

August 1, 2016

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Monday, August 1, 2016 in the Board Room of the high school.

**Call to Order**

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:10 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. Joylynn Pruitt, Superintendent; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

**Closed Session**

Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Visitors**

Chris Donovan, Burcy Hines, Julie Griffin, Wyanetta Johnson, Ellen Pimentel, Mike Poirier, Wayne Franklin, Judith Alexander, Mary Roberts, Monica Sheehan, Dr. Carl Spight, and Kevin Peppard, community members.

**Public Comments**

Chris Donovan, resident of Oak Park and graduate, supported not tearing down the parking garage as it has debt that is still owed and it may continue to serve the community for 25 years. He talked about the long-term facility plan that added storage space, a black box, and eliminated the adaptive PE space. He was impressed with the Board of Education. He favored Plan A as it was the most practical and cost effective, and it did not tear down the garage, and it made sense for the taxpayers.

Burcy Hines, resident of Oak Park, spoke on behalf of having open-ended resources for other activities for other students. The pool had been talked about more than AYP, the record card, curriculum, enhancing learning, and tracking. She asked the Board of Education not to forget about the other concerns in the community who want a pool, but not at the higher cost.

Julie Griffin, resident of Oak Park, spoke on behalf of the performing arts. The arts are an economic engine for the state. The academic benefits of performing arts is significant. Enrollment is up 26%, 1,100 enrollments in 37 sections. Marching band up enrollment is up 45% in the last six years. Over 200 students participate in theatre and design, and music classes in Studio 200. Music classes have also increased in the last few years. Not all of the students will go on to the performing arts, but they will have the skills to survive in the 21st-century workforce.

Ellen Pimentel, resident of Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education for the pursuit for the facilities in the high school. Serious academic issues always exist and must be addressed. The Board of Education meetings are longer and longer. She supported Plan

B. She felt that the community needed to be educated about the condition of the pools: they are crumbling. It will raise the pool's level of importance in the community's eyes. Education is important.

Gina Sennella, resident of Oak Park, spoke on behalf of the garage and fiscal responsibility. The previous Board tended to take as much as it could and then find a way to spend it. While this Board of Education is different, if it tears down the garage, it will erase the progress it has made in the community as it has a 25-year life span. She asked the Board of Education to continue to study the issues and to vet the expenditures with the LTFP and to represent all of the community members, not just the pool and performing arts.

Mike Poirier, resident of Oak Park, wanted to understand the differences between Options A and B and reminded the Board of Education that this process was started to address the existing pools. Plan A solved that problem and in a superior way provided an 8-lane competitive pool and returned diving back on site. Then, because one group wanted to do more, Option A is inferior. A press release demeaned the additional four-lane pool saying it was nothing more than a large bathtub. However, PE could use that space for adaptive PE. \$20 million for the benefit 200 students is too much; it is a \$100,000 premium per student. What other small group is supported in that way?

Wayne Franklin supported Option B for the LTFP and he appreciated the Board of Education's work and listened carefully. He encouraged making a decision at this meeting.

Judith Alexander, resident of Oak Park, referenced the material in the packet and read the following statement: "A [chart](#) showing the proposed usage of the three pool plans was released at last week's meeting. It clearly shows that pool Option A, the pragmatic plan, meets the needs of OPRF and provides the community with the most flexibility in usage.

"During the fall and winter, usage is the SAME for all three options. Practices begin and end at the same time. In fact, the same is true even during the spring season for the water polo teams. There is, however, a glaring omission in Options B & C. Pool time for synchronized swimming appears nowhere on the chart. Would it be eliminated? Under Option A, synchronized swimming gets an earlier practice time and an additional hour of pool time.

"It's true that during the spring season, the water polo teams would have to share the pools, something they have never had to do before. But why should this be seen as such a problem? Other OPRF sports teams stagger practices, without complaint, due to limited field space. And other high school swimming programs do the same. Evanston's aquatics, including water polo, operate successfully in pools smaller than those in Option A. Fenwick's aquatics include powerhouse water polo teams. They work with the same pool space as Option A--12 lanes, eight deep and four warm-ups.

