MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON

May 19, 2010

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session at 5:30 p.m., a regular board meeting at 7 p.m., followed by an executive session on May 19, 2010, at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on May 14, 2010, and published in The Register-Guard on May 17, 2010.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Craig Smith, Chair
Alicia Hays, Vice Chair
Jennifer Geller
Beth Gerot
Anne Marie Levis – joined the meeting by phone for the Civic Stadium feasibility study item only
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management
Sara Cramer, Director of Elementary Education
Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services
Kerry Delf, Communications Coordinator
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis and Budget Manager

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:
Sarah Hankins, Jennifer Kerfoot and Yuki Partridge, North Eugene High School
Linda Gai, International High School, All Campuses

OTHERS
Merri Steele, Eugene Education Association Co-President
Paul Duchin, Eugene Education Association Co-President
Nate Levenson, District Management Council
Carol Knobbe, Assistant Superintendent, Lane Education Service District
Dave Standridge, Director of Fiscal Services, Lane Education Service District
Marshall Glickman, Chief Executive Officer of G2 Strategic
Chris Pryor, Eugene City Councilor
Sue Cutsogeorge, City of Eugene, Finance Division
Mike Sullivan, City of Eugene, Community Development Division

MEDIA:
KRVM
CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Board Chair Craig Smith called the work session of the School District 4J Board of Directors to order. He led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. He noted that Board Member Anne Marie Levis intended to join the meeting by telephone during the regular meeting for the agenda item on the Civic Stadium feasibility study.

WORK SESSION – Conduct a Work Session on the Special Education Services Review by the District Management Council

One of the board and superintendent’s goals for 2009-10 was to conduct a focused review of the district’s Special Education services to identify opportunities to increase student achievement and optimize cost-effective strategies and practices, and present a report to the board in April 2010.

The District Management Council (DMC) recently completed a Special Education Opportunities Review of the district’s Educational Support Services area. This review is part of the district’s ongoing efforts to continuously improve Special Education. Tighter budgets, increased needs of our students and higher achievement expectations required us to look for ways to provide effective and efficient services and control spending.

The Special Education Opportunities Review included the following:

- Compiling student achievement and spending data;
- Conducting interviews with staff, special education leadership, principals, special education teachers, and parents;
- Visiting classrooms;
- Administering online surveys;
- Analyzing data for trends and opportunities;
- Benchmarking to similar districts;
- Identifying three to five highest leverage opportunities and commending current successes;
- Sharing findings with district leaders and survey participants;
- Hosting a retreat to plan implementation; and
- Providing a comprehensive report that will highlight commendable practices already in place in the district and three to five high leverage opportunities.

Nate Levenson, from the DMC, was scheduled to discuss the results of the Special Education Opportunities Review and respond to board member questions. A copy of the draft Special Opportunities Review, dated May 15, 2010, was included in the board packet. A final version of the Review was to be included in the red folders at the board meeting, should there be revisions.

Superintendent George Russell stated that Mr. Levenson and the DMC had spent a lot of time reviewing the data and asked him to present his report regarding the conclusions the DMC had drawn from the work. He noted that Mr. Levenson was a former superintendent from Massachusetts.

Mr. Levenson underscored that the DMC came to its work with special education with the belief that student achievement had to be raised with every step while considering how to do so cost effectively. He explained that they had interviewed 67 people from all different aspects of the
district in order to gain a sense of how things worked in the district in addition to reviewing mountains of data and conducting online surveys. He stressed that every school district has a unique culture and they had tried to understand the district’s culture and customize the recommendations accordingly.

Mr. Levenson highlighted some of the data:
- Overall parent satisfaction was high for services and staff -- 325 parents had responded to the survey;
- 90 percent indicated their input was considered through the Individual Education Plan (IEP);
- 91 percent indicated their child was accepted in the school community;
- 82 percent were “overall pleased.”

He commended the life skills program for high school aged students for its excellence. He said they had shared this program with a number of other clients since becoming acquainted with it. He stated that a plus for site-based management was the innovation that different campuses employed in the special education programs. They had seen lots of good efforts underway.

Mr. Levenson considered the special education costs within the district to be typical. They had broken costs into the categories of things that happened under the roof of the schools and things that happened off campus. He related that they had seen an extraordinarily detailed look at staffing that demonstrated a thoughtful process of how to get the most out of what was available. He thought the district was managing costs well.

Mr. Levenson discussed the opportunities:
- Achievement of students with special needs could be dramatically increased -- the achievement gap averaged 66 points in math and 67 points in English.
- The achievement gap in the rest of the state was about half the achievement gap in Eugene.
- As the students get older, the achievement gap became larger.

He asserted that there was an opportunity to reduce the gap. He stated that the gold standard for reducing the achievement gap was a standards-based education system that would be uniform across every classroom in the district. He noted that this model was uncomfortable in the site-based management structure. He said the second best solution would be to take all of the knowledge and innovation that existed in the system and figure out what was working and share it.

Mr. Levenson stated that the district had robust data collection; there was no money needed to be spent on information technology. He believed there were a number of ways to calculate and identify what was working and to share them within the context of site-based management. He stressed that most of what was needed as far as staff and infrastructure was in place.

Superintendent Russell introduced the two representatives from the Lane Education Service District (ESD) who had come to hear the presentation, Carol Knobbe and David Standridge.

Continuing, Mr. Levenson said opportunity number two was greatly integrated with reporting and management systems to control special education spending. He related that the district’s leadership team looked at costs and made good decisions, adding that it was important that they received all of the information available. He felt that if the goal was to make decisions
about how to do things differently, the information was not always there. He cited, as an example, the Transportation Department. He explained that both sides had detailed information about who was being transported and where, but they did not know the cost of transportation per student.

Mr. Levenson suggested that a streamlined system needed to be found to access Medicaid payments for students with special needs, a third opportunity. He noted that there would be hoops to jump through.

