OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL

Finance Committee Meeting Agenda

February 16, 2010 Board Room 7:30 a.m.

| 1. | Minutes | |
|-----|--------------------------------|------------------|
| 2. | Wight Contract Addendum | Cheryl Witham |
| 3. | Enernoc Contract | Robert ZumMallen |
| 4. | Refuse Contract | Robert ZumMallen |
| 5. | Athletic Uniforms, Fall/Winter | Tim Keeley |
| 6. | Student Parking Fees | Attila Weninger |
| 7. | Student Fees 2010-2011 | Cheryl Witham |
| 8. | Banking Services | Cheryl Witham |
| 9. | PTAB Resolution | Cheryl Witham |
| 10. | Monthly Financial Report | Information |
| 11. | Treasurer's Report | Information |

Finance Committee Members Chair: John C. Allen IV

Board of Education DLT Jim Hunter – FSEC Chair FINANCE COMMITTEE

| | | | S. C. |
|--|--|---|---|
| July, 2009 | August, 2009 | BOARD REPORTS September, 2009 | October, 2009 |
| Tentative Budget 2009 - 2010 | 2009 - 2010 Budget Approval | Ed Red - Erika Lindley | 2009 Audit |
| | | Residency Report and Policy/Procedures | Levy Timeline |
| | | Workers Comp History | Wellness Update |
| | | | FY 2009 Audit Report |
| | | | Books & Fees Report |
| | | | Insurance Renewals |
| November, 2009 | December, 2009 | January, 2010 | February, 2010 |
| Preliminary 2009 Levy | 2009 Levy | | Student Fees 10/11 |
| RFP Superintendents Search | | Authority to Commence Amend. Budget 09/10 | Fall Athletic Uniform Bid |
| | | Authority to Commence 10/11 Budget Prep | PTAB Resolution |
| | | Contracts of \$10,000 - \$25,000 Report | |
| | | Coaches Stipends vs Activity Funds | |
| | | | |
| March, 2010 | April, 2010 | May, 2010 | June, 2010 |
| Staffing Summary Update | Staffing and Stipends10 - 11 budget | Prevailing wage | FY 11 Preliminary Budget |
| Division FTE | Sub Teacher - Sub clerical pay 10 - 11 | Resolution to transfer funds | Property & Liability Ins Renewal |
| RFP Bus Service | Food Service lunch prices 10 - 11 | PTAB Resolution | Workers Comp Renewal |
| Authorization to Commence 2010 Audit | Athletic Uniforms - Spring | RFP for Insurance Broker | TIF Update |
| Amended Budget | Triton Contract | Contracts for FY 10 - 11 | E2-Contract |
| Food Service Rollover Bids | Contracted Security Services Bid | Thrive Services | Theatrical Costume contract |
| Life Safety | Amended Budget Approval | Xerographic Paper Bid | Sanitary Paper Bid |
| Board Goal Budget | B-circlessmanner. | Towel Service Bid | |
| 5 Year Plan | To company the same of the sam | Wellness Report | |
| | | | |
| Every Meeting: | ACCOUNTS AND ACCOU | | |
| Minutes | | | |
| Financial Reports | | | |
| Treasurer's Report | | | |
| * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** * | | | |
| - Control - Cont | | | |

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL 201 North Scoville Avenue Oak Park, IL 60302

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, January 19, 2010

A Finance Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, January 19, 2010. Chair Allen called the meeting to order at 7:38 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV, Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; Doug Wiley, OPRFHS Supervisor of Finance; James Paul Hunter, OPRFHS Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Robert Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds, Dale Craft, Summer School Director; and John Stelzer, Director of Athletics.

Acceptance of Minutes of December 8, 2009 Finance Committee Meeting It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to accept by acclimation the minutes of the December 8, 2009 Finance Committee meeting.

Summer School Budget

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the 2010 summer school dates, tuition, teaching stipends, and budget at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

The following was noted:

- The dates are: June 16, 2010 through July 23, 2010. (No school will be held on Monday, July 5)
- No significant changes are recommended for the summer course offerings.
- No increase in tuition is being recommended; it will remain at \$180 per class.
- The teaching stipend will be \$2450 per section, representing a 2.2% increase.

Students take 63 instructional hours per class in the summer. If it is an in-District teacher who teaches the class, he/she has already done the preparatory work. While there is no formal training for non-District teachers, materials are sent to them in advance with information about class expectations. Students in health classes receive the same standardized tests that are used during the regular school year.

Mr. Craft recognized the Business Office for the hard work it has done on the budgeting process. The budget has gone from being a negative \$27,000 a positive \$17,000. One reason for this change in the budget is that some of the classes offered previously were

not as full as they could have been and, thus, teachers were allocated to areas of more need.

Because last year's revenue was higher, the administration discussed offering a program for students between their freshman and sophomore years who struggle academically, titled the 9 to 10 Program. It allows students to take one study hall class and retake a failed health or math class. As such, the school awarded thirty (30) \$100 grants to students to help with summer school tuition. Also, the Oak Park Youth Township helped provide work study opportunities for the students. Mr. Finnegan testified that students in the 9 to 10 Program were very well behaved.

When asked if the administrative fee for sports camps was paid by the camp tuition, Ms. Witham responded that the administrative, secretarial, and dean of discipline expenditures for the summer programs are paid from that fee. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that last year's surplus suggested that summer school fees were too high and the school must look to reduce them so that more students can participate. Mr. Craft noted that the registration fee had been held at \$180 for three years and the lab fees are only \$25. When Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there was a sense that other students might like to go to summer school but financially cannot afford to do so, Mr. Craft responded that the students who have expressed a need have been helped. A review of the course selections is completed every summer so that the school can provide as many relevant courses as possible within the budget.

Funding of Coaching Stipends

Mr. Stelzer reported that OPRFHS currently ranks second in the number of sports it offers in the West Suburban Conference and sixth in the number of coaching stipends for those sports. The administration proposes adding seventeen (17) additional coaching stipends (12 presently being funded through summer camps or fundraising activities) in an effort to bring the current "fundraising" stipends into the District budget. A list of the stipends was provided.

In order to generate revenue for these additional stipends, the Administration proposes:

- 1) increasing the administrative fee for summer camps from \$15 to \$40;
- 2) increasing the Pay to Play fee from \$50 to \$55;
- 3) reducing the athletic equipment budget by \$10,000; and
- 4) selling banner space in the stadium.

The above items will generate \$105,000 and the cost of the proposed stipends is \$103,393.

Mr. Stelzer, Ms. Sakelaris, and four head coaches developed this proposal after reviewing the number of teams, the number of participants, the safety factors, the daily travel, the additional supervisories, etc. of each sports program. This proposal illustrates a reconfiguration of the funding and bringing OPRFHS up to the level of other schools in the West Suburban Conference.

Mr. Finnegan asked if the proposed \$10,000 budget reduction for athletic equipment would be sustainable in future years. It was noted that the sports camps would not be spending their fundraising on personnel costs but rather on things such as equipment. Ms. Witham added that sports camps had an entrepreneurial spirit and they will still be raising money, but it will be used for equipment, warm-ups, etc., rather than for coaching stipends.

With 1200 students participating in the athletic program last year, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there was a link between the monetary value of a stipend and the actual salary of the person receiving the stipend. It was noted that coaching salaries are tied to the salary schedule of BA 1 (Bachelors' Degree plus 1-year of service) and years of coaching, not to the length of teaching service or degree. The Stipend Committee meets quarterly to review the stipends and then makes recommendations once per year to DLT. It is a multi-factorial decision as to the number of stipends for the number of students.

Mr. Conway stated that when coaches are required to bring in so much money from fundraising, it puts pressure on the students and the parents. Coaches chastise those who cannot raise funds. He did not want to see that pressure put on the students to make up the difference. Mr. Seltzer concurred stating that what Mr. Conway described was happening now and the District wanted to take that responsibility from them. The District is looking for creative ways to do that, e.g., stadium sponsorship, having Boosters pay for equipment, etc. The goal is to decrease how much parents and students are paying for coaches.

Discussion ensued about the lack of diversity in the coaching staff at OPRFHS or other schools. Mr. Stelzer stated that the Board of Education's goal is to hire minority teachers, and staff and that is just as important for athletics; it is important for young teachers to be involved in the coaching process. Examples of where diversity has been accomplished are Saleema Rogers who is an assistant coach for Varsity Field Hockey and Lyle Shirley who is an Asst. Coach for Varsity Boys' Lacrosse. In addition, a head coach and assistant coach evaluation process has been instituted this year. Mr. Rouse was involved in the process and coaches have more accountability. Mr. Stelzer said that too many coaches are outside coaches; they do not teach in the building. More internal personnel are needed. He believed that when students see their teachers reacting differently, it helps them in all parts of their lives, including their academics. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for a Board of Education report as to how many students were repeat students by gender, grade, etc to be presented regularly. She wanted it as a regular Board of Education report. She asked also about the five new stipends proposed. Because the cost of the five new stipends will continue to rise, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked where the District anticipated getting the dollars. The dollars spent to pay these before were paid for out of fundraising dollars and those dollars did not conform to the regular stipend schedule. Mr. Stelzer stated that these stipends were not the same as regular coaching stipends. Swimming camp pays its stipends from the money it raises. Some sports fees might have to be raised minimally, but a majority will not be raised at all. Soccer camp is for children ranging from the sixth grade level to the high school level, so in some ways stipends are being subsidized, just as is the case with swimming. This is considered a summer camp activity and they would participate even if they were

not high school students. For Ms. Patchak-Layman, it is about balancing sports with the other activities in the school. Without being able to see the other activities and see the number of participants involved, she found it difficult to spot budget without seeing the activities and desires of the other programs at the school, both academic and co-curricular.

Mr. Allen noted that spot budgeting focuses on different aspects at different times. It helps the Board of Education focus on specific areas, rather than go through the entire budget in one sitting. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that approximately thirty-three percent of the students are involved in sports program. She suggested that perhaps the intramural program should have more emphasis or increase participation in other areas. The concern is that when the stipends are being taken care of by the District, it is then accountable for those dollars. She asked: Where do the dollars come from? How were they paid? How will they impact the school? Where should the sports program be in terms of participation and dollars? Do students have to compete or could they be in intramural programs? Dr. Lee shared the same concern about things coming to the Board of Education in a piecemeal fashion. His concern was what would be cut to make room for something else. The District has not been faced with that situation and there are no easy answers on how to do that. Ms. Witham replied that she recently saved \$235,000 in health insurance, \$50,000 in the leasing of copy machines, \$700,000 in the bond and interest fund, etc. She looks for large savings so that programs do not have to end.

