

June 30, 2016

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, June 30, 2016, in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:05 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; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Assessment; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:07 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to enter into closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; and The placement of individual students in special education programs and other matters relating to individual students 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11); seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 6:30 p.m. the Board of Education returned to the open session.

Visitors

Fred Preuss, Mike Carioscio, and Karin Sullivan, OPRFHS Staff; Judith Alexander, Daniel Beven, Katherine and Larry Christmas, Chris Donovan, Robert Douglas, Wayne Franklin, Bill Gale, Derrick Griffin, Lynn Kamenitsa, Bruce & Maureen Kleinman, Amanda Massie, Mary Roberts, Gina Semillia, Monica Sheehan, Dr. Carl Spight, Kevin Peppard, Robert Zeh community members; Legat representatives Rob Wroble, Mike Maloney, and Robin. Steve Schering of the Pioneer Press and Mike Romain of *Wednesday Journal*.

**Public
Comments**

Amanda Massie, resident of Oak Park, was distraught about the parking garage being torn down. Her oldest son was a swimmer and a water polo player, and she agreed that the pools need to be fixed. She believed that the community needed to look at things that facilitated education and to distinguish between the “wants” and “needs.” She was surprised that OPRFHS had ranked 36th in the US News Report, as she thought it would be much higher. She wanted the District to vet performing arts, as well.

Chris Donovan, resident of Oak Park, questioned why the plans for the pool kept getting bigger and when would the “needs” versus the “wants” be determined.

Robert Zeh the Board of Education to consider the average resident. Bundling the long-term facilities plan with the pool is something he would not support. He asked the Board of Education to make the decision about the pool only.

Bruce Kleinman, resident of Oak Park, noted that achievement is the core issue of the school, not the pool. If a decision is made to put up a big pool building, it will be a waste of time. Other taxing bodies, the Park District, District 97, the Village of Oak Park for the Eisenhower, will be going for referendums. He suggested going with the “needs” only, not the “wants.” He urged the Board of Education to submit a referendum that will pass.

Judith Alexander, resident of Oak Park, noted that Legat had said that all pool options could accommodate the program and that the program could not be changed without a month of consulting with the pool community, which has already taken place. The Board of Education has the right to review the program and to cut some usage if this is in the best interests of all concerned, including academic programs, other athletic programs and all the citizens of Oak Park and River Forest. She asked why swimming should be the only two-session PE requirement. Why should students who know how to swim be required to take swimming? Stevenson High School has a 50-meter pool, but swimming is only a PE option for those who can swim. Forcing all students to take swimming has long been abandoned by most high schools that still have aquatic programs. It makes sense for them to use the pools when the high school doesn't need access. But it does not make sense to include this usage in the program, especially because the Park District may build a community center with an indoor pool. Feeder programs point to how the demand for the pool time has been used. Option 2 is the least costly. Ms. Alexander understood the Board of Education is trying to consider pool options as part of the long-term facility plan. But by pairing Option 2 with the performing arts addition, it is coupling something that meets an undeniable need with something really has not been vetted as a need. The performing arts renovation plans have not been vetted. She asked that the Board of Education apply the “wants” versus “needs” test in the facility plan. She favored spending more money when it made sense and she regretted the Board of Education's decision not to hire a highly experienced history instructor in favor of a less expensive, more junior one.

Lynn Kamenitsa, resident of Oak Park, had comments and questions about the performing arts space. It had been vetted by Applause! and one outside group. The reasons for renovating this area is because there is not enough space to store materials, etc. Citizens asked that attention is paid to the other needs of the school, something that has not been revisited for a few years. Performing arts is an identified need that the public asked the Board of Education to do in a systematic way. The boys' locker room is a need, not a want.

Heather Claxton, resident of Oak Park, moved to Oak Park in 2014 because of the school district. She agreed the community needed to invest wisely in its

schools. The US News and Report published the high school's rankings, and it was curious that Oak Park was not among the top 10 and that the number 2 school does not have a pool. She provided some additional statistics from the report, noting that over one-half of the disadvantaged students are not proficient in English or math, and are not capable of getting a job with minimum wage. That is a "need." An Olympic pool cannot fix these issues.

