

May 17, 2016

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, May 17, 2016 in Room 293 and the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Dr. Frank Danes, Interim HR Director; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Chris Donovan, John, Maggie, and Mary Dring, Wayne Franklin, William Gale, John Gerut, Jeff Gravery, Julie and M. Griffin, Cedric Johnson, Lynn Kamenish, Bruce Kleinman, Maureen Kleinman, Byron Lanning, Amanda Massie, Chris Meister, Tony Nowak, Kevin Peppard, John Phelan, Ellen Pimentel, Mike Poirier, Monica Sheehan, John Shelton, Karen Steward-Nolan, and Karin West; community members; JP Coughlin, John Hoerster, Chris Ledbetter, and Katie O'Keefe of OPRFHS; Catharine Vargas and Robert Wroble of Legat Architects; and Steve Scheuring of the Oak Leaves;

Mr. Weissglass noted that 1) no action would be taken on the film. He reviewed the pool decision-making timeline, which was included in the packet. Mr. Weissglass noted that Ms. Sutter would be providing a report on what had been learned from the community meetings. Options 2 and 4 showed the most promise. Questions were raised about how the garage study merged with the Long-term Facilities Plan and how to merge them with pool option 2 and four from the community engagement meetings. This meeting is the first opportunity for the Board of Education to review this information and discuss how this will work with the LTFP.

Public Comments

Kevin Peppard, a resident of 715 Thomas, Oak Park, spoke about how to finance the LTFP and put it on the ballot. OPRFHS has an allowable debt limit of 6.9% of the EAV which equals \$129 million. By December of next year, OPRFHS will be debt free. If Option 2 and the LTPF is financed with 20-year bonds, the debt will leave no flexibility for 20 years, so priorities should be set. A referendum will be necessary. Back-door bonds are not necessarily back doors. The community would not support this venue because the school would have its money too early; the capital plan spans a 1-10 year time horizon. The question on

the ballot should elicit a “yes” or “no” response. It will be difficult to write such a question for the November election, leaving little time for the people to organize and support the Board’s wishes. The presidential election has five times the number of voters, as opposed to the last board election.

John Hoerster read the following statement: “I was disappointed with the plan as it was designed without thought or consideration for the athletic programs that would be impacted negatively. Tennis, softball, baseball, soccer, lacrosse, field hockey and football would all be impacted by this plan, and in all cases would be detrimental. If just football were isolated, the negative effects of this plan were tremendous. It eliminates much of the area in which the freshman football team practices and plays their “B” games—the new pool would effectively displace roughly 80 freshman football players. There is no mathematical way to fit a full-sized football field in this space. Just like the track teams, the freshman football players would have to be bussed to another space. Like the impact, this pool proposal would have on our freshman football program, our youth program, the Junior Huskies, would face a similar displacement outcome. It would be sad to lose such a positive organization from our campus—not to mention the loss of revenue the Jr. Huskie program provides.

“Finally, the thought of a class 8A school, the largest class in the state, reducing its visitors’ stands and placing them on the roof of the pool is more than a bit troubling. Those who developed this plan clearly have not experienced a Friday night football game within the last four years. The football games have become a destination for our community, where nearly 4,000 community members attend on a regular basis. In fact, we have had several instances where the administration has even had to turn people away due to the lack of current seating. I actually was under the impression that the district was trying to find ways to expand the visitors stands to accommodate more fans. But instead, this proposal drastically reduces and questionably locates, rooftop visitor seating. Would the visiting crowd overflow then be relocated to the home stands? What are the ramifications when we place rival fans and their student sections on the home side? Would we need more security? This would not only all but eliminate our ability to host playoff games, which are routinely overcrowded as is, but it would also dissuade our community from continuing to attend our games, which would truly be a shame.

“While I am focusing on football, I can’t imagine that a single coach outside of aquatics would support this proposal. It would only make sense to me that those affected by a costly project such as this would be

consulted and that their expertise would be called upon to collaborate on ways to serve all parties involved—clearly that is not the case.

“Furthermore, I was one of the many who volunteered to take notes at a forum where several proposals were put before the community in order to get feedback. This proposal was not one of them. There seems to be a lack of transparency and a lack of continuity within the Board as to the plans that are put forth.

