

September 11, 2018

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on September 11, 2018, in Room 293E of the high school.

Call to Order

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. Also, Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer attended.

Also present were Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Roxana Sanders, Director of Human Resources; Cyndi Sidor, Interim Chief School Business Officer, Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications; and Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer.

Visitors

Spencer Baker, Renee Bell, Dori, and Marty Bernstein, Dawn & Doug Brightfield, Sigmund Burdin, Kitty Conklin, Stevens Enders, Sally Gibbs, Barbara Goldman, Heidi Groux, Marge & Barry Greenfield, Margaret H., Paul Hardin, Jim Hunter, Sandy Iller, Lynn Kamenitsa, Margaret & Bruce Kleinman, Ryan Magnuson, Amanda Massie, Meredith McGuire, Ed Miller, Manning Peterson, Mike Poirier, Peter Ryan, Monica Sheehan, David Yamashita, Terry Fielden and Marc Poskin of ICI, Rob Wrobble of Legat, Mike Dolter, Mark Jolicoeur, and Rick Young of Perkins + Will; Steve Schering of the *Oak Leaves*, and Michael Romain of the *Wednesday Journal*.

Approval of Culture, Climate, and Behavior Committee Membership for the 2018-19 School Year

Dr. Moore moved to approve the membership of the Culture, Climate, and Behavior Committee for the 2018-19 school year; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

First Draft of Master Facilities Plan

Dr. Pruitt-Adams publicly recognized the IMAGINE workgroup for their year-long work and this has come to fruition because of their hard work.

Ms. Kamenitsa thanked the Board of Education, including Dr. Moore, for the opportunity to present a draft of the Imagine facilities master plan. She introduced Mike Poirier and consultants from Perkins + Will (Rick Young, Mike Dolter, and Mark Jolicoeur); consultants from ICI (Terry Felden and Marc Poskin).

Ms. Kamenitsa noted that the agenda for the evening was to walk through the master plan diagrams, discuss costs and timeline and timing of sequences. Then the Board will be asked for their feedback.

The community-led Imagine Team has been working since August 2017 to assess facilities needs at Oak Park and River Forest High School, and to develop a long-range facilities master plan that will meet those needs now and in the future. The attached documents comprise a draft of the facilities master plan that the Imagine Team will present to the District 200 Board of Education in November 2018, subject to additional input from Board members and the community. It is a consolidated plan

that combines features from both of the concepts Imagine shared with the Board in June and incorporates Board members' feedback from that working session.

The Team spent six months collecting data about the use and adequacy of OPRF's facilities, in addition to reviewing professional research and visiting comparable area schools. Data collection methods were thorough, detailed, and diverse, including a student survey, faculty and staff surveys, listening sessions with students, listening sessions and interviews with faculty and staff, tours of OPRF's facilities, tours of other area schools, several Community Engagement Sessions to gather public input, and consultation with architects and construction consultants engaged by District 200.

The Imagine Group spent seven months determining how the identified needs could fit together in a master plan with the professional guidance of the consulting architects and feedback from the community, the faculty, the staff, the students and feedback from Board of Education in June.

The plan being presented is a consolidated plan that combines features from both of the concepts IMAGINE shared with the Board in June and incorporates Board members' feedback from that working session. The input from the Board at this meeting and from the community on October 3, will help to recommend a final plan in November.

Ms. Kamenitsa highlighted the following:

- 1) Imagine has kept students and student learning at the center of their work. And Team members can happily tie almost every element to student learning: from all-gender bathrooms to daylighting in classrooms, to the creation of collaboration spaces.
- 2) Imagine's emphasis on equity resulted in a plan to create a building that welcomes, values, and affects ALL students. It is not about just one facility or group. The team would be happy to share how the plan helps foster equity: from creating a truly welcoming Welcome Center, to making the building fully ADA accessible, to improving access to on-campus resource to help mitigate inequities at home – from printers to sound recording technology to spaces for quiet study or group work.
- 3) Imagine's work has been thorough, detailed, and needs-driven. The master plan addresses critical needs without a lot of extras. The initial list of identified needs was long. As they grappled with the constraints of the physical space, other District priorities, and community concerns about funds, they had to prioritize and many needs did not make the cut.
- 4) Imagine has considered improved campus security at every stage of the work. They believe this master plan will enhance security measures already in place. Team members would happily share more detail there.

