communication she thought of in addition to the minutes. Ms. Webber thought community members might be unsure of where to access the minutes, or that the minutes might not make sense to someone who didn't attend the meeting. Ms. McCulley asked for content clarification. Ms. Webber said questions she heard were around what exactly the Board and District were accomplishing.

Mr. Jobanek wondered whether more understanding on the District website was needed for people to direct themselves to the minutes, or if the minutes generally had excess information. Ms. Webber thought staff and Board members could first provide direction and see if more people were engaged.

Mr. Smolnisky had no issue with additional public outreach, but also wanted to protect necessary staff time. Staff would look at options and return to the Board with recommendations. Ms. McCulley added that the District has created a new website specifically to help facilitate more community engagement. The website would go live at the start of the 2018-2019 academic year. Additionally, Ms. McCulley conducted professional development with staff around functional newsletters. The department would restart a sign up option so people could receive updates. Ms. McCulley thought a Board section could be included if that was helpful.

Dr. Hernandez reiterated Ms. Webber's point, and said when he was vice chair, there were many items in the "parking lot." Some of those issues hadn't been revisited, such as how to get information out to the community. Dr. Hernandez wondered where the "parking lot" list was? Mr. Bessett responded the list was included on a GoogleDoc which he would go through and update. He added the issue would be on the agenda at a future meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part C, Role of Board Leadership, which discussed the chair and vice chair positions. He asked for questions or concerns. Mr. Bessett asked about Item Number 4. He had no issue ensuring the facilitation of new Board members orientation, however, as a new Board member himself, he felt somewhat uneasy conducting the process. Mr. Smolnisky explained staff would lead the process, per District policy.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part D, Role of the Superintendent. Mr. Smolnisky was unsure of exactly what Item Number 6 meant when it said facilitation of communication requiring "more than 20 minutes of staff time." Mr. Yancey responded that several years ago, there was an agreement between the Superintendent and the Board in which Board members were free to contact cabinet level staff, without going through the Superintendent, if the issue took about 20 minutes or less. The clause was included to ensure the Superintendent was involved and to ensure staff time wasn't taken away for issues that could have been streamlined differently. Mr. Collins added the item was also to ensure everyone had the same information.

Mr. Jobanek asked how Mr. Smolnisky felt about Item Number 6. Mr. Smolnisky supported Item Number 6, and reiterated the need to keep everyone informed. Mr. Jobanek agreed, and thought it would be important for Board members to relay information to each other and to the Superintendent when and if they met with a director. Mr. Smolnisky added that he would send email updates on Fridays. Mr. Yancey noted simple questions about happenings at schools (such as small landscaping projects, evening events, etc.) required informal conversations, and board members could send him an email or text. Other questions might require more formal, sit down settings. Mr. Jobanek thought it was important to use discretion when making those contacts, and to let Mr. Smolnisky know about the contact as a common courtesy.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part E, Meeting Operations and Decision Making. He pointed to Item Number 2, which focused on cell phones and computers. He hoped the use of the devices would be minimal, in order to respect everyone's work and time. Mr. Bessett agreed, and added it was especially important to avoid use during the public comment portion of a business meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky wanted to discuss Item Number 6. He clarified that staff welcomed questions from Board members during meetings, but asked that whenever possible, they provide those questions in advance so staff could come prepared. He explained if staff couldn't answer a question brought forward during a meeting, staff would return with answers in the future.

Mr. Bessett addressed a similar issue. He asked to receive meeting topic requests from board members prior to meeting with the vice chair. He proposed having a deadline of 5:00 p.m. the Monday before this meeting. Mr. Bessett also committed himself to send reminders to Board members.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part F, Communication. Mr. Smolnisky thought Item Number 5 might be tricky for Board members, because they often received informal complaints from community members in their role. Each situation was unique. Mr. Bessett added that often times Board members were called to attend meetings. He wanted to ensure members were inviting the Superintendent when appropriate.

Ms. Webber thought it was important to have the Chair and Superintendent meet with community leaders together to build trust and transparency. It would allow Board members be on the same page, and to avoid several one on one conversations about the same issue.

Since the district would begin the hiring process for a new superintendent starting January 2019, Mr. Smolnisky recommended Board members take a close look at Part F. Some superintendents wanted specific language within the contract on how they would communicate with members of the community. Mr. Jobanek wondered if, as written, Section F functioned as hoped. Mr. Smolnisky said yes, and added the toughest situations were really when a community member had a complaint outside of a public meeting, because Board members were sometimes put in uncomfortable positions.