“As a faculty member, as a coach, and as a taxpaying member of this community, this pool process has been disappointing, to say the least, and this newest proposal is the latest and greatest example of this disappointment.

“I, for one, look forward to seeing the next proposal, a long-term plan with vision, one that creates an athletic facility on our campus that addresses the needs of all our athletes, one that is a model for other schools in our conference—a plan that doesn’t marginalize one sport in the name of another.”

Ellen Pimentel, a resident of 147 N. Lombard, Oak Park, has been engaged with several school boards. In February 2011 she called for the crumbling pools to be addressed. She has had three children attend OPRFHS, and they have participated in many sports. She was involved in the Wellness Committee. Last January, she was invited to comment on the LTFP, as well as other current and former parents, board members, community members, and other stakeholders. Presentations were made and people were separated into teams and used colored post-it notes to express their ideas on the layouts. That was an energizing process. She had pleaded for a new indoor track facility such as the one at Proviso West, and it was included in Option 3. Now the indoor track is removed. Track is a no-cut sport. While she supports all things that are best, this plan did not align with that statement.

Chris Donovan, resident of 733 S. Elmwood, Oak Park, parent of a graduate, had one of the community meetings on the four plans, and complimented the Board of Education for hosting them. The citizenry responded well, but now there is a fifth plan.

Julie Griffin, resident of 1008 S. Maple, Oak Park and member of APPLAUSE! thanked the Board of Education for addressing the spaces for performing arts in the LTFP. In addition to athletic teams that use the west field to practice, so, too, does the marching band. She did not know the ins and outs of the new proposal, but she wanted the Board of

Education to keep performing arts in mind, as it debates the different possibilities.

Mike Poirier, resident of 308 N Elmwood, Oak Park, too thanked the Board of Education for the informational meetings it had on the pool options. After the Board of Education completes its due diligence, it will find that most of the athletic coaches consider Option 5 untenable and the space does not work. He suggested exercising option 2, as it met the needs. Once completed, not all of the constituencies will be dissatisfied, and that will tell the Board of Education that it made the right decision.

JP Coughlin, OPRFHS history teacher, head varsity basketball coach, and softball coach, spoke about safety being the number one concern. He pointed out several deficiency with Option 5, with regard to light poles, lack of bleacher seating, visitor dugout, batting cages, etc. He urged the Board of Education not to consider this proposal.

Wayne Franklin, resident, was pleased that the District was looking at the whole picture, i.e., aquatics and the LTFP. He reviewed the cost for each of the plans being considered. Only option 2 does not displace anyone, i.e., track teams are still on site, option 1 which correlates with pool option 2, may not be the most pragmatic because it moves the track and field offsite. He strongly encouraged the Board of Education to look more closely at option 2 of LTFP which is pool option 4.

Tony Nowak, 825 N. Cuyler, represented Oak Park Youth Baseball and spoke about the suitability of Plan 5 and some IHSA rules that would prevent playing a sport if all of the issues are not addressed, i.e., the amount of space for tennis courts, dugouts, etc. There is also a concern about the loss of green space which has a tremendous trickle-down effect in the community.

Monica Sheehan, 626 Fair Oaks, read the following statement. “In a cursory review of the three proposed Long Term Facility Plans, I find them concerning and unacceptable. Tonight, I will focus my time and comments on Plan #1. In this plan, you, the school board, would force the indoor track teams, the largest teams at OPRF, to some unknown location off campus and yet, you haven't even consulted the coaches. While you haven't communicated with them, I have, and they don't want to move their programs off campus. They are already forced to practice and hold home meets off---site for outdoor track.

“The coaches and the teams are unable to attend this meeting tonight due to a post---season coaches' meeting and the scheduled

team dinner. The athletes on the track teams are Oak Park and River Forest High School. They are diverse, they are wonderful, and they embody “those things that are best”. You should make a point of speaking with the coaches and getting their input on this drastic plan. It’s the right thing to do.

“Nearly two years ago, the coaches and the majority of the track teams fought successfully to keep their Fieldhouse and indoor track programs on campus. It was the first time that the school board tried to confiscate their space for a pool. Did you forget about that episode or are you simply disregarding it? Whatever happened to the goal of keeping all the current sports teams on campus? I just heard that at last month's school board meeting.

