

June 14, 2016

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, June 14, 2016 in Room 293 and the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 7:41 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Dr. Frank Danes, Interim HR Director; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; Philip Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Representatives from BWP, Dr. Barnes and Mr. Earnhardt; representatives from Legat Architects; Lawrence and Katharine Christmas, Chris Donovan, Robert Douglas, Wayne Franklin, Bill Gale, Bruce & Maureen Kleinman, Paul Kovatchis, CJ Pospisil, Gia Sennella, and Monica Sheehan, community.

Public Comments

Chris Donovan spoke about his belief that the garage served a community purpose and to demolish it would be a waste of money. At the last meeting, he learned that the garage had a 25-year life span. He was confused about why testing the structure of the garage that has a 25-year life span.

Bruce Kleinman suggested that the Board of Education if when doing its due diligence on the structure of the garage consider doing its due diligence strategies on other contractors, i.e. Legat, and pointed out failings in measurements and presentations in the past.

Catherine Christmas, long time community member, supported building a pool large enough for the aquatics and PE programs, but it should not be more expensive than necessary. She had been helping with Option 5%, the 40 meter X 25 yard pool, the smallest size that would meet all aquatic needs, be the least disruptive to the all, have no impact on either the parking garage or the school building, the only one that is a green option, be both inspirational and educational, and cost millions less than the other options. When Option 5B was approved to be costed out, Legat and members of the Board working group worked to make Option 5 meet the program needs. After seeing the needs, she disputed the necessity of some of them, reiterating that it was the size of the pool that mattered. Option 5B is now larger by 5,000 sq. ft. than the previously designed pools for the west fields that were 50 meters. That now costs more than \$5 million that she could not justify. While she supported the concept of the underground pool as previously presented, she did not support this plan and felt that the coaches should have been involved in the process from the beginning.

Pool and Facilities

The decision-making timeline for the pool was reviewed. Additional meetings might be scheduled. Funding options will be presented by Liz Hennessey on June 23, 2016.

**Pool and Facilities
Options to include for
Phase II of the
Community
Engagement**

Agenda Item E was moved up on the agenda to make it the framing element of the conversation.

Mr. Weissglass moved to direct the administration to plan and implement the community engagement process with Plan A and B; seconded by Ms. Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in 6 ayes and one nay. Mr. Arkin voted nay. Motion carried.

Timeline

Mr. Altenburg gave a review of events. On June 3, the LTF Plan Committee reconvened to provide additional input either personally or via email. Board of Education members and the pool subcommittee gave their input and the current draft was in alignment with the comments received.

Revised Plan

Mr. Prale had reviewed the latest draft presented in the packet. The four Broad of Education parameters were 1) Enrollment, 2) 5-year Budget, 3) Recapturing and Reusing Vacant Pool Space, and 4) Future Learning Environments. Enrollment will increase 5% in the next 5 years. If just 4 or 5 classrooms were to be added, more office space will also be needed. The District believes it can accommodate current enrollment and will continue to monitor enrollment every two years. The administration believes it will have the funds to recapture the vacated pool to provide future learning environments which will mean more active learning spaces. The district will need additional collaboration processes in some of the areas.

The structure of the Fieldhouse is sound and the District has a well-cared for building with a capital improvement plan through 2022 for ongoing maintenance (HVAC, tuckpointing, lighting, etc). The District will engage in a 10-year Life Safety Plan this fall. The boys' locker rooms are insufficient. Performing Arts enrollment is increasing and a larger cafeteria space is needed. Page 7 of the report showed the current needs and the anticipated needs in years 6-10. Option B included a natatorium, expanding performing arts and renovating the locker rooms.

Based on prior feedback from the Board of Education, Option A maintains the current Track.

Page 9 detailed the Program Elements in years 1-5 of the South End of Option A with a narrative description and the Program Elements in years 6-10. This is the concept-design phase to get a perspective for the south end discussion which will have a ripple effect in other parts of the building, i.e. opening up opportunities for media, teacher workspaces, collaborative spaces, etc. Pages 9 and 14 are the details of the two different options.

Page 6, on the third floor, spoke to the designing of model classrooms in the first year at the cost of \$1.8 million. This amount will come out of the current budget parameters and not be included in the capital improvement fund. The yellow, blue and orange areas were possible spaces. These spaces could be redesigned to maximize

their use and technology could track the learning that took place and use that to spearhead what is possible in years 6-10.