“I don’t think we should be asked to pay for a pool to accommodate community groups. But if pool time is available, these groups certainly should be able to use it. And Option A provides them with the most access. In the comparison chart, it wrongly states that the community will only have access to four lanes with Option A while 17 lanes would be available under Options B & C. In fact, during the fall and winter, the community groups would have access to all 12 lanes in Option A. This is one more lane than currently available. In the spring, usage falls to four lanes during the week. But the community would have NO use of the pools in Options B & C on weekdays. “Pool Option A, the pragmatic pool plan, is the clear choice for the school, the community and taxpayers.”

William Gale, read a letter from Maureen Kleinman. “In reading over the informational material attached to the agenda for tonight, it seems that a major justification to tear down the parking garage in order to build a bigger pool is so that the boys and girls water polo teams don’t have scheduling conflicts for practice times.

“That is an incredibly flimsy reason. The water polo season is eight weeks long; add another 2-4 week for tryouts and preseason - that makes it, at most, twelve weeks. It makes no sense to go through the extra cost to taxpayers and inconvenience to the community (and visitors) for something that will provide a minor benefit to a relatively small group for just 12 weeks out of the year.

“I have a lot of faith that the coaches and P.E. staff will figure out a way to make a 4-lane, 25-yard west pool serves their needs, despite dire warnings otherwise. And, if it truly is as useless as they fear, then do away with it and repurpose that space.”

Mr. Gale commented that the phone survey had no contextual questions about education. Plan A only had \$1.5 million earmarked for learning. He stated that some of the community felt that spending another \$15 million to tear down the parking garage and rebuild it was not acceptable. If the Board of Education chooses Option B, the referendum will not pass.

Mary Roberts, resident of Oak Park, encouraged the Board of Education to vote tonight and move on towards the referendum. She supported Option B and she highlighted what the athletic director explained last week as to why Option B was a superior option for students and the school and why it would provide the most opportunity for the students in PE and athletics.

Monica Sheehan, resident of Oak Park, read a statement: “Over the past few months, you have spent considerable time, effort and taxpayer dollars seeking community input on the pools and their proposed plans. I appreciate this effort. It should have been done three years ago. Now that you have gathered this information, the big question tonight is whether you will vote by the community’s wishes or whether you will vote to ignore them.

“The community meetings were a positive addition to the pool discussion. In the last round, attendees overwhelmingly favored Option A, the least expensive pool, and its long-term facility plan. Your commissioned-phone survey confirmed it. Option A is the plan favored most by voters. The Fako Survey provides the most compelling and objective data. In it, voters rejected all three of the plans.

“Option A, on page 4, is the only plan in which voters are evenly split. 46% Favor it (15% Strongly / 31% Somewhat) v. 47% Oppose it (25% Strongly / 22% Somewhat).

“The survey reveals support falls dramatically after Option A. With the rising costs of Options B & C, the percentage of those who are recorded as “strongly favoring either plan,” sharply declines.

“The survey shows that voters would overwhelmingly reject both of the 40-meter pools and their long-term facility plans, Options B & C, respectively.

“When presented with Option B, on page 5, the \$54 million plan, opposition increases: 56% Oppose it (32% Strongly / 24% Somewhat). Less than two-fifths of residents (37%) favor this version; Fako notes that support for this plan is lukewarm with only 28% somewhat in favor of the plan and 9% strongly in favor. The community clearly does not support Option B.

“A majority of residents (69%) oppose Option C, on page 6, the \$68 million plan, (45% Strongly / 24% Somewhat). Only a quarter of residents (27%) favor this iteration of the plan (7% Strongly / 20% Somewhat). “The charts on page 7 show voters’ willingness to increase taxes to pay for the plans. Support declines sharply after \$75 per year. On the Financing & Tax handout, it shows the tax burden of even the least expensive plan, Option A, surpasses the \$100 mark and would be unacceptable to River Forest voters. On page 8, Fako highlights the aspects that voters like best and least about the plans. The high costs of the plans and tearing down the parking garage are both chief concerns.

