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

August 18, 2010

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular board meeting and work session at 7 p.m. on August 18, 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 August 13, 2010, and published in The Register-Guard on August 16, 2010.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Craig Smith, Chair
Alicia Hays, Vice Chair
Jennifer Geller
Beth Gerot
Anne Marie Levis
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management
Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer

MEDIA:
KRVM

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE

Mr. Smith called the regular meeting of the School District Board of Directors to order at 7:02 p.m. and noted that 4J Board member Ann Marie Levis would be arriving late.

Mr. Smith took the roll call of those present and led the pledge of allegiance.

AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Smith noted that there were no changes to the meeting agenda.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Superintendent Russell referenced the passage of recent federal legislation that had created the Education Jobs Fund program and further referenced correspondence from Congressman Peter DeFazio to Oregon Superintendent of Public Instruction Susan Castillo regarding the matter. Superintendent Russell summarized the letter stating that the intent of the bill had been primarily to restore teachers’ jobs and lost instruction days and not to place significant funding amounts from the legislation into reserve accounts.
Superintendent Russell noted recent correspondence from Governor Kulongoski's office indicating that the state revenue projections to be released on August 26 would show a further decline of between $200 million and $500 million. Superintendent Russell further noted that Governor Kulongoski was expected to ask schools throughout the state to take a proportional cut related to the federal Education Jobs program funding.

Chief Financial Officer Susan Fahey noted that School District 4J's portion of the federal Education Jobs Fund program would be approximately $3.75 million and was intended to be used for staff compensation and benefits.

Ms. Fahey noted that U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan had confirmed during a recent conference call that the federal Education Jobs funding could be carried over.

Ms. Fahey referred to Superintendent Russell's previous comment regarding state revenue shortfalls and reported that the proportional share of those shortfalls to School District 4J was $2.25 million on a $200 million revenue shortfall and $5.7 million on a $500 million shortfall. She further stated that the "break even" threshold for the district for the Education Jobs bill versus the state revenue reductions was approximately $300 million.

Ms. Fahey stated that district financial staff had not yet finalized the books for FY2009/2010 and that the ending fund balances were currently unknown.

Ms. Fahey maintained that in consideration of the state budget information to be released on August 26 it was premature to make any decisions regarding the use of the Education Jobs bill funding.

Ms. Fahey believed that future state revenue projects could show additional declines.

Ms. Fahey, responding to a question from Ms. Gerot, stated that the maintenance of effort requirement indicated in the initial guidance information regarding the Education Jobs bill applied only to the state and thus required the State of Oregon to maintain effort at the 2010 level for 2011. She understood from available information that seven states had not met the maintenance of effort requirement but that Oregon was not one of them.

Ms. Fahey, responding to a question from Ms. Geller, stated that under current district contracts five restored school days cost approximately $2 million.

Ms. Fahey, responding to a question from Mr. Smith, noted that the language of the district contracts specified that any additional or unanticipated funding from any source was to be applied first to the restoration of school days.

Director of Human Resources Celia Feres-Johnson stated that the district fully intended to honor its prior commitments to the employee groups and that district staff in conjunction with those groups continued to investigate various means of mitigating current financial difficulties.

Ms. Fahey, responding to a question from Ms. Walston, stated that more information regarding the Education Jobs bill funding and the state revenue projections would be forwarded to the board members as it became available. She further noted that the ending balance for the district's accounts would be forwarded once that information became available.

**ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE**
Mr. Smith briefed the audience members on the guidelines for public comments.

**Teri Giustina** discussed her serious concerns regarding the potential consolidation of Crest Drive Elementary School. She noted recent community meetings led by Assistant Superintendent Carl Hermanns and asked how she and other community members might positively contribute to the district's processes and discussions in that regard.