“It is illogical that Pool Option #2, the least expensive plan, is included in only one Long-Term Facility Plan, and it includes the eviction of the track teams and the demolition and repurposing of the historic Field House, the oldest high school field house in the country. It would be reasonable for at least one plan to include Pool Option #2 along with actual "needs" not "wants". The blurring of needs and wants is a recurring, unproductive theme in the years---long pool saga. In looking at the three proposed plans, how can something that is listed as a "need" in one plan not even be included in another? The Long Term Planning Committee actually said they found "more opportunities than pressing needs" at the school. What are the school’s true needs?

“If your goal is to turn a plan into reality, it should be need—based and value—driven. There is a great demand for taxpayer dollars. It's time to be pragmatic, address the true "needs" at the school, treat all sports teams equally and fairly, solve the pool problem, and move on to the most important issues of all: improving academic outcomes and addressing the Achievement Gap in a significant way.

“In the recent U.S. News & World Report, OPRF is ranked 36th among high schools in Illinois, Evanston High School is ranked 13th. It is a school that is often compared with OPRF for its size and demographics. What is Evanston doing that OPRF is not? How are they spending their money to improve student outcomes? By the way, Evanston’s two swimming pools are smaller than the two pools in Pool Option #2.”

Karen Steward Nolan stated that keeping all sports on campus was all important and reviewing a field option is how the District ended up at the parking garage site. For those who sat through the Pool Committee meetings, the garage was the last option. Water polo, in Option 2 pool, has one extra lane and thus has more water, but it is risky to shrink a pool to 4 lanes and go from a 6-lane pool to an 8-lane pool. The second pool could not be used for practice. A deep pool is needed. Students are now in the pool starting from after school to 6:30 p.m. or later; that scheduling would have to be collapsed. She was proud of OPRFHS, the process, and the Board of Education members and asked that they not spend good money on fixing the current pools.

Chris Ledbetter, PE teacher, baseball coach, acknowledged that this was a difficult process, and he applauded the Board of Education for looking at every plan and proposal thoroughly. He had supported baseball going off site as it would have given baseball a new facility and it would have to be something that would make the program even better. The plan to keep the current teams on site and add a pool, instead of improving each facility, actually diminishes each program, disrupt three programs, and everyone would have substandard facilities. He asked the Board of Education to find the best solution to improve each team's facilities and the overall facilities, not to just keep all of the teams on campus and add a pool. As a teacher, he appreciated the honest work of the Board of Education.

John Phelan, resident of 600 Thatcher, River Forest, thanked the Board of Education, the administrators, staff members, and Faculty Senate representatives, for their time and dedication. He had an uninformed opinion as do most of the people who attended the community meetings. He stated that it was the Board of Education's decision to make as they have the right amount of information. The Board of Education needed to understand the voices are a small fraction of the community. Thousands of voters elected them to this position and they trusted them.

William Gale, 925 N. Euclid, observed that the LTFP was now an add on to the information provided at the community meetings, and it contained substantive items. Option 2 is being combined with the lack of the track program on campus. The Board of Education cannot take an existing athletic program and move it off campus. The LTFP lacks balance. It lacked a competitive gym, and the field house did not exist. He had not seen the same passion for academics as he had for the LTFP. Glenbard West is spending \$16M on a science building. Athletics provides one path in life and academics another. Both are needed in long-term planning; this plan is a comment on this community.

Bruce Kleinman, resident of 245 Kenilworth, Oak Park, was confused about the purpose of long-term plans and the original community meetings. When he saw the movie Concussion, he remembered a dialogue about the corporation that owns Sunday, the NFL. It struck him that football had been elevated to a religion in Texas and swimming had been elevated to a religion in Illinois. He admired the coaches at OPRFHS. The core mission of a school is STEM, and proficiency in reading, and mathematics. Swimming and wrestling are not life skills. He wanted to focus on the 21st century and would that should be in Oak Park.

Maureen Kleinman, resident of 245 Kenilworth, Oak Park, read a statement written by Judith Vincent. “Dear Board of Education,

“I attended the first and third high school facility planning sessions. In the third session, I was impressed with the faculty, and especially the students, who participated on the same evaluation team I did. While I don’t pretend to understand the needs of the high school, they certainly do.