“The Fako Survey provides an objective assessment of voter interest and support. Based on the survey, Option A has the only possible chance of being approved by voters. While I believe an expenditure of \$22.3 million dollars should rightfully go to referendum for voter consent and approval, I would not oppose it tonight if you vote to unbundle Option A’s pool and fund it with the cash reserve. Such an action would give you the time needed to fully vet the other components of its long-term facility plan before going to referendum. If you choose to ignore the community’s wishes and put Option B on the ballot and drag this community through months more of needless division, I will publicly oppose any future effort to bypass voters and fund any pool with the cash reserve.”

Bruce Kleinman, resident of Oak Park, felt that both Plan B and C would be rejected by the voters. He asked the Board of Education to consider the implications of the survey. In his opinion, it was important to focus on the needs of the high school’s PE program.

Dr. Carl Spight, resident of Oak Park, father of three adult children, 2 of whom graduated from the high school and one a powerful swimmer, did not advocate for any plan. He offered some caveats going into the election. Other issues exist on which the Board of Education should focus its energies, i.e., social equity, excellence in education for all, the issues of African-American's in the discipline system, etc. He cautioned the Board of Education not to go to November without articulating a propriety as to how funds are to be used, a proper measure.

Kevin Peppard, resident of Oak Park, referred to the telephone survey which indicated Option B and C would fail in a referendum. People here are self-selected as were the people at the community meetings. Ms. Sheehan got 4,300 signatures in two weeks' time. The public sentiment is angry about the priorities of the Board of Education. He suggested they talk with past board members who lost a referendum, i.e., Steve Bruner, Nancy Smiley, Bill Craig, and Don Offermann and to speak with peer level people, i.e., John Hubbuck, head of Huskie Boosters, co-officers of the 1996 referendum about their experiences.

**Instructional  
Materials Fee**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the reduction of the Instructional Materials Fees; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Long-range  
Facilities  
Plan  
Options**

The Board of Education had received the requested follow-up information from the July 28 meeting. The Board of Education members were allowed to present their views and level of support on the three options.

Dr. Gevinson believed that the pool problem was urgent and the Board of Education had spent much time on it. The Board of Education is focused on committing funds to equity issues and it would continue to focus on that. The pool issue is a capital investment that needs to be addressed. He remembered a comment made by a community member about the Board of Education being visionary. This is a once in a century or half-century decision. He had a copy of the book about the history of OPRFHS from 1873 to 1976. He started teaching in 1978. He read from the first paragraph and the last sentence of the book, starting with Greek Phase, nothing assuredly but what is the best translated freely into "Those Things that are Best." It is the model of the OPRFHS. The school crest carries TAGARISTA, meaning "the best," is the symbol of that model. From the beginning, there has been a quest for excellence. A phrase often used in the past to describe the motivation of faculty, students, administrators, and boards of education. Ted Johnson of the History Department in his 1975 slide presentation spoke of the willing and the productive struggle against the ordinary and the limiting of a broad spectrum of endeavors.

Last sentence, "In the future, we hope that OPRFHS will continue the quest for excellence and will always choose those things that are best."

He continued, "This is context about who we are and what the school is. I personally have lived this as much as the faculty and administration, and I hope we continue to

follow it. Over the years, there were major projects on this site. Just building this building which was open in 1907 was a project, and it is a beautiful building. The stadium was built in 1924. The South athletic facility, including the field house, girls gyms and boys' and girls' pools were completed in 1928. For two years, students walked from the north side of Ontario St. with traffic and walked to the field house until they built a tunnel in 1930, which was used until 1967 when they needed to go to gym class. The tunnel still exists. A former dean who graduated had used the tunnel in the 1960's. The major addition built between 1966 and 1971 was done at the cost of \$14M. The web translator says that is \$104 million in 2016 dollars. We have done nothing major since 1971 We acquired the property south of Lake Street and developed the track, created a girls' track, built the garage, and converted football field into artificial turf. We should make this choice consistent with school and community. The first choice is a two pool solution and a 40-meter solution. The three simultaneous practices solution, which means it does not have to be 40 meters. To have three simultaneous practice spaces, one needs five lanes x 3, which is 15 lanes, And that means 40 meter is 141 feet, 15 lanes with 7 1/2 foot lanes would mean 124, could build less for simultaneous actions. That is my choice. What he felt about the 2-pool solution:

“The four-lane pool is useless for water polo practices and meets, inadequate for swim practice if need five lanes. One coach called the bathtub, and another coach said doing nothing would be better than Option A. An eight-lane pool for competitive aquatics is substandard for a school our size. Fenwick has a third of OPRFHS's enrollment and has a 12 lane 25-yard, underground pool. The practice and competition would be diminished for 50 years, which we have sought to avoid in every other athletic program. When we had the plan to reduce tennis courts from eight to seven, it was significant to tennis coach. I pulled back from that because of that. The justification in 1920's for two pools was to keep the gender separate. Why fill those two footprints when it is not superior. Regarding the replacement of adaptive gym, there is no solution that is satisfactory, and that is troubling. The long-term solution between the main entrance on Scoville and the athletic entrance is problematic, we have not see a plan other than a floor plan as to what that would do to this look at the building. The setback is very nice and attractive.

“To recommend is relative cost, but it is a waste of money. It buys something worse than what we had for 90 years and inadequate for the next 90 years. How is it the best? How is it a good investment for the school and community? How would accommodate PE and Athletics? Plan A should be eliminated. The choice between B and C, plan B accommodates all aquatics and parking needs, but the drawback is to knock down a parking garage and build one three times higher and close off the alley. Are there any concerns about emergency services? What would the short-term disruptions be? The cost is more than the cheapest of the options, but I am unsure if it would be possible to pass a referendum, but it would be worth a try because Plan A is not worth it. For plan C, drawbacks are 1) cost, and the perceived drawbacks of safety and unforeseen risks. I would not support the option of \$68 million for the whole thing, and 27% said they would support it and there are only two sentences about it. I

am sure that we could design a safe, leaner green design for an underground pool for at least \$15 to \$20 million less than the \$68 million or the \$53.5 million for the pool itself. That would make it competitive for the Plan B option. Plan C as it now is drawn throws in every possible precautions several of which are unnecessary, and many expensive program components. He has seen a plan by Frank Heisman and Garret Eakin, awarding winning architects, that meets all aquatic needs and safety needs and costs less than \$36 million. They think that is high because it uses an unrealistic figure of \$710 per square foot to arrive at the estimate. He had seen the Brunswick Pool in Greenwich Conn and was given a tour by the director of facilities. It was designed by Skidmore, built by Turner Construction, it opened in 2014, sits under an artificial turf football field and its water table is higher than Oak Park. It is an 8-lane pool, the school is pre-K-12, with a hydraulic floor one end that moves from the deck level to about 8 feet down. It has no double concrete wall, no smoke evaluation system, no surge tank, and no lower level. A hole was dug, concrete was poured, and it was waterproof. All of the mechanicals, HVAC, chemicals are on the upper level. The only pumps used were during the construction. One elevator, 2 exit stairways, locker rooms, coaches' locker room, a janitor closet. The key safety feature is a lock down system so no one can get to the pool deck without a key card. That is what they were concerned. Turner estimated it was in the mid to high \$20 million. Those are the reasons why we can have an underground pool that would be comparable and less expensive than the Plan B. Other issues on Plan C have to do with baseball/softball and crossing the mall. Baseball would not lose an inch away from baseball. No bow to the outfield, it comes across at a right angle on the right and left the field, it is misdrawn. I cannot understand how it could impinge on softball as will not come within a 100 ft. The staging area is the baseball field. Crossing the mall, 15 to 20 feet, could take 5 or 6 seconds, but if still too much for a student, a temporary coordinator could be put up, or a tunnel could be dug without disrupting utilities that run close to the surface. It meets aquatics needs, safe, it's appealing, saves green space, visionary, maintains parking garage, most usable space for instruction. Both Plan B and C would work and would cost the same, and the underground pool would be better for continuing to aspire to the long-standing tradition of those things that are best. This is a visionary community, and a safe, cost-effective architect innovative underground pool would meet all of the aquatics needs, and I support it.”