Mr. Weissglass moved to direct administration to plan comm engagement meetings based on plan A and B; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy.

When asked whether less expensive alternatives had been considered for adding a performing arts addition to the east side of the building that would run from the athletic entrance to the main entrance, the response is the alternatives would be fewer sections, larger class sizes, additional sections both before and after school, etc. From the building perspective, the options presented were the best, because of the opportunities they created. The addition goes from the athletic entrance to the PE support area. The Driver Ed classrooms and balcony would be located above that area.

Discussion ensued about where the adaptive gym programming would be moved if two levels of locker rooms were created. That had not yet been discussed. The District would have to verify all of the existing elements because the District is committed to not losing any programs, including being equitable in the size of locker rooms for both boys and girls.

The Facility Advisory Committee had recommended earmarking \$20 million of the fund balance for capital improvements, not just for the pool, and the Board of Education approved that recommendation. The District looked at its expected needs and its aggregate DSEB availability of \$42 million. The Board decided to keep the borrowing to half of the \$42 million. The amount being proposed is over and above that amount. Capital improvement funds have been used to keep this building in good shape, and some of those future funds might be used for this project.

At this time, only estimates exist for the classroom remodeling plan in year one, and student discussion could still influence the plan. The locker rooms adjacent to the pool are part of the pool costs; the 4 boys' locker rooms and a small one by the pool that are along the western side of the Fieldhouse are not.

The differences in Option A and B during years 1-5 are: Option A has a bump out along Scoville Avenue which could be used for adequate practice rooms, performance spaces storage areas (for Performing Arts), and PE offices. Option B has no bump out. Load bearing walls would dictate what would be feasible. However, Performing Arts may not be the driver of any change, because the pool choice would drive what might be possible. A request was made for the architect to provide the suggested square footage amounts in both options if it is moved forward.

One member remarked that this information seemed a la carte. In most cases, the connections resonated, clearly coupled, and some of the choices were more of free radical. Another member asked that gender and equity be valued and factored into the plan. While the administration has not received information relative to the length of

the construction and disruption, classroom renovations could occur over the summer. The faculty has a vested interest in having more classroom spaces, and the administration has looked to division with the highest amount of teachers sharing rooms for examples. Computer lab utilization is reviewed annually to see if they can be returned to classroom usage. A sustainability discussion would come forward in the schematic design phase.

A request was made to focus on sustainability. The administration acknowledges saying that it would come in the schematic phase, not the design phase.

The discussion of the library space prompted powerful feedback, and that feedback prevented locating the library in the center of the building. The committee focused on enlarging the tutoring center and moving it to a space closer to the cafeteria area, because its use was higher at lunchtime. If it were moved to the cafeteria area, students would have more accessibility to it during their lunch periods.

Discussion ensued about Option C, page 21, but no motion was made to include this option in the community engagement meetings. Regarding Option 5B, the Board of Education had asked the administration to work with the architects to make sure there was an apples-to-apples comparison in regards to the pool design aspects discussed through the design phase of the work when it was considering a 50-meter pool on the site of the parking lot. The administration had been asked to bring this to the cost estimator, CCS. These tasks were accomplished. Peer review, construction costs and building program comparison chart for Option 5B were presented. Legat reviewed the material and said the full verified program was not included and provided the additional square foot for a verified program. The estimated cost of \$33.7 million was based on the original presented and increased to \$37 million with the expanded square footage to accommodate the apples-to-apples comparison of programs. Legat had suggested looking at Option 1 of a 50 meter pool and scaling it down to a 40 meter pool.

One member did not feel an apples-to-apples comparison had been accomplished because the designs were drawn in different levels of detail (concept or schematic designs). Option 1 and Option 5 are more schematic than the other options. Option 1 was expanded more than 20% over than when the west pool option was drawn. At the time it was 49,000 sq. ft., but the new drawing sent to Heisman came to more than 58,000 sq. ft. with no more water, but with more program space? It seemed that this proposal should be re-costed for an apples-to-apples comparison. Options 2, 3 and 4 do not contain the same level of detail. Seemingly, the Board of Education wanted the width of the pool to be 75 feet for options 2 and 4, yet in the Legat's most recent communication in response to the proposal by Mr. Heitzman and Mr. Eakin, Legat stated that Option 2 could not be 75 ft. wide without knocking down walls. The retort was that the 75 ft. dimension is only important on a 40 ft. pool, not a 25' yard pool because swimming does not occur crosswise. The counter-argument back was that it did not matter because it can be made 75 ft. wide to preserve programs. Part of the concept of an apples-to-apples comparison is that one must meet the competitive and