Dr. Hernandez asked how they would follow up with public comments, as a Board and a district. Mr. Bessett thought it was great to keep track of issues brought to the Board during meetings, but was unsure if they wanted to continue the GoogleDoc as a tracking method. He thought an update on items the public brought forward could possibly be included in the Friday update. Mr. Smolnisky clarified whether Dr. Hernandez was interested in how staff relayed information to the Board, the individual patron, or the entire community. Dr. Hernandez responded that information should be shared with the entire community at the following meeting whenever issues were brought to the Board.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Section G, Board and Superintendent Subcommittees. He explained if a committee was formed, the Board member sitting on it was responsible to keep their colleagues informed. Mr. Bessett wondered about responsibilities to Board members' assigned committees. Mr. Smolnisky thought responsibilities could be discussed. Generally, each Board member would provide a summary on the committee meeting to the Board and Superintendent at the next regular Board meeting. Mr. Smolnisky

explained when members were at meetings, they were to represent the District and might sometimes need to vote on issues.

Mr. Smolnisky closed the discussion, and said staff would edit the working agreements based on Board comments. The document would be brought forward for adoption at the next meeting.

4. HIRING PERMANENT SUPERINTENDENT

Jen McCulley shared a PowerPoint entitled, "*Superintendent Search.*" She explained the PowerPoint would allow the board to understand the overall process and prepare to move forward. One question to consider during the presentation was whether the Board wanted to delegate search tasks to a group, or conduct the search themselves.

In preparing for a candidate search, Ms. McCulley met with peers from partner districts and conducted extensive research. Key decision points included: undergoing a public or confidential process; conducting a regional or national search; using a search firm, OSBA, or conducting the search in-house (although that option was not recommended); and identification of stakeholder groups.

Ms. McCulley shared pros and cons of a public process in which candidates were known from the beginning. Positives included the fact that the process was completely transparent, so there was increased trust from community members. She concluded that was the main positive, and most high-level executive searches were moving to a closed process. Concerns of an open process were that it was challenging for candidates, and it could impact the candidate pool before evaluation even began.

Ms. McCulley shared positives of a closed process, which included a greater ability to recruit the largest candidate pool. Confidential processes were routinely recommended by search firms and were generally understood by stakeholders as common practice for hiring high level executives. Some concerns were the potential for less initial buy in by stakeholders because fewer were involved from the start. Ms. McCulley said the process could be designed where it was confidential until the final few applicants, with stakeholder involvement occurring during the final stages.

Mr. Bessett asked whether the Board would look at applications and résumés. Ms. McCulley said that would be step two in the decision making process. It was a large process so some districts delegated portions of the process to a Board representative and a screening committee. Ultimately, interviews and the way the process rolled out was up to the Board. In addition, if a search firm was hired, they would help guide the board in these decisions. Mr. Smolnisky said technically, the board could conduct the entire process itself. Dr. Hernandez didn't believe it was wise for the Board to conduct the entire process itself.

Mr. Bessett asked if a search firm would go through applications and take out demographic indicators. Ms. McCulley didn't ask the search firm that degree of finite questions, since the Board hadn't yet made their decision. The contract with the firm would be for the Board to negotiate. Dr. Hernandez said that the Board didn't want to know demographics, however, it did want a diversified applicant pool.

In response to a question from Mr. Bessett, Ms. McCulley said different firms had different approaches in re-naming applicants (i.e. Applicant 1A) to ensure privacy. Some had all personal information in a separate portal and managed that information for the district. Mr. Jobanek asked whether a confidential type process could have ample ways for stakeholders to take part in the process. Ms. McCulley said absolutely. In a recent conversation with Eugene 4J School District (4J), they delegated the initial screening to a committee. Then, there was an interview committee; ultimately, they designed the process in a way where candidates came and met with a wide swath of stakeholder groups.

Ms. McCulley explained that once the Board decided whether or not to utilize a search firm or staff, the firm would need to know whether they wanted to conduct a regional or national search. When speaking with other

August 27, 2018

districts, she heard pros and cons for both choices. Positive aspects of regional searches included more applicants who were familiar with Oregon's education system, as well as lower advertising and travel costs. Cons were that the District would be geographically limiting itself, so there would be a smaller and less diverse candidate pool. The main pro for a national search was a broader pool of applicants overall. Cons were that there would be additional advertising and travel costs. In addition, candidates from out of state may be used to an entirely different system of education.

