

Junction City School District, #69  
**Long-Term Facilities Plan**  
Proposed to the Board September 23, 2013  
Revision to the Board February 22, 2016

In September 2006, the Junction City School District Board of Directors began examining the state of district facilities in preparation for constructing a new district Long-Term Facilities Plan. At their regular board meeting on September 25, 2006, it was the consensus of the Board to have the Portland Population Study Center conduct a five-year population study for the Junction City School District. The results of that study, along with information gathered from a Bonds and Ballots work shop that several board members, a community member, and most of the administrative team attended in January 2007, was presented to the Board at their regular meeting on February 26, 2007.

At the March 19, 2007 board meeting, Maintenance Director Christopher Meyer gave a report on all buildings in the Junction City School District. This report included the year each building was constructed, the year(s) that any additions or remodeling was completed, and the square footage of each facility. (Attachment A).

In March of 2007, Junction City School District staff members were asked to complete a survey regarding district facilities. Results of this survey were presented to the Board of Directors at a work session on April 19, 2007. At the same work session, results from past facilities reviews, safe school design inspections, and energy reviews that were conducted on district facilities in the past were discussed. At this work session, participants also discussed the current state of district facilities. Copies of reports discussed at this meeting are available for review at the school district office as indicated in the Appendix.

At their board meeting on April 23, 2007, the Junction City School District Board of Directors approved a plan to conduct a comprehensive assessment of district facilities. That assessment was conducted by gLAs Architects during the Summer of 2007. At a board meeting on October 29, 2007, Reid Anderson with gLAs Architects reported the findings of the Facilities Assessment to the Board.

At work sessions on December 10, 2007 and January 14, 2008 the results of the Facilities Assessment were discussed as well as a recommended list of priorities for future consideration.

At a board meeting on February 4, 2008 the board took action to approve an extension of the contract with gLAs Architects to include the facilitation of a Facilities Steering Committee consisting of 12-15 people to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP). Members of the Committee were selected from a pool of interested applicants. The Facilities Steering Committee (also known as the "FSC") is comprised of two board members, five district staff members, and six members of the community.

The Facilities Steering Committee met on March 10, 2008, April 1, 2008, and again on April 21, 2008, to review the Facilities Assessment results and develop an RFP for Visioning and Facilitation Services.

Interviews were conducted and Angelo Planning Group (APG) was retained to assist with long-term planning services. As the Committee started the visioning process and began developing strategies for capital improvement implementation, national and local economies began a downward trend. The Committee decided that it would not be a good time to ask voters to pay for capital improvements to the School District facilities. The activities of the Facilities Steering Committee were suspended until such time that the community might better consider funding for needed improvements.

At their regular board meeting on June 25, 2012, the Board approved the recommendation from the Facilities Steering Committee to have Portland State University Population Study Center conduct an updated 10-year population study for the Junction City School District. The results of that study were presented to the Board at their regular meeting on February 25, 2013. Under their mid-growth model- which is the most likely scenario- it is projected that enrollment will grow at about a half a percent each year, resulting in an increase of just over 90 students within ten years. Under their high-growth model- which is a possible scenario due to the construction of the hospital and improvement in the local economy and housing industry- it is projected that enrollment will grow at about 1.5% each year, resulting in an increase of approximately 270 students within ten years.

In the Fall of 2012, the Facilities Steering Committee was re-established. gLAs Architects was asked to update and refine information from the Facilities Assessment report published in 2008. While updating the Assessment, gLAs also created possible construction projects by logically grouping recommended improvements or repairs. Through several meetings from Fall 2012 through Spring 2013, this work was developed into a list of potential projects to be considered for funding and implementation.

During the same time period, Junction City School District also reengaged the services of Angelo Planning Group to help facilitate planning for a bond measure. Through several meetings, the Facilities Steering Committee developed and refined groups of packages to be considered for a bond measure. The projects were presented at community meetings, and reviewed with focus groups outside the FSC. A phone poll was conducted to registered voters within the School District boundaries to determine the level of support for a bond measure. After gathering significant data and refining project descriptions, a final package of projects was identified as most critical to the educational and community needs. The total cost of this package is approximately \$32.4 million. The Committee recommended to the School Board that a general obligation bond measure to fund these capital improvements be submitted for inclusion on the November 2013 ballot. The Board approved this initiative at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the 2013-14 school year on August 26, 2013.