As a fourth opportunity, Mr. Levenson related that they had looked at the services the district is receiving from Lane ESD and what the district needed from the ESD. He acknowledged that the quality of services from Lane ESD had been very good. He stated that Eugene was the largest member of the ESD – 38 percent of the total number of kids served and 36 percent of the funding, $6.7 million. He considered the services they provided to be significant, with 103 students served. He noted, however, that there were 250 to 270 kids receiving services elsewhere. He questioned whether there could be an opportunity to maximize the utility of what Lane ESD could provide to the district.

Superintendent Russell said the next steps included a meeting between Mr. Levenson and administrative staff on the following day to review the report again. He indicated that he would provide the board with a report on their response. He noted that the Lane ESD budget was already set for the next year.

Mr. Smith asked if they were measuring the strategies that enhance the education for all of the students. Mr. Levenson responded that overwhelmingly the strategies that helped students with special needs helped all students. He reiterated that they had seen evidence that standards-based education models raised the boats for all students. He thought that they should look for strategies within the Eugene site-based model for strategies that had helped special needs kids and they might find that they helped all kids.

Board Member Jennifer Geller hoped that the district would communicate some of the positive aspects from the report. She had been impressed by the positive comments about staff and the level of parental satisfaction.

In response to a question from Ms. Geller, Mr. Levenson said in a district with site-based management there would be policies and ideas that would not be universal and few things would be exactly the same across all schools.

Board Member Beth Gerot was pleased that they considered the culture of 4J when looking at recommendations. She had also been impressed with the commonalities of what seemed to be missing, such as the lack of professional development, not enough sharing of best practices, and the need for more help in classrooms.

Board Vice Chair Alicia Hays thanked Mr. Levenson for the report. She was looking forward to hearing the staff response to it.

Mr. Levenson remarked that if anything was easy, it would already have been done. He advised that as they read through the report, it would be important to glean a shorter list from the longer list of ideas. He stated that fewer things done well would have a better impact.
Board Member Mary Walston asked if Mr. Levenson would prioritize the opportunities. Mr. Levenson replied that he would not, but he would choose one that was primarily financial and one that was primarily oriented to education so that it would be a good mix. He thought that the least amount of change for the greatest gain would be the best plan.

Board Member Jim Torrey observed that the report indicated that the district should be getting more of a return from its investment. He asked how Mr. Levenson would suggest they identify services that they could get from Lane ESD so that it would allow the district to utilize the relief that some of the staff would experience to improve some of the areas the report talked about. Mr. Levenson responded that he would recommend that they look at the mix they serve and determine what things the ESD could do to help and compare that with the services the district was paying tuition to other entities for. He underscored the importance of understanding what the needs were in the present time.

Ms. Geller asked, regarding the Medicaid reimbursements, if districts did the paperwork or used a service to do that. Mr. Levenson replied that the district would have to collect and document certain things and then take that documentation and file it with the state. He said almost every district was using an external service to file with the state, but the internal information was difficult for an external service to access.

Ms. Gerot had not realized that the district was not collecting Medicaid anymore.

Ms. Hays was glad that they were not tampering with the Lane ESD budget.

Mr. Smith said the board recognized that there was an achievement gap.

Mr. Torrey thought that ESDs all over the state should be asking this question. He said they would be looking to the legislature to either keep them in business or to make some adjustments. He believed that looking at it would not automatically mean they were not going to agree that it was okay to spend some of the money in this way, but to not look at it in light of the plans they needed to come up with to address the looming budget shortfall would be an oversight. He remarked that having a central source for pursuing Medicaid reimbursements would be helpful and the ESD could consider providing this service.

Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Levenson for his report.

Mr. Torrey asked where they could find some of the best practices Mr. Levenson spoke of. Mr. Levenson responded that they could refer to the District Management Council web site.

The work session adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Mr. Smith convened the regular board meeting at 7 p.m.

AGENDA REVIEW

No changes were made to the agenda.
INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell introduced former board member and current City Councilor Chris Pryor and welcomed him to the meeting.

Student Board Representative Recognition

The following student board representatives were presented with certificates of appreciation for their service to the school district during the 2009-10 school year:
- Linda Gai, International High School, All Campuses
- Sarah Hankins, North Eugene High School
- Jennifer Kerfoot, North Eugene High School
- Yuki Partridge, North Eugene High School

The following representatives were recognized for their efforts, however, were not in attendance:
- Jenna Careccia, Churchill High School
- Sasha Johnson-Freyd, South Eugene High School
- Hannah Rosenberg, Sheldon High School

Superintendent Russell recognized the student representatives and thanked them for their participation this school year.

Ms. Gerot spoke glowingly of Jennifer Kerfoot. She listed some of her accomplishments, which included a lot of world travel and a paper that Ms. Kerfoot had written on small schools. She encouraged the board members to read the paper.

Ms. Walston commended Linda Gai for her intelligence and noted that she had interned with the University of Oregon (UO) during the previous summer studying zebra fish. She believed that Ms. Gai would meet with success.

Mr. Torrey had been impressed with Sarah Hankins’ interest in acting. He had enjoyed getting to know Ms. Hankins.

Mr. Smith said Yuki Partridge had good participation in meetings, providing the voice of youth. He felt the group had been helpful in providing good information to the board.

Ms. Geller had been struck by Sasha Johnson-Freyd’s intelligence. She said Ms. Johnson-Freyd was a great student and was already taking classes at the UO. She thanked her for her service.

Ms. Hays had enjoyed the opportunity to get to know Jenna Careccia. She also wanted to thank all of the student representatives for their service. She encouraged those that will serve for the next year to speak up. She stressed that by doing so, they could change the world.

Ms. Hankins said she had been honored to receive the invitation. She related that she had been accepted to the Cordon Bleu Culinary Institute, though acting was still a big passion.
Ms. Kerfoot considered her two years at the school board to be super fun. She said even though she had been admitted to several colleges, she had been sworn into the Navy in February. She hoped to be serving in the Middle East as a medic in the next year.

Ms. Partridge also considered it an honor to be asked to be a representative. She had enjoyed her time there. She plans to go to the UO and major in Ethnic Studies.

Ms. Gai echoed the sentiments expressed. She had also felt honored to be invited to serve. She plans to go to Cornell College.