Ms. McCulley explained that out-of-house search firms would be OSBA or an unidentified firm. She prepared some information in case the Board opted for any sort of outside expertise, however, Ms. McCulley didn't have detailed information in case the Board opted for an in-house process. She explained OSBA was familiar with the district, as well as nearby districts and employees in the region. Ms. McCulley added OSBA was the cheaper option overall. Partner districts reported OSBA was a great resource for smaller districts, but not as beneficial for larger districts (like Springfield). In general, partner districts felt they could do most of the process themselves or hire out some parts.

Ms. McCulley said a search firm would have larger recruiting and advertising options, so they would be more familiar with national candidates; however, they would also be more expensive.

Dr. Hernandez asked if it would be possible to create a budget for both options. Mr. Yancey explained the district needed to go through a formal process, therefore a set of criteria would need to be defined. In order to get an equal comparison from firms, Ms. McCulley would release a Request for Proposals (RFP) with particular criteria; then, firms would provide bids. Based on those bids the Board would select a firm. Mr. Yancey noted cost was only one variable, and didn't need to be the deciding factor. The district could choose to go with a more expensive firm, if the firm fit the criteria in a better fashion. Mr. Yancey reiterated the budget wasn't limiting the district as there were other funds to draw from if absolutely needed.

Dr. Hernandez said the process made sense. He noted Board members would travel to sites in order to receive information from the applicant's school district and community, so those costs also had to be looked at. Ms. McCulley said he was absolutely right; there was a base travel cost for backgrounding. She added there were lessons learned from an unnamed partner district on how to approach the process differently, in terms of bringing candidates in. As they approached that finite level, the Board could start working with the finance office and add it to the contract so it was known from the onset where they were with respect to the budget. Mr. Yancey said legal counsel would also be asked for their input to ensure the process was done correctly.

Ms. McCulley reiterated the process was up to the Board, but noted that recruitment firms were experienced, and would articulate the needs of the district during the search. She added the District wanted to ensure groups of key stakeholders were engaged along the way, whether they opted for a search firm, OSBA, or in-house. One thing that worked well for districts was a broader survey. Board members could provide the same questions to stakeholders who missed the larger meetings. The information would be compiled and returned to the Board. Surveys would allow the Board to define a clear description of what the community was looking for in a superintendent. Dr. Hernandez thought the initial group of stakeholders was strong, but wanted to specifically mention students. He also wanted to include the LGBTQ, Native American, African American, and Asian American communities. Ms. McCulley responded she thought the additions were a great idea.

Ms. McCulley shared the preliminary calendar outline. She explained that based on best practices, the District would plan the process during the fall and offer options for meetings and public surveys. Then, the job description would be created Winter 2018, with posting and recruitment beginning January 2019. Ideally, finalists would be identified Spring 2019 with a public announcement to follow.

Mr. Smolnisky said in the past there were stakeholder interviews with the last two or three candidates, in which anyone from the public came to ask questions, which was a useful process. Mr. Bessett thought the next steps seemed right on par for the overall timeline. Ms. McCulley said the timeline would be more

formalized in order to coordinate with all five board members. Mr. Bessett asked if it seemed reasonable for the Board to direct the Chair and Vice Chair to work through the next steps. Dr. Hernandez said yes, and Ms. Webber agreed. Dr. Hernandez said if any questions arose he would be happy to help, as he had been through similar processes before.

5. DISTRICT GOALS UPDATE

Mr. Smolnisky led a discussion and shared a PowerPoint entitled “*2018-19 Strategic Plan Overview.*” The Strategic Plan was adopted a few years ago by the Board, but the District wanted to update the document.

Mr. Smolnisky explained the Strategic Plan informed staff exactly what they needed to be doing. Additionally, superintendent candidates would look at any strategic plans adopted by the District.

Mr. Smolnisky walked through each of the five goals. He said mission values were taken from a larger visioning document to create one statement. The vision was *Every student a graduate, prepared for a bright and successful future, through supporting every student every day.* Mr. Smolnisky said the measurement didn’t include graduation rates because a 100% graduation rate was the only goal the District would ever have. It would celebrate progress made along the way, but the District would not be completely successful until every student graduated. In addition, the District wanted to prepare students with skills and habits of mind, like integrity.