Mary Roberts noted that Jordin Hale was a disadvantaged youth who attended OPRFHS and because of her participation on the water polo team, she graduated from OPRFHS with enough academic excellence to get a full ride to Iona College to play water polo. This decision is not about an Olympic pool; it is about coupling sports and athletics with academic excellence. The students who are involved in athletics are also students on top of their game with academics. She thanked the Board of Education for tackling this very large problem.

Robert Douglass, a software developer, said the waterfall model that he uses to develop software generates requirements, a document that is given first to the software engineer, then to implementers, then to testers, and finally to the customers. Regardless of the philosophy of the software model, they agree that it is the worst way to develop a problem. He asked that the Board of Education to start with the requirements desired. He urged them to reconsider the program verification. More information has been provided and he asked them to make informed decisions on whether the wants were worth the price.

Discussion of Pool and Facilities

At its June 23, 2016, regular meeting, the Board considered a motion to bring forward a draft of Pool Option 5C to the community meetings in July. Option 5C is a separate underground pool beneath the baseball field. (Option 5C replaced the previously presented Option 5B, which did not include all verified program elements; Option 5C does.) Based on figures from an independent CCS cost estimate, the approximate projected cost of Option 5C was believed to be \$38.7 million. The motion was tabled so that Legat Architects could integrate Option 5C into a long-term facilities plan for further consideration. Legat was asked to prepare documents for discussion at the June 30 Special Board meeting that will focus on helping the Board of Education consider Long Term Facilities Plan A and Plan B, which incorporate Pool Options 2 and 4 respectively, without consideration of the underground pool. Legat also provided draft documents regarding a possible Plan C that incorporates Pool Option 5C. Documents presented included a review of the Pool Verification Program and a matrix comparing the Long Term Facilities Plans, as requested by the Board of Education.

The Board of Education members reviewed the timeline to make a decision about the pools presented in the packet. It was the consensus of the Board of Education to schedule further meetings on July 28 and August 1 at 6:00 p.m. However, Mr. Cofsky will be out of town July 28.

The community engagement meetings would include a long-term facilities plan presentation and a modified gallery walk where the administrators, the architects, and Board of Education members will be available to answer questions. Those conversations will be recorded as anecdotal information. Board members were encouraged to attend to hear those conversations. The administration is working on the questions for the random telephone survey of 300 likely voters, which will provide quantitative data and give a broader picture of what the community knows about the options.

In 2014, the OPRFHS's Pool Committee looked at various site options and ultimately recommended the garage site if no other location could be found. In May 2015, Legat was tasked with charged with designing a natatorium on site. Planning meetings were scheduled with various stakeholder groups about the high school's facilities. The public groups included TOPS, West Suburban Recreation, student athletic groups, the Park District, etc. Each session consisted of 5 to 6 administrators, architects, Board of Education members and they were one to two hours in length. The number of stakeholders in a group was no more than 10 or 12; their input was collected. Notes were prepared of the meetings, and that information was used to develop the diagrams about specifics, i.e., equipment, facilities, etc. In September 2015, Legat brought forward a program that the Board of Education approved and that program was moved to the schematic design phase. The core team expanded to include Clay Reagan, Ed Kraus, Fred Preuss and John Stelzer. The process was comprehensive and the involved stakeholders who determined the needs. The programs were driven the need to have a secure, safe environment for people and equipment and one that supported the development of programs. Deck space is important to allow people to move freely. Kayaks are an obstruction, just as is a scorekeeper's table. Storage facilities are needed. Also, the need for staff available at all times, changing rooms, an office to work in, etc.

Discussion ensued about the fact that the contingencies were not included in the costs of Plan 5C, as developed by Legat, as is usually done and therefore Plan C was significantly more expensive than Plan B. As such, Mr. Weissglass directed the administration to bring forward documents comparing Plan A and B on the assumption that one of them would be moved forward. He stated, however, that if a Board of Education member wanted to make a motion and it is seconded, the Board of Education can discuss moving Plan C forward.