At the June meeting, two concepts were discussed: orange and blue. Basic components were similar, but some were differently arranged. The major differences have been resolved in this consolidated plan:

- 1) Lib & Tutoring (SRC) center will be in a new, two-story space on top of current South Café
- 2) Performing Arts located at sw corner of the building (nearest stadium)
- 3) Eliminated Scoville bump-out between main and south entrances
- 4) Locates pool on first floor (not lower level)
- 5) Small group offices rather than full department offices

At the June 26 meeting, Board of Education members asked questions of the sub-teams which they had researched. Attached to the packet was a draft summation of the 56-page facilities needs assessment overview. A final document would be presented in November.

The draft master plan has five construction stages or sequences, designed to be implemented over a 6-10 year period. It assumes pauses to some sequences to give occupants breaks from construction and to line up funding and construction bids. The sequences are designed to enable the school to function during construction and to have the school be reasonably whole between sequences

The sequence order is based on: the physical urgency of facilities, Imagine prioritization, the impact of construction on students, benefits of completed spaces on students, and constructability. All components are important. She asked them not to assume that the later components were less important to Imagine. The master plan a living document that changes over time; this one is intended for 6-10 years of construction projects.

For Sequences 1-3, a capital construction plan w/scope, construction timelines, and construction cost estimates is being presented. For Sequences 4-5, only the scope and construction timelines were presented, not the construction costs. Those sequences are likely to be implemented more than five years from now when both costs and plan elements are likely to have changed as part of a living master plan.

The main components of Sequence 1 are:

- Builds a new Student Resource Center (library & tutoring center): two new stories above south cafeteria; moves key resources to the center of the building where students can access them more easily during the day and outside of school hours. This forms the anchor for the new Student Commons (more later)
- Creation or renovation of 76 classrooms: moving the library & TC creates space for construction of new classrooms along the perimeter (with daylighting); including some new visarts space (solid color is heavy renovation; dotted color is light renovation)
- Complete redesign and renovation of Spec Ed spaces: locating offices and meeting spaces near the door for families and outside professionals attending IEP meetings; and new spaces for the TEAM program that serves students with the most profound special needs, who require a space that meets their learning needs.

The Student Resource Center & South Cafeteria renovation will take 14 months (two summers and one school year); the other components can be completed during the two summers. The Cost Estimates: \$28,507,600 for all of the work in Seq. 1

The main components of Sequence 2 are:

- Significant improvements will be made to physical education learning spaces. The current 90-year-old buildings at the south end, east of FieldHouse are totally replaced with a new, 4-story facility. From the bottom up:
 - L - PE changing facilities: girls, boys, and all gender w/ improved privacy for all students
 - [some storage, dressing room, and ventilation improvements to perform arts Green Room]
 - 1 - new PE & Athletic “offices” which really includes: trainers’ room, coaches’ locker rooms, laundry facilities, and more)
 - new 25-yard x 40-yard pool & locker rooms - for PE instruction, athletics, and community use
 - new elevator (south end of building currently lacks an elevator) & bathrooms
 - Multi-purpose room for classes, team meetings, etc
 - 2 - New multi-purpose dance gym (w/appropriate flooring)
 - 3 - weight room
 - 3- court competition gym
 - 4 - 2nd floor of comp gym & storage (both designed to be repurposed in later stages)

A green roof can be added on top of the building, which was not shown.

It will take a full 18 months to demolish and to construct: two summers, a full academic year and a few months off of either spring or fall at beginning or end. The cost estimate for rebuilding almost half of the south end in Sequence 2 is \$66,742,100.

Sequence 1 has to happen early on to create space that gets filled with other uses. Sequences 1 and 2 could be constructed simultaneously. Sequence 3 has to follow Sequence 2 enough space must be had to keep PE instruction going during construction.

The main components of Sequence 3 are:

Basic Elements: Replaces 90-year old building west of the Fieldhouse on south end with new 4-story performing arts and physical education facility. Expands footprint to edge of mall driving space, but retains mall

- L - new multi-purpose wrestling room
 - team changing and equipment facilities
- 1 & 2 - two floors of new PA facilities: band, orchestra, choir (2 story classrooms); black box theatre w/ dressing room; stage craft space; practice and ensemble rooms on both floors
- 3 & 4 - new multi-purpose/gymnastics gym and adaptive/cardio gym

Green roof on top

The center of the building, floors 1 and 2 would be renovated to create new a Student Commons which would be more welcoming, functional and act as a hub for student-centered activities and services.