Superintendent Russell continued his report. He said there were a couple of articles in the red folder provided to the board, one in regard to the Harkin bill to provide $23 billion to avert large-scale teacher layoffs, which President Obama supported. He stated that another piece had to do with the proposed changes to the No Child Left Behind Act. He related that as part of the governing board of the American Association of Administrators, he had an opportunity to participate in conversations with Education Secretary Arne Duncan. He said they had decided to have video presentations from the Secretary on a monthly basis and share the most recent one with the board, with limited success [video issues cut the presentation short].

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Linda Gai, International High Schools, reported that student government was holding elections. She explained that students wrote essays so that it would not become a popularity contest. She related that the International Baccalaureate (IB) tests were almost over. A farewell assembly for IHS students would be held on June 7 during the day and graduation was scheduled for that evening. She invited the board members to attend.

Sarah Hankins, North Eugene High School, said the film connections continued to work with various organizations and was doing a film for 4J students with Asperger’s Syndrome. She stated that a team of psychologists from the UO had studied the implementation of the anti-bullying program at their school. She related that there was an 87 percent compliance rate and of the students that were interviewed, 100 percent indicated they had an adult they could talk to. She noted that the prom had been held and it had gone without a hitch. June 2 was the last Pride Day of the year and a showcase of the works of the small school that focused on the arts would be held later that evening. She stated that graduation would be held on June 9 at Gerlinger Hall on the UO campus.

Jennifer Kerfoot, North Eugene High School, provided handouts for the first annual Relay for Life, scheduled for 3:30 to 8 p.m. on the following day which would include student entertainment. She reported that the Advanced Placement and IB testing had wrapped up and senior projects were completed. She related that Amy Lewis of Education Northwest had spent two days with the schools. She had been on a panel that spoke with Ms. Lewis. She said her summary report indicated that the school was a positive environment. She stated that the school had gone up almost 10 percent in reading and mathematics, according to OAKS testing results. She noted that the school population had increased by 7 percent. She invited the board to the IDEAS graduation, planned for June 8 at the NEHS auditorium and the bigger North Eugene graduation on June 12.

Yuki Partridge, North Eugene High School, stated that IHS testing was finishing up. She said the IHS students had started their last units. She related that a hike up Spencer’s Butte was scheduled for their last day of school, noting that they would have to write a haiku about it. She
also noted that the seniors planned to take a coast trip for a day. She had attended the prom, the theme of which was *Passport to Memories*. She said the last day of school was only three weeks away, with the small school graduation for IHS at NEHS scheduled for June 10 at the Shedd Institute.

**ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE**

Mr. Smith opened the floor for public comment and outlined guidelines for testimony.

**Bev Smith** said she was speaking as a community member and as executive director of Kidsports. She felt the proposal for Civic Stadium was compelling. She said Kidsports had been meeting the needs of the community for team sports for youth and it needed space for its activities. She believed that Civic could provide the opportunity for partnership and for the community to work together. She recalled the history of Civic Stadium and underscored that it was a legacy. She stated that soccer was one of Kidsports biggest activities. She stated that access was important for Kidsports and they stressed the importance of providing access for people regardless of socio-economic status.

**Derek Johnson** thought the proposal regarding Civic Stadium presented the opportunity to have a men’s team and a women’s team playing in a historic venue. He thanked the board for keeping an open mind and considering the proposal. He said he was a member of the Eugene Metro Futbol Club (EMFC) board and a lifetime soccer player. He stated that the stadium offered a tremendous opportunity for the community and for School District 4J. He also wanted to thank the Save Civic Stadium (SCS) group for having the temerity to suggest that the historic structure be saved. He believed that retaining it would provide a number of user groups with a place to have family entertainment, spectator sports, and participatory sports. He related that soccer was experiencing a wave of enthusiasm. He noted that EMFC, Futbol Club Willamette, and Kidsports all had a great number of competitive soccer teams. He stated that EMFC had the opportunity to bring four teams to the area and had tremendous support by the community to come and see them play. He believed that preserving Civic Stadium offered the chance to do something special for the community.

**Dennis Hebert** thanked the board for extending the time so that SCS could complete the re-use study for Civic Stadium. He also thanked the community and the City of Eugene for contributing funding for it. Additionally, he thanked the SCS board for their tireless efforts throughout the project. He reiterated the SCS contention that in addition to being an irreplaceable part of the community’s heritage, the stadium was a recreational resource and, by actively promoting its use, it had the potential to support itself. He had reviewed the study conducted by Marshall Glickman of G2 Strategic and agreed with findings that indicated that there were ways to restore the stadium and have it be a community resource. He underscored that it would take a community effort to do so.

**Dave Perez** spoke on behalf of the YMCA. He said they had been following the discussion on Civic Stadium. He related that YMCA board members had met with Mr. Glickman to discuss potential plans for the facility. He stated that the YMCA appreciated and applauded the work of the SCS. He remarked that it would be fair to state that the YMCA would be interested in exploring the vision of SCS and the community. He thought it could be too early at present to know whether the vision for the stadium would work, but they believed that it was in the community’s best interest to keep options open and to work for the best solutions. He said the YMCA had been in the community for 125 years and at its existing facility for nearly 60 years.
He said the board, staff, and users of the YMCA deserved a new home and that was why they were anticipating being a part of the Civic Stadium solution.

**Warren Walsh** shared a story that his 12-year-old in 6th grade had been made to read that he believed was inappropriate, involving shooting a gun at a dog and suicide. He declared that children at that age should study grammar and sentence structure. He said the teachers had apologized, but he wanted the district to rededicate itself to reading, writing, and arithmetic. He had spoken to over 50 people about the reading his daughter had been subjected to and all of them had condemned it.

**COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS**

Merri Steele, Eugene Education Association Co-President (EEA), extended EEA’s congratulations to the student representatives. She said it had been a joy to see them and she hoped that they would consider going into teaching. She related that EEA provided scholarships to future teachers.

