

DALLAS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2
LRFP/FINANCE JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, December 18, 2025 at 5:30 p.m.
LaCreole Middle School Library

Present: Tyler Ferrari, Rob Oglivie, Christy Perry, Jeffrey Hernandez, Emma Jackson, Austin Markee, Wendy Latta, Lydia Hodge, Tyler Lalack, Tami Larson, Sara LeRoy, Bob Archer

Absent: Kelli McGuire, Michael McCollum, Ed Dressel, Robert Spivey, Stephen Burroughs, Trista Girt

Guest: Marlene Gillis, Megan Baker-Wilmes, Soderstrom Architects

Called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair, Jeffrey Hernandez

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

2.0 Approval of the December 18, 2025 Agenda: Motion by Lydia Hodge, seconded by Wendy Latta. The motion passed unanimously.

3.0 Approval of November 13, 2025 Minutes: Motion by Wendy Latta, seconded by Lydia Hodge. The motion passed unanimously.

4.0 LaCreole Middle School Tour and discussion: A school tour led by Principal Lalack, focused on the evolution and repurposing of space at LaCreole over approximately the past 20 years. During the tour, the principal explains how a former full-scale library was transformed as educational needs and technology changed—particularly with the decline of encyclopedias and the rise of digital resources like Google. The space was repurposed into a project-based learning area with computers and reused furniture sourced from other buildings.

More recently, the school has begun transitioning the space back toward a library model, reintroducing books and restoring library alcoves. The discussion also highlights broader structural changes that began around 2008, when significant budget cuts and a reduction in force (RIF) led to the elimination of many electives. This resulted in a condensed five-period school day focused solely on core subjects (social studies, math, language arts/reading, science, and physical education/health), along with substantial staffing changes. Overall, the narrative emphasizes adaptability, space repurposing, and the impact of financial and staffing constraints on educational programming.

5.0 Guest Report – Facility Assessment, Soderstrom Architects: A detailed presentation and discussion of a district-wide facilities assessment and the long-range planning process was led by the district's long-standing architectural firm, Soderstrom Architects. The purpose of the session was to provide a high-level overview of current facility conditions, remaining bond-funded projects, and how this information will inform future planning over the next 10–30 years.

Key points include:

- **Facilities Assessment Overview:**

The assessment evaluates school buildings using metrics required by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), including the Facilities Condition Index (FCI), structural integrity, and major building systems (mechanical, electrical, plumbing). The FCI compares the cost of repairs to the cost of replacement and serves as a starting point rather than a comprehensive decision-making tool.

- **Current Condition and Priorities:**

Overall, district buildings are well maintained but aging, resulting in ongoing infrastructure needs.

Major cost drivers include plumbing (particularly aging galvanized piping), electrical systems (especially at the high school due to scale), roofing, and building envelope improvements. Structural and seismic needs are identified at a high level, with many seismic upgrades already completed through state grants.

- **Bond Projects and Overlap:**

The assessment reflects conditions during the middle of ongoing bond-funded work (2024), resulting in some overlap between completed, underway, and remaining projects. A tracking system visually identifies completed and in-progress projects, and the district plans to continue updating the assessment as work is finished.

- **Cost Framework:**

The assessment generates a comprehensive “repair everything” cost estimate (likened to fully restoring an old car), which is not intended to be executed all at once. Costs are divided into construction (“hard”) costs and “soft” costs such as design, permits, inspections, and contingencies. Approximately \$13 million was identified for high-priority physical needs focused on keeping buildings safe, dry, and operational.

- **Planning vs. Assessment:**

A clear distinction was made between addressing immediate physical needs and engaging in strategic planning. While the assessment focuses on current conditions, the upcoming planning phase will define district priorities, educational vision, and how spaces should support future programs.

- **Special Education and Specialized Spaces:**

A recurring theme was the growing need for purpose-built special education and specialized learning spaces. These needs were not as prominent during the last bond cycle but have escalated significantly. Examples from other districts demonstrate how existing spaces can be renovated into effective, accessible environments without full rebuilds.

- **Energy Efficiency Considerations:**

Energy efficiency (lighting, HVAC, insulation) is addressed at a high level in the assessment, with more detailed analysis to occur during planning. The district actively pursues state and energy grants where available, though some upgrades (e.g., windows) remain cost-prohibitive.

- **Enrollment and Demographics:**

Future planning will be guided by updated 10-year enrollment projections prepared by a professional demographer, using cohort survival methods and multiple data sources. Charter school enrollment will be analyzed separately to ensure accurate district planning.

- **Next Steps:**

The committee’s role moving forward is to review the assessment, raise questions, and help guide the transition into the planning phase. This phase will integrate enrollment projections, programmatic needs (especially special education), and facility priorities to develop a long-term, strategic facilities plan.

Overall, the session emphasized proactive planning, informed prioritization, and aligning facilities with evolving educational needs rather than reactive, short-term fixes.

6.0 Staff Reports

The committee chair proposed postponing the scheduled report to the next meeting. No objections were raised by committee members. The discussion concluded with a brief comment regarding estimating student capacity, followed by thanks to participants.

7.0 Discussion

The discussion focused on identifying next steps beyond the current presentation. While participants agreed that enrollment should remain a key priority, there was also strong interest in continuing to

evaluate other district buildings. Members expressed that the recent building tour was helpful and supported the idea of touring a different school at each upcoming meeting. There was general agreement to include additional school tours as future agenda items, with openness to planning and scheduling the next site visit.

8.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9.0 Reports/Recommendations to Board

The committee reviewed whether there were any recommendations to forward to the school board. Members confirmed that no formal recommendations were prepared at this time, noting that recent board interactions had gone smoothly. It was agreed that additional information is needed before bringing specific items to the board. With no disagreements or further discussion, the topic was concluded.

10.0 Future Agenda Items

The discussion focused on planning school visits and addressing space needs, particularly in older facilities like Lyle Elementary, which is over 75 years old. The committee emphasized the importance of coordinating with school administration to ensure scheduling works with ongoing activities. Lyle was identified as a priority due to questions about its suitability as a modern, safe elementary school.

Additionally, there was strong interest in understanding special education (SPED) and behavior support programs. Committee members suggested a presentation by the SPED director to provide context on:

- Program types and enrollment (e.g., DLC programs)
- Behavioral and complex needs of students, including those not formally under SPED
- Historical and current approaches to accommodating these students in available spaces

There was also a recommendation to explore examples of purpose-built spaces for SPED and behavior needs across elementary, middle, and high schools, highlighting physical design solutions without focusing on program operations. The goal is to inform future planning for space utilization and enrollment management.

Future agenda items include continuing school tours, reviewing SPED and behavior support needs, and examining examples of purpose-built educational spaces.

11.0 Adjourn at 7:02 pm: Motion by Wendy Latta, seconded by Lydia Hodge. The motion passed unanimously.

Proposed 2025-26 Proposed Meeting Schedule

January 15, 2026

February 19, 2026

March 19, 2026