“The proposed reconfiguration that moves faculty offices outside of classrooms made a lot of sense to them and to me. I was told you no longer think you’ll need more classroom space in total, but the reconfiguration will give the high school much more flexibility. (You’ll be able to schedule classes during faculty office hours, for example.) But I also came away with some concerns, based on their feedback. Their consensus was that almost all of the proposed changes were nice to have, but not necessary. For example, a whole new student cafeteria addition is not needed to address students’ main complaints: cracked floors and uncomfortable furniture. Meanwhile, the new plans don’t address the oldest and most problematic parts of the building.

“I attended the board meeting when you elected to forego the cost-of-living 2017 budget increase proposed by high school staff. As I recall, board member Tom Cofsky said that previous practice was to ask taxpayers for as much as the high school could get and figure out later how to spend the money. He said that the current board is determined to ask taxpayers for what the high school really needs.

“I applaud your new attitude and ask you to take this approach in evaluating the long-term facilities plan and plans for the high school pool(s).

“In the meantime, thank you for inviting community members like me to attend the planning sessions, and for this opportunity to share my thoughts.”

Katie O’Keefe, resident of 1105 Wisconsin, and OPRFHS history teacher agreed with minimizing the diverse effects of the existing programs. She stated: “Moving the pool on the field does not make sense. Moving the visitors to the home side would be a mistake. While she understood that the Fieldhouse was historic, it was outdated. One of the baseball coaches said the court is problematic because of knee injuries. She was worried about first fixing the pool and then needing to do something else. I think moving tennis is a possibility. She lives by Maple Park and moving tennis off campus might be the least disruptive. The idea that athletics takes away from academics is problematic. Kids are motivated by athletics.”

Lynn Kamenish, while appreciative of another option, felt that Option 5 was not safe, and it would not allow marching band to use the field both during the summer and before school. She was excited by the LTFP, as it is a holistic process, i.e., new labs, new music space, new pool, libraries, etc. She suggested renaming the options A, B, and C.

Chris Meister, Oak Park resident, volunteer on FAC and the Pool Committee, parent and works in the world of infrastructure finance, noted that interest rates will not be lower. Since the Pool Committee met, commodity prices have come down due to global demand. The people who built the pools, the Fieldhouse and the school in the 1920’s were visionary in providing equal facilities for women and men. He suggested that this Board of Education undertakes the same vision as the Board of Education members at that time did because it is more expensive to add to a pool or a building, rather than to plan for future logical needs. Now is the time to buy, finance, and have a honest conversation with the community. He supported Option 2.

Approval of Resolution to Place Amended Budget on Display

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the resolution to place the amended budget on display for public inspection; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Clarification of Culture, Climate And Behavior Committee Membership

Mr. Weissglass moved to clarify that both voting and nonvoting members of the Climate, Culture, and Behavior Committee may be counted for the quorum; seconded by Ms. Spivy. A voice vote resulted in Motion carried.

Pool Project Community Engagement Report

Marcia Sutter, consultant, was thanked her for her work. The pools are 90 years old and have exceeded their useful life. Three meetings were held to gather feedback on four proposals (1 was held at the River Forest Community Center, and 2 at the high school). The Information is qualitative, and while over 350 resident attended the meeting, the results were not indicative of the full community. Tours of the pool were given, presentations by the superintendent and the president of the Board of Education were given, the architects talked about the history of the pools, the process, the role that aquatics played in academics and extracurricular programs. Four options were displayed and table discussion was facilitated.

- Option #1: Build a new 50-meter pool on the existing garage site. The east and west pools would be eliminated. A parking plan would be developed with the village; staff and visitors would park on adjacent streets.
- Option #2: Replace the east pool with a 25-yard competition pool by expanding into adjacent areas. Replace the west pool with a smaller pool in the existing space. The existing garage would not be affected.
- Option #3: Build a 25-yard competition pool and a new garage on the existing garage site. Renovate the east pool and surrounding areas. Eliminate the west pool, and repurpose the space.
- Option #4: Build a new 40-meter pool and a new garage on the existing garage site. Eliminate the east and west pools, and repurpose the space.