**Christine Thompson** spoke on behalf of the Save Civic Stadium group and appreciated that the board had planned a work session to discuss the fate of the stadium. Ms. Thompson supported the proposed criteria to preserve the stadium's grandstands and suggested that the board add the phrase "and field" to that criteria so that the full national register property might be included. She asked the board to consider the importance of the stadium as both a public entity and a 4J asset as discussions were conducted. She further supported the proposed criteria regarding compatibility with existing land use regulations.

**Dennis Hebert** agreed with Ms. Thompson's previous suggestions regarding Civic Stadium and maintained that her comments were indicative of most of the community's feelings regarding the importance of the stadium. Mr. Agar suggested that the criteria points regarding the preservation of the stadium grandstands be increased.

**Nancy Ellen Locke** spoke in her capacity as a member of the Friendly Neighborhood Association and noted that her group continued to support the preservation of Civic Stadium. She briefly discussed how the Friendly Neighborhood Association had evaluated various right of way concerns regarding Civic Stadium and suggested that district staff coordinate with Eugene City Planner Patty Thomas regarding such matters.

**COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS**

EEA President Dayna Mitchell expressed appreciation for Superintendent Russell's work and commended him for his efforts during his tenure. She stated that Superintendent Russell had fostered a spirit of partnership and collaboration during a critical time for the district. Ms. Mitchell referenced the district staff's previous comments regarding the Education Jobs bill and thanked Ms. Gerot for her recent letter to the Register-Guard regarding the bill. She reminded the board members that they had previously committed to the restoration of no less than five instructional days in the event that additional funding became available.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**Appoint Search Committee for the Superintendent of Schools Vacancy**

Mr. Smith referred to a list of names of individuals who had been recommended to serve on the superintendent search committee. He further noted that he and Ms. Hays as board leadership had chosen a slate of names that were representative of the community.

- **Motion:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to approve the slate of search committee candidates as submitted by Mr. Smith.

Ms. Hays noticed that no individuals representing the interests of disabled members of the community had been included in the slate and asked that the board members and staff recommend someone in that regard.

Superintendent Russell, responding to a question from Ms. Gerot, noted that the student representatives for the search committee had not yet been identified.
Vote: Mr. Smith called for a vote on Ms. Gerot's previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Approve Selection of Search Consultant for the Superintendent of Schools Vacancy

Ms. Feres-Johnson introduced Associate Director of Legal Labor & Employment Services, Jessica Neeling, from the Oregon School Board Association to provide an overview of OSBA's consulting services.

Ms. Neeling introduced her associate, Chuck Bugge, and distributed a copy of the OSBA consultant information materials.

Mr. Bugge outlined the key components of the process by which he and Ms. Neeling planned to conduct the search for the new superintendent of School District 4J. Mr. Bugge noted that those key components would include: 1) the determination of a board approved calendar or similar timeline for the search process; 2) the identification of the skills and attributes of desired candidates; and 3) interviews with candidates for the superintendent position.

Mr. Bugge understood that the board members had already begun drafting a timeline for the superintendent search process and noted that that information would be taken into consideration by the OSBA consultants.

Mr. Bugge understood that the board planned for the District's Superintendent Search Committee to have opportunities for its members to interview potential candidates and believed that such actions would not interfere with the work of the OSBA consultants.

Mr. Bugge stated that March of 2011 would be the earliest that any decision making process regarding the superintendent position might be initiated.

Mr. Bugge asked that representatives from the district be identified as information contacts for him, Ms. Neeling, and the OSBA consultants.

Mr. Bugge briefly discussed how the timeline for the superintendent search process would need to be generated.

Mr. Smith noted that the board had already determined a preliminary calendar for the search process in an attempt to determine the number of board and staff meetings that might be necessary. He noted that the calendar in its current form was highly tentative and subject to change.

Ms. Neeling, responding to a question from Superintendent Russell briefly described the recruitment process by which the consultants planned to generate a diverse pool of candidates.