Some members were frustrated that they had not received all of the information they needed from the experts. Mr. Weissglass noted that not including the adjustment was because the Board of Education has requested Legat to do work at a very fast pace. Surfacing things is a collaborative part of a group process; it is not a negative. Over 20 designs have been requested in the last 21 months. Once the Board of Education approves a plan, it can explore architectural and management services moving forward, but stopping to explore that now would

distract from the tight timeframe. While it may have been a mistake, it was an understandable mistake. One Board of Education member responded to the reason for not having the right information was because of the number of requests for designs it made was not entirely a fair or accurate depiction. Part of the reason is that the Board of Education is not being given full information is that they are not anticipating information in a way that this member would expect the experts to be able to do, given that they have the expertise and the Board of Education members do not know what questions to ask. Mr. Arkin who is part of the internal pool committee stated that when this process started in January, the tight timeline was known. It has been difficult. The Board of Education has tried to be transparent. Legat has been asked to expedite things that would normally would have taken it weeks to not a few days. The Board of Education has also been sidetracked by other things, such as the other architects on Plan C. Some of the blame is situational because of what Legat has been asked to do in the timeline requested. Mr. Arkin noted that the third option cost 50% more than what was originally told to the Board of Education. A plan is needed to go for a referendum in November. During the course of time, there are processes and one of them would be to review the process of creating a facility like this—start with a concept, do verification, conceptual design, program verification, price—what is that timeline for that and what should the expectations be. That is important for everyone to note. What are the steps of the project, the natural timeline?

Legat stated that the conceptual design is where one tests the master plan and then takes it to a systemic level. Once approved, it will take 8 to 9 months to produce construction documents, bid documents, go out for bid, and then 18 months for construction. The verification process is very important in the design development stage. The costs are estimated by a third party estimate company. When the design documents are completed and more information is known about the materials, structure square footage, etc., a more accurate estimate can be completed by a third party. This is a funneling process. The final number is a result of the bid documents. Relative to the dollars, Legat has done three other projects, and these numbers are based on cost per square footage plus design and construction contingencies (10% and 15% respectively). Soft cost adjustment factor is included at 25%.

Discussion ensued about how to determine a “want” versus a “need.” If in the design phase the Board of Education wants to make some adjustments downward in cost, the referendum number may not be accurate. Legat noted too that an escalator clause was included because construction will not occur for two years. The District has a line item in the Capital Improvement Fund, and the Board of Education can ask the administration to provide an analysis as to how much of the annual capital budget would be able to be redirected to these capital costs, which would bring down the costs.

About whether the Board of Education was involved in the verification process, the response that the core team did have Board of Education representation.

Legat also said that the wants and needs were a result of the filtering and included in the notes. When asked to define the definition of want and need, Mr. Cofsky stated that the ultimate need was to keep the swimming pool open and that need would be met with a \$22 million pool. Another plan provides more and costs more. What is critical? The Board of Education has the responsibility to balance the vision of the future with the financial challenges of the District. The bigger the gap, the bigger the hurdle and the Board of Education needs to find out what that is and determine how to address it. The verification program of September 2015 was based on the pool being built on the garage site. When that ended, and the Board of Education withdrew that option and went back to the drawing board, the basic elements that had been verified were incorporated into the other three options created in April, so there was an apples-to-apples comparison. After an option has been decided upon, the Board of Education were revisit verification with the new players, and that could involve trimming or changing the plan. In the referendum scenario, the Board of Education would decide on a project first but then wait until the funding was approved by the voters before revisiting verification.

Dr. Gevinson had spoken recently to an athletic director at another school about an aquatics facility, and he said it was the Board of Education's job to make it work with what it has. That could have been the approach used once the petition was successful. The Board of Education should have revised the pool options and not gone with a big pool. The Board of Education could have looked at the program in a similar way and defined the program down, in the same way it defined the pool down if it were reasonable. If that had been done, a better designed and more cost effective options may have been the result. He felt this was a reverse process. He believed the program verification process for an apples-to-apples comparison had been a straitjacket into a very large program that will ultimately not be the approved program and the Board of Education will have to look at the wants and needs.

Discussion ensued regarding the Building Program Comparison Chart. In reviewing it, a typo was noted regarding the size of Plan Option B and would be corrected. Discussion also ensued regarding the size of the total construction area. The total water volume is a 20% reduction between Plan B and Plan A.