All-gender bathrooms would be on all four floors and this will reduce missed instructional time.

The elevators and bathrooms can be done in the summer, the Commons in 6 Months and the SW addition will take 15 months. The cost estimated for Sequence 3 is \$49,629,100.

The main components of Sequence 4 are:

- The Building and District administration (superintendent's office, board room, other offices that see a high degree of public traffic) will be located in the former performing arts area.
- The Welcome Center is renovated and the student center is located to the commons area.
- It creates or renovates 25 classrooms and 14 science labs in the previous superintendent and board room space.

This work can be done in the summer over a 3 to 4-month timeframe.

The main components of Sequence 5 are:

- Completes 32 classrooms,
- Third-floor renovation of commons,
- Relocates PE competitive gym to existing fieldhouse and 2nd is open to pool, 3rd-floor indoor track.

A Comparison of Proposed Versus Existing Facilities Summary Table and potential sequenced implementation schedule chart were reviewed. The grey shaded areas in the chart were the timelines for engineering design, construction bids, etc. The solid colors were the actual construction phases. There were three approaches: conservative, moderate, and aggressive. The most aggressive approach is doing sequences 1 and 2 simultaneously and construction would be completed in about two years. The moderate approach would take 7.5 years and the conservative approach would take 9.5 year proposition. The longer it takes, the more costs will escalate.

The draft detail of the Concept Cost Estimates for Sequences 1-3 were provided.

Cost Estimates Notes for IMAGINE Master Plan Narrative were presented. When asked about cost savings, ICI responded that there were savings in doing Sequences 1 through 3 but for each year, there would be a 4% labor and material increase. These costs do include demolition.

The cost includes: construction cost are two components. These are total project costs that include construction and indirect or soft costs and are inclusive of everything. Direct payment and material, cost escalation, contingencies for design and construction (12%), general conditions, reimbursable expenses for job offices, safety, contractor insurance, etc., builders risk insurance, architect, material testing, 3rd party, moving, technology an audio-visual (10 items).

Sequences 1 and 2 want temporary space in the school. Throughout this process, the existing Fieldhouse remains intact, and it would allow the sequencing to go on in a reasonable and manageable fashion. The Fieldhouse can be used for classes in a way that is not used today. Phase 5 would entail removing the roof support structures in order to net a new indoor track. What other work needs to be done is unclear at this point. Note the sequences have been designed to allow the district to pause. However, if the process was stopped altogether, many needs would not be met. The Fieldhouse is structurally sound but it does not meet the needs of the school. Perkins + Will will meet with the Village of Oak Park shortly to discuss what zoning issues would need to be resolved with the bump outs. Then, the Design Review Committee will meet to discuss.

About phases 4 and 5, the question was asked if there were a ballpark. The response was no. When asked how much renovation would be needed and what the cost would be to completing phase 5, the response was that there had not been enough time or resources to explore this at this time. A request was made to provide at least a minimum.

With the adaptive gym on the 3rd floor on the far west side, was there a concern that the changing areas are on the far east side? In sequence 5, the changing facilities were located closer to the adaptive gym.

How were the priorities decided? ADA accessibility compliance, Safety and Security Team, and the students' wants played a major role in the sequencing. They tried to address what things got in the way of student learning, i.e., not having the right equipment or space for classes and equipment.