Ms. Neeling described the various communications and notices the OSBA planned to use as part of its recruitment strategy. Superintendent Russell replied that the OSBA consultants might wish to expand its recruitment efforts in order to facilitate the recruitment of members of minority populations. Superintendent Russell further suggested a number of local minority groups that might be contacted by the consultants.

Ms. Neeling, responding to a comment from Ms. Levis, noted the primary benefits of using OSBA as the consultant group for the search process. She noted that the OSBA’s services were guaranteed and that they would conduct an additional search at no charge to the district in the event that the first selected candidate proved unfeasible.
Ms. Knieling briefly described the various OSBA resources that would be available to the district as part of the superintendent search process.

Mr. Bugge, responding to a question from Ms. Walston, described that the OSBA consultants planned to hold a community workshop meeting during the week of September 27 and that they also intended to coordinate with district staff regarding the manner in which those meetings would be conducted.

Ms. Knieling, responding to a comment from Ms. Hays, stated that the OSBA consultants planned to incorporate various community outreach strategies as part of the search process so that community feedback regarding the superintendent position might be presented to the board.

Ms. Levis suggested that the district's search committee might assist with the OSBA's public outreach efforts as part of the search process and further suggested the use of various social networking media in order to facilitate the process. Ms. Walston agreed with Ms. Levis' comments.

Ms. Hays noted that it had been important for the board and district staff that a search committee be created regarding the superintendent position rather than a screening committee.

Mr. Torrey asked how the board planned to distribute information regarding the search process and the criteria being used to evaluate potential candidates for the position prior to January of 2011. Mr. Smith replied that the board planned to formally adopt specific criteria for the position during their October 20 meeting.

Ms. Levis responded to Ms. Hays' previous comment and noted that the board's intent with respect to the creation of a search committee had been to create a highly active committee comprised of a broad cross-section of community members.

Mr. Bugge stated that the final decision regarding the selection of the new superintendent would ultimately rest with the board.

Mr. Smith asked how the board members wished to proceed with the selection of OSBA as the search consultants for the superintendent position. Ms. Geller stated that in the absence of immediate action further deliberations regarding the matter would use valuable time that might be better spent proceeding with the actual search process.

Mr. Smith agreed that the timelines that had been proposed for the search process were aggressive.

**Motion:** Ms. Levis, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to authorize the board leadership to enter into a contract with the OSBA as a consultant for the superintendent search.

**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Ms. Knieling distributed additional information regarding the OSBA.

**Authorize Staff to Explore Options to Potentially Acquire Property Adjacent to River Road Elementary School**
Director of Facilities Management, Jon Lauch, noted that the agenda item regarding the River Road Elementary School did not represent an express board action to acquire the property, but rather an opportunity to explore if such an acquisition would ultimately be feasible and beneficial to the district.

Mr. Smith suggested that adjacent properties to River Road Elementary School might serve as an acceptable alternative to the property currently under consideration.

Mr. Lauch responded to Mr. Smith’s suggestion and noted that the board was welcome to modify or expand its approval of the acquisition in order to direct staff to investigate the viability of adjacent properties.

Mr. Smith, responding to a question from Ms. Gerot regarding which adjacent properties he might be referring to, stated that he had not intended to refer to any specific adjacent properties.

Motion: Ms. Levis, seconded by Ms. Geller, moved that the board authorize the superintendent to explore options to acquire the property up to and including preparing an offer to purchase the property, noting that any potential offer would need to be contingent upon board approval and available funding and that the district's Land Use Decision Process would be required and would be initiated if a favorable purchase agreement could be negotiated.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Approve Addendum to the Contract with the Superintendent of Schools for July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011

Superintendent Russell directed board members to the copies of the proposed contract addendum that had been included with the agenda item summary materials. He proceeded to outline the terms of the addendum for the benefit of the board members.

Superintendent Russell noted his concerns regarding the district's market comparability for its next superintendent and further cited salary and compensation for similar positions at other school districts as recently reported in the Oregonian.