Mr. Smolnisky started with strategic objectives around Goal #1, *Promote Growth and Success for Every Student.* Specific indicators of success included: an articulated curriculum, and a systematic, master schedule to optimize student learning. A second objective was to have highly effective staff systems in place to support teaching and learning. The final strategic objective was responsible deployment of resources.

Mr. Jabonek asked if discussion should wait until the end of the presentation. Mr. Bessett wanted to dissect the goals as they moved along. Mr. Bessett asked how to hire for specific qualities in teachers who kept kids wanting to come to class daily. Mr. Smolnisky said it was difficult to know whenever the District hired someone. It was partly on how staff was trained upon hiring. Mr. Reese, Director of Human Resources explained the recruitment process and said candidates interviewed the District as much as the District interviewed the applicant. Mr. Collins added the quality of classroom infrastructure also affected learning; it was important to develop a rich classroom environment.

Dr. Hernandez asked how to attract diversity and equity in teachers. He thought the community overall didn’t have the best image when it came to those types of issues. He wondered if the district would consider things to attract those applicants. Mr. Smolnisky thought Board members would see the issue addressed in the following section, Family Support.

Mr. Bessett announced the Board would take a short break from 5:30 p.m. until 5:50 p.m.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Goal # 2, *Support families so that every student is ready to learn.* Strategic objectives included diversifying the District’s workforce by creating an equitable and inclusive recruitment, hiring, and selection process. Success indicators included all job announcements having equity minded language; hiring committee members trained on the importance of Equal Employment Opportunity; and an adverse impact analysis would allow for exploration into the if and how selection processes have implicit or explicit bias. Other objectives included safe and inclusive learning environments. Essentially, the District wanted to provide learning environments that met the needs of students and staff, while also providing parents confidence in the District’s care for their children.

Dr. Hernandez noted the previous year, Board members were asked questions about specific buildings, regarding safety doors. He wondered how members would answer those questions, especially when they involved unsolvable issues around infrastructure. Mr. Yancey explained in 2017-2018, an issue with safety

doors arose. The District worked with the Fire Marshall to come up with an alternate solution, and added doors to other classrooms so students could evacuate to a classroom that did lock. There were ongoing conversations with staff and public officials around school safety.

Mr. Smolnisky shared Goal #3, *Provide personalized learning opportunities for every student*. Strategic objectives included offering a multi-tiered system of support. One way to accomplish the goal was to support administrative, classified, and teaching staff in improving skills. Success indicators included setting goals; reviewing progress; and staff development. Surveys and School Wide Information System (SWIS) data were considered to understand parent involvement. Other strategic objectives included high school success, facilities and technology and Career and Technical Education (CTE). Mr. Smolnisky discussed the success indicators for each objective. The strategic objectives were embedded in all of the goals.

Dr. Hernandez asked if there was any flexibility in ODE's requirement for Smarter Balance. He wondered if there were other options for students who didn't have the capability to take those tests. Mr. Collins said there was an opt out option. The District also looked at other measures of success over the past couple years, such as formative benchmarks. Currently, the District had not explored alternative options within the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) model. He didn't believe it was viable option based on state reporting system.

Mr. Smolnisky stated all kids deserved inspiring and equitable facilities, and explained what the District planned to accomplish in order to reach Goal #4, *Create safe and future ready facilities that inspire learning*. At a recent staff meeting, there was a presentation from maintenance staff who understood this goal perfectly. From the department's point of view, everything needed to be maintained and in excellent working condition so that every kid had access to the best tools for learning.

Mr. Smolnisky shared Goal #5, *Advocate for funding and policies that support education*. The first objective was intentional and effective advocacy, meaning Board members might have roles to play in meeting with legislators. The Board would see outreach develop throughout the year. Mr. Smolnisky added that clear and meaningful policies were crucial. He added that OSBA recommended the District update their policies. This process would take place over the next two years.

Mr. Bessett asked if an advocacy plan had been developed. Ms. McCulley responded that in past years, the District and Board moved away from a more formalized legislative priorities list. During Fall 2018, staff would discuss potential legislation. At the Fall OSBA Conference in November, Board members would hear OSBA's legislative priorities. Afterward, the District and Board would work to create a concise document of their own legislative priorities.