The same questions were asked at every table. The data was analyzed, reviewed, coded, grouped and prioritized. The 5 most frequently asked or mentioned topics were: 1) the LTFP plan, 2) the existing garage and parking, 3) funding and the impact on tax bills, 4) funding and impact on school activities, and 5) suggestions for creating multi-story building that would include some combination of pools, parking, etc. Other Areas of high interest included:

- 1) Academic and competitive advantages of the pool options and Various lengths
- 2) School finance and budgets—types of funds and ending fund balances (reserves)
- 3) Intergovernmental cooperation—Village of Oak Park, both park districts, and other local entities were all mentioned
- 4) Comparative information about other high schools—swimming requirements, pool sizes, building costs for new pools, etc.
- 5) OPRFHS enrollment—current, projected, and percentage of students involved in water sports

- 6) OPRFHS swimming requirement—attendees both questioned and promoted the requirement

Discussion ensued. A suggestion was to do quantitative research as the Board of Education moved forward in this endeavor, i.e., a phone survey of likely voters using landline and cellphone numbers, asking questions as to which aspect they found appealing, their threshold for the maximum amount if bonding were necessary, and their attitudes about the school and the project.

Engineering

Larson Engineering did a visual assessment of the condition of the parking garage on May 4. Over 20 items were of concern. The cost to fix these items would be approximately \$271,000. If the repairs were not implemented promptly and maintained yearly, Larson’s opinion was that the working life expectancy would be ten more years. If the repairs were made and the District continued its annual upkeep, the life expectancy would be 25 years. The Board of Education members asked for an estimate of maintenance costs. If the Board of Education wanted to do a more extensive exploration of the structure, it would be a longer process and cost about \$5,000. It would include tapping on the concrete, pressurized testing to determine structural issues, etc. It was the consensus of the Board of Education members that a more significant report could be done at a later time if desired.

The Board of Education recessed at 8:37 p.m. and resumed at 8:44 p.m.

Acceptance of Long Term Facilities Plan Mr. Weissglass moved to accept the Long-term Facilities Plan Reports, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson.

LTF Plans with Costs The following members of the executive committee were acknowledged for their work.

Tod Altenburg	Jennifer Cassell	Mark Collins
Phil Prale	Laure Goode	Jason Dennis
Dove Hunter	Fred Preuss	Frank Lipo
Allison Myers	Clay Reagan	Steve Beck
JP Coughlin	Jared Scott	
Tom Cofsky	Mike Carioscio	

The work was recaptured in 106 pages. The costs are presented in 2016 dollars. As such the report is set up in a 10-year period of time split into two smaller pieces, years 1-5 (aligned with needs) and years 6-10 (aligned with additional opportunities) and corresponding recommendation.

The initial committee had specific parameters: 1) reclaim the vacant pool and support space, 2) accommodate projected student enrollment, 3) envision the design of future learning environments, and 4) staying in a \$20 million budget. Because an updated enrollment forecast predicted a smaller enrollment that was factored in the LTFFP and lead to different conversations about space utilization and opportunities in the two time periods.

The five-step collaborative design process included the following steps:

- 1) Gather the information about the school district, including the physical condition and the educational adequacy of the facilities.
- 2) Understand the purpose and mission of the school district and to envision how these concepts could be applied to the built environment. Envisioning was a time to dream about the potential of the educational environment for the students and the community.
- 3) Define the program of the project, both quantitatively and qualitatively. In listing the spaces that are required for the school district, we assigned area adjacencies and set priorities.
- 4) Collaborative design and test fit of all the facility options for the district. This phase could include reallocation of space within an existing facility, additions and alterations, and/or new facilities. During this step, all possibilities were considered, factoring in priorities of the program, goals set for the project, and site conditions.
- 5) Transformed into place. Through a consensus building process, the community selected the preferred option that best meet the needs, mission, and budget of the district.

Legat had fashioned three concepts (A, B, and C) from the list of the needs and opportunities in years 1-5 and years 6-10, noting that they were points for dialogue, not solutions. All three concepts have strengths and weaknesses. Getting input was an intensive process with identified many needs, and Legat tried to represent them. Each concept was reviewed floor by floor.