One member was frustrated because he/she did not understand the need versus want question and would be unable to explain it to the community why the Board of Education would seek a referendum. People are seeking that information. The Board of Education would seek that information from the content experts. How much could the cost of the facilities be reduced is unknown. One member asked if the pool was being built for the community or for the high school. Dr. Moore hoped that the high school was not trying to build a community pool and keeping at the heart of the discussion the students. One member asked if when the administration met with stakeholders they were told there was a financial target and the response was no. A financial target can decrease the delta between

2 and 4 and that would provide success. Originally, FAC had recommended earmarking \$20 million for capital improvements, not for the pool. The \$20 million came from the committee's deliberations about a 2013 estimate as to the cost of a 50-meter pool anoint. It had not included soft costs, and during the expansive exploration by the Pool Committee, it was learned that the costs were significantly higher. At that time, Mr. Weissglass almost disbanded the committee, but the Board of Education determined to go higher. While Mr. Arkin suggested allowing the administration to make some cuts, he was afraid to force an arbitrary number because the result would be unknown. He was more comfortable looking at the individual numbers and asking the original stakeholders if changes could be made. Option B also has 8,500 of additional, expanded, and unallocated space and if repurposed for classrooms at \$300 per square foot would cost \$2 to \$3 million.

In order for the Board of Education to go for a referendum in November it must approve a resolution in August. Could Plan 5C be analyzed between now and then? There were questions as to why Legat's drawing of the underground pool was over \$50 million and yet the pool in Connecticut was in service for \$18 million. Was the Board of Education willing to change the program and do a study of what is available in the world? Should the Board of Education stop at the 20 plus designs it has had received over the past 21 months and believe it has the best it can have and then make a decision?

Mr. Arkin moved to bring forth the community engagement meetings on July 19 and 20 Options A & B; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Options A and B were presented at the June 23 meeting. Ms. Sullivan presented a draft of the comparison chart for the community meetings and asked for feedback.

Dr. Moore felt the \$37 million was heart stopping and as the process has moved forward, the price has increased. The Board of Education needed to consider what is in the best interest of the students and what is in the best interest of a long-term view that does not try to plan for everyone, every need, every want, and has cost parameters. It was a matter of budgeting. She went back to earlier comments and discussions about this and the prior Board of Education's concern about the overall means of the school community that affect more than one percent of the students. Mr. Arkin agreed with Dr. Moore's comments, and that was the reason for two options. He will vote to bring one option to referendum as part of the process to get the questions answered.

Questions yet to be considered:

- 1) A comparison the loss of green space was requested. (bump-outs)
- 2) What is the impact on athletics, i.e., does not say that the smaller 4-lane pool cannot be used for water polo practice, so that means that because boys and girls are scheduled in the same season they cannot practice at the same time.

There would be two practices every day and one would go as late as 9 p.m. It is during construction time.

- 3) What disruption would there be beyond the school?
- 4) What is traffic and parking disruptions?
- 5) Is Scoville disrupted?
- 6) Is the fact that closing the alley for Option 4 so it could not be used as a corridor for emergency vehicles and they would not be able to turn around serious?
- 7) How would construction affect sports outside of aquatics be represented, including crossing the streets?
- 8) What is the length of the power shutdown when working on the two pools?

Board of Education members were asked to send additional comments to Ms. Sullivan.

The purpose of the community meetings are to inform them that it is the Board of Education 's intent to take collective input and refine one of the two options. How will this work? Refinements before a referendum decision is made are highly unlikely due to the timing of the community meetings. The Board of Education will ask for feedback and take that into account in making a decision. The Board of Education will have quantitative research, in addition to the qualitative information as well via the phone survey. An apprehension was expressed that the phone survey with a target of N of 300 or 350 may not be statistically significant, but the phone research firms say that sampling is statistically significant. Ms. Sutter has found phone surveys useful and effective.

One member was concerned that the coaches of water polo, swimming, diving, and synchronized swim had not been asked their opinion as to the ramifications on their programs. That information will be provided. It was noted that if there were a modified piece of community engagement that could specifically target a subgroup of interested parties that would be helpful. The scheduling of events is not just about the water, it is also about locker rooms.

The Board of Education needs to understand the information from PE and athletics in order to understand the impact on the options. Plan A has much less water, and if chosen, plans would be tailored to that. One member believed that the west pool was too deep for learning how to swim at a 7 foot depth.

Discussion ensued about managing or identifying costs, and providing a target. It was suggested that the administration along with a Board of Education member meet with as many primary stakeholders as possible, i.e., PE, adaptive PE, athletics, and re-review the verification program to see if some items could be removed from the process. Legat suggested listing the items in the order of priorities with the pool being the number one priority. A suggestion was made to do a PowerPoint introduction at the community meetings and provide useful information.