Mr. Jobanek asked if there was a legislative point person? Ms. McCulley said no, there was not. Mr. Smolnisky said the District spoke with local legislators, who were advocates of SPS. Ms. McCulley thought the Board was poised to make targeted movement. She was looking forward to engaging in advocacy with the Board. Ms. McCulley noted that historically the community liked to hear from elected officials.

Mr. Smolnisky shared next steps. At the District level, staff would continue to work on an action plan and measurable outcomes for each goal and subsequent strategies. Those would be published to the new website. Finally, the District would develop a strategic plan document and position themselves with a new Superintendent. Staff would bring back the document to the Board at a future meeting, and the Board would pass a resolution to amend and readopt goals for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Dr. Hernandez returned to Vision and Values of the District. As Board members, the goal of every student graduating made sense, but people in the community specifically wanted to see numbers around graduation rates. Mr. Smolnisky said those numbers were still out there and published by the State; the District would accept those numbers and work with them because it didn't change the ultimate goal. Dr. Hernandez

understood, but for the community to understand they needed to see the numbers changing. He wondered if the website was a good place to address statistics and put more meaning to the backstory.

Mr. Collins said the District wanted to consider growth over the year, rather than the end of a year situation. Every plan would report back on high school success in various ways. The Strategic Plan focused on Measure 98 and normal indicators of success. The data would inform and adjust District strategies employed throughout the year. He hoped the public heard about progress through classroom teachers and schools, and that it aligned with feedback the Board heard during meetings. Dr. Hernandez asked if schools would communicate to parents, through a newsletter for example. Mr. Collins said each school would consider parent engagement. The hope was to have personalized communication for each student. Dr. Hernandez added the hope was also to increase parent engagement.

Ms. McCulley said an added benefit of aligning and embedding work into plans themselves was alignment across departments. Dr. Hernandez liked the idea of embedding the work, and thought something could be created where superintendent candidates could quickly look at the data in order to understand the overall Strategic Plan and conduct their own research on the District.

Mr. Smolnisky concluded an updated District Goals document would come forward at the next Board meeting for Board approval.

6. BOARD COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

Mr. Bessett directed the Board members to a document entitled "*School Board Representation 2018-2019.*" It was a revised version of agencies and civic organizations board member assignments, following a discussion by the Chair and Vice Chair. Big changes included that Mr. Bessett would work with Ms. Adams on Springfield Education Foundation. Ms. Webber would represent SPS for the Wildish Theater while Mr. Jobanek would represent SPS at Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board Meetings. Lastly, the Chair and Vice Chair would work on the Facilities Advisory Committee.

Mr. Jobanek requested a schedule of assigned committee meeting dates and times for the 2018-2019 academic year. Staff would identify meeting information for Board members.

7. OLD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING PLANS

Mr. Yancey shared a document entitled "*Hazardous Material Study and Phase I environmental Assessment.*" He explained it was important for the Board to have the information, as they decided what to do with the building. The Hazardous Material Study was required no matter what the District ended up doing with the building. The study performed uncovered hazardous materials including asbestos and lead paint in windows, doors, flooring, roofing, walls, and chalkboards. Mr. Yancey said the building needed to be abated in order to do any demolition work.

Mr. Yancey explained Phase I of the Environmental Assessment, which looked at soils and the surrounding landscape. There was some good news, including a 4,000-gallon heating tank that had already been decommissioned. It still sat underground in sand or cement. However, no one could find the decommissioning papers, so additional testing was needed. Minimal testing didn't show soil contamination. As of that time, there were no environmental conditions with the property, however, Phase II had not been conducted. He was nervous about Phase II because the entire area used to be used for orchards and farming, so a lot of pesticides were used. Mr. Yancey said the cost to abate hazardous materials would be an estimated \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Yancey said according to the City of Springfield, 525 Mill Street was considered one tax lot but it was formed from 13 platted lots. The District would have to redo the plat planning process again if it wanted to sell a portion of the 3.32-acre property. The cost estimate to replat was just under \$30,000. The cost estimate

of demolition was \$50,000. Mr. Yancey concluded the total estimate cost of the project would be \$251,835 to \$396,834. The District had not yet gone through a formal bid process.