Ms. Steele reported that they were well into bargaining with the district. She said they were exchanging proposals and they hoped the school board was aware of them. She encouraged board members to attend the bargaining sessions. She underscored the need to maintain a respectful environment in bargaining sessions. She added that they looked forward to having a contract.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

**Receive Results of Feasibility Study from Save Civic Stadium**

Save Civic Stadium (SCS) completed the feasibility study for the rehabilitation of Civic Stadium and redevelopment of the property for sports, recreation, entertainment, and community events. The consultant for SCS, Marshall Glickman, Chief Executive Officer of G2 Strategic, presented a summary of the study and was available to answer questions. A copy of the study, without appendices, was included in the board packet.

Superintendent Russell introduced Mr. Glickman. He said it had been a pleasure to meet with Mr. Glickman and thanked him for his great vision.

Ms. Levis joined the meeting by telephone.

Mr. Glickman reviewed his report. Some of the recommendations for viability of Civic Stadium included the following:
- It could be a venue for outdoor concerts and other entertainment.
- The area could acquire a professional soccer franchise that could use the stadium.
- Soccer could become the anchor for the site. U.S. soccer was on the rise, including women’s soccer.
- The site would be multi-purpose and baseball could also be played at the site.
- Mere rehabilitation would not be enough for economic viability – the stadium would need to be active year-round.
- The area around the stadium could become a destination such as the Pearl District in Portland.
Mr. Glickman stated that this could not be done without a public/private partnership. He believed there was an opportunity to integrate the YMCA in any plans. He recommended that a private investor group be formed that would then be prepared to respond to an RFP that the district intended to issue in the fall. He suggested that the private investor group would acquire a professional soccer franchise before going to voters with a General Obligation (GO) bond. He did not anticipate any difficulty in doing this. He thought it would be the role of the private investment group to advance the money required for technical studies, conceptual design work, community outreach, and running a GO campaign.

Mr. Glickman outlined his conceptual proposal for how the site could be reused, which included an indoor fieldhouse and rehabilitation of the stadium and a possible facility for the YMCA. He said the pro forma had been carefully done and showed that the property would generate an operating profit, with ten percent of the profit set aside for renewal and replacement every year. The increase in property taxes that a GO bond for the project would bring was estimated to be $6 to $7 per month. He acknowledged that it was an ambitious project, but he believed that if the community worked together something great could happen.

Mr. Smith asked about the timing of the GO bond as opposed to the levy for schools. Mr. Glickman responded that they would have to go hand-in-hand or would have to be timed differently.

Mr. Smith observed that the report was very detailed and that the funding stages were pretty aggressive. He wondered if Mr. Glickman had a sense of how realistic it was. Mr. Glickman agreed that it was aggressive, but he believed it was realistic.

Mr. Lauch stated that they were looking at a tentative release date of the RFP when the board returned from its recess in August. He thought there could be a 60 to 90 day period in which to respond.

Mr. Torrey asked if Mr. Glickman was married to the idea of a GO bond in June 2011. He asked if he would be ready to take a GO bond to the voters in November. Mr. Glickman replied that he did not think so. He said they needed the unknowns to be knowns.

Mr. Torrey did not think there would be any higher awareness of this issue in the community than there was now. He asked if Mr. Glickman thought he could bring to an RFP a commitment by the City in terms of being willing to be a partner. Mr. Glickman replied that it would be difficult to answer. He thought the intention would be to come to the district with a clear and precise proposal relating to how economic and non-economic relationships could work.

Ms. Walston asked if there was a Plan B if the vote failed. Mr. Glickman replied that they could go for the bond a second time or the private investors would have spent $1 million and lost it. He said the question would be how many responses they would get to the RFP.

Ms. Walston asked if the stadium’s historic status would add delays to any potential project. She also noted that the traffic impact was mostly limited to the summertime and asked if the neighborhood would be able to handle traffic other times of the year. Mr. Glickman responded that the way Portland had approached a similar situation was to provide transit access to the events. He thought that most of the events there would be in the summertime. He added that he thought the historic designation was terrific, there was nothing about it that could be considered a negative.
In response to a question from Mr. Smith, Mr. Glickman responded that he had been told that the historic designation of the stadium would not impede development of the field.

Mr. Torrey asked Mr. Lauch to clarify this. Mr. Lauch said he would agree with Mr. Glickman. He explained that although the field was included in the listing on the historic registry, he thought that was in recognition that the stadium was of little value without the field.

Superintendent Russell asked if there was anything in the plan that would preclude the City from putting in money to purchase the property as part of the bond measure. Mr. Glickman replied that there was not.

Mr. Torrey asked what the board should feel comfortable with in terms of the number of people who had stepped up and provided their investments. Mr. Glickman replied that they were attempting to raise Series A, which sought to raise $75,000 by May 21. He said the Series B investors were hoping to raise $925,000 by August through the sale of 37 limited partnership units in the amount of $25,000. He related that they hoped to garner a Series C level of investment to bring in $1.3 to $1.4 million after the GO bond.

Mr. Torrey ascertained that the people involved in the first million would be responding to the RFP.

Mr. Smith said the SCS members had suggested renting the facility on a short-term basis. He was worried about the ongoing costs to the district. Mr. Glickman responded that the facility was not marketable at this point. He was not certain who would be willing to take on the maintenance. He said the key was how to get everyone to the table and to figure out a win-win solution.

Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Glickman for a great report.

Following this discussion, Ms. Levis left the meeting by disconnecting her call.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

Approve the Superintendent's Recommendation to Concur with the City of Eugene Downtown Urban Renewal District Plan Amendment

Background: The Eugene City Council is considering a proposal to amend the Central Eugene Project (Downtown) Urban Renewal Plan to increase the maximum spending limit and provide funding for Lane Community College’s new downtown campus, a Veteran’s Affairs (VA) medical clinic, Farmers Market improvements, and providing additional support for the Broadway Garages (freeing up other funds for additional police officers for the Downtown Safety Initiative). The plan amendment would 1) increase the spending by $16.15 million to cover the four projects for a total of $49.15 million, 2) expand the district boundary by 7 percent (five acres), and 3) provide for termination of the district as soon as sufficient funds were collected to pay for those projects. The City Council has scheduled its vote on this proposal for May 24.