Because Ms. Spivy felt that Option 5C had not been given enough consideration and was mentioned as a mysterious option at the community meetings, she felt it should be presented. Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to advance Option 5C to the community forums for input; seconded by Dr. Moore. A comparison chart of Options A, B, and C was distributed and reviewed. Ms. Spivy added that the Board of Education has been unfairly accused of not being transparent with the community and not presenting it with an option that has not be discussed with the community was not being as transparent as possible. Dr. Gevinson concurred and said he was uncomfortable with 5C as drawn and he wondered if the cost and size could be reduced and still achieve a cost-effective, a well-designed underground pool that would serve the District's needs and be safe. He was uncomfortable with the high cost and favored offering a choice with the explanation that the District would push to economize to make it more cost effective, if selected.

Ms. Cassell felt Option 5C should be brought forward because of the disclaimer in the initial community meetings. However, now that there is a new cost estimate that included soft cost, it is not viable. The community could be disappointed. If the community supported it maybe the Board of Education would be supportive, but comments about Option 5 that it should be less expensive lead her to believe the Board of Education would support it.

Mr. Arkin felt Option 5C had a considerable amount of risk and so many unknowns exist when going underground. The known ones are the water table issues, life safety, ventilation, natural light, etc. One cannot just add in an additional 10% for those risks because of the ongoing risks. He did not believe this option would pass a referendum and, therefore, it did not make sense to move it forward.

Dr. Moore did not feel that any of the numbers were real in terms of options. While she thought that the cost of 5C was prohibitive, she also believed that Plan A and B were prohibitive. Mr. Cofsky saw no harm in bringing it forward to the community. He had hoped for lower costs with other benefits.

Mr. Weissglass did not believe Plan 5C was a viable option. He was concerned about the risk issues around construction and operating an underground pool with this many students in this environment. He did not think it was a good idea on its merits. It is politically dangerous to bring an option at this cost level because it was raised it at the Board of Education level. He felt that doing a re-visit of the program was as applicable to this as was Option 4, so anything would be helpful regarding talking about the potential costs and that will temper the idea of bringing a higher number forward. He noted that it would be healthy to have a 4/3 vote as the Board of Education was ambivalent about bringing it forward previously. He would work to have it have a fair place in the conversation. This

option will add another level of complexity to the community meetings and phone survey. He also felt that if the Board of Education approved this project, it would learn that it was not feasible to build it based on the ten risk factors Legat noted.

Dr. Gevinson added that Fenwick has an underground pool with a gymnasium 10 feet above it. It is 12-lanes, 25-yards, has narrow deck space and it supports the state championship water polo team. It struck him that the pool being proposed in Option 5C is expensive, but it seems indestructible.

Mr. Arkin noted that the Board of Education had many plans with big price tags come forward and were dismissed by the Board of Education. He did not believe Option 5C was not a feasible number to bring to the public.

Dr. Gevinson stated that he thought that the markup process used and the program being used disadvantaged a free standing building because the amount of space needed for the program is more expensive if one has to start from scratch. He did not believe the numbers were realistic and this point they will not change for the community meetings. But if it were selected, he believed the cost would come down significantly. Mr. Weissglass stated that if the contingencies and adjustors outside of program verification piece are high and the new building take 20% more space when the adjustment is removed, it will come down a couple of percentage points.

A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and three nays. Motion Passed. Mr. Arkin, Mr. Weissglass, and Ms. Cassell voted nay.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the personnel recommendations as presented; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Interim
Superintendent**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the contract with Dr. Joylynn Pruitt as the Interim Superintendent for the 2016-17 school year; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Weissglass noted that she had the experience of being a special education teacher, principal, and a superintendent for nine years. The interim position usually goes to retired superintendents within one's state, and they are limited to 100 days per year. Because Dr. Pruitt is out of state and the best candidate, she is not subject to that limitation and will work 200 days. A press release will be available.

Mr. Weissglass thanked Dr. Isoye for his service to the District for six years and wished him great luck at Niles Township High School.

Dr. Gevinson expressed his gratitude to Dr. Isoye, noting that it had been a pleasure to work with him and it was with much regret that his tenure was ending much sooner than he thought. He wished him the best in your career and thanked him for his service to OPRFHS.

Mr. Arkin too appreciated Dr. Isoye wisdom, depth of knowledge and demeanor. Niles Townships High School is getting an A+ superintendent.

Adjournment

At 10:20 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass
President

Sara Dixon Spivy
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board