Construction Update

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the addition of air-conditioning to 34 rooms and 2 offices during the summer at a cost of \$240,000.

Mr. Zummallen presented a color-coded map showing all of the areas in the building currently not air conditioned. He stated that the two fan units scheduled for replacement during the summer of 2010 service most of the areas in the school that are not air-conditioned, except for bathrooms, hallways, locker rooms, swimming pools, and the West Gym 1, etc. The two fan units would allow the marked rooms to be air-conditioned at an additional cost of \$240,000. Air-conditioning the other areas could be considered during the replacement of the fan units that service those areas.

Discussion ensued about this project. In some instances staff and programs will have to be relocated during the summer. This year, all of the bid documents will be reviewed for accuracy and completeness so that there are no costly change orders, etc.

Mr. Conway asked if there were any long term plans for technology, screens, in the classrooms, etc. Ms. Witham noted that all the new science labs will have access to all technology. Mr. Carioscio will review all the construction plans and decide what technology should be placed in the new construction so that there will be a long-term access plan for technology throughout the building.

The rooms to be air-conditioned have exterior walls. The new ventilators to be installed can be controlled electronically and individually. If a single classroom is used, it can be

heated or air conditioned separately without putting on a chiller or boiler. When asked about the cost of this equipment versus centrally air-conditioning the entire building, it was noted that the current ductwork will not accommodate central air-conditioning. Outside air is necessary and previously the concrete tunnels were used for the flow-through of fresh air, but that is no longer possible under code. The annual cost to operate these units versus central air-conditioning the entire building would be the same. Over the next two years, discussion will continue on bringing air condition to the rest of the building.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the District was balancing air-conditioning class rooms with reducing its costs. If the primary goal is to reduce energy efficiency, then this is not the way to do this. Mr. Zummallen stated that this needs to be done now as the District needs to bring in fresh air per the Code.

Authority to Commence the Amended Budget 2009/10

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Resolution to Prepare the Amended Budget for fiscal year 2009-2010 at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

Authority to Commence with Tentative Budget 2001-11

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Resolution to Prepare the Tentative Budget for fiscal year 2010-2011 at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

Resolution to Abate \$1 million from the Working Cash Fund

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Resolution to Abate \$1 million from the Working Cash Fund to the Education Fund at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

Resolution To Transfer \$1 million from the Educational Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Resolution to Transfer \$1 million from the Educational Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

This funding will be used for construction projects previously discussed.

Order Calling a Public Hearing for the Intent to Transfer \$1 Million from the Education Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund

It was the consensus of the Finance Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the order to call for a public hearing for the Intent to Transfer \$1 million from the Education Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund at the January 19, 2010 Special Board Meeting.

Contracts between \$10,000 and \$25,000

Ms. Witham provided the Finance Committee members with a list of contracts and purchase orders that ranged between \$10,000 and \$25,000 from July 2009 through January 2010.

Monthly Financial Reports

The Board of Education will be asked to approve the November 2009 Financial Reports at the regular January Board of Education meeting.

Monthly Treasurers Report

The Board of Education will be asked to approve the November 2009 Treasurers Reports at the regular January Board of Education meeting.

Additional information

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that she received communication addressed to parents of high school juniors by a company selling life insurance. She was informed that a confidentiality clause exists in all contracts. That particular company is also not a vendor of OPRFHS. However, it was noted that the ACT/SAT organizations, Jostens, and the military do get student information.

Adjournment

The Finance Committee adjourned 8:59 a.m.

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Boa

Board of Education

FROM:

Cheryl Witham

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Wight and Co. Contract Addendum

BACKGROUND

The Board of Education previously approved the summer 2010 construction plans. Subsequently the Board agreed to add air conditioning to the approved plan.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

An addendum to the original contract is necessary and is provided for your review.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Approve the addendum to the Wight contract at the Special Board Meeting.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910



February 8, 2010

Ms. Cheryl Witham
Chief Financial Officer
Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200
Oak Park, IL 60302

Wight & Company wightco.com 2500 North Frontage Road Darien, IL 60561 P 630.969.7000 F 630.969.7979

ADDITIONAL SERVICES PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FEE PROPOSAL OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST SCHOOL DISTRICT 200 SUMMER 2010 LIFE SAFETY AND RENOVATION WORK

Dear Ms. Witham:

Wight & Company (Wight) is pleased to submit this proposal to the Oak Park and River Forest High School District (District) to provide additional architectural and engineering services for the Summer 2010 Life Safety and Renovation Work. This letter is an amendment to our signed proposal dated December 3, 2009 and signed by the Board of Education on December 8, 2009. We have prepared our proposal in the following four parts:

- PROJECT UNDERSTANDING
- SCOPE OF SERVICES
- SCHEDULE
- COMPENSATION

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

We understand that based on additional field investigation and modifications to the scope of work additional architectural and engineering services are required as per the revised Construction Projects Long Range Planning spreadsheet dated 1/29/2010rz. The additional work includes providing the design for air-conditioning as part of the ventilation units that are being replaced under the Life Safety Scope of Work, converting room 119 into science offices, renovating the broadcast room, and adding additional new ceilings and lighting to accommodate HVAC upgrades.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Design of a new chiller to provide air-conditioning to various areas of the 1920-24 sections of the building

The following services will be provided:

- Size and specify new chiller equipment.
- Evaluate electrical capacity of the school for the new chiller.
- Structural engineer's review of the roof to support placement of the chiller.
- Construction documents, permitting, bidding and construction administration for this work as per our original agreement.

Design of room 119 to be converted to science offices

The following services will be provided:

- Meetings with stakeholders to develop layout options for the room.
- Structural Engineer's review of masonry wall removal and design of new supporting steel.
- Construction documents, permitting, bidding and construction administration for this work as per our original agreement.

Ms. Cheryl Witham Summer 2010 Life Safety and Renovation Work February 8, 2010 Page 2 of 2

Broadcast Booth Room 398

The following services will be provided:

- Removal of existing wood platform, carpet and asbestos mastic.
- Design of new wood platform
- Construction documents, permitting, bidding and construction administration for this work as per our original agreement.

Additional Ceilings and Lighting

The following services will be provided:

- Additional new suspended acoustical ceilings and new lighting will be provided in areas
 related to the new HVAC renovations for the Life Safety Scope of Work. Many existing
 ceilings could not be saved due to age of the systems. Consequently, in areas where the
 old ceilings are removed, new energy efficient lighting will be included with the new
 suspended acoustic ceilings.
- Construction documents, permitting, bidding and construction administration for this work as per our original agreement.

SCHEDULE

No change is anticipated in the schedule as stated in our original scope of work for this added work except as follows:

• The District should be advised that the start-up and full operation of the new chiller may extend beyond the substantial completion date of August 13 by three to four weeks.

COMPENSATION

Wight proposes to provide the additional scope of services described in this proposal for a fixed fee of Forty Thousand Three Hundred Seventy Seven and 00/100 dollars (\$40,377.00) based on a Total Project Budget of \$5,093,595.00. Please refer to Exhibit A, updated 2/2/10, for calculation of updated total A/E fee amount. The original Exhibit A, dated 12/3/2009, has been attached for reference.

If this proposal is acceptable to you, please signify your acceptance by signing in the space provided below and return one copy to us for our files. If you have any questions, please contact Leanne Meyer-Smith at (630) 739-6704.

| Respectfully Submitted WIGHT & COMPANY Leanne Meyer-Smith, Senior Project Manage | yer Smeth MA, LEED AP | Richard A. Carlson, AIA, LEED AP President, Architecture | |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|
| Accepted by: | Signature | Date: | |
| Copy: Ray Prokop File: A 2.0 | Title | | |
| Attachment: Exhibit A, | , updated 2/2/2010 and E | exhibit A, dated 12/3/2009 original | 400000000000000000000000000000000000000 |
| | | | mos ostáníw |

UPDATED 2/2/10

EXHIBIT A

2010 - 2011 Construction Projects

2/2/2010

| | | | | | Section of the sectio | |
|----|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|----------------|
| 数 | Description | Construction Budget * | A/E Fees (7.75%)* | Work Item Totals | Contingency | Project Totals |
| 1 | Elevator Code Upgrade | \$73,800.00 | \$ 6,200.00 | \$ 00.000.00\$ | | \$88,000.00 |
| 2 | Air Handlers | \$1,018,440.00 | \$ 85,560.00 | \$1,104,000.00 | \$ 110,400.00 | \$1,214,400.00 |
| m | Fire Damper Installation | \$91,327.50 | \$ 7,672.50 | 00.000,66\$ | \$ 9,900.00 | \$108,900.00 |
| 4 | Mechanical VAV Box Replacement | \$710,325.00 | \$ 59,675.00 | \$770,000.00 | 5 7 | \$847,000.00 |
| ın | Plumbing | \$452,025.00 \$ | | \$490,000.00 | \$ | \$539,000.00 |
| 9 | Science Lab Renovation | \$1,247,446.94 \$ | | \$1.352.246.00 | | \$1.487.470.60 |
| 7 | Paol Improvements | \$369,000.00 \$ | | \$400,000,00 | | \$440.000.00 |
| œ | Masonry Repairs | \$309,309.64 | | \$335,295,00 | \$ | \$368.824.50 |
| | Totals | \$4,271,674.07 | ** | 7\$ | 87 | \$5,093,595.10 |

* Note: the A/E fees include Asbestos Design Fees ** Note: the construction budget includes Pre-Construction Activity Fee, CM Fees, Asbestos Removal and Asbestos On-Site Project Management Fees

EXHIBIT A

Oak Park and River Forest High School

2010 - 2011 Construction Projects

12/3/2009

| | | Construction | A/E Fees | Work tem | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| * | Description | Budget * | (7.75%)** | Totals | Contingency | Project Totals |
| | Elevator Code Upgrade | \$73,800.00 | \$ 6,200.00 | \$ 00.000.08\$ | \$ 8,000.00 | \$88,000.00 |
| 2 | Air Handlers | \$756,450.00 | \$ 63,550.00 | \$820,000.00 | \$ 82,000.00 | \$902,000.00 |
| 3 | Fire Damper Installation | \$243,540.00 | \$ 20,460.00 | \$264,000.00 | \$ 26,400.00 | \$290,400.00 |
| 4 | Mechanical VAV Box Replacement | \$221,400.00 | \$ 18,600.00 | \$ 240,000.00 | \$ 24,000.00 | \$264,000.00 |
| 5 | Plumbing | \$940,950.00 | \$ 79,050.00 | \$1,020,000.00 | \$ 102,000.00 | \$1,122,000.00 |
| 9 | Science Lab Renovation | \$1,053,721,94 | \$ 88,524.07 | \$1,142,246.00 | \$ 114,224.60 | \$1,256,470.60 |
| 7 | Pool Improvements | \$191,880.00 | \$ 16,120.00 | \$208,006.00 | \$ 20,800.00 | \$228,800.00 |
| 8 | Masonry Repairs | \$309,309.64 | \$ 25,985.36 | \$335,295.00 | \$ 33,529.50 | \$368,824.50 |
| | Fotals | \$3,791,051.57 | \$ 318,489,43 | \$4,109,541.00 | \$ 410,954.10 | \$4,520,495.10 |

^{*} Note: the construction budget includes Pre-Construction Activity Fee, CM Fees, Asbestos Removal and Asbestos On-Site Project Management Fees

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Robert Zummallen

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Enernoc Contract

BACKGROUND

Enernoc is a company that provides Demand Response Programs for businesses and schools. They are located in Glen Ellyn. A presentation will be given by Dan Docel, Business Development Manager for Enernoc.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enernoc will provide an annual income from Electrical curtailment for the School District in the amount of \$12,720. The projections are in the attached proposal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A recommendation will be presented to accept the proposal from Enernoc at the February regularly schedule Board of Education meeting.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910



To: Robert Zummallen, OPRFHS

January 26, 2010 From: Brian Gallagher Re: Summary of EnerNOC's proposal for OPRFHS

Bob. to recap our discussions:

As we've discussed, EnerNOC offers OPRFHS a no cost, no risk opportunity to earn \$26,000 to \$30,000 or more over the next three years by supporting a reliable electric grid. The advantages of EnerNOC include:

1. Financial Strength EnerNOC is the market leader in Demand Response solutions. By any financial standard, EnerNOC is the leading non utility provider. The lack of liquidity of some of

our competitors calls into question the ability to pay revenues when they are due to clients. One of my contacts recently told me he checked D&B on EnerNOC and our other local competitor and we were far more creditworthy. Unlike other providers, EnerNOC has no debt and does not pledge revenues from the grid as collateral to their third party lenders. We've never been late on a contractual payment. We have a blue chip client base, and respectfully suggest

Energy EnerNOC COMV Connect Market Cap: 803.57M 7.17M 278.52M Employ ees: 370 30 Qtrly Rev Growth (yoy): 133.60% 36.70% -11.00% Revenue (ttm): 183.61M 91.02M 21.0M Gross Margin (ttm): 46.46% 41.89% 34.50% Cash on Hand (3Q 09) (000's) \$ 137,800 \$ 50,800 \$ 1,600 Net Assets (3Q 09) (000's) \$ 183,000 \$ 29,259 \$

From Yahoo Financial Webpage

that the leading office building manager in North America (if not the world) should partner with the leading Demand Response provider.

- 2. <u>Technological Advantages</u> EnerNOC provides PowerTrak, an on site server which provides visibility into real time electrical usage. This allows EnerNOC to guide our clients through a test or event in real time. Our clients have access to PowerTrak via the internet year round. Many of them use Power Trak to reduce electrical costs on a regular basis. This is the beginning of a "Smart Grid" solution which is provided to you at no cost.
- 3. Emphasis on Real Time Support due to 2010 PLC methodology. As you've now seen ComEd's PLC calculation for 2010 did not include a "weather adjustment" as it did in 2009. Therefore, in most cases, your PLC's will approximate your peak summer loads. For you to maximize the benefit of the highest \$/MW paid by PJM in ComEd in the program's history (\$63,000 vs 09's \$37,000), Real Time insight into your one hour test event or (unlikely) emergency event will be critical. Only EnerNOC offers Power Trak, at our cost, to give you this insight.
- 4. Economic Program EnerNOC offers complete participation in the PJM Economic program in addition to the capacity program. Real time prices, as you know, have been relatively low. Therefore, there is little opportunity in this program at the moment. However, assuming Real Time prices will make this program economically rewarding. EnerNOC offers the same opportunity as other providers.
- 5. No Cost or Risk for Non Performance There is absolutely no cost or risk to your buildings to participate in the EnerNOC demand response programs - Economic or Capacity (described below). EnerNOC installs Power Trak at its cost. There are no monthly fees either, and if your building does not achieve the reduction targeted, EnerNOC bears the out of pocket risk. ComEd doubles the total commitment From the ComEd pdf describing ComEd's comparable program:

(of events and hours) and would pass any penalty through to you on your monthly bill. (see box at right)

Penalty for participant's failure to interrupt.

The participant will be responsible for any penalties or other economic consequences assessed to the Company by PJM as a result of the Participant's failure to comply with an Event initiated by PJM or the Company.



6. More revenue from EnerNOC Finally, per the chart Below, we will pay you based upon your targeted reduction, and still offer Power Trak and our financial security - an estimated \$43,000 per MW benefit at no cost or risk over three years, with a limited window of performance excluding the period after August 20 of each year.

You earn revenue based upon the amount of Kilowatt Hours (KWH) you target to reduce when called EnerNOC clients without backup generators generally target 15-20% of their peak load, or more.

40.0%

| KWH Reduction targeted | 400 | 500 | 600 | 700 | 800 | 900 | 1,000 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| Net to you - 2010 | \$ 10,176 | \$ 12,720 | \$ 15,264 | \$ 17,808 \$ | 20,352 \$ | 22,896 \$ | 25,440 |
| Net to you- 2011 | \$ 6,400 | \$ 8,000 | \$ 9,600 | \$ 11,200 \$ | 12,800 \$ | 14,400 \$ | 16,000 |
| Net to you -2012 | \$ 960 | \$ 1,200 | \$ 1,440 | \$ 1,680 \$ | 1,920 \$ | 2,160 \$ | 2,400 |
| 3 year total | \$ 17,536 | \$ 21,920 | \$ 26,304 | \$ 30,688 \$ | 35,072 \$ | 39,456 \$ | 43,840 |

7. Obligations under the program

To recap, the program is intended to relieve primarily weather related stress on the grid by registering large electrical users willing to reduce their electrical load (in lieu of using more natural gas peaker plants to avoid blackouts).

The pure obligation is up to 10 separate 6 hour events, between 11am and 7pm, Monday to Friday, from June 1 to Sept. 30 (normally - but we will limit your participation to June 1 to Aug 20 of each year for a special split of 40/60.)

Because no events have been called, PJM instituted a one hour test in 2009 to validate facilities registrations (i.e., you must pass a one hour test to establish the amount you registered for a possible 6 hour event is in good faith). If you fail either the 6 hour emergency events or the one hour test, the payments you may have received will be reduced. If you fail the one hour test badly enough, PJM may assess an out of pocket penalty.

Note EnerNOC will absorb any penalty, so you have no out of pocket risk with EnerNOC. unlike other providers of this program.

EnerNOC will use Power Trak, our real time load monitoring system, also available to you over the Internet, to guide you through the one hour test.

In the unlikely event of a 6 hour emergency, you'll get partial credit, and, keep in mind, that if the program isn't successful (in reducing load on the grid), you may black or brown out anyway.

In sum, we'll guide you through a one hour test, at no cost or risk to you, and you'll have the benefit of our Power Trak system year round to better manage your energy consumption.

8. Participating in a Demand Response program should be a no-brainer – it's a sustainable. green energy program that pays you thousands on a no cost, no risk basis to support your community and an reliable electric grid. The key question is - who should your partner be? We respectfully request that it be EnerNOC.

I've attached our standard agreement and a comparison with ComEd's version of this program. I'll call to follow up shortly. Thanks for your consideration.

Brian Gallagher OPRFHS Class of 1977, Bradley U '81, JMLS '92, Northwestern MBA 2003



January 24, 2010 EnerNOC comparison to ComEd on key program characteristics:

| *************************************** | Characteristic | EnerNOC | ComEd | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1. | Is the client at Risk of Out of Pocket Charge for Non- Performance? | Under no circumstances are EnerNOC clients exposed to out of pocket penalties. EnerNOC relies on our expertise to guide you to performance, but if unsuccessful, we bear all risk. | From ComEd CLR pdf: However, nonperformance penalties will be assessed to participants not complying with requests for load reductions between June 1 and September 30. | This is a key differentiator among clients who do not wish to be exposed to a 20% out of pocket penalty for non-performance. They choose EnerNOC. |
| 2. | What Real Time Metering Support is offered? | EnerNOC offers Power Trak to read meters in 5 minute intervals in Real Time to guide you through the One hour test, any possible event, and to monitor your usage year round via Internet access. | ComEd offers EnergyInsights Online, a monthly depiction of electrical usage, not available in real time to guide you through the test or event. | EnerNOC has installed PowerTrak approximately 5,000 times across the country to provide the highest level of reliability. |
| 3. | How much notice does the Client get in advance of event? | EnerNOC's Network Operation Center provides notice 2 hours before an event. Our NOC also monitors grid load daily, and provides early warning when necessary – even a day ahead. | From ComEd CLR pdf: Participants can choose a Short Lead Time (30 minutes minimum) or a Long Lead Time (90 minutes minimum). | Generally, more notice (2hr. vs. 90 minutes) should lead to greater performance with EnerNOC. |
| 4. | How many events may be called? | EnerNOC will call no more than the PJM maximum of 10 events, and in negotiated circumstances, may limit the number further. | From ComEd CLR pdf: Participants agree to up to 15 curtailment periods per year beginning June 1 and ending May 31 of the following year. | ComEd may choose to call 5 additional 8 hour events, even if PJM does not require the effort. |
| 5. | How long are the possible events? | EnerNOC events mirror the 4-6 hour events called by PJM. | Participants will be asked to reduce their load no fewer than 2 hours and no more than 8 hours, per curtailment. Interruptions can be called any time between 11:00 am (CST) and 7:00 pm (CST). | ComEd's 8 hour events would obviously be more difficult to satisfy, potentially reducing Client payments. |
| 6. | How is the targeted reduction calculated? | EnerNOC studies client ability and compares to comparable facilities. If time permits, EnerNOC performs an acceptance test to validate registration, all aimed to generate maximum revenue for the Client and grid support. | Not certain, but some ComEd prospects have been registered at much lower levels than might have been achievable with the level of analysis EnerNOC provides | Because of EnerNOC's higher probability of success (from Power Trak and NOC support), risk insulation (no 20% penalty) and higher registered KW, more revenue can be earned. |
| 7. | What percent of the total is paid? | Because of the higher degree of value and risk assumption, EnerNOC typically retains a higher percentage of the gross than ComEd. | ComEd has offered as much as 100% of the Gross. | In light of the EnerNOC value above, EnerNOC respectfully believes it earns its higher margin. |



Demand Response Services Agreement

This Demand Response Services Agreement (this "Agreement"), effective as of ______2010 ("Effective Date"), the scope of which is described more fully below, is made by and between EnerNOC, Inc. ("EnerNOC"), located at 101 Federal St., Boston, MA 02110, and Oak Park and River Forest High School Cook Co. District 200 ("Customer"), located at 201 N Scoville, Oak Park, IL 60302. EnerNOC and Customer are defined herein as the Parties ("Parties") to this Agreement.