That bond issue was submitted to our voters in November 2013 and was defeated by a 64.32% No Vote. Additionally, informal exit polling indicated that uncertainty about the location of the replacement Laurel School was a factor in the voting: a new site had not been identified and replacement on the same site would impact the community-built Laurel ball field complex. Sentiment regarding the true conditions and cost / benefit of the replacement facility as well as the tax burden associated with the work were also factors affecting the position of the voters.

In May 2014, Junction City School District reached out to DLR Group Architecture & Planning who had facilitated the planning efforts that lead to successful bonds in May 2014 in the Fern Ridge and Pleasant Hill communities, both in Lane County. The District entered into contract with DLR Group in October 2014 to facilitate a community-based process to analyze the data and adjust the long range plan. That group met in five workshops between March 30, 2015 and January 13, 2016.

The results of the analysis confirmed the earlier positions regarding:

- Replacement of Laurel Elementary School
- Heating, Lighting, and Ceiling Upgrades at Oaklea Middle School
- Communication and Security Infrastructure Upgrades – District-Wide

However, areas that were determined to need more immediate attention than originally assumed included:

- Phased replacement of Junction City High School
- Failing pavement at Territorial Elementary

Junction City High School's East Wing is in failure in most systems and is rated poor seismically compared to other buildings in the district. It also does not provide modern learning environments competitive to offerings from other Lane County Districts. Equally important are the safety concerns with a widespread, open campus. The committee determined that a portion of the district's plan for safety needs to include consolidating the campus. The committee also determined that starting a phased replacement of the high school now will reduce current maintenance costs and make an eventual overall replacement more financially viable than deferring this work further out.

With respect to the replacement of Laurel Elementary School, the most suitable land was determined to be an undeveloped parcel the District does not currently own adjacent to the Oaklea campus. It was determined that this parcel would allow for a safer interaction between sites (no bisecting road) and more efficient use of staff and transportation circulation. Development on the current Laurel site has significant storm water control issues and would eliminate current soccer and softball fields that our community has volunteered thousands of hours in development and maintenance. Additionally, elimination of these fields would be counter-productive to Chapter 8 of the City's Comprehensive Plan where a DEFICIT of parks and playing fields was identified. As this land is not able to be secured by the District in 2016, it was determined that replacement of the Laurel School should be deferred up to, but not exceeding, five (5) years. HOWEVER, other needs require immediate action as identified above.

“The wise school board knows that while the education of students is its first priority, maintaining the facilities within which students are learning is also an important stewardship responsibility. A safe and healthy learning environment can support learning (Rickabaugh, 2003).” The Junction City School Board's priorities for facilities are detailed as follows:

1. Protection of life and health; compliance with mandated requirements governing facilities and fire safety requirements;
2. Direct support of the educational program;
3. Fulfillment of the priorities set forth in the District's comprehensive planning program for facilities and sites; and
4. Consideration of other needs that do not fall into priorities 1-3 above.

While research related to the effect school facilities has on student academic outcomes is somewhat limited, the evidence that does exist indicates that school facilities do affect student learning. Spatial configuration, light, noise, temperature and air quality obviously impact students' and teachers' ability to perform (Schneider, 2002). Many states are looking at policies and funding related to the maintenance, updating, and construction of school facilities. Today, more than 40 states provide some level of facilities funding, with most states prioritizing funding for high poverty school districts (Hunter, 2006).

Junction City School District is comprised of four school sites, all at different locations. The District's school boundaries span 164 square miles. In addition to the four school sites, the District owns and maintains two other buildings including a maintenance facility and the School District Office, and owns the field between Oaklea Middle School and Laurel Elementary School that has been developed into soccer and softball fields, a walking path, and a concessions stand that are co-maintained with Junction City Athletics. The total acreage of all seven sites is 98.6 acres. While the District's four schools currently sit on a total of nearly 100 acres, the board should consider acquiring additional property for future school siting.