Mr. Yancey said at that point, they needed to discuss options for the property. It was not big enough for a school site. He thought it would be wise to hang onto the bare land because it would be worth more. The land could be used for parking or saved for future space if the District wanted to build a training facility, or a staff support building, for example. A second option was that the District could enter into conversations with the City or a nonprofit organization to create an affordable housing development.

Mr. Yancey thought options and opportunities were there, but only without the building on it; the Board would have to discuss demolition at a future meeting. The site was a liability in its current condition. Mr. Yancey shared the site was not currently designated as a historical site, however, it could potentially be one if someone initiated the process.

Mr. Jabonek thanked Mr. Yancey for putting the information together. He clarified the potential costs.

Mr. Yancey said a realtor previously outlined two options for the Board. One option was to put the land up for sale and to see what was offered. The realtor thought a sale would be contingent on demolition or taking abatement costs into consideration. Another option would be a sealed bid process where the sale was announced, and all bids were due on a particular date. The Board would then look at the confidential bids and then accept one or none of them.

Dr. Hernandez asked how much taxes would be if the property sat without a building. Mr. Yancey said the property would still be tax exempt because it was owned by a government entity.

Mr. Jabonek asked how much the assessed value was of the property. Mr. Yancey responded the assessed value was \$3.2 million, but that included all structures on site. He explained any interested party would want a copy of the hazardous materials and environmental assessment reports.

Dr. Hernandez thought the District was approached by an individual who wanted to submit the site as historical. Mr. Yancey said there were interested parties in the community, but they still hadn't heard from those folks. Ms. McCulley clarified no one had filled out paperwork.

Mr. Jabonek clarified in order to sell the property, it would have to be re-platted because the District didn't want to sell the entire property. Mr. Yancey said yes, the District was looking to keep about two thirds of the property. Income from the sale could be net zero due to expenses associated with the project. Mr. Bessett said the buyer would have to take care of those expenses. Mr. Yancey said yes, but any buyer would take those costs into consideration in their bid. Mr. Jabonek was unclear exactly which expenses the District would cover; he asked if the District was responsible for the replat. Mr. Yancey confirmed yes.

Dr. Hernandez wondered if the information presented would be available to the public. All the meeting information would be posted as part of the agenda packet on the Board webpage. Dr. Hernandez thought the data would cause fewer people to view the building as historic and more people viewing it as a hazard. Mr. Yancey said there was a small amount of dollars in capital improvement fund that could be used to demolish the building, but staff would likely have to approach the Board with a contingency request. Mr. Jabonek asked if the District had to replat whether they kept or sold the property. Mr. Yancey said a replat wouldn't be recommended if the property was kept.

Mr. Yancey thought the land could be valuable to the City or other entities in the future, because the land might be needed for projects such as parks or low-income housing; however, at this time, no options were presenting themselves.

Dr. Hernandez asked if there was a project timeline, if the Board chose to demolish the building. Mr. Yancey said companies moved quickly. Abatement would take the longest because there was a lot of asbestos. Once it was abated, it was essentially torn apart and was no longer a functional building. After that, the demolition process was about two weeks. Dr. Hernandez asked if it would be disruptive to nearby workplaces. Mr. Yancey said it wouldn't be very disruptive, as there would be security fencing and other measures taken.

Mr. Bessett asked if the building could be sold after abatement without demolition. Mr. Yancey said yes, but he was unsure of what type of infrastructure would be left after abatement. The District staff would also collect anything useable such as hardware and fire alarms, so the building wouldn't be functional.

Mr. Jabonek said the District's options were to pay up to \$300,000 to demolish the building with the idea to utilize the property in future, or, sell the property and have a net zero gain. Mr. Yancey added that John Brown, a local realtor, shared the building's seismic information with folks and the site became even more unattractive to them.

Dr. Hernandez asked how long the building would sit there if it was put up for sale. Mr. Yancey said staff had thoughts, but he wanted direction on what the Board wanted to see next, such as a more formal ask in a regular board meeting. Mr. Jabonek thought it would be helpful to have Mr. Yancey return with recommendations. Mr. Yancey said the decision was inevitable, it was just a matter of when to make it.

8. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Mr. Bessett said he was looking forward to Mr. Yancey and Mr. Smolnisky's recommendations.

10. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Mr. Bessett adjourned the meeting at 6:51 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Marina Brassfield)