Because the total adds up to more than is affordable, how can the District cut back on the plans? How would that be decided, understanding that some problem would not get solved? A suggestion was not to renovate the math and English spaces. However, the IMAGINE Workgroup did not recommend limiting the scope because they felt strongly that all of the needs should be addressed. Perkins + Will suggested thinking about this as a strategic master plan and implementing the components over time. The next component is cost. That is how the sequences were developed with the master plan being the entire strategy so that the District can implement groupings logically and the investment is used in the best way, just as businesses and universities do. One has to first look at the sequence. The challenge is that there are certain components in the sequence that need to happen in order for other improvements are made. The library cannot be upgraded without moving it. Perkins + Will applied a cost per square foot for renovation based on the historical data and cost of other schools. It has worked in over 30 districts, and this is not at a high end or low end. It would be standard for a high school in this community. Mr. Iseli did not know either the quality or specific needs and if the District cannot fund this work, it would be challenged. An option given was to extend the timing of the sequencing

Dr. Moore noted wanted to know the items that were standalone and those that were dependent upon another as changes to the membership of the Board may alter the plan. What are the areas of priorities such as health and safety and accessibility and equity? Mr. Poirier responded that there is a scope that is independent and

interdependent. The plan does not reflect that one issue is more important than another. Minor elements have distributed to balance the cost and activities.

Dr. Pruitt Adams echoed Dr. Moore's comments about keeping equity, health and life safety at the forefront. Without the right light, what does that do for student learning? What needs to be considered is what it means to the students being served, if something has to be cut from the scope.

Mr. Poirier added that a new building would not solve all of the student issues. This is a well-thought-out design which will have a profoundly positive impact on faculty and staff. It is a fact that poor or marginal facilities have a disproportionately negative impact on students who are economically disadvantaged versus their peers. The other students can remedy their situation. These plans will move the needle in the right direction. He believed the gains would be worth what the community will be asked to make.

Each of the Board members thanked the team for their work.

Potential Funding Options

Dr. Pruitt-Adams introduced Dr. Grossi, consultant, who presented a PowerPoint presentations on potential funding options of the IMAGINE work.

The first issue for the Board to consider is how much fund balance reserve Should be maintained throughout the completion of first three project sequences? (approximately five years). The areas of consideration should be:

How will future Board action impact fund balance reserves over the next five years, i.e., future decisions on tax levy growth and collective bargaining agreements? Should additional fund balance reserves be maintained to prepare for possible legislative action beyond the control of District, i.e., pension shift to school districts and property tax freeze legislation

The total fund balances on June 30, 2018, are estimated at \$107 million or 15 months of fund balance reserves. Policy 4:20, Fund Balance, targets reserves in the 25% to 75% range (3 to 9 months of annual expenses). If the fund balance were brought down to 9 months of reserves or 75%, the District could use \$42 million for this project. If the fund balance were brought to 3 months' reserves or 25%, then \$84 million would be available.

In managing the gap between revenue and expense growth, each one-percent gap in revenue versus expense growth over a five-year period impacts fund balance reserves by approximately \$13 million. A chart in the packet illustrated the effect over a 5-year period with different scenarios. Historically, running 4% expense growth and the amount that can be levied is close to 2% overall. The maximum to be levied in December would be 2.8%.

Legislative action that may impact fund balance reserves over the next five years and beyond is the shifting of pension burden to school districts. The impact assuming cost equal to 9% of creditable earnings and full phase-in during year 2 would be a maximum of \$3 million in new benefit expenses annually after full phase-in. (A Loss of \$12 million in fund balance reserves over next five years-worst case scenario). If there was a state-imposed property tax freeze the impact assuming 2.1% inflation and

two-year freeze would be a \$2.8 million in loss of potential real estate tax growth annually beginning in year two, or \$13 million over a five-year period.

1. Annual capital budget, issuance of bonds, outside funding sources.

Graph page 8 - historical annual capital expenses - spending \$6 million annually. How much \$6 million can be aligned with the imagine project.

The District's borrowing options are as follows:

- Non-Referendum Bonds (\$40 Million Capacity)
 - Future tax levies may be used to retire off debt
- Life Safety Bonds (\$40 Million Capacity less other non-referendum bonds)
 - Future tax levies may be used to retire debt
 - Addresses areas deemed by State as a significant health safety concern for students.
- Debt Certificates
 - Future general operating budgets, not tax levies will pay off debt
 - Example: District receives \$40 million upfront and commits approximately \$3 million of the annual operating budget annually over the next 20 years to pay off the loan.
- Referendum Bonds (\$150 Million Capacity)
 - Amount to request?
 - When to ask the question?
 - What projects will it cover?

Mr. Iseli clarified that the \$40 million is a subset of the \$150 million, the maximum borrowing capacity. So the maximum would be \$110,000 million.