PE needs of the aquatics program. However, in every option the needs of the aquatics program can be met. Because it was not vetted by the aquatic coaches after those options were drawn, an official response about whether the programs can be accommodated had not been received. Would Option 2 be able to do so or would it have to be revised? Options 2, 3 and 4 did not have the same level of scrutiny as did Option 5B and Option 1. Dr. Gevinson was frustrated with the process because there was no true apples-to-apples comparison and asked how the level of detail in the drawings was determined.

Discussion ensued about the logistics of putting in an underground pool. Is there something unique that must be done that would make it a different size? Are there additional safety requirements needed because it is underground and would it require more space? Option 4 takes much of the space of the east pool for locker rooms, offices, mechanicals and then ends up with 8,400 square feet of unused space. The LTFFP has not done work that assumes the project is outside of the building, which would leave that space completely vacated. Should it be asked to do so? A new option could be designed assuming the spaces were vacated with distinct line items.

One member favored Option 5B because it was the greenest alternative and did not require taking down the garage, a fundamentally structurally sound building, and putting up a structure that was tall and skinny. Another member had visited two schools with underground pools and stated that input from the coaches on Option 5B should be had. Why was this option not a part of the vetting process?

One member of the pool's working group stated that Options 2, 3, and 4 were conceptual in design. While design detail was not available of these options, the cost elements on each of these options were just like the ones in Option 5B. Legat created Options 2, 3, and 4 based on the elements of the program that were created and verified. They were created with the core of a committee that included members of the athletic and PE department as well as other faculty, administrators, and stakeholders. The elements of the program are those things that are needed to create this facility based on a program. Options 2, 3, and 4 would not have gone to the schematic/design phase. All of the elements of the programs were costed out by CCS. Discussion can occur on the elements of the program, but if any were removed, it would not be necessary to go forward with any of the options. In Options 2 and 4, the elements are built within the existing structure. In Option 4, many of the elements needed to support the pool are within the existing structure. That is an apple-to-apples comparison. The greatest concerns of one board member about going underground, other than the additional costs, were the unknown factors. Soil testing was completed but there are always unknowns because it depends on where was drilled. However, the risks include life safety, egress and ingress, not just what *The School Code of Illinois* allows or what is required for the youth in the building 12 hours per day, smoke control, air circulation, etc. Because going upstairs to evacuate a building is more problematic than going downstairs, an additional stairwell was added to the southwest side, but it would still be 250 feet from any point to the stairway. Many

more unknowns and greater risks of accuracy in the estimates of an underground facility are involved versus renovating the current building.

Discussion ensued about this process. Not following the process originally had put tremendous pressure on Legat to frequently and quickly develop drawings in response to Board of Education members' questions. Legat was complimented for helping the Board of Education to understand the issues and respond to its questions. The concerns about the height of the parking garage and its entry are valid, and if Option 5B worked, it would be good. Concerns still existed about 1) feasibility (does it meet the needs; 2) height, 3) risks (air quality management, fire safety issues, having a field above, and the unknowns). Option 2 needs compromise from the verified program—does it compromise too much? If it just meets the verified program, it would probably have been rejected because of not enough water. If spending \$30+ million, the District should get its intended program. If not, lesser materials could be used or certain elements could be eliminated. One member believed that the cost of this project is \$38 million plus the cost of repurposing the pool space and is comparable to the cost in Option 1 (\$37.5M.). If so, Option 1 would cost \$49 million for the pool and creating an additional 9,500 sq. ft. space versus Option 4 which is \$42 million and creating only an 8,400 sq. ft. space. The difference between Option 4 and Option 5B is \$7 million. Thus, Option 5B has an additional 1,500 sq. ft. Is a \$7 million premium to avoid disruption worthy? That would obviate the question of tearing down the garage because it was already there rather than spending \$5 million to own it.

The concern was about how to take this to the community in the July 13 and 20 timeline. The Board of Education must decide if it wants to go for a referendum by August 22. If not, the Board of Education will not move forward with the community on the pool discussion. The next time the Board of Education would be able to go for a referendum is March 2018. Because of that, one member was inclined to say no to Option 5B.

In response to the previous discussion, Dr. Gevinson stated that if one adds up the square footage in Option 4, one gets much smaller footage for the same size pool and that is the same problem in looking at the original option for the parking garage pool versus the one now drawn in detail. It was drawn to be 20% larger. If one increases the size of Option 4, as is Option 5B, it will increase the cost by an unknown amount. The program is biased against an external pool. Because one can use the space inside the pool and the locker room, it would not cost as much to build a new locker room. If the program were reconceived, less locker room space would be available, and then Option 5B would be less expensive.

The drawing that was provided by Mr. Heitzman and Mr. Eakin took in all of the actual needs and came up with less square footage needed. Legat's drawing has 5 separate locker rooms, (male and female, P.E. male and female locker rooms, and a family locker room area). The coaches' lockers, showers, and office space is ten times larger than it needs to be. Dr. Gevinson did not believe that any pool had that many locker rooms. While the reason for the proposed locker rooms was security driven, it

was pointed out that Fenwick hosts 11 schools at a sectional meet with only 2 locker rooms. The state tournament is hosted at a pool with 2 locker rooms. The proposed 500 sq. ft. concession stand is unnecessary. This plan was too expansive, and it should be pared down. The administration stated that the District has boys' and girls' swimming and diving, water polo, synchronized swimming, and TOPS. There is often a crossover of use by young children, families, and students. The current and former Boards of Education valued the idea of community use of the pool. A family locker room would eliminate the use of student locker rooms.

The only way for the program verification to occur for Option 5B would be for the Board of Education to vote on it. Because Option 5B is being discussed in the media and at Board of Education meetings, one member felt it should be important to bring it to the community.

A hesitancy existed in bringing forward the proposal of Mr. Eakin and Mr. Heitzman, as it would be different from Legat's, and the District cannot put work forward that is not created by its architects. An intermediate step would be for Legat work to refine Option 5B, in collaboration with the other two architects, for the Board of Education to accept it in order to present it to the community.

Dr. Gevinson suggested that the guideline or the spirit of Option 5B was not a strict program verification rule, and that was the reason for asking for different materials to be used. Mr. Weissglass stated that Option 1, 3, and 4 got as close to the program verifications within the parameters given. If change is to be made to the program verifications, it needs to occur by Board of Education vote at another meeting.

Another question asked was how Option 5B (page 15) compared to Option A. One member asked that Option 5B be brought into the fold Sand for Legat to refine Option 5B in collaboration in with the other architects and bring it to the Board for acceptance before it goes out to the public along with the long-term facilities plan.

Dr. Gevinson moved to include consideration of Option 5B during the community engagement meetings and for Legat to develop a LTF concept that incorporated Option 5B subject to the final approval of the Board; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Mr. Arkin voted nay. Motion carried.

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve LTFP Plans A and B to be included in the community engagement meetings as well as Option 5B; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Mr. Arkin voted nay. Motion carried.

**Structural Study
Of the Garage**

The Board of Education took no action to approve the engineering services for the condition assessment of the Lake Street Parking Structure.

The Board of Education recessed at 9:45 and resumed at 9:55 p.m.

Superintendent Search Process

BWP gave an update on the progress of the search for a superintendent. Dr. Barnes and Mr. Earnhardt spoke about their professional backgrounds.

The process including posting the position on the websites of BWP and the Illinois Job Bank. BWP is actively recruiting and identifying candidates. Thus far 20 candidates have applied and have been screened. BWP has looked at the diversity of the candidates, searched for them on Google them, and completed reference checks. The superintendent search timeline was reiterated.

- 1) Begin search June 3
- 2) Present candidates June 14
- 3) Interview candidates the week of June 27, determine a candidate and finalize an agreement.
- 4) Early in July begin the permanent superintendent search.

Note: TRS only allows retirees from Illinois to work 100 days and continuity may be lost from the first semester to the second semester. While candidates who do not work in Illinois can work the full year, they may not understand Illinois finance and the complexity of the rules.

Ms. Kalmerton and Dr. Danes were thanked for their help with the search process thus far.

Closed Session

At 10:06 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); and The placement of individual students in special education programs and other matters relating to individual students 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11); seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 11:28 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session.

Personnel Recommendations

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Personnel Recommendations, as presented; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

SEIU Memorandum Of Understanding

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between District 200 and members of the Service Employees International Union, specifically CPGA and Safety and Security with regard to Casimir Pulaski Day; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 11:29 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass
President

Sara Dixon Spivy
Secretary