Option 1 addressed increased enrollment in the performing arts, i.e., instructional practice rooms, storage and an opportunity for black box addition, as well as a competition gym, and new boys' locker rooms, Driver's' Ed addition, more classrooms, more PE space, a larger cafeteria which would be closer to the tutoring center, faculty offices, consolidating Huskie Pups to one central location in order to make drop off and entry easier and, perhaps, relocate it adjacent to Family and Consumer Science. Consideration had been given to exploring how

better to organize the Fieldhouse space. Engineers have said that the renovating of the boys' locker room would be difficult because of its height, so it will be relocated.

Option 2 was Pool Option 4. The volume of boys' locker room was split and used for music and performing arts.

Option 3 included an indoor track, three courts and 3 PE stations. Special education is also part of this option. Sufficient classroom space exists for the projected increase in enrollment but the faculty desired additional spaces to meet with students, parents, etc.

Once a decision is made as to where the pool will be built, decisions can be made about the LTFP. The second recommendation which can be acted upon in the first year is on page 37, and it gives opportunities for the redesign of interior rooms, a repurposing of classrooms with an eye toward redesign.

Budget numbers are significant, they were meant to be deliberate and selective and are overwhelming. Discussion ensued about how priorities would be set and what steps the administration and Board of Education would take to pare them before going to the community, as it felt like a laundry list of opportunities. The Board of Education had said it had a budget of \$20 million above the pool cost over the first five years.

Legat stated that after the scope of the work is determined, two years of prep work would have to occur before construction could start.

After the Board of Education's discussion, the administration stated that it would work with Legat about the Board of Education members' comments below, prioritize and take into consideration the concerns of other stakeholders in order for the Board of Education to move forward on this. These options is a working document, not a blueprint. The administration brought the plan forward to this meeting so that it could receive the Board of Education member comments. It will be brought back at the regular May meeting. The District can renovate the footprint of the pool and still do the track. The south end of the building is a strong reflection of what is being presented. This will be revisited.

Comments:

- 1) What things have been identified as needs for increased enrollment and what things have been identified as wants.
- 2) This plan addresses the building, but not the facilities and, as such, the acreage should be included.

- 3) The facility overall is structurally sound, including the Fieldhouse. Good resources have been put forth to keep the facility maintained.
- 4) Before any recommendations are made for the first year, where to put the pool needs to be decided.
- 5) The community meetings received good marks.
- 6) The students participated and had suggested a 200-meter track. A question remained as to whether their thoughts were put into the concepts provided.
- 7) Use the word “concepts” rather than “options”.
- 8) The concepts that had been reviewed have changed dramatically. The Committee had no input on the recommendation, and no costs were delineated.
- 9) The Board of Education needs to determine what things it would like to do versus what is tenable for the community.
- 10) One member had expected an ala carte report, based on the current conditions of facilities and what needs are going forward based on instructional methodology growth in participation rates and enrollment growth, not these 3 options. The pool options were not incorporated into this. Option 3 gives a pool option #6. Option 1, which incorporates pool option #2, does not create the space for athletic offices and second-floor locker rooms, and additional space is being used differently. Option 1 does not dovetail with the pool plan. The one thing that makes sense is page 37 about the use of offices, i.e., replacing computer labs, optimizing that space for learning and offices makes sense.
- 11) How would the school operate during the pre-work, rebuilding of the areas. A concern was expressed about electrical. The District will have to find a way to provide power to the south end of the building during the renovation, i.e., through the use of generators, etc.
- 12) There was a lack of committee input on these “concepts.”
- 13) Surprise was expressed at the maintenance costs of an antique structure, the pool, and ongoing utility costs due to the leak in the pool.
- 14) What are the school community’s priorities?
- 15) Has environmental sustainability been discussed? It was part of the discussion in terms of green space.
- 16) Are the right questions being considered? More time is needed to digest this information.
- 17) This as a complex set of issues. Some very good work has been done as to what the Board of Education needs to use to solve the problem.
- 18) The substantive points are experimenting with learning spaces, classrooms with offices next to them, performing arts is

- surprisingly large in this options. How does performing arts fit into the reconfiguration serves the overall enrollment issue?
- 19) Surprised at losing the track, and that is not possible. To lose a track and build a black box studio so that four performances rather than three can be scheduled is not reasonable.
 - 20) The removal of the track caused consternation in the community. The process for input included the request for a 200-meter track. The track fits into the Fieldhouse. It was a mistake not to show it.
 - 21) The financial priority is the pool.