The closing messages were:

1. The District has fund balance capacity available to fund a portion of IMAGINE projects.
2. The level of fund balance reserves available is based on several controllable and uncontrollable key factors.
3. The District needs to determine how to incorporate its current capital projects plan into a facilities master plan.
4. The funding of the project sequences will require a mix of sources that may include the need to pursue a referendum.

Questions the Board of Education needs to consider:

1. How much fund balance reserves is the Board of Education willing to dedicate towards the project?
2. Is the Board of Education willing to levy at a level that will offset expected expenditure growth?
3. How aggressively is the Board willing to re-prioritize the capital project budget towards IMAGINE projects?
4. At what point and for what reason is the Board willing to run a referendum?

Discussion ensued. Dr. Moore found this presentation very helpful. Which summer construction projects could be dovetailed and encapsulated in the IMAGINE budget? The administration has tasked itself to do this, and this alignment will be known in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Arkin felt it was a concise and well-done presentation and asked if a property tax freeze would be a freeze overall or would it realize new construction projects. Mr. Grossi noted that it would depend upon on how the Board adopted the new levy.

Also, the TIF expiration could generate more tax revenues going forward.

Mr. Iseli thanked Mr. Grossi as well for this presentation. The District has the tools via its fund balance and overall the fund balance is in a good situation. The next steps would be to get clarity from the IMAGINE team and get Board of Education input on the sequence and timing, putting together specific options and getting input from the Board of Education.

Public Comments

Kitty Conklin thanked the IMAGINE team for all of the work they were doing. She addressed the tax levy growth vs. expense growth. As deficit spending continues, it is important to keep in mind that as the fund balance spends down, the sooner the need will be for operating refund to continue running the business.

She noted that however, the borrowings occur, it will hit the taxpayers.

SP Goal 6, Action item 1 was to commence in 2017 a community finance advisory committee. Since nothing has been done so far, she requested that it become a higher priority. When will the details outlining this committee be available to the public?

Dr. Pruitt-Adams had stated that the purpose is to educate students. Having looked at the cost projects, the academic component is eighth on the list. Whether students can swim, run a track, light weights, they have the rest of the lives ahead, and vocational and academic subjects are too far down the priority list.

Peter Ryan, read the following statement: “Good evening – Peter Ryan from Oak Park. I am here tonight because I believe in the value of investing in this high school, in multiple ways, in service to current and future students, and in service of ensuring that every student who attends here has the same access and opportunities for learning, enrichment and success.

“Having attended back-to-school nights and walked the halls here again, as a parent, I do believe OPRF currently is a very fine high school, with outstanding faculty, staff and administration. A school facing challenges for sure, as many are watching unfold on film. I also believe it is undeniable that the infrastructure and organization of facilities here, well rooted in - and suited to - the past, are in significant need of updating and in some cases replacement.

“Some of my friends here will interpret that as a reference to the swimming pools, but they would be missing a much larger point. What the Imagine OPRF group has delivered – through interviews, exhaustive evidenced-based research and study of best practices – is something District 200 and OPRF have long been criticized for not having – a holistic master plan for long-range and strategic planning.

“What Imagine has provided is a plan that addresses inequities in access for people with physical challenges and for kids navigating their own identities. A plan that centralizes student services and creates safe, accessible common spaces for gathering.

And yes, plans to create new, reorganized or expanded spaces for learning, the arts, and physical education. These essential activities are growing and in high demand but have inadequate spaces or functionalities. Finally, though short of giving the plan full accounting, the Imagine group has provided plans for adaptable spaces to help meet future educational needs.

“None of this means Imagine’s plans are exempt from debate or criticism. By all means, let’s have a respectful and civil discussion. But, I differ greatly with those who would try to discredit the dedicated work, of their neighbors and fellow community members, as somehow stacked in favor of, or beholden to, certain groups. That claim is not only demonstrably false; it does a major disservice to those who dedicated so much time and energy to the Imagine Group process. I further disagree with those who would sow doubt about Imagine’s findings or who would dismiss them with little consideration. To me, those responses reflect a level of cynicism I do not believe is representative of our broader communities.

“Can we afford to implement the projects put forth in Imagine’s proposals? I may be a dreamer, but I hope we can find fiscally responsible ways to implement these important recommendations. I believe OPRF is worth the investments the Imagine group has proposed. I also believe there are many in our communities who feel the same, though we may reserve our energies for forums outside of social media or online message boards. Thank you, and thank you to the Imagine Group for your efforts.”