The City Council requested an analysis of the potential impact of continuing the downtown urban renewal district on other local taxing agencies, including the Eugene School District. Lane County Assessor Anette Spickard conducted the analysis, which was reviewed by 4J
finance staff. The analysis showed that if the downtown urban renewal district was discontinued, the potential financial impact would be, as follows:

- **On an ongoing basis, the school district would lose approximately $117,000 in annual revenue.** This reflected the net effects of an increase in the school district's operating levy, which was subject to the State School formula, and a decrease in the school district's local option levy. The district's operating levy was projected to increase by approximately $550,000; however, the district's portion would be less than $20,000 after applying the state funding formula. A $137,000 decrease in the local option levy was expected to result from an increasing number of properties moving into compression. The state funding formula does not apply to local option levies, so the full impact of this reduction would be felt. The school district understands that these estimates were based on 2009 tax roll information and would vary in future years with changes in market conditions.

- **On a one-time basis, the school district would receive an estimated $30,000 in revenue.** If the downtown urban renewal district was discontinued, urban renewal taxes collected, but not spent, would be returned to overlapping tax districts. It was estimated that District 4J’s share of these excess taxes would be $1 million. Since this amount qualified as district local revenue under the State School Fund formula, the incremental revenue increase to District 4J would be approximately 3 percent or $30,000.

The City Manager attended the April 21 board meeting and asked the board to formally concur with the proposal to increase maximum indebtedness for the Downtown Urban Renewal District by $16.15 million. Legislation passed in 2009 places some new requirements on an urban renewal district when it increases maximum indebtedness. ORS 457.470 states that certain limitations “do not apply to the extent the municipality approving a plan obtains the written concurrence of taxing districts imposing at least 75 percent of the amount of taxes imposed under permanent rate limits in the urban renewal area.”

At that time, the City Manager said that he did not believe that the City must obtain concurrence from 4J under this statute, but he wished to ensure the plan amendment could not be challenged, assuming the City Council voted to proceed. Since that time, the City has undertaken additional legal analysis based on new information. The conclusion is that there is a high risk that a court would find that written concurrence by the school district is necessary, before the Council takes action.

At the May 5 board meeting, the board postponed action due to questions regarding the potential financial impact on the school district and other concerns. In response, the City drafted an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that would ensure that, should the downtown urban renewal district tax increment financing negatively impact revenue to 4J in the future, the City would in some way provide funding (or in kind services) to the district to offset the revenue loss. A draft IGA was provided to the board.

**Discussion:**

1. **Rationale:** The primary impact for consideration would be whether there could be a negative financial impact on the school district. Assuming that the City’s proposed IGA would be sufficient to protect the school district from any potential future revenue loss due to the existence of the urban renewal district, the increase in the maximum indebtedness of the downtown urban renewal district would not have a negative impact on local revenue for 4J schools.
2. **Options and Alternatives:** The board may approve the proposed motion/action, amend the proposed motion/action, reject the proposed motion/action, chose to delay a vote, or not to act on the motion. The City’s bond counsel recommended that written concurrence be obtained as described in state statute before the City Council vote.

3. **Budget/Resource Implications:** Continuing the urban renewal district would have the same effect on current district tax revenue as we had already been experiencing. Urban renewal has had a small positive revenue impact on the school district based on current market conditions because urban renewal shifts education taxes to local government and reduces compression on the district’s properties. If property real market values escalate rapidly in the future, the benefit of assessing the taxes under local government might be eliminated. Further, if the school district’s local option levy were not renewed in the future, there would be a small negative financial impact because 4J’s regular operating levy would be reduced.

4. **Board and Superintendent Goals:** This decision is related to the board goal to provide prudent stewardship of district resource to best support student success, educational equity and choice.

**Recommendation:** The superintendent has recommended that the board approve the motion to concur with the Eugene City Council’s proposed plan amendment to increase maximum indebtedness for the Downtown Urban Renewal District by $16.15 million with the understanding that a final IGA with the City be negotiated by the superintendent to protect the school district from any net revenue loss due to the Downtown Urban Renewal District. This concurrence is given for purposes of ORS 457.220 and 457.470(7).

Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, reminded the board that they were being asked to take formal action to concur with the City’s changes in the urban renewal district. She noted that the proposed Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), signed by the Eugene City Manager, was in the board folder and would ensure that the school district did not bear a financial burden.

Mr. Smith invited City Councilor Chris Pryor to speak to the board.

Mr. Pryor noted that he had enjoyed the previous presentation on Civic Stadium. He stated that the urban renewal district in the downtown area had been around for 40 years and had been a part of many projects. He said the City Council planned to take action in the following week to indicate that the district would be in line for termination in 2019. He related that they wanted to do some good with the money in the meantime by gearing it toward specific projects. The City Manager had proposed four such projects: To underwrite Lane Community College (LCC) so that it could build in the “pit”; provide enhancements for the Farmers Market; to increase public safety downtown; and to potentially provide support for a Veterans Administration hospital if they wanted to relocate downtown. He said if the district concurred that this was a good use of urban renewal funds, the City could move forward. He underscored that the urban renewal mechanism would not increase taxes, though taking money out of the tax rolls did impact funding for the school district. He related that they had determined that because of the state funding formula, compression, and the local option levy the urban renewal district made it so that the school district received $117,000 more per year. He said if conditions changed, the IGA would guarantee the City’s commitment to have the district remain whole.
MOTION: Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Geller, moved to approve the motion to concur with the Eugene City Council’s proposed plan amendment to increase maximum indebtedness for the Downtown Urban Renewal District by $16.15 million. This concurrence is given for purposes of ORS 457.220 and 457.470(7) and is contingent upon an Intergovernmental Agreement that holds the district harmless with respect to any future loss of revenue resulting from the Eugene Downtown Urban Renewal District plan amendment.

Ms. Hays remarked that they had to look at what was best for School District 4J and what was best for the larger community. She found the LCC project to be compelling and would vote positively because of it.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 6-0.

CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION

Award of Construction Contract for Reroofing and Seismic Upgrades at Monroe Middle School and North Eugene High School

Background: Bids for the Multi-site (Monroe & NEHS) Roofing and Seismic project were opened on May 11, 2010. The project consists of reroofing the majority of Monroe Middle School and a portion of the roofing at North Eugene High School. Previously identified and deferred seismically-related upgrades would be completed in conjunction with the reroofing which would now provide the needed access to effect those upgrades.

Six local firms submitted bids as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Base Bud “A”</th>
<th>Base Bud “B”</th>
<th>Base Bud “C”</th>
<th>Alternate No. 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hyland Construction</td>
<td>$338,923.00</td>
<td>$345,496.00</td>
<td>$684,419.00</td>
<td>$33,281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie Commercial</td>
<td>$355,280.00</td>
<td>$372,650.00</td>
<td>$726,000.00</td>
<td>$33,330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Construction</td>
<td>$374,945.00</td>
<td>$356,819.00</td>
<td>$727,964.00</td>
<td>$33,535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2G Construction</td>
<td>$355,000.00</td>
<td>$351,000.00</td>
<td>$695,000.00</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua Roofing</td>
<td>$338,773.00</td>
<td>$341,540.00</td>
<td>$680,313.00</td>
<td>$31,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Construction</td>
<td>$443,800.00</td>
<td>$425,100.00</td>
<td>$848,700.00</td>
<td>$34,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bid Package A would be the cost for reroofing and seismic work at North Eugene High School. Bid Package B would be the cost for reroofing and seismic work at Monroe Middle School. Bid Package C would be the cost for the combined reroofing and seismic work at both schools. Alternate No. 1 would be supplemental to Bid Package B for an upgraded installation method for the roof membrane.

The district has reserved the right to select any combination of the Bids and Alternates above. The total construction budget for this work was established at approximately $1,200,000. Funding would be provided from the Sale of Surplus Property Fund (F450).
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Discussion:

1. **Rationale:** The district has had an established program for routine replacement of roofs. In general, the useful life of a roof is about 20 years, after which time maintenance and repair costs begin to accelerate. The roofs at Monroe Middle School and North Eugene High School are approximately 21 and 23 years old respectively. The annual repair efforts and costs for the Monroe roofing in particular have become excessive over the past two years. When roofs are replaced, the opportunity is taken to include any needed structural upgrades (particularly those that increase seismic stability) that cannot otherwise be made cost-effectively.

2. **Options and Alternatives:** The project could be deferred until a later time which would preserve capital funds for later expenditure or reallocation. The implications of deferring the project include: 1) Increased annual maintenance costs; 2) greater potential for damaging water intrusion and disruption to instruction; and 3) greater risk of personal injury and building damage in the event of seismic activity.

3. **Budget/Resource Implications:** Proceeding with the project now would result in reduced maintenance costs. As a result of the current economic circumstances, the resulting bid price was considered very favorable. Deferring the project would increase annual maintenance costs and could increase capital cost in future bidding climates.

4. **Board and Superintendent Goals:** The project supports the board goal to provide prudent stewardship of district resources to best support student success, educational equity and choice.

**Recommendation:** The superintendent recommended award of the contract for the Multisite Roofing and Seismic project to Umpqua Roofing, submitting the lowest responsive bid for the combined project (Base Bid C) of $680,313.

**Approve Ratification of CIP Contract Awards**

On September 18, 2002, the Board of Directors affirmed the 1993 district policy for delegating Contract Award authority for Bond Funded CIP contracts of $500,000 or less to the superintendent, or designee, subject to subsequent ratification by the board. The designee is Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities and Transportation. Contracts in excess of $500,000 would continue to require board approval. The purpose of the board item is to summarize all CIP contract award activity requiring a formal bid or formal competitive selection and for the board to ratify those awards that had been made by authorized staff since the last ratification.

The summary sheet included in the board packet identified all contracts that had been awarded as of the status date indicated in accordance with delegated authority. The summary also identified who awarded the project and indicated board ratification data of said awards as applicable.

The CIP management staff will continue to provide the board with Contract Award Status updates for ratification, pursuant to School Board Policy DI (Capital improvement Contracts Financed by Bond Levy Funds).

The superintendent recommended ratification of awards for CIP GO Bond funded projects as indicated on the summary sheet which was included in the board packet.
Approve Board Meeting Minutes

The superintendent recommended approval of the minutes from the March 17, 2010, regular board meeting. A copy of the minutes was included in the board packet.

Approve Personnel Items

The superintendent recommended approval of the personnel items included in the board packet. These cover employment, resignations, and other routine personnel matters. The board may adjourn to executive session for matters dealing with employment if deemed necessary per ORS 192.660 (2)(a).

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to approve the consent items.

Mr. Smith disclosed that his firm has several clients included among the list of bidders for the roofing project.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously and the consent items were approved; 6-0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Adopt Proposed Findings of Fact Regarding the Sale of the Civic Stadium Property and Approve the Superintendent’s Recommendation for Disposition of Civic Stadium

Background: On February 3, 2010, the board received a summary report from the district’s real estate consultants regarding the Civic Stadium property. The report included two recommendations: 1) That the district pursue a zone change for the property north of the 20th Avenue right-of-way (from F-1 to R-2) and to market the two lots for sale; and 2) that the district use a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to solicit proposals for the disposition/acquisition of the larger stadium parcel.

On February 17, 2010, upon the superintendent’s recommendation, the board initiated the Land Use Process for the sale of the Civic Stadium property. The schedule was modified to provide a 60-day delay to the process in order to allow Save Civic Stadium approximately 90 days to conduct a feasibility study for potential re-use of the stadium and property. The superintendent’s recommendation and board approval departed from the real estate consultants’ recommendation to immediately market the north lots for sale, but instead elected to include the lots in the RFP process with the larger stadium parcel.

On February 17, 2010, the board approved moving forward with a zone change request for the north lots from R-1 (low density residential) to R-2 (medium density residential). The City’s public hearing on the zone change was scheduled for May 12, 2010. The results of that hearing were provided at this meeting.