The Council for Educational Facility Planners (CEFPI) has recommendations for site sizes, which is compared to the Junction City sites below:

Site	CEFPI Formula	Current Enrollment	Appropriate Acreage	Actual Acreage
Junction City High School	30 acres plus 1/100 students	552	36 acres	35
Oaklea Middle School	20 acres plus 1/100 students	519	25 acres	12
Laurel Elementary	10 acres plus 1/100 students	498	15 acres	23*
Territorial Elementary	10 acres plus 1/100 students	134	11 acres	29

*\*Note that the community-built ball field complex at Laurel takes up 8 acres*

As can be seen above, the acreage for Laurel, Oaklea Middle School and Junction City High School is fully-developed (and in some cases, over-developed such as at Oaklea) with school buildings, playgrounds, parking lots, playing fields, and storage facilities. Currently, the District does not own an adequate inventory of additional, undeveloped land located within or in proximity to residential areas to meet future school siting needs or to even meet current needs at Oaklea. Territorial Elementary School, located in a rural, remote area of our District, is sited on 28.5 acres, the majority of which are not developed and are tree-covered. The board may wish to consider declaring some of the acreage at Territorial as surplus, and then consider selling some of that property, perhaps to fund the purchase of additional land "in-town" that would prove more suitable for future school sites.

The District's school buildings range in age from one constructed in 1934, and the newest building, Oaklea Middle School, which was constructed in 1977. The District's oldest school facility is the East Wing of Junction City High School which was built in 1934 and was added to in subsequent years. The cost of the original school is unknown.

The District's Long-Term Facilities Plan includes both a list of major capital improvement projects and a detailed list of facility deficiencies and associated repairs or upgrades. It is anticipated that major capital improvements will be executed only periodically using specialized funding sources such as general obligation bonds supported by taxpayers. These projects have been identified as work that is too expensive to be executed using General Fund dollars or other regularly available funds. Smaller scale facility deficiencies will be addressed on a regular basis using annually available funding sources. The 2008 Facilities Assessment report assists in prioritizing work planned to be completed.

### Major Capital Improvement Projects:

A large list of projects was generated in Spring 2013 to be considered for implementation by Junction City School District. Some projects are currently planned for inclusion in a bond measure to be put to voters in May 2016, while others are deferred for a future bond in four (4) - five (5) years. These were identified as the highest priority needs in the district at this time. The projects include:

- Replacement of Junction City High School over three phases:
  - Replacement of East Wing and Media Center (immediate)
  - Remaining Classrooms and Front Office (10 years out)
  - Arts, Physical Education & Athletic Facilities (20 years out)
- Heating, Lighting, and Ceiling Upgrades at Oaklea Middle School
- Communication and Security Infrastructure Upgrades – District-Wide
- Paving at Territorial Elementary
- Energy improvements based on Ameresco analysis / funding opportunities
- Seismic Rehabilitation of large volume structures (gyms and cafeterias) depending on State SRG
- Replacement of Laurel Elementary School (*A Priority 1 need, but deferred up to five (5) years or until land is acquired*)

Depending upon voter willingness to support these improvements and repairs, the School District will amend the list of projects or move forward with implementation.

A master plan for the phased replacement of Junction City High School was developed to illustrate a means of completing this work over multiple years while continuing to function at the same site. Other significant projects include district-wide repaving, district-wide accessibility upgrades, and breezeway enclosure and covered play shelter at Territorial.

### Regular Facility Maintenance and Upgrade:

Junction City School District's Long-Term Facilities Plan shall provide for incremental improvements to existing facilities through a maintenance program that includes improvements and repairs. It is critical to the success of this program that funds be made available to complete some upgrades each year. The 2008 Facilities Assessment provides a list of repair and improvement projects. The report also describes the relative priority of the various projects listed related to critical need, and categorizes each project relative to the reason for the need. (For example, the report could list a deficiency needing correction as Priority 1, Category B to indicate need for immediate correction because the existing condition is a fire and life safety hazard.) From this report, and in pursuit of the guiding principles for facilities management, projects are organized in to three levels of priority: Priority 1, or immediate projects; Priority 2, or intermediate projects; and Priority 3, or long-term projects.

- **Immediate Projects (Priority 1 or Categories B and D) Completion Goal: 0-3 years**

These projects include correction of deficiencies that represent a current failure of systems that is likely to reduce the life of other systems or cause additional damage to the building. Immediate projects also include items that require correction because they endanger building occupants, represent a fire and life safety concern, or cause the building or systems to fail to function. Projects that affect the health of building occupant are also considered as immediate need projects.

○ **Intermediate Projects (Priority 2) Completion Goal: 3-7 years**

These projects don't affect the immediate health and safety of staff and students but are approaching that standard. In the Facilities Assessment, these items are listed where a noted condition is likely to reach failure in less than five years. This includes life expectancy of mechanical or electrical systems and architectural conditions that will likely become a Priority 1 condition within the next five years.

○ **Long-Term Projects (Priority 3) Completion Goal: 7+ years**

These projects are inevitable, but the funding requirements tend to put these projects off into the future. They are not immediate safety or health concerns, and aren't likely to occur, due to funding or planning considerations, before seven years. However, the deficiency could require correction if the building is altered or added to. Examples include mechanical systems that do not comply with current code, insufficient exiting, electrical systems that are fully loaded, or ADA accessibility items. Long-term projects also include replacement of finishes or cabinetry when they wear beyond use or appearance and can no longer be maintained through general cleaning.

All of the facility maintenance and upgrade projects can be impacted or replaced by major capital improvement projects. For example, if Laurel Elementary is replaced with a new school, then any needed upgrades or repairs associated with the existing school are eliminated. It will also be important to track completed work and to periodically reassess the condition of the existing facilities. Most Priority 2 projects listed in the 2008 Assessment should be Priority 1 projects in 2016. If Priority 1 projects are not yet complete, then they remain Priority 1, and should be addressed in the next 0-3 years.

Junction City School District's Long-Term Facilities Plan is to also consider population growth and/or population redistribution in the District and need for property acquisition for future new school sites. Larger sites suitable for a new school are typically scarcer than smaller sites. Some siting considerations for placement of a new school include:

- *Does it support the educational program?*
- *Is the site located close to the centers of current or future neighborhoods?*
- *Is the site available?*
- *Is the site near other community services? Is it near city services?*
- *Is the site logically related to other school sites?*
- *Does the site allow for safe transportation and pedestrian traffic?*

Currently there are three main resources used to implement the Long-Term Facilities Plan. These funding sources include:

1. **General Fund 100 (2540)** – allocated \$1,377,752 for the 2015-16 school year. Of this amount, \$662,766 is for payroll and associated benefit costs for two maintenance workers and nine custodians. The remaining \$714,986 supports contracted services, repairs, supplies, equipment, and dues and fees.
2. **General Fund 100 (Transfer to Special Maintenance Fund 202)** – transferred \$50,000 in 2014-15. This transfer funds any needed maintenance projects that were unforeseen at budget time or for large-scale, multi-year projects. Any unexpended funds in the Special Maintenance Fund carry over to the next fiscal year for future maintenance projects. The balance at the beginning of the 2015-16 year, before the \$100,000 scheduled transfer, is approximately \$831,000.

3. **The Construction Excise Tax (CET)** – this tax is a result of a piece of legislation passed in the 2007 Oregon Legislative Session. Senate Bill 1036 gave the authority to local school boards to enact a construction tax (per square foot of new construction) based on certain parameters and Intergovernmental Agreements with the city and county agencies. The actual amount collected from the CET differs each year based on construction activity, but will be used to fund components of the District’s Long-Term Facilities Plan. Between the 2008-2009 and 2014-2015 school years the amounts have ranged from \$27,735 to \$159,206 averaging \$95,993 over the six years.

One of the School Board’s objectives is to fund as many action items as possible from the Plan in a given year. The availability of resources shall determine how much of the action plan is accomplished. The Plan will be reviewed and revised each year to make adjustments based on available resources. The District will seek additional funds when available to help support the plan.

One such effort was the application of a matching grant through the Oregon School Capital Improvement Matching Program (OSCIM). Junction City applied in January of 2016 and while we were not awarded a grant, we were placed on both waiting lists. On the “First In Time” List, Junction City is 9<sup>th</sup> of 6 awarded districts with a grant level of \$4 million. What this means is that if at least 3 of the 8 districts above Junction City do NOT pass their bonds, and Junction City does, then we will receive the \$4 million grant to apply toward our most immediate project list. We will know by March 18, 2016 which districts have filed bond referendums and by May 18, 2016 which District passed bonds.

## Appendix

The following documents are available for review at the Junction City School District Office at 325 Maple Street:

- Board Meeting / Work Session Minutes
- Facilities Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- 2008 Facilities Assessment
- Past Facilities Reviews
- Safe School Design Inspections
- Energy Reviews
- 2007 Population Study
- 2013 Population Study
- Complete List of Potential Projects Developed by the Facilities Steering Committee