Superintendent Russell was convinced that the district would need to provide a substantially higher salary in order to attract and hire a new superintendent. He asked the board to consider a provision in the addendum whereby the district would make a one-time payment into his TSA that represented the difference between his exiting salary and the agreed upon entering salary of the new superintendent.

Superintendent Russell, responding to a question from Mr. Smith, stated that the federal funding from the Education Jobs Fund program could only be applied directly to schools, teachers and instructional concerns and could not be applied toward any elements of district administration including the superintendent's compensation.

Ms. Hays supported the adoption of the proposed contract addendum as described by Superintendent Russell.

Motion: Ms. Hays, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to accept the proposed addendum to the Contract with the Superintendent of Schools for July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011.
Vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

CONSENT GROUP - ITEMS FOR ACTION

Motion: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Levis, moved to approve the Consent Calendar item.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

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 will 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 have been made by authorized staff since the last ratification.

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 that was included in the board packet.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Approve New Board Policy JHFF-Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students

Christine Nesbit briefed the board members on the provisions of the proposed board policy.

Ms. Nesbit, responding to questions from Ms. Walston, stated that no funding would be provided by the state for the training, background checks, or reporting requirements described in the new policy. She further commented that the nature and extent of any law enforcement involvement with respect to the reporting or sexual conduct with students within the district would depend on the circumstances of each individual case.

COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Levis noted that she and Mr. Torrey had attended a meeting with the Eugene Chamber of Commerce to discuss the Oregon Business Plan. She noted the meeting, which had involved a review and discussion of various state economic statistics going back to 1960, had been quite sobering. Ms. Levis further reported that the Chamber had begun establishing groups around the state that would be focused on regional discussions of educational and related economic issues.

Ms. Levis noted that the Chamber planned to meet again in the fall of 2010 to hold further education and economic discussions and that she and Mr. Torrey had been invited to attend.
Ms. Levis suggested that the board members visit www.oregonbusinessplan.org to learn more about the Oregon Business Plan.

Ms. Gerot reported she had recently been appointed to an education reform work group by Governor Kulongoski, whose purpose was to investigate various means of advancing next step reforms for education practice. She noted that the work group was comprised of members of the OBC, OBA, Stand for Children, and other groups and had planned to begin meeting the week of August 25 with the goal of completing a report by October 16, 2010. She hoped that board members might contribute to the work group’s processes.

Ms. Gerot reported that the leadership team for OSBA had met on August 17 to discuss its future and had also held a meeting with the State Board to discuss ways that the State Board might better connect with the work of the OSBA.

Ms. Walston thanked those members of the community who had offered comments.

Ms. Walston noted she had recently received information from the Oregon Workforce Partnership regarding career technical education. She planned to share the information with the board members once she had the opportunity to review it.

Ms. Geller noted she had attended a demonstration of the Tumblebooks electronic reading resource that had been made available at the Eugene Public Library.

Mr. Torrey noted his attendance at the recent Eugene Chamber of Commerce meeting.

Mr. Torrey reminded the board members and staff that approximately 25% of all the four year-old children in Oregon were Hispanic and encouraged the board to take such statistics into account in future education policy discussions.

ADJOURN

Mr. Smith adjourned the regular meeting of the School District 4J Board and convened the Board’s work session meeting at 8:09 p.m.

WORK SESSION: CONDUCT A WORK SESSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE DISPOSITION OF THE CIVIC STADIUM PROPERTY

Mr. Lauch introduced Larry Massey, who he noted had taken the lead in the drafting of the RFP regarding Civic Stadium, and also John Brown, who he noted had agreed to provide assistance to the district regarding the stadium on a fee for service basis.