Ms. Dixon Spivy addressed the idea that somehow because the Board of Education had spent so much time talking about the pool that it mattered more than all other things the Board of Education was doing. She noted that the Culture, Climate, and Behavior Committee is trying to make the discipline code equitable. She invited everyone to the August 9 meeting. Much work is done outside of the Board room. The pools are falling apart, and the Board of Education needs to be visionary. Given the fact that these pools last 100 years, Option A is short-sighted. The community needs to think about the long-term use. OPRFHS is expanding. Enrollment is rising. The Board of Education needs to think ahead 30 and 40 years. Two inferior pools would maintain the 1920 status quo and limit options in the south end of the building. She favored Option C, even though it has not been well vetted. Option B would be her second choice. She would not support Option A.

Mr. Cofsky said the Board of Education must balance the needs of the students with the financial means of the community. The Board of Education must have vision. The balance is often blurred by advocacy groups and the Board of Education's challenge is to de-blur and seek what is best for the majority. The research done was powerful because individual advocacy and public input did provide additional information that was representative of the community. He observed 1) how challenging it is to educate the community; 2) data shows that citizens do have cost concerns; 3) many taxing bodies have needs as well. An article in the Wednesday Journal was powerful and he believed there is a population that cannot afford to see steep increases taxes in the community, but we run the risk of being a different community, a wealthy community. He thinks about that in the context of the facility and the community as a whole. This is an area with high taxes, and this will increase taxes. Option A is a lower cost, and it meets the current level of needs, but it is disruptive regarding implementation, and it does not meet the level of a visionary. Option B provides some vision and a better pool structure, but the incremental costs as it stands is a major concern. Option C is visionary, a pool space that is an enhancement and frees up the most space for educational needs but the economics of what was presented, he could not support as is. He would have liked Option C played out better, but it is time to dismiss it. He leaned toward Option A or to getting the cost down in Option B.

Ms. Cassell had not believed Plan C was a viable option based on the data from the phone survey and it was not fiscally responsible as presented at this time. It was too risky to be going underground given the water tables, etc. Safety should be paramount, and she would support a pared-down version of Option C. With no clear cut decision, Option A seems to be the right choice because of the cost, PE swimming, and diving. If just the pool were rebuilt and not the long-term facilities plan, the adaptive gym would be lost, and she would not support that. Scheduling challenges exist with Options A as well. If the LTFP improvements are included, green space is lost. Power would be lost for six weeks. Option B is more expensive, and she too had difficulty with tearing down the parking garage that could last another 25 years but takes up too much space. She had concerns with the public thinking that an option that cost \$40 million would be chosen and that the District was not addressing the equity issues. The CCB has been looking at irregularities in disciplinary code and student discipline data and that work will continue. Last year the Board of Education approved the contract with Equity Opportunity Schools (EOS) to help increase the number of support in AP courses and committed as a Board to ensure the superintendent search leads to equity and excellence. Option B has 8400 square feet of additional instructional space and curricular and extracurricular advantages. Having girls walk from the west pool to the east pool in their towels is unacceptable, and that is an equity issue. The Board of Education has to allow the community vote on Option B with some pared down costs, as that is the best investment. She would not support reducing the model classroom that moves toward 21st learning. Performing arts needs to be included in any option brought forth to the community, as enrollment has increased and a need exists. She supported Option B.

Dr. Moore echoed the comments about the Board of Education's focus and intent, and her reasons to be on the board was to be a good steward of finances and a shepherd of the resources for the students to be their best, and the building is part of that reasoning. She was on the FAC because of the huge fund balance. Just because the school can ask for the most, it does not mean it should. As a reminder to the community members, being on the school board is a voluntary commitment; it is about public service. She is a board member, a homeowner, a parent, and a taxpayer. She is a Board of Education member because of her deep love for education. She eventually recognized that the pools needed to be addressed. If the pools are retrofitted, the girls' pool becomes smaller. Plan A maintains but does not upgrade the pools. She read the 1928 Wednesday Journal about the decision to build a field house, and OPRFHS was the first school in the country to make space for the girls. Option A feels would maintain status quo, disrupt the school for a long time, and would displace the adaptive gym. She also felt there would be cost overruns to bring things up to today's standards. She did support Option A. Option C came to the Board of Education late, and she was frustrated with two iterations of Board of Education configurations. It was forward thinking, and it allowed for the recapturing the space in the pool house. But there was not enough time to fully explore it, and she had questions about safety and interruption issues. The process she used was equity. Since the parking garage was put up, the Village has not made money, and the District has had to assume some responsibility for it. The garage takes up a lot of land. She originally supported no students having parking passes and shuttling the teachers. However, going taller and having the pool on that site is the best solution. Regarding equity, she looked at the swimming program and have heard from various sides of the community who said the Board of Education had to deal with academics. Either/or was troubling to her, but she believed that the number of black students that do not know water safety skills. OPRFHS can provide that knowledge, and that is an issue of equity. In her conversations with students, the current pools make swimming scary, i.e., leaking showers, girls racing at the end of swim class to get the shower head with the best water pressure, having lockers with ventilation issues. The current environment is unsustainable, but many students have left here with water scholarships. She supported Option B with reduced costs. This is a call to action, and it is a time to put data and dollars into the programs that serve the student needs and highlight them on the website.

Mr. Arkin was heartened by the community members who engaged in the process, staff, administration, Legat, Marcia Sutter and Karin Sullivan. This has been a complicated and deferred issue, and there is no ideal solution. For the past eight months, the Board of Education has embarked on a process to review reasonable solutions, including five very positive community meetings. Because transparency was essential in a tight timeline, some imperfect information was released prematurely. It is disconcerting that a few voices are calling for the limiting or eliminating the aquatics program. Schools have a direct effect on the property values. He believed that aquatics PE sports are part of a holistic solution. Enrollment is growing and so are extracurricular programs. There is no free space available. He disagreed with Plan C because of the cost and the risk that accompanies an underground pool. Smoke and ingress and egress issues are a problem. He was impressed with Mr. Stelzer's report last week and for the first time crystallized

in his mind the difference between a two pool solution and a one-pool solution. He knew the conditions of the pool and locker rooms. He wanted a referendum question prepared for August 16 and to scale back the project. In looking at Mr. Altenburg's memo to the Board of Education on July 28 on the school's 5-year facility plan, there may be \$7 to \$7.5 million out of the entire plan. He knows anecdotally of the needs of performing arts because he is in the building so often. The garage can be reduced by one level and replace the sixty spaces in non-residential areas, bond over a 30-year span to reduce the annual tax rate, and if a vote for Plan B, the Board of Education must hold a referendum in November. Plan B gives more options, it would give parking on campus, needed space for performing arts, a new boys' locker room, and improved learning spaces configured for 21st-century learning. This fits with the vision of the school. The only course of action is to have the community decide via a referendum. Legat was asked to create drawings, plans, and budgets on an expedited basis. The task has been onerous, and he thanked them.

Mr. Weissglass noted the Board of Education's dedication to excellence and equity in various ways. He is affiliated with the group called Education Reimagined which is about thinking deeply about how to transform education in every moment. It is exciting to work. This pool project has taken an enormous amount of time and energy, and he was gratified that it was close to being solved. The community learned that the pools were in bad shape and what the choices were. Not everyone agreed with the avenue the Board of Education determined.

**Adoption of Pool Plan**

Mr. Weissglass moved to adopt the LTFP Option 5B, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson.

Mr. Arkin moved to amend the motion to reduce Option B by the items outlined in Mr. Altenburg's memo; seconded by Ms. Spivy. Mr. Weissglass moved to direct the administration to bring the Board of Education a revised plan incorporating those changes for the Board of Education to take final action on at the August 16 meeting; seconded by Dr. Gevinson.

Ms. Spivy moved to Adopt Plan B as the long-term facilities plan with the further instruction that the administration and Legat work together to present the Board of Education with a plan for a total cost not to exceed \$45 million; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Personnel Recommendations**

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

**Adjournment**

At 10:05 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass  
President

Sara Dixon Spivy  
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board