Ms. Hardin asked the plans be reviewed by the LTPF Committee as the Board of Education prioritizes the three plans. The plans are hard to read online, and she was concerned about faculty and community members being able to read this. She also noted that staff and students deserve time apart during lunch students need a chance to get away from teachers. The Committee members voices need to be heard, why faculty want their classrooms.

Mr. Weissglass revised his motion. He moved to accept the concepts presented in the report presented and request that the administration recommends a process for setting priorities and moving the plan forward; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. A roll call vote resulted in 6 ayes and one nay. Mr. Arkin voted nay.

Authorize Costing Dr. Gevinson appreciated the comments as it is essential to consult with coaches that affect their support and want to do as much as possible as an option on that and present and clarify options. He read the following statement. “This process has been unusual. The memo that has been attached to the agenda is a brief schedule and the architects who have done the pro bono work will explain in more detail the plan. This is an effort to consider an excellent idea for a decision we will have to make for a century and appreciate the opportunity to share even though coming forward in unconventional way. You may think this solution emerged quickly, but have been thinking about such things for a while but only recently felt it was possible to keep 7 courts on campus and diminished or squeeze any other sports or the users of the west field. We have made that clear in the architects. It eliminates of the previous plan, IGA and putting sport off campus and a less expensive solution and is an economical one. It could not have been accomplished without these superb architects. Yesterday I spoke with Brian Endless who is on board of OPYB and representing youth baseball and softball community and Mel Kolbusz and Fred Galluzzo about the plan posted on the agenda and got much input and some of it was similar to the commenters today. In particular, Mr. Endless raised some questions, and I believe we can answer them. I picked up a sense of resistance that it was not about

where we would put things , seats, dugouts, but a strong sense of not want to lose what these sports had and a feeling that they would lose something and for some of the them that would not threaten any of the sports on the west fields and I understand and respect that but I do believe this option will satisfy the needs. Fred Galluzzo had said that he would prefer status quo of the eight courts on 80-year-old cement rather than seven state-of-the art courts and bathrooms on the field. That reaction combined with comments, made me ask Mr. Galluzzo and Brian Endless how they would feel about a pool on the same site if it were underground. And would not change anything. That is what Mr. Eakin brought up early in their talks and the reaction could be good or even great. So, Mr. Eakin and Mr. Heitzman were asked to put something tighter and they did. What surprised him, was the cost. Putting it underground is expensive, but by not renovating the west fields and not using expensive facing materials, it would more than offset the additional expense, it was less expensive than an above ground pool.”

He introduced Garret Eakin and Frank Heitzman. Mr. Eakin is past OP Preservation and Plan Commissioner, an architecture critic for the *Wednesday Journal*, adjunct professor of Architecture at the School of the Art Institute, Recipient of 23 national and local architecture and preservation awards, and co-author of *Interior Architecture* 1993 Van Noustrand Reinhold. Mr. Heitzman is the current president of the Downtown Oak Park, Village of Oak Park Volunteer of the Year, 2003, Past Director and Past President, American Institute of Architects, Chicago Chapter, 1985-1993, First Vice-President of the Oak Park Preservation Association (PPA), 1984 to present and Instructor in Architectural Design, Building Construction, Interior Design and Computer-Aided Design in the Triton College Architectural Program, 1984 to now.

Mr. Garrett was asked by Ms. Katherine Christmas to draft an accurate plan of the Oak Park High School pro bono as she felt it the current plans were not accurate. He then asked Mr. Heitzman to help. Some months ago, he and Mr. Heitzman met with Mr. Weissglass to propose a commission of a world-class architect to design this project. The idea was banned due to timing issues. He and Mr. Heitzman then met with Ms. Christmas and Dr. Gevinson, and they relayed the history of the natatorium project, including a program for interior and exterior spaces. They received a complete tour of the areas of interest, a topical survey, and an overlaid the west field.