Mr. Lauch noted that Joe Richards was in attendance to provide input regarding the confidentiality matters surrounding the Civic Stadium RFP.
Mr. Lauch addressed various comments made by community members and noted that the district had engaged the City of Eugene and had discussed with City staff at length their plans for the realignment of Willamette Street and other transportation issues relating to the stadium. He noted that the district had suggested to the City that it would be an ideal time for it to acquire right of way property in order to accommodate future realignments in the areas near Civic Stadium. He further noted that the City had responded, but had not expressed interest in acquiring any public right of way that had not been improved to public street standards.

Mr. Lauch stated he had requested that the City expand its south Willamette study area north to 19th Avenue so that Civic Stadium parcel might be included in the study but that the City had chosen not to do so.

Mr. Lauch referred to the RFP discussion information that had been provided to the board members in the agenda item summary materials and stated that staff had asked for direction from the board on specific items to be included in the RFP. He noted that staff planned to return to the board at a future meeting with a draft of the RFP as a future action item.

Confidentiality of Proposals

Mr. Lauch noted a belief that certain degrees of confidentiality in the proposals could potentially increase the number of proposals that might be submitted regarding Civic Stadium.

Mr. Lauch stated that public records laws allowed for only a limited number of exemptions to the disclosure of information.

Mr. Lauch recommended that the staff proposal regarding confidentiality not be modified so that a proposer could choose to require that the entire proposal be made confidential.

Mr. Lauch distributed information regarding the state statutes governing confidentiality with respect to RFP’s and further noted that the applicable statutes concerned the definition of trade secrets.

Mr. Smith expressed that the board should allow certain elements of the proposals to be submitted regarding Civic Stadium to remain confidential within the standards of compliance established by state law.

Ms. Geller agreed that a proposing agency should be able to request certain portions of a proposal to be kept confidential, but that the district should reserve the right to disclose information.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Ms. Walston, suggested that it was unlikely that any elements of the most successful proposal regarding Civic Stadium could remain confidential, but that it was possible that there were elements of unsuccessful proposals that might need to remain confidential.

Ms. Walston suggested that the district would need to err on the side of transparency with respect to the Civic Stadium RFP.
Mr. Richards noted the background regarding the district's levels of confidentiality as they pertained to the 1990 Oregon Supreme Court case of the Register-Guard versus the Eugene School District. Mr. Richards proceeded to summarize the circumstances and outcomes of that case for the benefit of the board members. Mr. Richards then discussed the perceived legal tensions that existed between public records laws and the public interest that might be affected by disclosures of information.

Superintendent Russell stated that during his tenure he had tried to protect the board's interests in the public eye. He maintained that it was very important for the board to carefully weigh the legality of the district's confidentiality policies against the stewardship of the public trust with which they had been entrusted.

Ms. Levis suggested that the level and quality of the proposals submitted might be downgraded by any RFP process where levels of confidentiality had not been carefully addressed.

Superintendent Russell briefly discussed how Mr. Lauch's suggestion to allow proposing agencies to dictate certain areas of confidentiality might be perceived by the public.

Mr. Smith believed that it made sense for the district to allow proposing agencies to partially or fully withdraw from the RFP process in order to maintain confidentiality.

The board members and staff discussed how the confidentiality of proposals submitted in response to the Civic Stadium RFP would be addressed by the district.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Ms. Geller, stated that the staff discussions regarding confidentiality had primarily addressed the identity of the proposing agencies rather than any trade secrets contained in any responses to the Civic Stadium RFP.

Mr. Lauch referred to the second option recommended by staff and noted that the limited confidentiality provided for therein might or might not address the identity of the agencies responding to the RFP. Mr. Lauch further discussed how limited levels of confidentiality would allow for more productive negotiations with respect to the proposals that had been submitted.

Mr. Torrey understood that public records and disclosure laws would not necessarily require the district to disclose which agencies or individuals had submitted responses to the RFP.

Mr. Lauch responded to Mr. Torrey's comment and noted that staff had expressly stated in its recommendations that neither the entire RFP nor the summary of property development proposal or revenue to the district shall be marked confidential.