David Yamashita thanked the IMAGINE committee, noting that there are huge issues with the facility and the Board of Education has much work ahead of it. He used to run track, an inclusive sport, and the committee found it has the most athletes of any sport on campus. He asked the Board of Education to think about this from an equity standpoint. It is the most diverse group on campus. The biggest challenge is financing. The Village of Oak Park is considering decreasing tax bills by consolidating taxing agencies, which may or may not result in change. He suggested that IGOV consider this to prioritize projects and expenditures in the community. This venue may be the only way to get these things done.

Monica Sheehan read the following statement: “Good evening, I’m Monica Sheehan, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. While there are many things to comment on regarding this plan, I will focus on only three points.

“First, the cost estimate for just the first three phases of Imagine’s plan is staggering. And, with nearly half of the proposed 145 million dollars earmarked for physical education “wants,” it makes me and many others think that the Imagine group, District 200 administrators and you, the school board, are oblivious to the tax crisis in Oak Park. Overspending on PE is an unjustified expense at any time, and most especially now with the unsustainable tax burden in the village, that’s forcing many residents to move.

“Second, Imagine’s plan does not include cost estimates for Phases 4 & 5 of its plan. That’s unacceptable. The outrageous total cost of Imagine’s plan should be made public now, with costs clearly listed for every line item. All of Legat’s Long-Term Facility Plans included costs for ALL phases, so we know it’s a reasonable expectation.

“Third, when is D200 planning to go to referendum for operating expenses? That is something that you should make clear to voters before asking them for funding approval for any facility plan.

“In closing, the total price tag of Imagine's plan will far exceed a similar plan proposed by Legat in May 2016. The school board, five members of whom sit on the board today, unanimously rejected the plan a month later based on its disruption factor and its price tag. It was the most expensive plan proposed at the time and was the subject of a recent opinion letter. It's a timely read or reread now in light of Imagine's proposed plan. One more thing, the last major investment in the school was 20 years ago, not 50 years ago as is often mistakenly stated, with the \$18.5 million 1998 Master Facility Plan, \$28 million in current dollars.”

[http://www.oakpark.com/News/Articles/8-7-2018/OPRF%27s-\\$152M-facilities-plan/](http://www.oakpark.com/News/Articles/8-7-2018/OPRF%27s-$152M-facilities-plan/)

Dori Bernstein read the following statement: “This board has an obligation to the community and to the school to spend public funds wisely. What I see tonight with the current Long Term Facility Plan shows a careless process and should not move forward without an overhaul. Good government best practices should be used for any LTFP. Without Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) comparisons between the various possibilities it is unethical to vote for a plan that could potentially cost a 1/4 of a billion dollars after all phases are completed.

“Why wasn't there a comparison between renovation versus demolish and rebuild? The Image Workgroup claims this was done. If that is the case where is the data? Where is the report with the numerical comparison using best practices? Did the architects that were paid to consult do this comparison or did they just advise that the more expensive option is best? Allowing the consulting architects to advise a demolish and rebuild plan without using a best practices method comparing alternatives.

“I went to an Imagine Workgroup information meeting in 2017 and was told the workgroup would consist of 25 community members. The staff were supposed to act in a consulting capacity for the community members. Somehow, the staff component of the workgroup consisted of about 25% of the workgroup. The workgroup was instructed to ignore all costs until all of their wants were put on paper. Any employee given no limits on improvements in their workplace would feel that the sky's the limit. Giving the staff the “cost is no object” instructions has led to an unaffordable LTFP.

“Good government best practices for fiscal, social, and environmental criteria should be used for all projects but especially for projects of this magnitude. A thorough life cycle cost analysis should be completed before continuing with this project. I will reference a paper and send each of you the source so you can understand some of the concepts of best practices.

“The purpose of a LCCA is to estimate the overall costs of project alternatives and to select the design that ensures the facility will provide the lowest overall cost of ownership consistent with its quality and function. The LCCA should be performed early in the design process while there is still a chance to refine the design to ensure a reduction in life-cycle costs. The costs include initial costs, energy, water, operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement costs.