Two options were proposed, Option 5A, all above ground, and Option 5B, below ground. This was developed from the knowledge of Ms.

Christmas and Dr. Gevinson, i.e., sizes of the courts, etc. Standardization and specifications were included and 5A and 5B will generate the least amount of disruption. Construction accessibility was direct from the west side, as opposed to Lake Street. The simplicity of plan will reduce costs and simplify construction. Option 5 has the most potential of being the most exciting, first class architecture, and it will serve all of the community for the next 100 years. The details of the plan were discussed. Both architects have experience with building underground. While expensive to dig the hole, that cost would be offset by not having to build above ground. Doing so would calm the fears of too much crowding. If 8 tennis courts were needed, then Option 5B would suffice. Regenstein Library was highlighted as an example of an underground building. The roof was vegetative with 1-foot of topsoil with grass on it.

Board of Education members were impressed with the time, skill and thoroughness that these architects had put to this endeavor. Ms. Spivy noted that her high school had an underground pool. This pool would have a double floor. These proposals addressed both issues, i.e., moving a sport off campus and 2) the complexity of the IGA. All other options have problems too. Option 2 is a construction nightmare in terms of having to rebuild, and the District would get less for a more money. Option 4 takes away green space, walkways and peripherally and does not address the professionals' needs. This was intriguing.

Mr. Arkin acknowledged the impeccable credentials of these two architects but noted that the School Code sets for a system as to how architects are engaged. He felt this presentation was inappropriate and had questions about each of these options. When asked what kind of liability the District would have if these services were pro bono, Mr. Arkin stated that the District pays an architectural firm through a request for qualifications. The qualifications are vetted, voted on by the Board of Education. This is a proposal from an architect that the District has not employed. Mr. Weissglass too had process concerns. Throughout the process, he had said if there were other viable options that they would be allowed to come forward. Part of what the Board of Education asked for through the community engagement process was how to improve upon what was presented. Out of respect for a fellow Board of Education member, he agreed that this could be added to the agenda and allow it to be voted down. This option on its face was plausible because it kept all sports on campus and encouraged SG to begin a process of testing with the community. He also asked to receive the presentation before a motion was made. Serious questions arise about whether something new should be entertained. The District would have to ask Legat to compare apples to apples this proposal to all of the proposals.

Dr. Gevinson moved to direct the admin to have an independent cost estimate to determine the construction to the west field solutions, keeping all sports on campus; seconded by Ms. Cassell. Discussion ensued. Some members wanted more details and deeper discussions with coaches, committee and the administration.

This plan would take out space from the mall area, not the roadway. There was resistance to Plan 5A because of community resistance.

The cost of an independent cost analysis would be \$7,000 to \$10,000.

The Board of Education decided to split the motion. Dr. Gevinson noted that with Option 5B, the pool could be made bigger and not impinge on anything.

Mr. Weissglass moved to replace the current motion with the following motion: Move to direct the administration to ask Legat to look at option 5B and express an opinion on its viability, its conformity with the program and from their own expertise, the wisdom moving forward. No second. This motion would eliminate Option 5A.

Questions were raised about why Legat told the Board of Education that tearing down the garage and putting a garage underneath the pool was too expensive and it would not work. The conceptual work was about putting parking underground, and that was too expensive and perhaps unsafe. A community member brought forth an idea after the community meetings to go underground on the north end of the mall, east of the tennis courts, but a water main was there and old foundations may exist.

Mr. Garrett stated that they were community volunteers only. They do this type of thing often. Legat is a colleague and they were not at the meeting to criticize anything they had done, and they would be happy to work with Legat on this. Nothing seems to be missing from the plan. The suggestion was to work with cost estimator.

Ms. Spivy moved for Legat to review the specifications of Option 5b to ensure that it meets the needs of the school and, if so, go forward with cost estimate; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes, one nay, and one abstention. Mr. Arkin voted nay and Mr. Weissglass abstained. Motion carried.

Closed Session

At 11:14 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation,

discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 11:47 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session.

**Approval
Documentary**

No action was taken.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the personnel recommendations, including new hires; as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 11:48 p.m., Mr. Cofsky moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass
President

Sara Dixon Spivy
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board of Education