Mr. Torrey believed it would be prudent to err on the most open of processes with respect to the confidentiality matters surrounding the Civic Stadium RFP.

Mr. Brown offered that less confidential processes on past RFP's from the City of Eugene had driven away certain agencies. He believed that providing an agency with the ability to opt out due to confidentiality concerns might necessitate the use of executive sessions in order to review responses to the RFP.

Mr. Richards, responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, suggested that further legal advice was needed before it could be determined if executive sessions would be needed to review responses to the Civic Stadium RFP.
Mr. Richards believed that an agency could maintain limited confidentiality with respect to a response to an RFP until they were granted a notice of intent to award.

Ms. Geller agreed with Mr. Richards' assessment that further legal advice and opinions were necessary regarding the confidentiality of proposals.

**Proposed Selection Criteria & Scoring**

Mr. Lauch, responding to a request from Mr. Smith, described the RFP selection criteria and subsequent scoring process. He further described how the selection criteria might be prorated in order to establish an objective points system that would be used to evaluate the proposals in greater detail.

Mr. Lauch summarized that the proposed selection criteria and scoring methods were a very subjective process that was intended to result in an objective score that would not only demonstrate the feasibility of each proposal but would also allow for a great deal of flexibility on the part of those persons or agencies that intended to submit proposals.

Mr. Lauch stated that the proposed selection criteria and scoring methods would allow the district to withstand any legal challenges as to the appropriateness of the final selection.

Mr. Lauch stated that the maximum score for any agency’s proposal was 100 points.

The board members and staff discussed various permutations of the points allotted under the proposed criteria.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Ms. Gerot, stated that the proposed selection criteria and scoring methodology represented a more complex process for the district's RFP's than had been used in the past.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Mr. Smith, proposed that the evaluation committee to review and score the proposals be made up of district staff and also Mr. Brown as the district's real estate consultant.

Mr. Torrey responded to Mr. Lauch’s comment and strongly believed that the board should not abdicate its responsibility with respect to the evaluation of the Civic Stadium proposals.

Mr. Smith suggested that the district's screening committee comprised of staff and Mr. Brown forward the three highest scoring proposals to the board for final review and selection.

Mr. Lauch responded to Mr. Torrey’s comments and understood that they indicated a desire for a broader community process with respect to the Civic Stadium proposals.

Superintendent Russell believed that previous RFP processes had resulted in the staff making only one recommendation to the board thereby limiting the board's ability to make an informed and objective selection. He understood the board's comments indicated a desire for the process by which proposals were evaluated to be more inclusive.

Mr. Smith, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Lauch, said that all proposals and the scoring information generated by the staff evaluation committee would be presented to the board during an executive session.
Mr. Smith hoped that the board's ability to reject all proposals would be maintained. Mr. Lauch confirmed that it would be.

The board members and staff continued their discussion regarding the points allotted under the proposed RFP evaluation criteria.

Mr. Richards, responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, confirmed that the board was legally permitted to review the top three scoring proposals in executive session.

The board members and staff briefly discussed how an executive session might be conducted in order to review the Civic Stadium proposals.

Mr. Lauch understood that the District's past practice had been that matters of real estate transactions and associated negotiations were a specific topic that was applicable to executive sessions. Mr. Richards confirmed Mr. Lauch's understanding.

The board members discussed the definitions to be applied to each of the proposed evaluation criteria and also discussed how and why the points allotted to each criteria might need to be changed.

Mr. Lauch responded to the board's comments and suggested that it might be premature to assign specific definitions to the selection criteria and advised that such definitions be determined later in the evaluation process.

Mr. Torrey asked if the board should determine that the top point total was the most significant item to consider when evaluating the Civic Stadium proposals.

The board members and Mr. Lauch discussed how the point totals for the Civic Stadium proposals would be considered as the RFP process moved forward.

Mr. Lauch noted that the board was not limited to only the point categories listed in agenda item summary materials and noted that the board was welcome to add or delete point categories.