“Net Present Value is used in order to be able to add and compare cash flows that are incurred at different times during the life cycle of a project. All costs have to be made time-equivalent. To make cash flows time-equivalent, the costs are converted to present values by discounting them to a common point in time.

“After identifying all costs by year and amount and discounting them to present value, they are added to arrive at total life-cycle costs for each alternative. This is best practice decision making. In conclusion, I request that an LTFP considers alternatives and is evaluated for life-cycle cost analysis, in keeping with best practices. The financial, social and environmental criteria of any LTFP has to be clearly justified. This combination of wish lists from staff, architects, community members, and special interest groups should not move forward. This community cannot afford to splurge on a ¼ billion-dollar Taj Mahal high school. <https://www.wbdg.org/resources/life-cycle-cost-analysis-lcca> .”

Ms. Massie spoke of her own long renovation of her house and the unknown issues she encountered during it, such as asbestos, etc. She asked what funds had been included in the budget for these types of unknowns. She felt that core samples should be taken before going further. She wanted to go on record that this should be considered, so the kind of money that will be spent on remediation will be known.

Marty Bernstein, thanked the IMAGINE group for its work. He had asked for information at the August 23 Board meeting regarding the financial consultant and was told that he would get a response. He had not yet received the response. Dr. Moore stated that there was a mix-up and that he would receive that reply the next day.

Mr. Bernstein then stated that he had attended several informational sessions about the District 97 referendum. He asked the question of the presenter, “What do you have to say about how the increased taxes will push people out of town?” The presenter acknowledged the problem, but there was no other response. He posed the same question to District 200 and asked for a response.

Spencer Baker, as a mom with students in the school, was grateful for the work on this plan. She saw that the financial part was not going to be pretty but sometimes “we have to suck it up.” She felt that everyone would benefit from this plan, and she trusted the Board of Education to implement it as responsive as possible.

Marge Greenwald, in general positively impressed with the plan. The extensive work is very impressive, especially in managing to speak to 600 students and faculty. She believed that the physical improvements would help the students on the margins, particularly on socially and economically, and will affect equity. She hoped that the Board of education would not approve a “big box look” because it may be cheaper, as it may offend the community. She hoped that something could be built that would be similar to what is in place. This school is a center, both physically and emotionally, for both communities. The massive changes will need to be presented to the taxpayers in a manner that will benefit all students.

Paul Harding and his wife live in River Forest. His children graduated from OPRFHS, and he felt it was a great school. In his opinion, as an architect, the

IMAGINE group and architects had done a great job with the master plan. He did not believe that all five phases need to be completed. He did not believe it was an all or nothing situation. He felt the master plan could be modified and come to reasonable compromises to make it more affordable.

Sally Gibbs started at OPRFHS in 1978 and felt both proud and sad at this meeting. She has twin sophomores in school this year and she noted that nothing has changed since 1978, and not as stated in 1998. She thanked the Board of Education for its prudence and acknowledging that massive amounts of work needed to be done without usurping decision making, fact-finding, and student, faculty, and community needs. The Board was here to solve a problem. Many things were left by multiple administrations were because people were afraid to make decisions. Students are affected, whether it be by the pool, tennis, or academics. It is a fact that students who participate in extracurricular athletics have higher GPA averages than those who do not. This school has rich history and tradition, but it is no longer lives up to its motto "Those things that are Best." She thanked the Board for their time and effort as it was a thankless job. Dr. Pruitt-Adams has been enlightening and commits equity. She suggested that people take a tour of the facilities that are in need of renovation.

Heidi Goulx, the mother of a graduate, a junior and a freshman student, echoed Mr. Peter Ryan's comments. It is evident that the facilities need improvement. She could not thank the IMAGINE group enough for the countless hours they put into this project. They were no careless and looked at this from the point of cost efficiencies and every imaginable possibility. She trusted them, and there were financial possibilities.

Dr. Moore thanked the IMAGINE Team for the long hours they worked to bring this draft plan forward. Dr. Pruitt-Adams' vision to be able to listen to the Board of Education and the Long-Term Facilities Plan and have this high school be a reflection of the community. She was grateful to all of them who stayed with this project.

Adjournment

At 8:55 p.m., on Tuesday, September 11, 2018, Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Baron. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary