

Tuesday, August 19, 2014

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, August 19, 2014 in the Second Floor Library of the high school.

Call to Order

President Phelan called the meeting to order at 8:16 p.m. on Tuesday, August 19, 2014. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak-Layman, John Phelan and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; Gwen Walker Qualls, Interim Director of Special Education; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Gary Kaplan, Tom Kindler of AYSO, Mike Adams, Karen Anderson, Steve Barnard, Mike Berfell, Steve Berggren, Mena Boulanger, Joan Callahan, Katherine Christmas, Connie Coleman, Dana, Hannah, and Emma Connell, Kim Cottee, Eric Davis, Kathy Duffy, Ben Endlss, Marc Falkoff, Karen Fischer, Wayne Franklin, Tom Gill, Linda Glennie, D. Gormae-Smith, Jeff Graux, Beryl Greenberg, Polly and Jim Groll, Bob Heilman, Carolyn Kalina, Gary Kaplan, John Kayser, Bill Ketcils, Dan Koenig, W. Leon, Terry Lieber, Lou Lombardo, Allison Lundo, Cami McBride, Traci Melcher, Kathy O'Donnell, Gary & Theresa Palese, Jennifer Patridge, Arlene Pedrazc, Ellen Pimentel, Dennis Podgoiski, Kathy Rigali, Peter Ryan, Ryan Schnizlein, Krista Schoenheider Kaplan, Steve Shorney, Ian Silver, Lisa & Eric Sorenson, Karen Steward-Nolan, Lisa Thornton, JP and Paul Ungaret, John Viise, Melanie Weiss, Daniel Weissglass, Jill Whilwhite, Vanessa Willey, Michael Schoeny, and Mark Trink, community members, Al Steffler of Henry Bros., Patrick Brosnan and Rob Wroble of Legat Architects, Rebecca Bibbs of the *Oak Leaves*, Glenn Compton of OPBYS, OPRFHS faculty and staff Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official, Randy Braverman, Director of Campus Security, Clyde Lundgren, Faculty Member, Phil Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction, John Stelzer, Athletic Director, Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations, Gwen Walker Qualls, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; Robert Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds; Ted Beecroft, Julie and Olivia Elmiger, Karl Lauger, Tony Nowak and Bill Sullivan of the OPYBS, Paul Aeschleman and Jan Arnold of the Park District of Oak Park, Terry Dean of the *Wednesday Journal*.

Mr. Phelan reviewed the procedures for public comments. While speakers were allotted 3 minutes to speak, one person was granted permission to speak for 4 minutes based on Board of Education policy. This information was an opportunity for the Board of Education to review the information on the different site options for the proposed swimming pool that was put together since the May Board of Education meeting. No vote was scheduled for this evening.

Public Comments

Bill Sullivan, resident of 825 Home Avenue, Oak Park, spoke as president of the Oak Park Youth Baseball/Softball, which represented 1500 students ranging from

age 5 to 18 years old. This is a de facto feeder program. The organization strongly objected to the current plan, as it has unintended consequences. Placing the building on the varsity field will render the baseball and softball diamonds useless for up to two years. It will force these sports to play on other fields currently being occupied by other teams, which already feel the stress of limited field space. There will be little, if any, practice time and that will eventually generate players for OPRFHS. By placing the building on this diamond, the District will have to put the baseball team on a Park District field, and the softball field will also have to go to the diamonds. Because of restrictions on base path lengths, the eldest leagues already have limited choices. The net sum of this action will not allow incoming students to develop the skills necessary to play at a high level at OPRFHS. Softball programs are disintegrating within the conference. The unintended consequence will be suicide for these programs and create a problem for many years. He asked the Board of Education to reconsider.

Tony Nowak, resident of 825 N. Cuyler, Oak Park, Vice President of softball for OPYBS, 16-year resident, and father of 3, noted that if the matrix was the impact study, it grossly neglected the impact on the community. If Site 2 or Site 3 is used, the park space in Oak Park is so limited that not only will it push baseball and the softball teams out to Oak Park fields but the Park District programs, Youth Football, AYSO Soccer, and Edge Soccer will be affected. This will affect all of the programs in which students practice.

Peter Ryan, resident of 414 Augusta St, Oak Park, was excited about the possible future of aquatics at OPRFHS and complimented those for doing an excellent job throughout the process in listening to the community and he was confident that they would continue to do. An Olympic size pool was correctly identified as the best and the only option moving forward. The two sites closest to the school make the most sense, but the District needs to be mindful how these sites will affect other sports and the domino effects. The Board of Education and the community has to be creative and flexible in how to make this work for everyone. His opinion was that this was one of the appropriate ways to spend taxpayer money.

Gary Kaplan, 23 year resident of Oak Park and current resident of 1026 Woodbine, Oak Park, spoke for the hundreds of families of girls who play softball. He believed that the recommendation was ill-conceived and would have a severe and disproportionate impact on girls' softball, and girls in general, in the OPRFHS community. His two core concerns were 1) the committee's recommendation to commandeer the baseball and softball fields for two years in order to build the natatorium will have a singularly and severe impact on girls' softball, not only for the two years to build the natatorium, but for many years to come, perhaps permanently. The committee's materials stated that all baseball and freshman softball boys' sports will be temporarily relocated for the duration of the structure. What about softball, a girls' sport? For the girls, the committee says there is only a possibility of temporarily relocating, acknowledging concerns about appropriate field space for girls' softball. There is no such space available. He asked if the committee had considered, under the Board of Education's policy manual and the law, the clear disparate impact this would have on girls in OPRFHS; and 2) why the dissemination of the softball and baseball fields is necessary. Why is a new building needed? The committee states that the first of

its goals is identifying the best possible solution for the OPRFHS aquatics solution. He noted that nothing is the “best” possible. He spoke of less than best conditions in some of his children’s classrooms. He suggested looking at rebuilding the current pools at a fraction of the \$35 million or more that it will take to build any of the other options to acceptable standards. If the pool deck, length, and site lines are less than perfect or no skylight, then “welcome to OPRFHS”. He felt that the complete rebuild of the current pool has not been considered as a serious option. The committee needs to develop that option.

Vanessa Wiley, resident of 122 S. Elmwood, Oak Park, a real estate agent sees the impact on tax dollars daily. For every rise in taxes, there is an appropriate lowering in property values. While the high school has the money now, the economic outlook is volatile. She worried about financing something with bonds. At some point, another education referendum will come forward and she was concerned that this discussion was about having a natatorium, not swimming. OPRFHS was just voted as the snobbiest suburb. That was upsetting to her because she touts Oak Park as being egalitarian. She did not feel that a natatorium should fall into the realm of the high school, it should be within the realm of the village and everyone in the village. Its relationship to education is marginal. Its relationship to TOPS and West Suburban Rec is higher. She knew no high school students who wanted to take swimming, even if they were swimmers, because there was not time enough in the day to change. OPRFHS is only 4.5 square miles and hard decisions have to be made. She wanted to know the numbers of students who would use it versus the number of students who will be hurt. Students have a short time here and she did not believe some students should be sacrificed for others.

Bob Heilman, resident of 633 Gunderson, Oak Park, is an architect and development manager. He studied the plan for two days and, while both his girls have been involved in athletics, he was speaking for himself. He complimented the District on how much work had been accomplished. He agreed that a pool was needed, but the issue is the two sites affecting the green space. Because green space is so valued, the District should use the site of the parking garage and do underground parking and look at the options to connect to the existing building. He objected going across roadways to build a separate building for a pool. He believed that if the District spent the money, it should be done right. He did not believe there was enough emphasis on the using the best space. He was willing to pay more to live here and that others lived here because they wanted to and they were willing to pay the money.

Dana Connell, resident of 538 N. Elmwood, Oak Park, noted that she and her husband have lived in the community for 25 years and they have three girls, all swimmers. She spoke about attending her daughters’ swim events and having to listen to others talk about OPRFHS’ deplorable conditions of the pool and the high school at a swim meet hosted by Morton Chance Swim Team. It was disheartening to hear visitor comments about their poor experience at OPRFHS and, ultimately, Oak Park in general. She thanked the Board of Education for listening and learning about the opportunities for all ages and the importance of teaching water safety. While her children will not benefit from this pool, an 8-lane and 50-meter pool will meet the needs of Physical Education, Athletics, West Suburban Recreation, TOPS, Huskies Swim Camp, and more. She wanted visitors

to enjoy the facilities, dine in area restaurants, shop in are stores and share positive commentary about the village. She continued that entire seasons have been lost with no alternatives for practice and meets and she hoped that the administration would minimize the construction and inconvenience. Someday she hoped the school could welcome IHSA state swim meet in Oak Park instead of New Trier or Evanston, and its athletes to a historic, diverse, and centrally located community.

Ian Silver, resident of 228 Wesley, Oak Park, complimented the Board of Education for realizing a pool was needed. As someone who has coached soccer and baseball and been involved with softball and swimming, he understood the feelings of others and he hoped the effect could be minimized on the other sports. He did not believe it would kill the other sports. He recommended that the second floor be pushed out so to be able to hold a 1,000 seats to host larger meets, i.e., state and some national meets. He thanked the Board of Education for the long process and appreciated its choices.

Connie Coleman, resident of 212 Scoville, Oak Park, 42-year resident of Oak Park, shared some history. The additional athletic field on Lake Street had been a used car lot. There had been a horrendous parking problem and it was improved when the parking garage was built at a large expense, but it greatly improved living conditions. She shared the concerns of those who do not want lose any open space and she would hate to see it lost. She also did not want the parking garage lost because the same problems from before will arise again. Her two sons, 4 grandchildren, and she have used the pools. Triton used to have a program to share athletics facilities through adult learning classes, and many community members longed for a year-round pool. She believed that any lack of interest in swimming had to do with the condition of the pools. She was disappointed the Park District and the high school were not able to collaborate on a solution for a year-round facility. As a taxpayer, she paid to the Park District, the elementary school and the high school, and she wanted to make sure all of the end users benefit. She did not want to lose the parking garage.

Mark Falkoff, resident of 840 Augusta Street, Oak Park, moved to Oak Park just after the decision to build a pool, which in this time of austerity, that seemed outrageous. The community must vote on whether to build this pool, whether it is free standing or not, and whether it is connected by a footbridge or not.

Eric Sorenson, resident of 138 S. East, Oak Park and parent, wanted this to be a forever option, acknowledging that softball and baseball might have a few years of relocating. He represented those who live on East Avenue and they did not want the building on East Avenue because there already significant traffic with OPRFHS and Fenwick High Schools in the vicinity. Closing Scoville would add more traffic. While the parking garage is for the teachers, it was built and paid for by the village. He asked how much money the garage made for the Village. While Site 1 seemed good to him, the problem is taking down the parking structure. He was unsure about the maturing of the bonds that were used to pay for the garage. He asked the Board of Education to remember that this was a forever idea.

Lou Lombardo, resident of 922 Linden, Oak Park, represented Chicago Edge Soccer. Its members too were concerned about losing green space. Ninety-five

percent of its 45 teams and 650 children come from Oak Park and River Forest. Field space is already sparse and it is paying huge fees to rent space. The parking garage site would be most ideal.

Wayne Franklin, resident of 302 Home Avenue, Oak Park, parent of a swimmer and baseball player, believed that the parking garage was the best option. He was concerned about funding it when the District had \$121 million in reserve. He suggested the exploration of paying this with interest from the reserve fund, similar to that of a 401K.

Brian Endless, resident of 1212 N. Columbian, Oak Park, and parent, was concerned about decreasing the green space, not the pool itself. The lack of green space would have an enormous impact; it would be a waterfall effect. He books fields and there are no others available. He strongly recommended the parking garage site to limit impact on other organizations.

Beryl Greenburg, resident of 207 Linden, Oak Park, represented the neighbors of the 100, 200 and 300 blocks of Linden. She noted that the neighbors were already experiencing dangerously high traffic on Linden with all of the current activities and the increased traffic from fields, and they were fearful for the students who play on the street. She echoed the concerns about the loss of green space. She was concerned about increased parking in the area. She asked that the Board of Education to consider the neighbors. This is not about just one sport and the District is trying to serving everyone.

Tom Gill, resident of 238 N. Kenilworth, Oak Park, has 2 daughters and his grandmother graduated in 1927. Both his children play lacrosse and soccer and participate in the feeder swim teams, Millenniums and TOPS. He believed that the current facilities ranked at the bottom of the schools with whom they compete and the District should make an upgrade of its pools.

Mark Trinko, resident of 600 Fair Oaks, Oak Park, represented the tennis community and all athletics. He felt this had been a collaborative and mindful process and thanked the Board of Education for listening and sharing and rejecting putting tennis on the roof. This is about trying to serve all sports. He asked the Board of Education to seek the best option that serves the most and disrupts the least amount of people. Thus, the best option is the parking garage.

Ms. Thornton, resident of 167 Linden, Oak Park, had lived across the street from the baseball field. Her son played Oak Park Youth Baseball and then baseball at the high school. She recognized the value of athletics in her son's life and how her son recognized its value and adhered to the policies set forth for athletes as such. In June he was drafted by the LA dodgers. She is impressed by the athletes that come out of OPRFHS and this community is lucky to put out the athletes that it does. Tearing down the parking structure seems crazy, but it seems like it would fulfill the needs of everyone.

**Tentative Budget
Resolution**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the resolution regarding the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-15 be placed on display and to set the date of the Public Hearing; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Swimming Pool

Mr. Phelan thanked the community members for their comments. This Board of Education has addressed this subject a number of times. It looked at all of the views and options available. The 3 site recommendations are a result of a 2-year process to determine a site. On August 28, the Board of Education will select the site. All viewpoints are respected.

An ad hoc committee has met every two weeks to determine available sites. The summary does not reflect the Board of Education's discussions. Mr. Phelan thanked the individuals who gave this careful consideration: Mr. Cofsky, Dr. Isoye, Tod Altenburg, Robert Zummallen, John Stelzer, Clay Reagan, Karin Sullivan, Al Steffler and Stan Jagielski of Henry Bros., Patrick Brosnan, and Rob Wroble of Legat Architects. Through much discussion, they looked at the options from every perspective possible, put together cost sheets to anticipate costs, compiled a matrix with the stakeholder interest and pros and cons, IHSA obligations, ISBE requirements for academic programs, athletic teams, etc. No organization was overlooked. Mr. Phelan had asked each member to send his/her recommendation for the site to him. They unanimously came up with the recommendation, although he was not asking any Board of Education member to proxy their decision to this committee. He hoped the presentation from Legat Architects would show the options they considered. One of the most significant options was to talk about the cost being related to the square footage of the building, while it did not have to be the original shape. If a longer, narrower building was built, it would keep 1) the tennis courts, 2) baseball and softball fields, and 3) provide optimal balance, even though the two fields could not be used at the same time for competition. That fact was a game-changer for the committee members. Option 3 was recommended as it provided the optimum balance. Sometimes balance means everyone is mad. They believed the communities expected a quality high school with quality facilities and a quality swimming pool was a part of that. As a result of that balance, they recommended going forward with Site 2, option 3. The committee did not select the parking garage, but it recommended that the Board of Education and the committee continue to explore the option of the parking garage and reclaiming some of the field space on Scoville between the railroad tracks and Lake Street to reclaim some of the green space.

Mr. Wroble compared the presentation of that evening versus the last one in April. In April, many more options were presented. The pool site selection committee focused on constructability. The difference between the April presentation and now is the stakeholder viewpoint which informed some of the decision about the building.

The purpose of the study was "to evaluate in greater detail the three potential sites for a new natatorium facility located on the Oak Park and River Forest High School campus and to provide as much information as possible to help inform a decision on which site is the most appropriate for a new natatorium facility." The process refined the information prepared to date, i.e., the matrix which looked at every sport and site. The study investigated existing conditions and focused on one building program and one building design, which narrowed the cost. The design was to create one conceptual natatorium facility. The goal was to make a decision on the site, not the building design or final cost.

They presented different pool size options and the most valuable asset is the volume of water, which will be the legacy. The decision was made to focus on an Olympic size pool, 75' X 170', which would be able to hold competitive events, with a movable bulkhead that will allow different activities to occur at one time. Every room appropriate for the building was reviewed for efficiency, i.e., location of showers, mechanical location, etc. Thus they settled on a 2-story g, 50,000 square foot building and access points, stairs to the second level at both ends. The largest area in the building is the pool. Locker rooms are at one end, support areas are at the other end, and 400-spectator seating on the long access of the pool. The length of the building is driven by the length of the water. A pedestrian bridge might be included for students to travel from one building to another, depending on what site is chosen.

The site options are:

- 1) Site 1, Parking Garage
- 2) Site 2, Baseball Field
- 3) Site 3, South of Lake Street on Scoville

Mr. Wroble spoke about the size of every competitive sport, where it is located, and how they would be affected with each option. Site 1 would be the least evasive option in terms of open space on the campus. Site 2 would have some impact on varsity baseball. Tennis is unaffected by this site as are softball fields. They would be unaffected not only permanently but also during construction staging. A narrow building is critical to be able to put varsity baseball and stay intact for competition. However, the outfielders will get tighter. The impact is in the fall when marching band and football use those fields. However, competition sports will remain intact. Site 3 would lose one field hockey field permanently because of building placement. The net loss would be one field hockey field and the gain would be more open space. During the 2 years of construction, half of the fields will be disrupted.

Mr. Phelan opened the floor to Board of Education member questions as the purpose of this meeting was to prepare for the next meeting.

Mr. Wroble explained that as they started looking from the north end of the property and worked toward the natatorium, leaving the tennis courts and softball fields alone, they determined how close baseball fields could be moved to the softball field and found that there was enough site left over to build the natatorium. The outside fences would still be intact for competition. Green area that separates the fences now would be reduced. Mr. Stelzer said that there would be no reduced PE usage as they do not use softball fields. In the fall, football and marching band like to use the same space. They all want to use the lined football field. It would not be a matter of the space, but moving them around and being more creative.

Both softball fields will be unaffected even during construction. Currently games can be played on all 3 fields currently. There will be a conflict in playing Varsity and JV games concurrently; however, they would be able to practice at the same time. The fence placement changes from season to season and softball fences do come down during games.

Dr. Gevinson wondered why the Scoville stub included in the cost, as it is new athletic space, because nothing would be lost if it was comparable to the size of the pool footprint. The response was that while green space could be recaptured, it would not be equivalent. Part of the recommendation in the executive summary was to refer to the Finance Committee the question of Scoville Avenue and making it field space and that would also include purchasing the parking garage. The village does not have much of a financial incentive to keep it in good condition. If the high school owned it, it could maintain and utilize it in a way that would be collaborative with Ridgeland Commons, The Farmers' Market, etc. When considering the option of site 3 to place the pool on the west side of the field, traffic control was an issue and it would have made it safer for students going back and forth because of the street light. Mr. Phelan personally recommended against it because students are part of a modified closed campus and that would be a deviation. It would require staff resources to maintain student safety going across the street both in the winter and inclement weather and it would take time away from instruction in the water because of the additional time it would take to get to the facility. Conversations about the options of site 3 did include acquiring the Scoville Avenue "stub" and turning that into field space to make up for some of the field space that would be lost.

Dr. Gevinson suggested that if the Site 3 option included capturing Scoville, then the track would not be lost, just moved. If the track was moved it would be smaller. For Mr. Phelan what tipped the scales for him were 1) the difficulties of having PE across the street and the narrower pool which would not require the loss of the tennis courts. He still believed capturing that green space would be beneficial.

During construction, Site 2 would have no impact on softball and baseball would have to find another place to play. Wherever one puts the natatorium other than the parking garage, it will impinge on some sport for at least a period of time.

Q: Why is the Site 3 location inseparable from closing Scoville Avenue? Are they forced together?

A: It was presumed because Site 3 was put on the table in May by Mr. Phelan during the Board of Education meeting and the concept he suggested included closing Scoville Avenue to minimize the loss of green space. No one has articulated Site 3 without capturing Scoville and, therefore, that had not been studied.

Dr. Lee suggested that the Board of Education consider not closing Scoville, as on the same basis of the other alternatives. Mr. Phelan felt they were at the end of the process and to him the losses in programs in soccer, field hockey and lacrosse without closing Scoville Avenue would be far greater than presented and he would not consider it. Dr. Lee felt that the flow of traffic on the neighbors and village was not given adequate consideration. Mr. Wroble stated that the site plan of the natatorium was larger than Scoville Avenue. There is only 80 feet of room from property line to property line. Even if it were built on Site 3 and Scoville Avenue was captured, one field hockey field would be lost.

Ms. Patchak-Layman observed that the only negative for choosing the parking garage site is the loss of parking spaces. She asked if the parking capacity in this area had been assessed recently. Students now have a modified closed campus and a reduction in the number of parking passes has been experienced. The Village of Oak Park wants to make this area more walkable and a bicycle community. What else needs to be known about parking? The neighbors feel it is easier not to have parking on the street, but this would push the goal of being walkable. She questioned where access for the pool would be if the field site were selected and if there would be separate community access. Her interest in building a natatorium was to allow the community to use it. Her concern with the west field was not just the loss of green space but the density that a new building will bring. Putting a building there and boxing in the football field, as well as putting in a semi-border in the rest of the field would change the look and the feel of the community that surrounds the west of the school. This is a residential community. What about zoning? With regard to the 30-foot setback, Mr. Wroble stated an investigative conversation would have to be had with the Village of Oak Park. There are facilities now that encroach on the setback, i.e., the baseball field and dugouts. If the 30-foot setback was required, one would have to be creative as to what spaces could move to the second floor. Mr. Phelan stated that it was an opinion of the committee was that with the additional water space, some of the programs that have to practice early in the morning and late of night might would have more access during the day, thus allowing possibilities for community programs during the weekdays and on Sundays. Discussions have occurred with the Park District as well.

Q: Where would the access be to the field site building?

A: Committee members felt most traffic would come from the mall.

Q: Why is the school not building on the alleyway between the garage and the Field House as there could be shared internal space, locker rooms, etc? One of the options had included and while 300 spaces would be gone, some parking would be available.

A: Discussion had occurred about a narrower footprint, thus, the alley would not be affected; however, gas, electric, and egress issues exist. Leaving the alley intact allows the present egress situation and district vehicles could park in it.

Q: Could the egress from the field house be redirected from other sides?

A: Yes, it could and in an earlier schematic a long coordinator was shown.

Q: Is there an internal space in the field house that could be an egress to the east or the west without the alleyway, if the pools were removed?

A: It would be possible.

Q: Why is there a special cost for an elevator with the parking garage as options include an internal elevator?

A: A new building would have to be ADA compliant and handicapped accessible. They assumed the cost of having an elevator on both sides of the bridge. As the review of that site continues, it might be eliminated if it were if not needed.

- Q: What is underneath the alley way, the athletic field and the parking garage?
- A: Under the alley is the gas service. Closer to west pool side is electrical infrastructure, some encroaching into the alley. It is preferable not to build on top of the alley, and by leaving part of it intact, it would save money.
- Q: Will the Board of Education get information about parking and other options? In 2002, a project was done before the parking garage was built. The village keeps track of the number of permits available and the street configurations. The parking garage is a more visible place for the community and for the community to have access to it and it fits with the athletic area by the field house. It doesn't disrupt residential area nor add more density of building. It would not displace any students or activities and it would allow the hosting of community fireworks.
- A: It was suggested that Ms. Patchak-Layman speak to Mr. Altenburg on her specific requests.
- Q: How many seats would be accommodated?
- A: Currently, the IHSA requires 1,000 seat capacities. The West Conference requires 7 lanes. OPRFHS does not host the conference. Currently, OPRFHS hosts dual meets, larger invitational, etc.
- Q: The cost of acquiring the parking garage in this report did not change from the last report. What would the actual cost be? What is the existing debt?
- A: The Village of Oak Park is obtaining that information.
- Q: What is the impact on competitive and instructional swimming programs in a 25-yard pool rather than a 50-meter pool, as a significant cost factor?
- A: The 50-meter pool is the only option that the committee felt appropriate, as this is a forever decision and one must be strategic about present and future needs. The school continues to grow and all aquatic programs are pushed to the limit and a 50-meter pool will support enrollment growth and growth in the swim programs. While enrollment numbers are expected to rise in the near future, currently single classes are running out of water space. The majority of classes are swimming only half of the class time. Additional water space will allow more instruction. This size is also an optimal for athletics.
- Q: Could the District make an investment to make the current pools viable?
- A: It would cost approximately \$18 million and include gutting and rebuilding it from scratch in order to meet the needs of the Illinois Department of Health.
- Q: When will funding options be discussed?
- A: This process is about phases. Phase I is the site selection and Phase II could be financing. Knowing how this will be funded is not necessary for purposes of site selection.

Q: Will athletes lose potential draft picks during the 2 years of construction?
A: Finding appropriate baseball fields will be challenging and the staff will start working on this immediately. While the hardest part of the decision was the displacing of baseball players, the committee was comforted by the fact that in 2 years, the fields will be brand new and in excellent condition. While the decision was difficult to make, the team members all came to the same conclusion independently.

Q: Scoville represents the 80' that would be captured?
A: The building is 125 feet and that would cost the loss of a field for field hockey. The track would be a smaller non-regulation track.

Dr. Moore asked for more information about parking as hosting meets will draw more car and foot traffic and the District cannot handle its needs now. Even if Site 2, Option 3, was recommended, what would be the solution for the baseball program? Baseball and softball would not be played as it currently is as presented. It needs to be clear that baseball and softball will be able to have practices, but not games. Dr. Moore was concerned about a building in the middle of the field space, as watching all of the students in that space is a testament to Oak Park. She was also concerned about safety issues of a building abutting up to another building, access, and coming off Lake Street. It made more sense that the access is accustomed to having that type of traffic, as opposed to being embedded on a residential street.

Mr. Wroble reported that bleachers were projected to be on the north side. The cost for adding more bleachers, toilets, etc., were not priced out and would be above the current estimated price. The visitor bleachers would be closer to the football field and the building would start where the bleachers ended.

Q: Does the light spillage change? Have there been discussion about sound?
A: Without knowing the final design of the building, acoustics and lighting are difficult to determine. The volume over the spectator area may not be the same.

Mr. Phelan noted that many questions will not be answered. Choosing a location is the first phase of this decision.

This will be discussed at the August 28 Board of Education meeting and information will be south about the cost of the parking garage.

Mr. Weissglass apologized for asking the question of the purchase price and wanted to support the comment that this is an enormous decision. In order to make a determination of information is critical. What things take more time, energy and cost? Each member of the Board of Education needs to determine whether they have enough information. He appreciated the committee's effort and the community members' comments. It is a balancing act as to what information is necessary.

Dr. Lee felt much progress had been made in this deliberation and by next week more progress would be made. He felt confident that in the next few months a decision could be made.

Adjournment

At 10:24 p.m., Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board