The board members discussed how the Community Benefit and Compatibility With Existing Land Use Regulation categories might affect the overall point values used in the board's evaluation and review process.

Ms. Levis agreed that it was necessary to have considerations of neighborhood and land use compatibility included in the scoring processes for the Civic Stadium proposals.

The board members discussed the importance of including references to neighborhood compatibility and benefits in the scoring process.

The board members proceeded to discuss how the Preservation of Grandstands for Continued Use category would be considered in relation to the overall point totals.

Mr. Smith advocated for a greater point allocation to the revenue criteria category and believed that doing so would help maximize the district's asset values with respect to the Civic Stadium property. Ms. Levis agreed with Mr. Smith's statement.

The board members continued their discussion regarding the amount of points allotted to each criteria category and suggested several permutations of the same.
Mr. Smith summarized the board's discussion and noted that the proposed allotment of criteria points stood at: 50 points for Revenue; 20 points for Additional Benefits to the District; 20 points for Community Benefit of proposed Use; and 10 points for Preservation of Grandstands for Continued Use.

Mr. Lauch noted that the board could further revise the allotment of points at their next meeting when the draft RFP was presented.

**Acquisition of North Lots Only or Stadium Parcel Only**

Mr. Smith hoped that the language used to describe the acquisition would remain consistent as to which area was being referenced. Mr. Lauch confirmed that the draft RFP would refer to the areas as "the stadium parcel, the north lots, and combined properties." Mr. Lauch further commented that an agency could submit on either or all of the areas.

Mr. Lauch noted that the draft RFP would preserve the district's right to give preference to proposals that addressed the combined properties.

Mr. Smith supported the recommendation of the staff as described in the agenda item summary materials. Several board members concurred with Mr. Smith's statement.

**Deed Restriction/Limitations of Use**

Mr. Lauch, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Smith, confirmed that the staff recommendation was to require a deed restriction to limit future use of the Civic Stadium property. Mr. Lauch further maintained that such a provision would allow proposing agencies to know that there might be limitations imposed on final contracts that would go beyond the City's various land use regulations.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, stated that any deed restrictions or similar limitations would be included as part of the RFP.

**Development Follow-Through Assurance**

Mr. Lauch noted that proposing agencies would be asked through their proposals to clearly describe how any development assurances would be provided.

Mr. Lauch, responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, stated that the district's role with respect to any agency's development assurance provisions would be clearly indicated in the RFP.

**Proposed Request for Proposal Schedule**

Mr. Lauch noted that staff planned to present the draft RFP at the board's September 1 meeting and suggested that the board take final action to approve the RFP at their September 15 meeting.

Mr. Lauch suggested that, upon final approval of the RFP, staff had recommended October 1, 2010 as the date the district would formally issue the RFP.
Mr. Smith referenced the proposed RFP schedule and maintained that between that and the upcoming district superintendent search it would be an extremely busy year for the 4J Board.

Mr. Smith encouraged the board members to forego any vacations in January or February of 2011 out of concern for the superintendent search and the RFP process.

Mr. Brown, responding to a question from Ms. Levis, believed that the staff proposed RFP timeline was not optimal but would represent sufficient time for the district to complete the process.

Ms. Levis suggested that the deadline for the submission of proposals be extended until the end of January 2010.

Mr. Torrey suggested that the board leadership continue to meet with Superintendent Russell and Mr. Lauch in order to impose sustainability discussions onto the superintendent search and RFP processes.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Torrey’s suggestion and stated that it would be very important for the board leadership to draft a very thoughtful timeline regarding the superintendent search and RFP processes.

Mr. Smith adjourned the work session at 9:45 p.m.

______________________________  ____________________________
George Russell     Craig Smith
District Clerk      Board Chair

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

Attachments to Official Minutes:
1. Addendum to the Contract with the Superintendent of Schools