Term. This Agreement shall commence on the Effective Date and end on December 31, 2013 (the "Initial Term"); unless
extended by the parties' mutual written agreement.

2. EnerNOC Managed Services

- a. Scope of Services. EnerNOC agrees to manage Customer's participation in the demand response program(s), as further described in Attachment A-1 attached hereto (each individually the "Program" and collectively, the "Programs"), in accordance with the rules set forth by the applicable independent system/grid operator and/or utility, which are subject to amendment by the applicable independent system/grid operator and/or utility from time to time. EnerNOC will (i) work with Customer to develop an appropriate curtailment plan for Customer's business; (ii) complete all necessary permits and associated reporting on Customer's behalf; (iii) register Customer's Accepted Capacity (as defined in Attachment A-1); (iv) manage Customer, provide real-time support to Customer during demand response events ("Demand Response Events") via, at Customer's sole discretion, direct load control or manual implementation by Customer, as applicable; and (v) reconcile all Program payments in accordance with the rules set forth by the applicable independent system/grid operator and/or utility and as further described in Attachment A-1. In addition, as necessary, EnerNOC will coordinate with Customer's host utility to capture kilowatthour (kWh) pulses from the Customer's primary utility meter to provide Customer near real-time, Internet-enabled power monitoring.
- b. EnerNOC System. EnerNOC agrees to equip Customer with the EnerNOC system, which includes an EnerNOC Site Server ("ESS") that can, at Customer's sole discretion, enable remote generator start/stop, and/or direct load management, power metering, data collection, near real-time data communication, and Internet-based reporting and analytics. EnerNOC agrees to install, free of charge, in a good and workmanlike manner, EnerNOC Site Servers at each Customer facility address (each a "Site Address") as identified on Attachment A-2 hereto. Subsequent to the date hereof, Attachment A-2 may be updated in writing from time to time by the Parties to reflect additional Site Addresses.

3. Customer Support Requirements

- a. ESS Installation. Within fourteen (14) days of execution by Customer of this Agreement, Customer shall provide either a static or non-static, as applicable, Internet Protocol (IP) address and Local Area Network (LAN) access that allows for Internet-based communication of Site Address' electricity consumption and Demand Response Event performance. EnerNOC shall be responsible for any charges assessed by ComEd in this regard.
- Acceptance Testing. Customer agrees to collaborate with EnerNOC in testing the ESS at each Site Address in a timely manner prior to registering with the Program(s).
- c. Event Performance. Customer agrees to use commercially reasonable efforts to generate and/or reduce electrical demand to achieve Accepted Capacity as defined in <u>Attachment A-1</u> at each Site Address when notified by EnerNOC during Demand Response Events. Customer and EnerNOC understand that the curtailable electrical capacity identified in <u>Attachment A-2</u> does not represent Accepted Capacity and is solely the Parties' best estimate of performance and that Accepted Capacity may vary.
- d. Nondisclosure to Third Parties. Customer acknowledges that, in its relationship with EnerNOC, it may receive information including (but without limitation): confidential information, business strategies, financial information, information relating to the ESS and the EnerNOC System, and information contained in this Agreement, including the terms of the revenue sharing arrangement described in Attachment A-1 (all collectively "Program information"). Customer shall not disclose any Program Information to any third party or allow any third party access to such Program Information except as required by law.
- e. Trade Secret Protection Obligations. Customer shall not alter, reverse engineer, disassemble, decompile or copy the ESS or any other EnerNOC System components and shall not allow any third party to use, access, or examine the ESS or any other EnerNOC System components.
- f. Use of Confidential Information. Customer acknowledges that EnerNOC may receive confidential information of Customer, either through data collected by the ESS and the EnerNOC System or otherwise, which may be disclosed by EnerNOC to the applicable independent system/grid operator and/or utility as solely necessary for the performance of this Agreement.

4. General Terms

a. Limitation on Liability. EnerNOC's liability hereunder is limited to direct actual damages as the sole and exclusive remedy, and total damages shall not exceed the lesser of (i) the total amount paid to Customer under this Agreement during the six-month period immediately preceding the event giving rise to the claim(s) or (ii) \$100,000. All other remedies or damages (at law, in equity, tort, contract, or otherwise) are expressly waived, including any



- indirect, punitive, special, consequential, or incidental damages, lost profit, or other business interruption damages.

 b. EnerNOC agrees to defend and indemnify, at its own expense, any third party claim against Customer, its parent corporation, affiliates, directors, employees and agents that arise due to any (i) bodily injury, death or damage to tangible personal property to the extent caused by the negligent acts or omissions of EnerNOC or its employees in the performance of this Agreement and (ii) a claim that the EnerNOC System or any goods or services provided by EnerNOC hereunder (so long as the foregoing have not been altered or modified by a party other than EnerNOC) or the use thereof by Customer infringes upon any copyright, trademark, trade secret or proprietary right of any third party. EnerNOC will pay reasonable legal fees as incurred and such damages or costs as are finally awarded against Customer or agreed to in settlement for such claim provided that Customer gives EnerNOC (i) prompt written notice of any such claim or threatened claim, (ii) sole control of the defense, negotiations and settlement of such claim, and (iii) full cooperation in any defense or settlement of the claim.
- c. Choice of Law. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois, without giving effect to choice of law rules.
- d. Miscellaneous. Customer may not assign any of its rights or delegate any of its performance obligations hereunder without the prior written consent of EnerNOC. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between Customer and EnerNOC and may only be amended in writing signed by each of the Parties. If any of its provisions shall be held invalid or unenforceable, this Agreement shall be construed as if not containing those provisions and the rights and obligations of the Parties hereto shall be construed and enforced accordingly. This Agreement shall be binding upon the Parties together with their successors and assigns.
- e. Force Majeure. The Parties shall be excused for any failure or delay in the performance of their obligations hereunder due to acts of God or any other legitimate cause beyond their reasonable control.
- f. Termination. Either Party may terminate this Agreement (i) in the event of the other Party's material breach of this Agreement; provided that the breaching Party fails to cure the specific breach within thirty (30) days following receipt of written notice from the non-breaching Party specifying the purported breach, or (ii) immediately if the Program(s) is materially altered, suspended or ended. .
- g. Notices. Any notices required or permitted to be given hereunder by either Party to the other shall be given in writing: (1) by personal delivery; (2) by electronic facsimile with confirmation sent by United States first class registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested; (3) by bonded courier or by a nationally recognized overnight delivery company; or (4) by United States first class registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, in each case, addressed to the Parties as follows (or to such other addresses as the Parties may request in writing by notice given pursuant to this Section): EnerNOC, Inc., Attn: Assistant General Counsel, 101 Federal Street, Suite 1100, Boston, MA 02110; and to the Customer at Oak Park and River Forest High School Cook Co. District 200, 201 N Scoville, Oak Park, IL 60302

| EnerNOC, Inc. | | Customer Oak | Park and River Forest High School Cook Co. District 200 |
|---------------|--|--------------|---|
| Name: | Management and the second seco | Name: | |
| Title: | | Title: | |
| Signature: | | Signature: | |
| Date: | | Date: | |



Attachment A-1 Emergency Load Response Program

- 1. **Program Description**. PJM Interconnection's (PJM) Emergency Load Response Program (ELRP) enables program participants to receive revenue for being available to reduce electricity consumption when the reliability of the electric grid is in jeopardy and voltage reductions and rolling brownouts are imminent.
- 2. **Program Rules.** The terms of this Agreement will reflect ELRP program terms and conditions, which may be amended from time to time by PJM. The current terms are summarized below:

| Program Availability | During the program period June 1-August 20 ("Program Period"), Customers must be able to respond during non-holiday weekdays from 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Availability during the period October 1-May 31 is optional. |
|----------------------------|--|
| Event Trigger | PJM will initiate Demand Response Events in ELRP in the case of a defined system emergency. |
| Advanced Notification | Customers are expected to be able to respond to an ELRP Demand Response Event notice within 120 minutes of notification from EnerNOC. |
| Event Frequency & Duration | Maximum of ten (10) Demand Response Events in a year, with event duration ranging from a minimum of one (1) hour to a maximum of six (6) hours. |
| Testing Requirement | If no Demand Response Event occurs, PJM requires EnerNOC to hold a Test Event by September 30 of the Program Period. |

- 3. Paid Capacity. "Paid Capacity" will be either (i) Accepted Capacity, if a Demand Response Event or a Test Event (collectively, a "DR Event") has not been initiated during the Program Period, or (ii) Customer's average Delivered Capacity for all DR Events initiated during the Program Period.
 - a. Accepted Capacity. "Accepted Capacity" shall represent the best estimate of Customer's expected curtailment based on analysis of consumption data and pre-enrollment testing. Customer agrees that the Accepted Capacity may be adjusted by EnerNOC in the future to reflect actual performance, changes in facility operations, Program rules, regulations and/or other relevant information.
 - b. Delivered Capacity. "Delivered Capacity" will be the calculated performance with respect to the Program baselines and as measured by the ESS following each DR Event, up to 100% of Accepted Capacity. Customer's Delivered Capacity may be adjusted by EnerNOC in the future following PJM approval of performance data from DR Events.

4. Payments

- a. Capacity Payments. Subject to Subsection 4(c) below, EnerNOC will pay Customer (i) 40% of the established PJM market clearing price obtained by EnerNOC multiplied by (ii) Paid Capacity.
- b. Energy Payments. EnerNOC will pay Customer 75% of the energy payments available from PJM to EnerNOC in connection with Customer responding to a Demand Response Event when notified by EnerNOC.
- c. Underperformance. In no event shall Customer be penalized for underperformance by being required to return money to EnerNOC. If Customer underperforms, adjustments will be made to future payments so that total payments made to Customer for the Program Period will reflect Paid Capacity for such Program Period.
- d. Payment Timing. EnerNOC shall make all payments associated with Customer's participation in the ELRP to Customer on a quarterly basis, and such payments shall be made within forty-five (45) days of EnerNOC's receipt of total payment from PJM.
- e. Payment Accrual. Subject to Subsection 4(d) hereof, payments for the 2010 Program Period will be accrued on a pro rata basis across the period beginning on the 1st of the month following the installation of the ESS and successful pre-enrollment testing and ending May 31, 2011. Thereafter, payments for subsequent Program Periods will begin to accrue on June 1 of the Program Period year and end on May 31 of the subsequent year.

5. Additional Terms

a. Curtailment Service Provider. Customer hereby designates EnerNOC as its sole curtailment services provider for the limited purpose of participating in PJM's ELRP.



Attachment A-2

| Site Address | City | State | Zip | Estimated Capacity (kW) |
|---|----------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Oak Park and River Forest High School 201 N Scoville Ave | Oak Park | IL. | 60302 | 500 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |



ACCOUNT INFORMATION RELEASE AUTHORIZATION FORM (Rev. 07-10-06)

This document authorizes Commonwealth Edison Company ("ConEd") to release to you or your agent, evailable billing and usage data.
Customer-Specific Customer Ivansition Charges ("Custom CICs"), Peak Load Contribution (PLC) values and/or Post 2006 Supply Group data.
The following types of data are available:

Summary Data – Kilowatt-how, kilowatt and dollar amount billed summarized by account per billing period. There is no charge for summary data with the exception of written requests for data exceeding 10 accounts. A \$5.00 postage and handling fee will be charged for each account in excess of the first 10 accounts on a single request.

<u>linterval Data</u> – Half-hour demand data for non-residential accounts having recording-type meters. A \$15.00 fee per meter on the account will be charged for all interval data requests.

Meter-Level Summary Data - Kilowatt-hour, kilowatt and Peak kilowatt demand data, where applicable, summarized by individual meter for each active meter on the account per billing period. A \$5.00 fee per meter on the account will be charged.

Custom CTCs - The current value that has been calculated for accounts having Custom CTCs and/or a multiple-year CTC term of contract ("CTC-MY term of contract"), if applicable, are available without charge. A \$10.00 fee per account may be charged for each Custom CTC when complete Custom CTC Calculation Detail is ordered.

<u>PLC Value</u> - A customer's contribution to a zone's normalized summer peak load, as estimated by the zone's Electric Distribution Company (EDC). PLC is used to determine a Load Serving Entity's (LSE's) Obligation peak load.

Post 2006 Supply Group - Each customer has been assigned to a supply group per Rider CPP- Competitive Procurement Process.

| Account Name: | | *Account Number | F | ***** |
|--|---|--|----------------------|---|
| Contact Name: | | * Meter Number: Telephone Numbe | | |
| Usage Data Type: Summary | | | PLC Value | Supply Group |
| CTC's: Current CTC value | _ Current CTC-M | TY term of contract | Custom CTC Ca | lculation Detail |
| Delivery Method:CD Rom | Email | US Mail – (Not available fe | r Interval Data) | |
| Mailing Address: | | City: | State: Z | IP: |
| Email Address: | | | | |
| *For multiple accounts, please list all ac | | | and attach with this | form. |
| Customer Name | ., | | Title | |
| | | | | |
| Customer Signature | MANAGEMENT OF THE STATE OF THE | | Date | ······································ |
| 2. General Account Agents/Supplier | rs: (Required only if | data is to be delivered to an A | zent or Supplier) | |
| Agent/Supplier Name: | | | | *************************************** |
| Mailing Address: | ar | City: | State: | ZP: |
| Contact Name: | | Telepiione Ni | ımber: | |
| Email Address: | | The second secon | | |
| 3. Billing Information: (Required for a | | | * | , |
| | | Account Number: | | |
| | このはこのできますのたとのをプラットできませんがあるか。 | nav por Sederane involeti | | |
| Charge Customer's Comba Acco | s selbre estreense chetran c | | | |

Swift Drive, Oak Brook, IL 60523

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Robert Zummallen/Tim Keeley

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Executive Summary for Waste Disposal and Recycling Services

BACKGROUND

On January 28, 2010, proposals were solicited for the District's refuse and recycling needs. Currently, the District's needs are met by Waste Management, Inc., the Village of Oak Park's waste hauler. All billing was negotiated and coordinated through the Village. In the past quarter, the District has seen a dramatic increase in the cost of this service, with very little notice or detail, to the current cost of \$3,644.90 per month, or \$43,738.80 annually. As the District has no legal obligation or contract in place with the Village of Oak Park for this service, it was determined that it would be best to allow the market, through an RFP process, to determine a fair price for this service.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Proposals were received from four vendors; Allied Waste, Flood Brothers, Veolia Environmental and Waste Management. Vendors were given the District's pickup schedule as well as daily usage statistics to aid in the pricing of the services. Results are below:

| CURRENT AGREEMENT | Monthly Cost | | Annual Cost |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Village of Oak Park/Waste Mgmt. | \$3644.90 | | \$43,738.80 |
| RFP PROPOSALS | Monthly Cost | Price per additional yd.* | Annual Cost! |
| Allied Waste | \$1,370.00 | \$8.00 | \$20,280.00 |
| Flood Brothers | \$1,675.00 | \$7.00 | \$23,460.00 |
| Veolia | \$2,193.60 | \$3.75 | \$28,123.20 |
| Waste Management | \$1,769.20 | \$13.00 | \$26,222.40 |

^{*}District requires approximately 10 additional yards of unbound refuse pickup per week.!Includes estimated charges for unbound refuse pickup per the vendor proposal price per yard.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

Award the contract to Allied Waste, whose references were all very positive. In fact, they do all waste hauling and recycling for Chicago Public Schools.

Allied has also pledged to work closely with the District 200 Green Committee as well as our student body to enhance our recycling efforts and reduce waste throughout the building. The initial focus will be in one of the most challenging recycling applications, the cafeterias.

The net annual savings will be \$23,458.80.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education

FROM: John Stelzer/Tim Keeley

DATE: February 16, 2010

RE: Executive Bid Summary for Fall 2010 Athletic Uniforms

BACKGROUND

On February 2, 2010, bids were solicited for fall athletic uniforms. Items in this bid include Football uniforms, Girls Swimming warm-ups, Girls Volleyball uniforms, Wrestling singlets, Wrestling warm-ups, Boys Swimming warm-ups and Boys Baseball warm-up jackets.. Team uniforms are on a revolving 4-year replacement schedule that will allow for OPRFHS athletes to have high quality competition wear while amortizing the expense of new uniforms over a reasonable period of time.

In concert with the head coaches, the Athletic Director compiled a list of specifications for products to fulfill the needs of the sports listed above. Quality, functionality, and value of the products were all taken into consideration. Emphasis was placed on quality to ensure that the product purchased would meet the needs of the athletic program and be resilient enough to maintain functionality until the next replacement date.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Responses to the solicitation were received from three vendors: Boathouse Sports, Riddell, and Salkeld Sports. Riddell sent back a response of "No bid." Results are as follows:

Salkeld

Boathouse

| SIGNED PRICE SHEET | | YES | YES |
|----------------------------|----|------------------|-----------------|
| REFERENCES PROVIDED | | YES | YES |
| NON-COLLUSION AFFIDAVIT | | YES | YES |
| PROJECT QUALIFICATION FORM | | YES | YES |
| PRICING | B | <u>Soathouse</u> | <u>Salkeld</u> |
| FOOTBALL UNIFORMS | \$ | 7,000.00(A) | \$ 10,500.00 |
| GIRLS SWIMMING WARM-UPS | | NO BID | \$ 1,792.00 |
| GIRLS VOLLEYBALL UNIFORMS | | NO BID | \$ 920.00 |
| WRESTLING SINGLETS | | NO BID | \$ 1608.00 |
| WRESTLING WARM-UPS | \$ | 2,664.00 | \$ 4,440.00 |
| BOYS SWIMMING WARM-UPS | | NO BID | \$ 1,792.00 |
| BOYS BASEBALL WARM-UPS | | NO BID | \$ 2,212.00 |
| | | | |

(A) Did not meet product specifications

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

In reviewing the bids from the two qualified bidders, the following awards have been recommended:

- Award the Wrestling warm-ups to Boathouse Sports. The District has worked with Boathouse on several sportswear items over the years and have found them to be a quality vendor.
- Award the Football uniforms to Salkeld Sports. The apparent low-bidder, Boathouse, provided samples of the product that they quoted. The Athletic Director found them to not be comparable to the specified product. The particular brand that was specified has not been on the market long enough for the District to confirm the product's long-term wear. Specific references for the product were not available at the time of the bid.
- Award the remaining items to Salkeld Sports. The District has worked with Salkeld on several sportswear items over the past five years and have found them to be a quality vendor.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprflis.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent

DATE:

February 10, 2010

RE:

Village of Oak Park Student Parking Fees

BACKGROUND

The Village of Oak Park has raised student parking fees for students attending schools within the boundaries of Oak Park. The Village will, however, reduce the cost of those permits by 30% for those students if 1. the schools which the students attend purchase all of the student parking permits for students at those schools for the full year prior to the beginning of that school year; and 2. that school agrees to administer the distribution of all such permits. In addition, the Village has a two tiered structure: one tier for Oak Park resident students, and one tier for non-Oak Park resident students. Below, please find information about the parking fees and 30% reduction.

| Student | Posted | 30% | Actual Student Cost | Posted | 30% | Actual Student Cost |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Status | 2009-2010 | Reduction | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | Reduction | 2010-2011 |
| Resident | \$160 | \$48 | \$112 | \$240 | \$72 | \$168 |
| Non-Resident | \$240 | \$72 | \$168 | \$320 | \$96 | \$224 |

For 2009-2010, OPRF did purchase the parking permits prior to the start of the school year and students benefited from the 30% reduction. The District purchases 200 student parking permits, and 125 are for Oak Park students and 75 are for River Forest students.

SUMMARY

We believe that the parking fee structure as passed by the Village of Oak Park is an unequal and unfair treatment of District 200 students who by virtue of being residents of the District (Oak Park or River Forest) should be treated equally. The District has not viewed itself nor have the Villages or the communities viewed our students in such separate and segregated ways before. OPRF is viewed as one of if not the most important institution within both Villages precisely because it is comprised of our greatest assets from both Villages: students. The District principle is that students should be treated equally. The Village seeks to raise money through parking fees. The challenge then is to find some common ground which embraces both.

The DLT has been considering this issue since the Village revised its parking ordinance, and believe it is in the District's, our students', and the two communities' best interest to do the following.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708)

434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

- 1. Purchase student parking permits from the Village prior to the start of the school year, take advantage of the 30% savings, and pass these along to our students.
- 2. Engage Village Trustees in discussions regarding the issue and make our case for equal treatment of all District 200 students regardless of their residency: \$168 for each permit.
- 3. Preparing for the 2010-2011 school year, outline options for the Board to consider. Options include the following:
 - a. equalize all student parking fees by purchasing the permits prior to the school year and selling them at a price equal for all students. In this option, the District would purchase 125 permits X \$168 = \$21,000, and 75 permits X \$224 = \$16,800 for a total of \$37,800. Equalizing this cost among all 200 permits would result in all students paying \$189 per permit. This is \$21 more for each Oak Park student and \$35 less for each River Forest Student. Oak Park students would be "underwriting" a reduction for River Forest students; **OR**
 - c. make-up the difference between the two tiered fee structure. In this option, the District would charge River Forest students \$168 (the same as Oak Park students) and pay the difference of \$4,200 to the Village; **OR**
 - d. entreat the Village to equalize the cost of all student parking permits to \$168, and designate 33 spaces along the east side of Linden from Lake St. to Erie for student parking. The Village would realize \$39,144, which is \$1,344 more than it would with its plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Board direct the Administration to undertake the following:

- 1. purchase student parking permits from the Village prior to the start of the school year, take advantage of the 30% savings, and pass these along to our students;
- 2. engage Village Trustees in discussions regarding the issue and make our case for equal treatment of all District 200 students regardless of their residency: \$168 for each permit; and
- 3.c.if student parking permit fees do not change, pursue option d. as outlined above.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708)

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Cheryl L. Witham

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Student Fees for Fiscal Year 2010 - 2011

BACKGROUND

Each year the administration reviews the student fees.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The athletic Pay to Play fee will increase by \$5.00, all other fees will remain the same as last year.

| Description | Amount | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Freshman | \$85.00 | | | | |
| Sophomore | \$245.00 | | | | |
| Juniors | \$60.00 | | | | |
| Seniors | \$95.00 | | | | |
| Pay to Play | \$55.00 | | | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

To approve the recommended student fees at the February 25th Board of Education meeting.

TEL: (708) 383-0700

WEB: www.oprfhs.org

TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500

FAX: (708) 434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Cheryl L. Witham

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Executive Summary for Banking Services from Community Bank

BACKGROUND

At the January Finance Committee meeting, discussion was had about the funds the District currently has deposited at the former Park National Bank, now U.S. Bank. Park National is no longer a locally owned bank and the Board stated a preference to maintain some District funds at a local bank.

The District currently maintains 2 accounts at U.S. Bank, one for the student activity accounts and the other for an imprest account. The student activity account generally has between \$200,000 and \$300,000 while the imprest account generally has \$25,000.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Martin Noll, Ruth McLaren, and Bob Ellison, all of Community Bank met with me and Doug Wiley to discuss the District's needs as they relate to these two accounts. It was determined that simple business checking accounts would most effectively meet those needs.

The District currently pays between \$30 and \$100 per month in fees for the student activity account and between \$10 and \$20 in fees for the imprest account. Total Park National Bank fees were \$622.26.

Community Bank is proposing to charge \$50 per month in fees for both accounts for 12 months. The fee would be reevaluated at the end of 12 months and adjusted if appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

To move the funds currently held at U.S. Bank to Community Bank due to its local ownership and reduced fees.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Cheryl L. Witham

DATE: February 16, 2010

RE: Approval of PTAB Resolution

BACKGROUND

The administration is asking the Board of Education to consider this resolution giving the administration, in conjunction with our law firm Franczek, Radelet P.C. authority to file a Request to Intervene in Appeal Proceedings for the re-assessment of property within our District.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

These PTAB requests have a negative effect on our property tax collection in subsequent years and the revenue cannot be recaptured. This request is necessary because the District must intervene within 30 days of notice. This is often too short a time period to bring the issue before the Board of Education.

This resolution must be approved by the Board of Education on an annual basis.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

This resolution will be presented to the Board of Education for approval at the Regular Board of Education meeting on February 25, 2010.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

Resolution Authorizing Intervention in Proceedings before the State of Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board

Whereas, an owner or manager of a parcel or parcels of real property located within the boundaries of the State of Illinois has the right to file an appeal challenging the assessed value of the parcel or parcels of real property with the State of Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board ("PTAB"); and

Whereas, a reduction in the assessed value of a parcel or parcels granted by the PTAB will lead to the issuance of a real estate tax refund from the Board of Education of Oak Park & River Forest High School District No. 200 ("Board"); and

Whereas, a taxing district has the right to intervene in proceedings before the PTAB in order to protect the taxing district's revenue interest in the assessed value of a parcel or parcels; and

Whereas, the time period during which a taxing district may intervene is 60 days after the taxing district's receipt, from the Cook County Board of Review, of notice of the filing of an appeal by an owner or manager of a parcel or parcels of real property; and

Whereas, the Board has determined that it is necessary, desirable, advantageous, and in the public interest to defend the Board's real property tax base by intervening in PTAB appeals filed on parcels within the boundaries of the Board.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, by the Board of Education of Oak Park & River Forest High School District No. 200, Cook County, Illinois, as follows:

- 1. The Board finds that all of the recitals contained above are true and correct, and that the same are hereby incorporated herein by reference.
- 2. The Board hereby authorizes Franczek Radelet P.C., as its legal representative, to: a) file a Request to Intervene in Appeal Proceedings in all 2008-2010 assessment-year appeals filed at the PTAB for which the Board receives notice from the Cook County Board of Review, and b) represent the Board's interests in those proceedings.
- 3. All motions and resolutions or parts thereof in conflict with the provisions of this Resolution are, to the extent of such conflict, hereby repealed.
- 4. If any section, paragraph, clause, or provision of this Resolution shall be held invalid, the invalidity of such section, paragraph, clause, or provision shall not affect any of the other sections, paragraphs, clauses, or provisions of this Resolution.
- 5. This Resolution shall be in force and effect upon its adoption.

| After a full and complete discussion thereof | , Member moved that the |
|--|---|
| foregoing Resolution be adopted and Member | seconded the motion. The |
| President directed the Secretary to call the i | roll for a vote upon the motion to adopt this |
| Resolution. Upon a roll call vote taken, the Boa | rd of Education voted as follows: |
| | |
| AYES: | |
| | |
| NAYS: | |
| | |
| Abstaining: | |
| PRESENT: | |
| | |
| Absent from Meeting: | |
| | |
| The President declared the motion carried | a and the Resolution duly adopted. |
| | |
| | |
| Dated: | By: |
| | By:President, Board of Education |
| | |
| ATTEST | |
| | |
| | |
| Secretary, Board of Education | |

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Cheryl Witham

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Financial Reports

BACKGROUND

It is a requirement that the Board of Education accepts and approves the monthly Financial Reports.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Attached are the Financial Reports for December, 2009.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

The December, 2009 Financial Reports, will be presented to the Board of Education for approval at the February 25th, Board of Education meeting.

TEL: (708) 383-0700

WEB: www.oprfhs.org

TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500

FAX: (708) 434-3910

Education Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | % | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| Receipts | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 44,164,908 | 22,333,430 | 50.6% | 44,221,578 | 22,949,760 | 51.9% | |
| Other Local Sources | 1,981,881 | 1,230,350 | 62.1% | 3,400,620 | 1,818,537 | 53.5% | |
| State Sources | 2,690,855 | 1,414,009 | 52.5% | 2,416,324 | 1,266,636 | 52.4% | |
| Federal Sources | 1,889,503 | 770,355 | 40.8% | 2,467,161 | 1,008,095 | 40.9% | |
| Transfers/Other | · · · · · <u>-</u> | - | N/A | - | - | N/A | |
| | 50,727,147 | 25,748,144 | 50.8% | 52,505,683 | 27,043,028 | 51.5% | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | |
| General Instruction | 19,702,602 | 7,722,128 | 39.2% | 20,572,513 | 7,240,975 | 35.2% | Ĭ |
| Special Education | 5,003,467 | 1,913,857 | 38.3% | 5,592,252 | 2,051,635 | 36.7% | |
| Adult Education | 19,910 | 6,000 | 30.1% | 20,282 | 6,000 | 29.6% | |
| Vocational Programs | 249,593 | 146,291 | 58.6% | 417,685 | 161,771 | 38.7% | 2 |
| Interscholastic Programs | 1,951,064 | 828,362 | 42.5% | 2,055,238 | 802,732 | 39.1% | |
| Summer School | 240,965 | 128,070 | 53.1% | 309,488 | 164,353 | 53.1% | |
| Drivers Education | 688,371 | 257,617 | 37.4% | 761,763 | 267,663 | 35.1% | |
| Other Instructional | 2,897,717 | 936,695 | 32.3% | 2,966,188 | 1,047,367 | 35.3% | 3 |
| Support Srvs Pupil | 6,436,368 | 2,452,841 | 38.1% | 7,144,050 | 2,573,819 | 36.0% | |
| Support Srys Admin. | 4,817,602 | 2,161,368 | 44.9% | 4,653,551 | 2,103,540 | 45.2% | |
| Transfers | | | N/A | | | N/A | |
| | 42,007,660 | 16,553,229 | 39.4% | 44,493,010 | 16,419,855 | 36.9% | |
| Change in Fund Balance | 8,719,488 | 9,194,915 | | 8,012,673 | 10,623,173 | | |
| Beginning Balance | 43,852,612 | 43,852,612 | | 52,572,100 | 52,572,100 | | |
| Ending Balance | 52,572,100 | 53,047,527 | | 60,584,773 | 63,195,273 | | |

^{1.} Prior year numbers include 10 faculty payrolls and current year only include 9.

^{2.} Expenditures for POET summer youth work grant were less than anticipated.

^{3.} Private facility tuition was billed to the District more timely in the current year.

Bookstore Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | % |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Other Local Sources | 853,433 | 608,377 | 71.3% | 899,427 | 571,508 | 63.5% 1 |
| | 853,433 | 608,377 | 71.3% | 899,427 | 571,508 | 63.5% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Other | 850,404 | 608,303 | 71.5% | 895,999 | 661,265 | 73.8% |
| | 850,404 | 608,303 | 71.5% | 895,999 | 661,265 | 73.8% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 3,029 | 74 | | 3,428 | (89,757) | |
| Beginning Balance | 692,810 | 692,810 | | 695,839 | 695,839 | |
| Ending Balance | 695,839 | 692,884 | | 699,267 | 606,082 | |

^{1.} The District has had an increase in the number of students who qualify for free or reduced textbooks.

Cafeteria Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | ⁰ / ₀ | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | % |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Receipts | | • | | | | |
| Other Local Sources | 2,015,691 | 894,343 | 44.4% | 2,084,204 | 843,563 | 40.5% |
| State Sources | 15,198 | 6,627 | 43.6% | 7,812 | 6,649 | 85.1% |
| Federal Sources | 251,914 | 90,941 | 36.1% | 249,266 | 67,646 | 27.1% |
| | 2,282,803 | 991,911 | 43.5% | 2,341,282 | 917,858 | 39.2% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Admin. | 2,297,317 | 956,924 | 41.7% | 2,309,947 | 856,143 | 37.1% |
| | 2,297,317 | 956,924 | 41.7% | 2,309,947 | 856,143 | 37.1% |
| Change in Fund Balance | (14,514) | 34,987 | | 31,335 | 61,715 | |
| Beginning Balance | 288,795 | 288,795 | | 274,281 | 274,281 | |
| Ending Balance | 274,281 | 323,782 | | 305,616 | 335,996 | |

Operations and Maintenance Fund

| | . 14. 1 | Fiscal to Date | | Original | Fiscal to Date | |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| | Audited | December 31 | | Budget | December 31 | |
| | 2008-2009 | <u>2008</u> | % | 2009-2010 | <u>2009</u> | % |
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 5,135,149 | 2,605,337 | 50.7% | 5,732,755 | 2,783,088 | 48.5% |
| Other Local Sources | 1,509,893 | 752,840 | 49.9% | 1,073,525 | 697,604 | 65.0% 1 |
| Transfers | 22,799 | | 0.0% | 48,480 | | 0.0% |
| | 6,667,841 | 3,358,177 | 50.4% | 6,854,760 | 3,480,692 | 50.8% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Admin. | 6,227,164 | 3,241,453 | 52.1% | 6,198,860 | 3,311,149 | 53.4% |
| | 6,227,164 | 3,241,453 | 52.1% | 6,198,860 | 3,311,149 | 53.4% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 440,677 | 116,724 | | 655,900 | 169,543 | |
| Beginning Balance | 8,603,680 | 8,603,680 | | 9,044,357 | 9,044,357 | |
| Ending Balance | 9,044,357 | 8,720,404 | | 9,700,257 | 9,213,900 | |

^{1.} Replacement tax collections have been greater than anticipated in the budget.

Life Safety Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | % |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 1,088,490 | 533,981 | 49.1% | 1,734,662 | 609,894 | 35.2% |
| Other Local Sources | 6,089 | 2,675 | 43.9% | 3,045 | 513 | 16.8% |
| | 1,094,579 | 536,656 | 49.0% | 1,737,707 | 610,407 | 35.1% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Business | 427,713 | 238,029 | 55.7% | 963,537 | 862,829 | 89.5% 1 |
| Transfers | 616,525 | | 0.0% | 618,263 | | 0.0% |
| | 1,044,238 | 238,029 | 22.8% | 1,581,800 | 862,829 | 54.5% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 50,342 | 298,627 | | 155,907 | (252,422) | |
| Beginning Balance | 304,795 | 304,795 | | 355,137 | 355,137 | |
| Ending Balance | 355,137 | 603,422 | | 511,044 | 102,715 | |

^{1.} Summer life safety projects were paid monthly rather than being billed completely at the end.

Bond and Interest Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | % |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Receipts | | _ | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 2,922,267 | 1,518,576 | 52.0% | 2,958,262 | 1,499,630 | 50.7% |
| Other Local Sources | 22,799 | 14,788 | 64.9% | 48,480 | 25,176 | 51.9% |
| Transfer | 616,525 | - | 0.0% | 618,263 | - | 0.0% |
| | 3,561,591 | 1,533,364 | 43.1% | 3,625,005 | 1,524,806 | 42.1% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Debt Service | 3,482,804 | 3,277,370 | 94.1% | 3,482,174 | 3,288,944 | 94.5% |
| Transfers | 22,799 | | 0.0% | 48,480 | | 0.0% |
| | 3,505,603 | 3,277,370 | 93.5% | 3,530,654 | 3,288,944 | 93.2% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 55,988 | (1,744,006) | | 94,351 | (1,764,138) | |
| Beginning Balance | 2,412,901 | 2,412,901 | | 2,468,889 | 2,468,889 | |
| Ending Balance | 2,468,889 | 668,895 | | 2,563,240 | 704,751 | |

Transportation Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | °⁄₀ |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 828,502 | 424,371 | 51.2% | 878,289 | 444,525 | 50.6% |
| Other Local Sources | 24,237 | 14,754 | 60.9% | 40,964 | 28,932 | 70.6% |
| State Sources | 728,472 | 362,783 | 49.8% | 650,354 | 380,772 | 58.5% |
| | 1,581,211 | 801,908 | 50.7% | 1,569,607 | 854,229 | 54.4% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Business | 1,367,241 | 519,981 | 38.0% | 1,488,837 | 567,575 | 38.1% |
| | 1,367,241 | 519,981 | 38.0% | 1,488,837 | 567,575 | 38.1% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 213,970 | 281,927 | | 80,770 | 286,654 | |
| Beginning Balance | 1,900,877 | 1,900,877 | | 2,114,847 | 2,114,847 | |
| Ending Balance | 2,114,847 | 2,182,804 | | 2,195,617 | 2,401,501 | |

Illinois Municipal Retirement/Social Security Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | ⁰ / ₆ | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | 0/6 |
|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Receipts | | • | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 2,044,839 | 1,049,421 | 51.3% | 2,209,285 | 1,094,796 | 49.6% |
| Other Local Sources | 89,867 | 7,319 | 8.1% | 95,721 | 16,909 | 17.7% |
| | 2,134,706 | 1,056,740 | 49.5% | 2,305,006 | 1,111,705 | 48.2% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| General Instruction | 295,293 | 110,819 | 37.5% | 364,875 | 122,474 | 33.6% |
| Special Education | 190,401 | 71,971 | 37.8% | 211,798 | 66,180 | 31.2% |
| Vocational Programs | 19,569 | 7,856 | 40.1% | 24,675 | 12,229 | 49.6% |
| Interscholastic Programs | 120,653 | 53,367 | 44.2% | 119,993 | 44,708 | 37.3% |
| Summer School | 7,329 | 4,043 | 55.2% | 808 | 5,308 | 656.9% 1 |
| Drivers Education | 4,865 | 1,947 | 40.0% | 7,467 | 2,015 | 27.0% |
| Other Instructional | 1,199 | 446 | 37.2% | 1,021 | 439 | 43.0% |
| Support Srvs Pupil | 336,739 | 139,145 | 41.3% | 390,326 | 126,640 | 32.4% |
| Support Srvs Admin. | 866,120 | 432,512 | 49.9% | 885,889 | 387,496 | 43.7% |
| | 1,842,167 | 822,106 | 44.6% | 2,006,852 | 767,489 | 38.2% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 292,539 | 234,634 | | 298,154 | 344,216 | |
| Beginning Balance | 1,031,102 | 1,031,102 | | 1,323,641 | 1,323,641 | |
| Ending Balance | 1,323,641 | 1,265,736 | | 1,621,795 | 1,667,857 | |

^{1.} Budget does not take into account IMRF benefits for summer school TA's. This will be amended in the spring.

Working Cash Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | 9/9 | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | °/ ₀ |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | 1,031,330 | 480,722 | 46.6% | 1,089,966 | 516,955 | 47.4% |
| Other Local Sources | 62,643 | 37,078 | 59.2% | 117,249 | 83,187 | 70.9% |
| Bond Proceds | _ | | N/A | | 1,000,000 | N/A |
| | 1,093,973 | 517,800 | 47.3% | 1,207,215 | 1,600,142 | 132.5% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Transfers | | * | N/A | | | N/A |
| | - | | N/A | * | - | N/A |
| Change in Fund Balance | 1,093,973 | 517,800 | | 1,207,215 | 1,600,142 | |
| Beginning Balance | 4,206,977 | 4,206,977 | | 5,300,950 | 5,300,950 | |
| Ending Balance | 5,300,950 | 4,724,777 | | 6,508,165 | 6,901,092 | |

^{1.} Proceeds from sale of bonds will be transferred to the O&M fund.

Tort Immunity Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | % | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | ⁹ /6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Receipts | | _ | _ | | ·- | |
| Property Taxes | 1,137,610 | 585,888 | 51.5% | 1,184,844 | 610,537 | 51.5% |
| Other Local Sources | 18,847 | 10,059 | 53.4% | 15,000 | 22,014 | 146.8% |
| | 1,156,457 | 595,947 | 51.5% | 1,199,844 | 632,551 | 52.7% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Support Srvs Admin. | 894,193 | 718,695 | 80.4% | 1,013,645 | 652,830 | 64.4% 1 |
| | 894,193 | 718,695 | 80.4% | 1,013,645 | 652,830 | 64.4% |
| Change in Fund Balance | 262,264 | (122,748) | | 186,199 | (20,279) | |
| Beginning Balance | 1,655,512 | 1,655,512 | | 1,917,776 | 1,917,776 | |
| Ending Balance | 1,917,776 | 1,532,764 | | 2,103,975 | 1,897,497 | |

^{1.} Decrease due to lower cost for worker's compensation insurance premium in the current year.

Dental Self Insurance Fund

| | Audited 2008-2009 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2008 | 9/0 | Original Budget 2009-2010 | Fiscal to Date December 31 2009 | 0/6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Receipts | | | | - | | |
| Insurance Premiums | 418,388 | 163,430 | 39.1% | 453,053 | 158,711 | 35.0% |
| Other Local Sources | 1,917 | 1,150 | 60.0% | 2,000 | 2,356 | 117.8% |
| | 420,304 | 164,580 | 39.2% | 455,053 | 161,067 | 35.4% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Staff Services | 434,677 | 213,265 | 49.1% | 453,053 | 159,138 | 35.1% 1 |
| Change in Fund Balance | (14,372) | (48,685) | | 2,000 | 1,929 | |
| Beginning Balance | 157,772 | 157,772 | | 143,400 | 143,400 | |
| Ending Balance | 143,400 | 109,087 | | 145,400 | 145,329 | |

^{1.} Dental claims have been less each month of fiscal 2010 compared to 2009.

Medical Self Insurance Fund

| | Audited | Fiscal to Date December 31 | | Original Budget | Fiscal to Date December 31 | |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| | 2008-2009 | 2008 | % | 2009-2010 | 2009 | 0/6 |
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Insurance Premiums | 4,178,002 | 2,082,767 | 49.9% | 4,378,763 | 2,095,748 | 47.9% |
| Other Local Sources | 20,467 | 11,633 | 56.8% | 15,000 | 33,126 | 220.8% |
| | 4,198,469 | 2,094,400 | 49.9% | 4,393,763 | 2,128,874 | 48.5% |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Staff Services | 3,404,305 | 1,685,534 | 49.5% | 4,378,763 | 1,533,317 | 35.0% 1 |
| Change in Fund Balance | 794,164 | 408,866 | | 15,000 | 595,557 | |
| Beginning Balance | 800,804 | 800,804 | | 1,594,968 | 1,594,968 | |
| Ending Balance | 1,594,968 | 1,209,670 | | 1,609,968 | 2,190,525 | |

^{1.} Prescription drug claims and medical claims have been less than in the prior year.

Self-Insurance Workers' Comp Fund

| | | Fiscal to Date | | Original | Fiscal to Date | |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----|-----------|----------------|-----|
| | Audited | December 31 | | Budget | December 31 | |
| | 2008-2009 | <u>2008</u> | % | 2009-2010 | 2009 | º⁄⊕ |
| Receipts | | | | | | |
| Insurance Premiums | - | - | N/A | - | • | N/A |
| Other Local Sources | - | - | N/A | - | ** | N/A |
| Transfers | | | N/A | _ | | N/A |
| | - | _ | | - | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Staff Services | _ | (15,676) | N/A | * | _ | N/A |
| Change in Fund Balance | | 15,676 | | - | - | |
| Beginning Balance | 15,857 | 15,857 | | 15,857 | 15,857 | |
| Ending Balance | 15,857 | 31,533 | | 15,857 | 15,857 | |

Note: Negative amount in prior year relates to premium refund from SELF for the years 1991 - 2003 which were closed out by SELF.

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO:

Board of Education

FROM:

Cheryl Witham

DATE:

February 16, 2010

RE:

Treasurer's Reports

BACKGROUND

It is a requirement that the Board of Education accepts and approves the monthly Treasurer's Reports.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Attached is the Treasurer Report for December, 2009.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

MOTION: To accept the December, 2009 Treasurer's Reports as presented.

TEL: (708) 383-0700 WEB: www.oprfhs.org TTY/TDD: (708) 524-5500 FAX: (708) 434-3910

Oak Park & River Forest High School District 200 Treasurers Report December 31, 2009

| | 90 | 8 48 4 48 | 83 | 82 | 8 | 80 | 70 | 55 | 40 | 30 | 20 | | 10 15 15 | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Total - All Funds | Fire Prevention & Safety | Harris - PMA Park National Total - Activity Funds | Workers' Comp Self Insurance | Medical Self Insurance | Dental Self Insurance | Tort Immunity | Working Cash | IMRF & SS Fund | Transportation Fund | Bond & Interest Fund | Operations, Building & Maintenance | Total - Education Fund | Education Food Service Book Store | Funds |
| \$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| 73,164,844.38 \$ | (164,303.81) | 346,474.33 186,792.11 533,266.44 | 15,857.04 | 2,245,308.04 | 159,658.49 | 1,564,113.64 | 5,587,726.26 | 1,151,328.72 | 1,864,945.02 | (181,287.20) | 7,790,961.16 | 52,597,270.58 | 52,004,079.61 302,989.49 290,201.48 | Opening Cash Balance 12/01/09 |
| 19,387,619.78 \$ | 353,619.22 | 17,393.67 46,486.67 63,880.34 | • | 14,384.78 | 2,074.99 | 354,936.16 | 1,305,763.63 | 634,583.65 | 259,086.14 | 866,681.60 | 1,678,251.38 | 13,854,357.89 | 13,635,342.68 201,815.85 17,199.36 | Cash <u>Receipts</u> |
| (4,389,793.79) \$ | (94,266.87) | (12,096.93) (26,763.97) (38,860.90) | • | (236,664.85) | (27,155.40) | (19,730.46) | • | (134,316.79) | (104,397.78) | , | (435,995.77) | (3,298,404.97) | (3,097,148.94) (186,010.52) (15,245.51) | Cash <u>Disbursements</u> |
| - 45 | , | (80,349.75) 80,000.00 (349.75) | ŧ | 339,121.41 | 34,138.51 | | , | 51.08 | (47.00) | ; | (47,266.03) | (325,648.22) | (311,457.54) (12,035.37) (2,155.31) | Adjustments to Cash (JE's) |
| 88,162,670.37 | 95,048.54 | 271,421.32 286,514.81 557,936.13 | 15,857.04 | 2,362,149.38 | 168,716.59 | 1,899,319.34 | 6,893,489.89 | 1,651,646.66 | 2,019,586.38 | 685,394.40 | 8,985,950.74 | 62,827,575.28 | 62,230,815.81 306,759.45 290,000.02 | Ending Cash Balance 12/31/09 |
| 100.00% | 0.11% | 0.31% 0.32% 0.63% | 0.02% | 2.68% | 0.19% | 2.15% | 7.82% | 1.87% | 2.29% | 0.78% | 10.19% | 71.26% | 70.59% 0.35% 0.33% | % of Total |

Summary of adjustments to cash:

Reclassification of food service chargebacks.

Reclassification of expenditures Reclassification of bookstore chargebacks.

PPO/Pharmacy reclassification.

Oak Park & River Forest High School District 200 Cash and Investments December 31, 2009

| | Account <u>Balance</u> | Treasurer's <u>Control</u> | % of <u>Total</u> |
|--|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Harris Bank Comingled Account (treas ofc.) Statement CTTO Less: Outstanding Checks Plus: Deposits in Transit |] 126,015.94 - | | |
| Adjusted | 126,015.94 | 126,015.94 | 0.14% |
| Park National Student Activity Account Statement Balance Less: Outstanding Checks Plus: Deposits in Transit | 290,551.93 (4,037.12) | | |
| Adjusted | 286,514.81 | | 0.32% |
| Harris ISDLAF Account (Liquid & Max) Statement Balance Less: Outstanding Checks Plus: Deposits in Transit Adjusted | 88,249,159.83 (576,679.72) 8,877.14 87,681,357.25 | | 99.45% |
| Park National Imprest Account Statement Balance Less: Outstanding Checks Plus: Deposits in Transit | 22,466.67 (1,084.30) | | |
| Adjusted | 21,382.37 | | 0.02% |
| Petty Cash | 7,400.00 | | 0.01% |
| Workers Compensation Escrow | 40,000.00 | | 0.05% |
| Total Cash and Investments | \$ 88,162,670.37 \$ | 126,015.94 | 100.00% |

Note: Petty cash number includes \$2,000 that is in the Athletic Imprest account maintained by the Athletic Department.

Oak Park & River Forest High School District 200 Schedule of Investments December 31, 2009

| | Average | Investment | Prior Monti | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| | Interest | Value | % of | % of | |
| By Financial Institution | Rate * | <u>12/31/09</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Total</u> | |
| Harris ISDLAF - Liquid MM | 0.08% | 1,333,304.71 | 1.51% | 12.86% | |
| Harris ISDLAF - Max MM | 0.28% | 9,593,555.12 | 10.86% | 10.45% | |
| Harris ISDLAF - CD's | 0.82% | 77,322,300.00 | 87.49% | 76.51% | |
| Harris - CTTO MM | * | 126,015.94 | 0.14% | 0.17% | |
| Total All Investments by Institution | | 88,375,175.77 | 100.00% | 100.00% | |

| | Average | Investment | | Prior Month |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Interest | Value | % of | % of |
| By Investment Type | Rate * | <u>12/31/09</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| CD's | 0.82% | 77,322,300.00 | 87.49% | 76.51% |
| Money Market | 0.18% | 11,052,875.77 | 12.51% | 23.49% |
| Total All Investments by Type | | 88,375,175.77 | 100.00% | 100.00% |

| | Average Interest <u>Rate *</u> | Investment Value <u>12/31/09</u> | % of <u>Total</u> | Prior Month % of <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| By Maturity Age | | | | |
| 1 month | 1.90% | 4,100,000.00 | 4.64% | 6.83% |
| 2 months | 1.50% | 3,500,000.00 | 3.96% | 5.59% |
| 3 months | 2.04% | 10,000,000.00 | 11.32% | 4.77% |
| 4-6 months | 0.50% | 10,331,300.00 | 11.69% | 19.21% |
| 7-9 months | 0.77% | 20,591,000.00 | 23.30% | 16.82% |
| 10-12 months | 0.43% | 20,600,000.00 | 23.31% | 15.12% |
| 1 year + | 0.63% | 8,200,000.00 | 9.28% | 8.18% |
| 2 years + | 0.00% | - | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Mature on demand | 0.18% | 11,052,875.77 | 12.51% | 23.49% |
| Total Investments | | 88,375,175.77 | 100.00% | 100.00% |

^{*} The rate of interest is not known for funds invested with the Trustee of the former CTTO.