At a neighborhood meeting on February 25, 2010, in the South Eugene High School cafeteria, staff presented information regarding the property and facility, surplus property disposition process, and the recommendations from the consultant’s report. An open forum discussion was held to gather input from the neighborhood and to collect feedback in response to the consultants’ report and recommendations. In addition to recording comments at the meeting, an online comment form was posted on the district web site for one week (February 25 – March 5).
The web form was publicized through the community meeting, news media, and email messages to the district’s Civic Stadium interested parties list, neighborhood leaders, and key communicator list. The results from the web comment form were summarized at the regular board meeting on March 17, 2010. The web comment form results and summary of neighborhood comment were provided to the board as well as posted on the district web site.

The superintendent and staff and some board members attended the Jefferson/Westside Neighborhood meeting on March 9 and the Friendly Area Neighbors meeting on April 22.

The proposed Findings of Fact regarding the sale of the property were presented to the board at this meeting. District need for the property, impact to the surrounding neighborhood, land use, fiscal considerations, and alternative property uses were evaluated in developing the proposed findings.

On June 2, 2010, a public hearing will be conducted regarding this matter. Board action is scheduled to take place on June 16, 2010. Adjacent property owners and public agencies were notified regarding the proposed sale and the schedule for the land use process.

Discussion: A summary of the proposed findings was presented at this meeting. The proposed findings were based upon the evaluation criteria approved by the board and listed above. You have each received a printed copy of the proposed findings and supporting documents. The proposed findings along with all appendices were available for viewing and download from the district’s web site.

1. **Rationale**: As established in the Proposed findings of Fact, the School District has made the following findings of fact with respect to the district need for the property, impact to the surrounding neighborhood, land use, fiscal considerations, and alternative property uses:

   a) **School District Need for the Property**: With the installation of the synthetic turf athletic fields, the Civic Stadium site is no longer needed for high school football. While it is beneficial to have access to the Civic Stadium field for high school baseball and fall soccer, there are adequate facilities, especially after improvements are effected, on the South Eugene High School (SEHS) site to accommodate high school athletic needs on par with, or at a higher level than, other 4J high schools. The parking area on the stadium property is not needed to meet the parking needs for SEHS operations. Access to the stadium property, if available, for event parking would be beneficial, so future joint-use parking agreements should be considered. Storage functions currently located on the property can be reduced/eliminated, or relocated. The property is no longer needed to support student transportation operations.

   b) **Impact to the Surrounding Neighborhood and Community**: Continued use of the property and stadium as status quo, or with similar use to that of the Eugene Emeralds, was likely to have a “no-change” impact on the neighborhood. Alternative use of the property and structures would have some impact on the neighborhood. Whether the impact was positive or negative would depend on individual perspective and upon what that final use becomes. Community recreation or services, such as an expanded homeless shelter, or YMCA facilities would also have positive benefits for the community. On the other hand, given its prime location and proximity to major thoroughfares and commercial enterprises, mixed-use development of the
property, with an emphasis on medium density housing, would be a possibility. Development of the property within the urban core would fulfill an identified need for additional commercial, residential, and/or mixed-use land in Eugene. Future development of the site could require realignment of northbound Willamette Street to Oak Street which would have a positive benefit for commuter (and perhaps neighborhood) traffic and could help resolve access issues with adjacent privately-owned residential properties. Redevelopment of the site without retention of the stadium structure and ball fields would result in a sense of loss for the local neighborhood both for the historical connections and the community sports/entertainment venue.

c) **Conformity with Applicable Land Use Plans:** A decision to offer the property for sale to another public agency, or to a non-profit organization established primarily to provide public uses allowed under the PL zoning designation does not affect zoning and, therefore, would be consistent with applicable land use plans. Sale of the property for private use would require zone change for areas currently zoned PL.

d) **Fiscal Considerations:** It is in the district’s best financial interest to sell the property in order to reduce ongoing maintenance costs, significant and looming capital costs, and other risks of ownership. There are immediate district needs toward which the proceeds could be applied. It is not in the district’s interest to invest in the existing structures with regard to restorative efforts since the question of preservation remained to be answered at the present time. Current market conditions indicate potential interest in the property for affordable housing, homeless shelter and related services, mixed-use development, recreational facilities such as the YMCA, and other potential uses and users so that a target audience could be identified for distribution of marketing information. The intent of the successful purchaser would determine if existing structures were demolished or retained. The potential also exists for a ground lease where the district would be free from financial liabilities of operating, capital and development costs, while maintaining ownership of the property. This could generate an income stream to the district, and the district would own the improvements at the conclusion of the lease. Depending upon use and change in ownership, the property could potentially generate property tax revenue in support of the district.

e) **Property Uses Considered:** Sale of the property on the open market would be the prime determinant of future use. Using the RFP process would be expected to allow for the broadest range of proposed uses, including potential preservation of the stadium grandstands. If it is not possible to achieve a reasonable market rate value appropriate to a mixed-use application, the district could consider rezoning to R-2 prior to selling the property, or the option to offer the property for other purposes. Marketing the property now with the buildings intact provides the greatest level of flexibility for the property.

2. **Options and Alternatives:** The board may accept the findings of fact as submitted or reject the findings, or modify them to reflect additional staff or community input. The board could also reject or revise the superintendent’s recommendation to dispose of the property; or, determine other options to sale, lease or trade of the property.

3. **Budget/Resource Implications:** Board policy provided that net proceeds from the sale or lease of facilities would be placed in a district capital improvement fund and used to
acquire and develop land and/or upgrade and improve district facilities unless the board decided otherwise for compelling reasons. The district’s current financial situation is one in which a disposition of the Civic Stadium site without some revenue realization would not be a prudent option. Some of the proceeds from the disposition of Civic Stadium would need to be used to provide for a suitable facility for south Eugene High School baseball and soccer use.

4. **Board and Superintendent Goals:** Disposition of Civic Stadium property would support the board goals related to prudent stewardship of district resources and implementing a sustainable budget by eliminating ongoing capital costs associated with operation and maintenance, and providing revenue that could be used to support unfunded or underfunded facility needs.

**Recommendation(s):** Pending review of the proposed findings, public hearing, and presentation of the Save Civic Stadium feasibility study, the superintendent plans to recommend disposing of the Civic Stadium property and marketing the property for sale, long-term lease or trade using a Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Mr. Lauch showed an aerial photo of the property.

Mr. Smith asked if the adjacent owner would require an easement. Mr. Lauch replied that the adjoining tax lots used to be one, but the owner had sold a piece of it without the easement.

Mr. Lauch discussed the order of property acquisitions. He said the Metro Plan suggested that R-2, residential, was the appropriate zoning and the property had been approved for rezoning on May 13. He stated that there were a number of property issues:

- The history of the property as a community venue;
- There are public utilities across the site that do not have easements;
- The aforementioned property access issue of a neighboring property;
- Street connectivity issues – the City’s connectivity standards could be enforced to exact or extract right of way;
- There are contaminated soils on the site outside of the outfield fence – the site has been closed and there was no further action required by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

Mr. Lauch stated that based on current and past uses of the stadium, when comparing South Eugene High School athletic facilities with the other high schools they are comparable to or better than the other facilities. He discussed some of the potential field upgrades to the school facilities, currently listed on a needs report. He noted the stadium parking was used for South Eugene High School overflow parking, but during the past year only five to ten cars had used it in a day. He thought that as they moved forward they should consider joint-use parking agreements.

Mr. Lauch related that among the findings they determined that the stadium was no longer needed for football. He said that while it was nice to have the facility available for baseball or soccer, it was no longer needed because there were adequate facilities available on the other campuses. He stated that the site had not been used for transportation since 1995 and was no longer needed to support those operations. He observed that there had been considerable support expressed by the neighborhoods regarding preservation of the stadium and preservation of the recreational use the venue provided for the community. He added that though they had not heard any complaints about the Eugene Emeralds games in the present
year, in past years they had fielded complaints about the noise and lights.

Mr. Lauch stated that the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA) had identified a shortage of land for development. He said the property was located close to the urban core and would be ideal for mixed use development. He noted that given that the infrastructure was already in place, the property would be easily developable. He stated that the district had a legal obligation to exercise its land use planning duties consistent with the planning documents established, which was the Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area Plan. He explained that it was zoned PL, public lands, which meant the land had to be owned by a public agency or a non-profit agency established to provide uses similar to a public use. If it was sold for private development the land would have to be rezoned.

Continuing, Mr. Lauch reported that the current leases generated about $13,000 annually and were from a combination of the rental to the City of Eugene for the public works maintenance satellite facility and the park and ride for the University of Oregon. He said the district was no longer receiving $70,000 for the lease of the stadium. He explained that operating costs were $50,000 annually; currently $20,000 had been spent and this did not include any overhead such as support staff and administrative overhead.

Mr. Lauch said staff had looked into a scenario of using the stadium minimally and had determined they would have to spend $2 million over the next five years. He underscored that this excluded accessibility upgrades and egress lighting. He estimated the cost of just mothballing the property at $25,000 annually. He understood that it was a pretty soft market at present and not necessarily a good time to sell. He believed it is in the district’s financial interest to dispose of the property nonetheless. He recommended marketing the property with the buildings intact because it would give the greatest flexibility for a broad range of uses. He emphasized that the decision ahead of the board is whether or not to dispose of the property and whether to market it using an RFP process.

Ms. Geller asked if they had previously done an RFP with alternate possibilities. Mr. Lauch replied that they had not. He said it was possible. He felt the difficulty would be in structuring the RFP and scoring of the proposals, which could be very different from one another.

**COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS**

Ms. Walston had attended the graduation requirement meeting. She said as the new graduation requirements are implemented, there would be more students needing more opportunities to take the tests, which would increase the demand on computers in schools. She related that this had been discussed during the meeting. She had also gone to the cook-off sponsored by the competing high schools.

Ms. Geller stated that the Budget Committee had wrapped up its process and a public hearing was scheduled for June 2. She related that it had been a difficult process. She wished to congratulate the ACE Award winners and to thank the Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring the awards. Additionally, she thanked the SCS group for the detailed report that had been presented.

Ms. Gerot reported that the last ExEL meeting had been held on May 7. She related that the group had spent some time reflecting on what the experience had meant. She said the last meeting would be held on June 11 and would include some discussion on how the work would...
continue. She stated that whatever form that took had to include board members engaged in the process. She had attended a breakfast at North Eugene High School on May 12. She said the breakfast had been joined by students from South Eugene High School and Sheldon High School. She related that the students had decided to pair up and visit each other’s schools. She had also attended the ACE Awards and had been impressed by what people in the community had done in support of students in the district. She said Carmen Urbina had done a training and had talked about the survey of teachers who had expressed interest in attending professional development workshops in collaboration with the University of Oregon, which would use the information in its teacher education programs.

Mr. Torrey related that the board would be invited to a special presentation at Sheldon High School on June 8. He explained that Colonel James Dutton, the astronaut, would be there. He hoped the board would have some kind of plaque for him.

ADJOURN

Mr. Smith adjourned the regular meeting of the school board at 10 p.m.

_____________________________   _____________________________
George Russell     Craig Smith.
District Clerk     Board Chair

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)

Following the adjournment of the regular board meeting, the board reconvened in executive session. The following board members and staff were in attendance:

BOARD MEMBERS:
Craig Smith, Chair
Jennifer Geller
Beth Gerot
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer
Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources
Larry Sullivan, Director or Educational Support Services
Christine Nesbit, Associate Director of Human Resources
Jeralynn Beghetto, Human Resources Administrator/District Bargaining Team

MEDIA:
None
EXECUTIVE SESSION: Under provisions of ORS 192.610 – 192.690, Open Meeting Laws, the Board of Directors conducted an Executive Session for the following purpose: To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2) (d).

Attachments to Official Minutes:
1. Special Education Opportunities Review
2. Lane ESD Response Letter to Special Education Opportunities Review
3. Civic Stadium Feasibility Study
4. Intergovernmental Agreement with City of Eugene
5. CIP Contract Award Status Summary
6. Personnel Action Items