

Board Minutes Involving Events Leading Up To The 2007 Building Referendum

School Board Meeting December 12, 2005

6.2b Mill Creek School Addition & Renovation Project

Allard reviewed the following: itemized costs associated with the addition, renovation and site expansion of Mill Creek Elementary School; the addition and renovation of Geneva Middle School South (security entrance/administrative space); and the renovations to the portion of the south middle school that would house the pre-school center. She noted that since November's meeting, the preschool space and needs had been reconsidered and the plan revised, which reduced the amount of space to be used for the preschool center and lowered the estimated costs for the preschool center project.

Shivers wondered if the revisions to the Friendship Station Preschool space had been discussed with the Park District. (The Park District has received the changes and made comments.) Shivers noted that the revised preschool plan indicated it would accommodate the current enrollment with minimal growth. (Jacoby noted that plans for maximum growth would require two more classrooms. Allard noted that the preschool plan would be considered in more depth when the facility master plan was presented in February.) Shivers commented that the plans for the relocation of the preschool failed in the last referendum and that we are moving forward continues to be a concern for her. She added that during the last referendum, the projected costs for the relocation of the preschool were lower. (Allard agreed that the estimated preschool relocation costs were lower but they were only estimates and did not factor in the mandates for bathrooms adjacent to each classroom.) Shivers commented that the estimated costs seemed high when a portion of the south middle school building would be used for storage. (Jacoby noted that the south facility needs storage areas but the plan also allows for the possibility of a third team center in the future, if needed, as well as for space for the A&E program. Jacoby stressed that this plan allows for flexibility.)

Stith commented that the failed referendum's statistical data didn't indicate that the relocation of the preschool was a concern, rather, the concerns cited were mostly related to the construction of a new auditorium at the middle school campus and the increased taxes. (Jacoby agreed and added that even the auditorium was not a major concern in the survey responses following the referendum. The concern was more about cost and wanting a total reduction in the size of the referendum package.)

Allard stressed that at this time, the administration was only asking the Board of Education for the authorization to initiate the design and development phase of the Mill Creek project with FMG Architects and Bovis Construction Management for the development of a cost estimate of 95% of construction design documents.

Selakovich requested clarification regarding the capacity of Mill Creek Elementary School. (Jacoby indicated that current enrollment is 461; without an addition capacity is 486; and December 12, 2005 with an addition it would be 564. Current capacity is limited because we don't have space for OT/PT, Band, etc. He added that we had been cited by the Regional Office of Education for housing classes in non-classroom spaces.)

Selakovich asked how many OT/PT students were served at one time. (It is a pull-out program and we need the rooms for OT/PT, A&E, Band, and music.)

Jacoby added that capacity figures can be confusing. We used to say we were building for 600 students but our program has changed and we need to ensure that we allow for flexibility of space for our programs and for extra classrooms for the times when grade levels may require additional sections.

Selakovich requested and received clarification regarding projected housing numbers and timeframes for new developments within Geneva's school district boundaries. (Three-to-five years is the projected buildout timeframe.) Selakovich noted that we need to remember that at the time Mill Creek Elementary School was built, the district had limited resources. She added that in the past, the district used referendums to construct additions to our school buildings and used health, life/safety funds for other projects. What is being proposed is just the opposite. (Jacoby responded that in the past we haven't had resources available in the O&M fund to do projects but we currently do.)

Selakovich wondered how health, life/safety projects would be completed if we had a referendum to fund them and the referendum failed. (The projects would be delayed.)

Moran commented that it concerns him that health, life/safety projects might be delayed.

Wilson noted that we have contingency funds available from other construction projects that could fund the projects being proposed. Moran indicated that while he understood that we have funds available, he didn't feel it was prudent to allocate funds to these projects. He added that he didn't think it would be easy to get referendum approval for health, life/safety projects and he didn't feel the cash on hand would be available to do them. (Allard noted that, historically, Geneva has kept its debt structured at 75-cents in the past and into the future and that would continue.)

Moran indicated that he, personally, felt we will need to go back to asking the community if they want to build.

Selakovich commented that the fee amounts for the architects and construction manager were all over the place and wondered if enough had been allowed for contingencies and if we were confident in the estimates for the projects. She noted the construction management fee for Mill Creek's project was 15% vs. 9% or 10% on other projects.

Wilson noted that smaller projects usually cost more and have a higher percentage. He stressed these were two separate projects and he added that we can negotiate on the staffing numbers.

Shivers indicated that she was concerned about the "shift in policy" to doing construction projects without going to the community for approval and shared Moran's concerns about the amount of available funds. She added that she also was concerned that we don't know what will be happening at Coultrap or the high school, or what needs we will have to the west and wondered if we are using resources in the best possible manner.

Allard stressed that 294 homes are planned for Phase 4 of the Mill Creek development and there is no space to house the anticipated number of students those homes will generate. She confirmed that the district can't build a new school without going to referendum, but it can construct school additions without going to referendum and that is what is necessary in order to accommodate projected student capacity by 2008.

Selakovich wondered what the current enrollment and capacity is at Heartland Elementary. (We can add about 100 more students at Heartland.)

Jacoby pointed out that there is not a lot of available student capacity within the school district. He added that the administration has provided information about the amount of available resources and the Mill Creek Elementary School renovation was the first priority decision the Board was being asked to make. He stressed that the addition to Mill Creek Elementary School was not part of the last referendum, only the purchase of land for site expansion was included in the last, failed referendum. Additionally, we told the community that would expand the Mill Creek Elementary School facility and we need to keep our word. Relative to the concern about a possible \$500,000 shortage of funds, he noted that we have received additional funds through developer contributions and, since the new middle school project is running under budget, we will have additional funds from that project, as well. He noted that when Mill Creek Elementary School was built originally, the district wasn't able to construct the facility as it had hoped because actual costs were much higher than the architect's estimated costs. We now need to provide facilities for our growing school district and since health, life/safety projects are multi-year projects, it is more important to focus on our priority projects, and the expansion of Mill Creek Elementary School is a priority project.

Stith commented that while she agreed with Moran's concern about the \$500,000, we made a commitment to the community to do the preschool relocation and we need to honor the commitment. She added that construction costs have gone up significantly over the last three-to-five years and will only continue to go up.

Selakovich commented that our commitment to the community was for site expansion. She added that the dilemma was whether to add on to Mill Creek School now or wait to see what the actual enrollment will be. She was concerned that going forward with an eight million dollar project could affect future referendums because most people won't understand where the funds came from. She added that she would prefer to go to the community and ask for permission but we are too far into this process and we don't have an informed community. She wondered what the Park District wanted for the preschool.

Jacoby responded that if we go to referendum, we would need to request an amount in the \$50-80 million range in order to cover all the projects we need to be working on (what to do about Coultrap, the high school, etc.) and going to referendum for these projects would add more time before they could be completed. He added that he didn't think we wanted to load up class sizes only at Mill Creek or to redo elementary boundaries again to load up classrooms across the district in order to see class sizes go up significantly. He felt it was more important to proceed with addressing our increasing enrollment in the manner proposed by the administration.

Shivers commented that at this time we don't know what we need.

Burns commented that she felt it was prudent to move forward with the proposed plans even with the risks and prove that we have used all our available resources before asking the community for more.

Allard reiterated that while the failed referendum was for only site expansion, discussions for the needed addition to the Mill Creek School facility were started then. She added that it was the administration's recommendation to move forward.

Moran clarified that at this time, the administration was only asking for authorization to initiate the design and development phase of the Mill Creek School project with FGM and Bovis that allows for the development of a cost estimate at 95% of construction design documents and the 95% cost estimate will be presented to the Board prior to public bidding of the project. (Correct.)

It was moved by Moran, and seconded by Wilson, to authorize the administration to initiate the design and development phase of the Mill Creek School project with FGM and Bovis that allows for the development of a cost estimate at 95% of construction design documents, as presented. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes, four (4), Moran, Stith, Wilson, Burns. Nays, two (2), Shivers, Selakovich. Motion carried.

POSSIBLE ACTION(S) RELATED TO EXECUTIVE SESSION DISCUSSIONS

It was moved by Wilson, and seconded by Burns, that the Board of Education approve the acquisition of 11.06 acres located on the southwest corner of Fabyan Parkway and South Mill Creek Road from Shodeen, Inc., for a price of \$2,000,000 plus or minus prorations, with closing to occur on or before December 31, 2005, and direct the District's administration and attorneys to prepare a real property purchase agreement for said property for consideration and action by the Board of Education at a special meeting to be held on Thursday, December 22n 2005, at 7:30 a.m. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes, five (5), Stith, Wilson, Burns, Moran, Selakovich. Nays, one (1), Shivers. Motion carried.

School Board Meeting February 22, 2006

2.1 Master Facilities Plan February 22, 2006

Jacoby provided an overview of the facilities master plan process. In May, 2005, the Board of Education directed the Administration to develop a Strategic Facility Master Plan. FGM Architects/Engineers, Inc., was commissioned to prepare the Master Plan for the existing seven elementary schools, the middle and high school facilities, as well as all other facilities in the district and to address enrollment growth issues for the next ten years. The executive summary report documents a nine-month master planning process. The process for developing the master plan for the school district was an inclusive, districtwide process that included the participation of the Board of Education, the district's administrators, staff, teachers, parents, students, and community members through a structure consisting of Site Committees, District Task Force, community forums and the design team from FGM. The process consisted of the following: data gathering phase, the vision phase, the programming phase (education adequacy, facility assessment, enrollment data), analysis, concepts and decision-making phase (options for addressing current and future facility needs, evaluating the plan's appropriateness to the district's needs).

Jacoby provided information regarding the district's enrollment history, facility construction history, historical growth, and historical funding for capital projects. In 1985, there were 2,007 students in the district. Currently, there are 5,738 students in the district.

From 1986 to the present, the district has constructed additions to Harrison and Western, built a new middle school, remodeled Coultrap Elementary School, constructed Mill Creek and Heartland Elementary Schools, relocated the district central offices and pre-school, constructed additions at the middle school and at the high school, begun construction of a second middle school, and is considering additions to Mill Creek Elementary School.

John D. Kasarda, Ph.D., Director of the Business School at the University of North Carolina and a specialist in economic development, urban development and demographics, was commissioned to prepare a demographic study for the district. Kasarda's report examines population and housing trends within Geneva School District 304 and assesses implication of these trends for future enrollment. The objectives of the report were fourfold:

- a summary of both historic and most recent housing development patterns and demographic dynamics underlying enrollment trends in the district.
- a focus on enrollment growth in District 304 from 1989-90 to 2005-06 and an analysis of student migration patterns and other sources of this growth.
- a discussion of new housing development potential and related factors that will shape future district enrollment.
- a projection of District 304 enrollment, by grade and by year, through school year 2015-2016. K-12 enrollment growth for the next ten years is projected to increase by 1,257 students (+420 elementary, from 2,564 to 2,984; +330 middle school, from 1,375 to 1,705; and +507 high school, from 1,784 to 2,291).

When is current capacity exceeded? Based on Kasarda's projections Series "C," the elementary schools' current capacity of 2,820 (five schools x 564 students per school) is first exceeded in August 2008, and the high school's current capacity of 2,000 is first exceeded in August 2009.

Battaglia, from FGM, reviewed the programming and space needs for each facility; reviewed building capacity levels; provided an overview of how each district facility was being used; and summarized the recommendations relative to each facility.

Recommendations included the following:

- one replacement school for Coultrap Elementary to open in 2008 (Coultrap's Site Committee identified primary issues affecting long-term viability of the existing building as an elementary school; i.e., site safety and operation issues due to current proximity to the high school; these issues become worse as the high school population increases; mechanical issues throughout the building; health/life-safety issues throughout the building; addition at high school requires use of Coultrap's play fields; adaptive re-use of the Coultrap building becomes a separate stand alone discussion. The Coultrap Site Committee recommended that the Coultrap school community be maintained within the current boundaries; some expressed a desire to keep the Coultrap building standing for historical significance. The Task Force recommended that the district consider a separate study to evaluate adaptive re-use options that would allow Coultrap to remain in place while providing health/life-safety and facility maintenance for an alternate use; i.e., upgrade mechanical systems within the existing system constraints; provide sprinkler system and upgrade all fire enclosures, existing routes and alarms; eliminate the safety and operation issues due to current proximity to the high school; upgrade deteriorating finishes.)
- one new elementary school on Fabyan site to open 2008; designed for 600 students
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at Harrison Elementary
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at Heartland Elementary
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at Western Elementary
- additions to Heartland Elementary (new cafeteria/multi-purpose room and dedicate existing space to PE)
- additions to Western Elementary (classrooms for A&E, Projects Success Instrument, new cafeteria/multi-purpose room and dedicate existing space to PE)
- additions and renovations at Mill Creek Elementary School
- one new elementary school located on potential Settlements of LaFox site to open 2011
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at Geneva Middle School South
- additions/renovations at Geneva Middle School South (secure main entrance/administration center; relocate Friendship Station; site improvements for bus drop-off and expansion for middle school and Friendship Station)
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at Geneva High School
- additions and renovations at Geneva High School (addition to south end of existing building; program renovations to existing building; parking options to add plus/minus 500 spaces)
- health/life-safety and facility maintenance at District Offices

Jacoby reviewed the timeline recommendation for construction phases - - Phase One 2007 -2011 and Phase Two 2011 - 2016.

Fielden (Bovis) reviewed construction budget estimates. He stressed the amounts are program budget estimates and were not intended to be the final budget amounts. They were not based on design documents as the final scope was not yet determined. The amounts were based on stand alone, single package pricing. Budgets for new elementary schools and high school additions are escalated to 2007 pricing but additional escalation will be added to each referendum phase when the final timeframe for construction is approved. The program budgets do not include any fees for architectural or construction management services. Those fees would be added to the project budgets as appropriate. The program budgets do not include costs for furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE). The health/life-safety and facility maintenance budgets include an allowance for security systems and an allowance for technology replacement district wide in two separate phases.

Phase One estimate of construction budget total was \$69,107,140, and included the following:

- Coultrap replacement school - \$17,617,886
- Fabyan site elementary school - \$17,617,886
- Harrison - \$4,729,018
- Heartland - \$2,913,088
- Mill Creek - \$2,069,630
- Western - \$9,873,034
- Middle School South - \$4,245,371

Transportation Facility - \$1,859

District Office - \$6,039,368

Technology - \$4,000,000

Phase Two estimate of construction budget total was \$57,021,966, and included the following:

High School - \$35,272,080

LaFox site Elementary School - \$17,749,886

Technology - \$4,000,000

Total estimate of construction budget for Phase One and Two was \$126,129,106.

Adaptive re-use of Coultrap costs were estimated at \$9,144,965.

Jacoby reported that future considerations included the impact of the Settlements of LaFox (Phase 2 construction budget); the adaptive re-use of the Coultrap building; and future expansion requirements for transportation services (Phase 2 construction budget). Jacoby stressed that tonight's presentation to the Board was information only and time will be allocated at future Board meetings for discussion of the decision paths related to the facility plan and recommendations.

Kilburg suggested that Board members' questions/comments begin with those associated with the elementary level, then move to the middle school and then to the high school.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL:

Shivers, regarding enrollment, noted that there were Series A, B and C. Shivers asked for the reason that we were constructing assuming "C" and staffing assuming "B". Shivers further noted that Series "B" was recommended. (Need to look at enrollment projections closer to the time actual decisions are being made). Won't we run the risk of constructing more space than needed? (No, because we'll have more data closer to the time of construction.)

Timeline recommendation suggests two elementary schools opening in 2008. (Yes.) Fabyan site school would require boundary changes? (Yes, and that was the timeline that was indicated when boundaries were recently changed - - three-to-five years.)

Selakovich expressed concern with enrollment numbers and wondered if they had considered putting Coultrap relocation and the high school's expansion together as a referendum package vs. just the elementary piece. (Various options were considered but the one recommended was believed to be the most necessary.) Relative to the Coultrap adaptive use as a stand alone issue, keeping the building is a Board decision. (Yes, and the recommendation is to study this issue and determine what use the Coultrap building would have in the future.)

Shivers commented that she felt it needed to be clarified that this was the first time these recommendations were being brought to the Board for discussion and that the Board wasn't necessarily agreeing with them. She felt the Board needed to start with the high school and then look at the other options.

Burns noted the recommendation for new elementary buildings was for 100,000 sq.ft. and wondered what Heartland was. (About 92,000 sq.ft. and that would be a design issue for discussion later.)

Moran reiterated that the Board members are just seeing this report and this information for the first time. He commented that he wasn't sure that Coultrap was doomed and he, too, felt that the high school needed to drive the decisions. Moran clarified that the estimated cost to bring Coultrap up to code was approximately \$9.1 million.

Wilson noted that, as a guideline, when renovation costs of an existing building exceed 50% to 60% of new building construction costs, economics typically swing in favor of new construction. With renovation costs for Coultrap estimated at \$9.1 million, not including costs for upgrading for high school use requirements, and new construction estimated at \$17 million, it may be more economical to proceed with new construction in lieu of renovating Coultrap for high school usage.

Kilburg wondered if it would be necessary to look at a different elementary building design for the Williamsburg site. (The building design would need to be adapted to the site.)

Jacoby felt the estimated dollar amounts would hold up but we would need to allow for escalation costs.)

Shivers asked if all-day kindergarten, foreign language at the elementary level, and afterschool care programs were considered during the program discussions. (They were looked at but only from a physical aspect. They are not in the recommendations because those programs don't exist in our current program. They were in a side study but they are not included in any budget figures.)

MIDDLE SCHOOL LEVEL:

There were no questions or comments related to the middle school south recommendations.

HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL:

Stith indicated that she felt it was hard to comment without having heard any of the community input. She agreed that Coultrap Elementary and the High School must be discussed together and before any decision is made regarding a new elementary school on the Fabyan site.

Shivers indicated that the Board needed to know what the high school's needs are and how we will accommodate those before we make a decision relative to the Coultrap building. Regarding to the recommendation for additional parking spaces, she noted there are currently two houses for sale on Anderson Boulevard and wondered if other options had been considered beyond those recommended. (Other options were looked at but they tried to limit options to those that didn't require crossing streets or closing streets.) Shivers asked if green space and water retention had been considered. (Yes, and those would require an engineering study once a decision was made.) Shivers indicated she was hesitant to retire Coultrap as an elementary school and use it for adaptive use.

Stith felt all segments of the community needed to have an opportunity to express their wants and wishes for the high school expansion (pool, new theater, etc.). She noted that the Board had asked the administration to do a long-range facility study and develop plans and recommendations and they have done that. She added there was more detailed information in the Site Committee and Task Force minutes and those are available on the district's web site. She noted that the Board will now need to consider plans for offering a referendum to the community.

Selakovich commented that she had hoped that the high school expansion could have connected to the Coultrap building. She asked if the architects had considered using Coultrap for specific high school programs or classes. (Yes, that was considered and the Board could look at that again but the Coultrap building would need to be significantly altered in order to adapt it for high school programs.) Selakovich wondered what was recommended for the boiler plant that was located between Coultrap and the high school

buildings. (It wasn't dealt with at this time because it is the joint boiler room for both buildings.) Selakovich felt that having Coultrap and high school expansion plans on the same referendum made sense to her and would make sense to the community. She added that parking is a huge issue at the high school and while the recommendation was to double the amount of parking available at the high school, she felt that the Board needed to make a decision about whether students should be able to bring cars to school. (Battaglia agreed that student parking permits could be limited. He added that the number of parking spots proposed was still short of the number that would be required to allow all juniors and seniors to have a parking spot.) Burns thanked FGM, staff, faculty, and community members for their efforts in this study. She noted that while the recommendation for a parking deck took her by surprise, she understood the need to balance both sides of the parking plan. She noted that the recommendation for the expansion of the high school would mean many changes in that neighborhood and the elimination of two play areas. She wondered if the Park District had seen the proposed plan. (The Park District participated in this process. The decision of whether to keep the small parks or have additional parking was one the Board would need to make.) Burns wondered why additional PE space was recommended for the space between Coultrap and the high school when other high school PE space is at the opposite end of the high school site. (Those were just "space" holders and specific PE stations were not defined.) Moran commented that the recommendations dealt with a lot of money that would remove an elementary school, playfields and parks. He asked that FGM and Bovis think outside of the box because he intends to do that regarding these recommendations. (Jacoby commented that ultimately, the decisions are all judgment issues that the Board will need to make in the best interest of all Geneva's students.)

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Item 3, Agenda dated February 22, 2006)

Leslie Juby requested and received clarification regarding the adaptive re-use costs for Coultrap.

Colin Campbell commented that he had been part of a similar process 20 years ago while living in New York. He encouraged the Board to keep the community informed and do five times as much community outreach as they thought was necessary. Regarding the Coultrap facility, he suggested that the Board consider using it for adaptive educational programming such as preschool, all-day kindergarten, gifted programs, or as a flex-building. Regarding expanded student parking, he felt that both students and parents need to learn that you don't always get what you want and that the school district needed to work with the City of Geneva to ensure enforcement of no parking areas in the neighborhoods surrounding the high school.

Kathy Fechner felt it would be too risky to go forward with a November referendum with two elementary schools on it when the community doesn't know yet what has occurred to bring us to this point. She felt the community needed to see the numbers projected per school and classroom.

Jamie Humbert commented that she has been a Geneva resident for eleven years and she agreed with Campbell that we need to inform the community about the district's facility needs. She agreed that we do need a referendum to open buildings in 2008 and that Coultrap and the high school needed to be a package. She added that she was not in favor of expanding parking at the high school.

Kelly Nowak noted that estimated budget amounts did not include architect fees and she wondered what they were historically. (6% to 7% is typical.) She felt that those numbers need to be made known as well. She added that we have an opportunity to lead by example and to respect what we have, so she would like to have the Coultrap facility maintained for some type of future use.

Karin Hahn commented that the opening of an elementary school on the Fabyan site in 2008 would mean another boundary change and her child would have had to attend three different elementary schools. She added that she believed the recent boundary decision was shortsighted. While she felt the Fabyan elementary school needs to be built, she didn't feel that it had to be accomplished by 2008. She felt the district needed to take care of the other health/life-safety and maintenance issues at the current elementary schools first.

Karen Kosog commented that the district only needed to accommodate 420 more elementary students. (Yes, in the next ten years but at complete build out, the district will need to house 1,200 more students.) She asked if there had been any zoning meeting yet for the Fabyan school site. (No.)

Gloria Campbell noted that she grew up in Geneva and was in the first class to graduate from the current high school facility. She reported that she had served on the school board in New York and understood what Geneva's Board is dealing with. However, she hoped that we will be able to preserve the Coultrap building and that we needed to engage the entire community in discussion about it. Sharon Scialabba expressed concern about the following: timeline for projects and new elementary school buildings is too short, especially when not all concerns have been considered by community members; things are happening too fast - she didn't feel there was a need for two elementary schools to be constructed this quickly; she needed assurance that the Board would take time to study all these issues more fully.

Holly Jacobson was opposed to the construction of anything on the Fabyan site and wanted to be informed as to when a decision will be made. She added that Geneva's mayor had said that growth is going to stop and she didn't feel a school on the Fabyan site was necessary. She added that the district couldn't construct an elementary school on that site without the removal of many trees and that would alter the environment and the natural habitat of animals in that area.

Selakovich pointed out that the Mayor had stated that the City's growth stops at Peck Road. However, the school district's doesn't and the school district is responsible for housing and educating all the students who live west of Peck Road to Harley and Bunker Road.

Tammy Smid clarified that the Phase One budget estimates included health/life-safety amounts. (Correct.) She asked what the \$6 million designated for the district's office covered. (Full analysis of the facility and maintenance/renovations to bring the building up to code.) Relative to the additional elementary schools, she requested clarification regarding plans for structuring the district's debt. (The debt would be structured for both referendum phases as it has been in the past - - to remain constant.) Smid thanked everyone for their efforts and work in completing this facility study. She indicated that she has some concerns about the recommended timeframe and whether some of the items were needs or wants. Regarding Coultrap and the high school, she, too, felt they needed to be considered as a package and that there needed to be community support in order to pass a referendum.

Jacoby indicated that he appreciated the comments about reaching out to the community and noted that this process had included community input. However, while we invite the public to participate, very few people do participate. He encouraged everyone who was in attendance tonight to get others to come to our meetings and to become informed about what has gone before. He stressed

these were only recommendations presented tonight and only recommended timelines. Any decisions will be made by the Board of Education.

School Board Meeting February 27, 2006

Jacoby reviewed the proposed Facility Master Plan adoption timeline and target dates for Board discussion and decisions. The target date for adoption of the master plan is June 26, 2006. The proposed schedule is as follows:

3/13/06 Review Enrollment & Class Size Estimates Discuss Enrollment Driven Target Dates for Key Facility Openings
3/18/06 Finalize Target Dates for Opening of Williamsburg School Finalize Target Date for Opening of High School Addition
Discuss Potential Options for Coultrap & Establish Parameters for Additional Study Establish Target Dates and Parameters for High School Addition Format Decision (9-12 or 9th Grade Center) Finalize Target Date for Opening of a New Elementary School
4/10/06 Begin Site Concept Planning for Williamsburg & Preliminary Site Review w/City of Geneva Begin Zoning & Site Design
Review with Kane County Receive 95% Design Estimates on Mill Creek School & Friendship Station/Geneva Middle School South & Approve Projects for Bid
4/24/06 Review Referendum/Design & Development/Construction Timelines Related to Target Dates Above Review & Prioritize Life-Safety Recommendations
5/8/06 Update Regarding Williamsburg Site Concept Planning Review & Prioritize Elementary Equity Recommendations
5/22/06 Receive Preliminary Financial Plan for Master Plan Implementation Receive Updated Master Plan
6/5/06 Public Hearing Regarding Updated Master Plan
6/12/06 Receive Final Master Plan
6/26/06 Adopt 2020 Master Facility Plan

Jacoby asked the Board to consider whether the draft timeline being recommended was one that would be useful for them as they move forward with this process.

Kilburg felt the timeline seemed manageable.

Wilson reported that he sat on the Task Force Committee and had participated in four of the five meetings. The timeline recommended by Jacoby included what the Task Force had already reviewed. He added that the Task Force was a good group with representatives beyond school personnel. In his opinion, following the recommended timeline and process would give the Board the opportunity to review and revise the information developed by the various Committees and Task Force.

Shivers noted that the master plan was scheduled for adoption on June 26th. She questioned whether the Board should adopt a master plan five days before a new superintendent begins employment in the District.

Wilson felt this was the Board's and the Community's master plan for the future of the school district and not a "superintendent's plan" and he felt he would prefer to have Jacoby provide leadership and input in this process since he has been involved for the past year. He added he would rather the Board work on this vs. the policy manual review.

Stith agreed with Wilson that it is the Board's plan and they needed to have it in place when the new superintendent comes on board. Burns felt the timeline as it appeared was something the Board could follow. While she also agreed with Wilson and Stith that it should be completed with Jacoby's leadership and input, she had some concerns but felt this was a road map that would evolve as the Board moved forward.

Selakovich agreed with Stith, Wilson, and Burns that it was a good timeline and it was the Board's project to complete.

Kilburg shared comments from a letter he had received from a community member regarding the facility master planning. The community member felt it was good to have a plan but the Board should move forward and deal with "smaller segments" of the plan one at a time.

Stith requested the following additional information: information on costs associated with the health & life/safety projects and whether they were stand alone projects, and information about what the district standard is now for new and rehabbed facilities. (Jacoby noted there is some health & life/safety information in the documents the Board will receive tonight from FGM and Bovis. In addition, they can look at the school designs and construction plans for gyms and cafeterias.)

Selakovich wanted to know, prior to review of enrollment numbers in March, what the middle ground was for the Fabyan school and the Williamsburg school openings. Are we going to fill the seats at Heartland first? What is the Board's philosophy about that?

While we don't want overcrowding or mobile classrooms, we also don't want too many empty seats, so what is the Board's philosophy statement on enrollment and space. She noted it will be difficult to pass a referendum for new schools if there are empty seats in the district and we can't show a definite need. In addition, she requested information on how long we could go if we filled the seats at Heartland. (Jacoby noted that when the figures showed a need for new capacity, it was when every seat was filled but we need to consider what happens if the seats fill faster than projected. What temporary measures will we take? How far over capacity and class size are we comfortable with before we open a new school? Those are the topics for the philosophical discussion.)

Wilson pointed out the difficulty in waiting to construct a new elementary school until we reach capacity is that we don't know for certain which schools will be over capacity and when. (Jacoby noted we are working with the County to determine "trending" data for specific geographic areas in order to determine enrollment trends. Initial data is in the County's program and this should help us plan for the future.) Wilson agreed that information would be useful as the Board makes future decisions.

Kilburg thanked the superintendent and FGM for the work involved preparing for tonight's meeting.

Kilburg commented that the Board may have been remiss on February 22nd in not recognizing all of the work of FGM as well as that of everyone who had worked on the Site Committees and the Task Force. On behalf of the Board of Education, he thanked everyone who had participated in this important process.

Kilburg opened the floor to comments or questions from audience members related to this item.

Stan Jagielski commented on the following: On 2/22/06, a new gym at Mill Creek was recommended at a cost of \$2 million, what is included in the \$2 million? (Battaglia indicated that the \$2 million was for health & life/safety work and facility maintenance and it did not include the construction costs for the addition at Mill Creek School.) Jagielski indicated he would like to see the construction

costs. (Battaglia indicated they aren't available yet but would come in April when the Board receives the 95% cost estimates.) Jagielski asked if the \$17.7 million was all inclusive and if it included FFE (furniture, fixtures & equipment). (FFE is not included and, as noted on 2/22, neither are architect fees.) Jagielski felt it would be nice to know more about the Fabyan site and based on his view of the site, it appeared that building would need to be a two-story building. (We don't know yet what the design of the building will need to be to accommodate the site.) Jagielski asked what size the school was planned to be. (100,000 sq. ft.) Bob McQuillan commented on the following: This is the second most difficult decision the Board will have to make after boundary decisions. He expressed concern about trying to maintain equity between elementary buildings. He felt the Coultrap building is the best school in the community and they are talking about closing and relocating it. He felt we may never solve our needs if we try to reach or have equity between the elementary schools. He appreciated that the Board may hold back on a decision about a new elementary school at Fabyan because he felt we needed to look at the net growth; i.e., new enrollment vs. number of students leaving the district. He wondered if we only needed a new elementary school in LaFox vs. one in LaFox and one on the Fabyan site, however, he felt that the district had obtained the Fabyan site for a very good price. He felt that the closing and relocation of Coultrap would be a tough sell in the community when it is a good elementary school and a new school would cost \$19 million. He suggested options for keeping playfields at Coultrap when the high school is renovated/expanded again. He felt that health, life/safety projects will be a hard sell and wondered if they could be called something else. He asked why it was necessary to redo the middle school "turn around" before it was even opened or completed. He was concerned about the recommendation for a parking deck at the high school and felt that, too, would be a hard sell with the community. He felt that there is a need for additional parking for the juniors and seniors at the high school.

Jacoby explained the Illinois School Code requirements for health, life/safety projects and noted while we receive no State funding for these projects, they must be completed within a specific timeframe.

Nancy Rasmussen commented that the 2020 Master Facility Plan report was an "excellent foot print" but wondered why all-day kindergarten wasn't included. She asked the Board to please consider including all-day kindergarten in the master plan.

Brian Grinstead commended those responsible for the way the Mill Creek School plan was thought out and presented. He added he appreciated that all of the information regarding the master facility plan and the meetings, etc. was made available on the district's web site. Regarding capacity, he commented that we are almost always under capacity and have to guess when to build new schools and that additions are always more costly. He preferred that we build for the space projected and just provide the information and layout the plans for the community. He added that he also preferred not to have to redo district boundaries.

Tammy Smid commented that she, too, would like to see a breakdown relative to the health & life/safety projects. Regarding building equity, she didn't feel two gyms were needed if we have staff in place and the curriculum is good.

School Board Meeting March 18, 2006

c. Target Opening Date Decision

The FGM recommendation established target dates for the opening of new schools associated with the first projected student in excess of current program capacity. Program capacity is used because it is driven by our "optimal" program design and class size goals at the elementary level. On March 13, 2006, the administration reviewed the implications of waiting until 2010 to open a new elementary school west of Randall Road, which illustrated a sense of the pressure for housing students that would likely be real at that time. The initial recommendation for 2008 relieves the district of those pressures, but brings others to the table. Most notable is the immediate nature of the decision to go to referendum in order to have a school open in 2008.

The administration suggested a target for 2009 for a new elementary west of Randall. That allows for a little more breathing room, but not much. A spring 2007 referendum would still be required. A failed referendum would then push the opening to 2010 and would likely require an investment in design and development in advance of a bond issue.

For the High School target, Jacoby provided an overview of those enrollment numbers. He summarized the yield factors for new development and applied the expectations that were similarly applied to the elementary analysis on March 13th. He then compared those factors to the Kasarda projections A, B and C and the ROE geographic study. Both the ROE geographic study and the Kasarda enrollment projection C are consistent in showing that the high school will exceed capacity around 2010. By 2015 that capacity will be exceeded by 150 to 260 students. Jacoby noted that delay in providing additional capacity for the high school is a gamble after 2010.

If you like to gamble with student access to programs and courses, you can choose a date farther into the future. However, if enrollment does exceed capacity, various limitations to access such as split shifts and limited course selection could be needed. If you don't want to take that risk, the ROE and Kasarda C projections would indicate that additional capacity needs to be on-line by 2012 at the latest. Jacoby noted that the high school decision is really a two-pronged decision because construction on the high school addition cannot begin until Coultrap is vacated by students. That would be true regardless of the location or nature of the addition. Therefore, the district will have to identify when the need is critical and look four years in advance of that need in order to begin the sequence of referendum, design and development, construction of a Coultrap replacement, construction of a high school addition, and, finally, any rehabilitation of Coultrap that is required for district reuse. In addition, the longer Coultrap remains an elementary school, the more need

there will be to make costly repairs to the facility to maintain a feasible educational environment. The Board discussed and reviewed the implications of both the elementary needs and the high school needs in relation to referendum dates. Consensus was achieved around the need to pursue a new elementary school on the Fabyan site to open in 2009. This translates to a spring 2007 referendum. Also, in order to meet high school needs by 2012, the four-year window would require a replacement elementary school for the current Coultrap students to be included in that 2007 referendum. A future referendum to expand the high school could be developed for 2009 with an anticipated completion date of 2011 or 2012. This would also include the rehabilitation of the Coultrap facility into

other district uses. In addition to facility referendums the Board discussed the need for an educational tax rate referendum in 2010. Jacoby outlined the possibilities of facility referendums in 2007 and 2009 and a tax rate referendum in 2011. More information regarding referendum options will be provided to the Board on April 10, 2006 and a financial plan for the facility options will be presented on May 22, 2006.

May 22, 2006, Board of Education Minutes

4.2 a Financial Facility Plan Presentation

Jacoby provided an overview of the facility master planning process and noted that tonight the Board would receive updated information regarding the district's financial resources, facility maintenance needs, Geneva High School and Coultrap Elementary School site plan options, options for additional high school parking, and alternate use options for Central Office and Coultrap. Allard reviewed the district's financial resources; projected facility construction/expansion and maintenance needs; future election dates for possible referendum questions to be placed on the ballot (November 2006, April 2007, March 2008, November 2008); district debt structure and debt limit (Unit District - 13.8%); total debt capacity and limits; cost to taxpayers for past three years (bond & interest tax rate 2003 - \$0.7483, 2004 - \$0.7824, 2005 - \$0.7977, per \$100 of Equalized Assessed Valuation); estimated cost for Facility Master Plan Phase I in 2007 (\$77,100,000) and Phase II in 2010 (\$77,000,000); projected tax rates over next four years and cost to taxpayers.

Shivers asked if Phase II included a new elementary school in Settlements of LaFox and the estimated cost. (Yes, if it is needed. Cost estimated at \$23 million.)

Selakovich noted that building/expansion referendums were projected for 2007 and 2010 and wondered when an Education Fund rate referendum was projected. (2010, 2011, or 2012.)

Moran wondered how overall growth projections would affect the timing of an Education Fund rate referendum. (It could move it up.)

Stith asked how pending legislation on tax rates might impact referendums. (Bond and interest is outside of that legislation.)

Jacoby reported that the school district has always tried to maintain a level tax rate for our taxpayers. However, home values go up, which cause the overall taxes to go up, and the school district can't control that. (statement is not true, taxes do not go up because home values go up, they go up because taxing bodies request the maximum levy increase every year and do not cut their budgets. Debt also increases taxes because it is not subject to the tax cap limit of 5%.) The administration continues to recommend spreading out debt and keeping a level tax rate.

4.2b Facility Plan Update Regarding Geneva High School & Coultrap Elementary School

August Battaglia, of FGM Architects, provided an overview of the following: possible alternate uses for Coultrap facility; expansion of Geneva High School; High School and Coultrap site plan options, excluding athletic fields; and options for additional high school parking. Options for alternate uses of Coultrap facility included: Relocation of District's Central Offices to that facility - would only use about 1/2 of the current space available. Remaining space could be rented out, or it could house a second preschool program similar in size to the current program. If the desire is to keep only the original 1923 facility, could demolish the 1960 addition and construct a maintenance facility. The Board will need to determine who may want to use the available space at Coultrap and how the community feels about keeping only the 1923 structure and demolishing the 1960 additions.

Selakovich wondered how the demolition of the 1960's additions would impact the original building and what the demolition cost might be. (Demolition on the 1960's portions may not negatively impact the original building and demolition costs are undetermined at this time.)

Three site plan options for the expansion of Geneva High School and additional high school parking were reviewed. Options included a 9-12 addition which included 1,021 parking spaces; a 9-12 addition which included 925 parking spaces; and a freshman center which included 983 parking spaces.

Moran noted that one site plan option included a placeholder for a 500 seat auditorium and wondered if construction of the shell was included. (That would be for the Board to discuss and decide and Battaglia recommended faculty input on the topic as well.)

Regarding parking spaces, what is the current number of high school parking spaces and do the 1021 and 925 figures include the current number? (500 current and that number is included in the increase options. Battaglia added that the parking plans would need community discussion, input, and cooperation.)

Burns noted that the proposal for more direct north/south, east/west hallways was a good idea. However, she wondered if the proposed additional classroom sizes were average and if the number proposed were adequate for program needs. (They are the same size as other classrooms - recommended 800 square feet. Anything smaller would be problematic. Battaglia believed the number proposed is adequate.)

Burns commented that if this is to be the last phase of the high school's expansion, we want to make sure there is the flexibility to add more classrooms if necessary. (Battaglia believed there was adequate space to add more classrooms if they were needed.)

Selakovich commented that parking is a real need at the high school and a real concern in the neighborhoods surrounding the high school and wondered if the 1960's portion of Coultrap was demolished, would that allow for adequate parking. (Battaglia commented there is no real "right" number of parking spaces. Rather, the Board needs to decide whether 1,000 parking spaces is a reasonable amount.)

Selakovich asked if the additional 500 spaces would just be adequate for the parking model currently in place at the high school.

Jacoby asked if the street parking and athletic field parking spaces were included in the 1,000/1,021 total. (Battaglia will check.)

Jacoby reported that the next steps in the facility master planning process included determining costs for the various options for Coultrap, the expansion of the high school, and for an opportunity for more community input and feedback at the special meeting to be held on June 5, 2006.

Jacoby thanked FGM and Bovis for their work and efforts in the process.

5.1 Elementary Equity Recommendations

Jacoby reported that the facility master planning process established standards for our facilities and our existing buildings were evaluated based on those standards. **The building used as the template for the elementary schools was Coultrap, even though it was planned to be replaced.**

Allard reported that elementary facility equity was an issue raised during the facility master planning process. She reviewed an "equity matrix" that was developed and which identified each elementary building and what was identified as the district standard. She stressed that for this purpose, the term "district standard" refers to the number of spaces in the building and not to the condition of those spaces. She reviewed estimated costs associated with elementary building equity issues which totaled \$9,130,345.00. The administration

recommended the following: 1) Continue with the planned additions to Mill Creek Elementary School (full-size gymnasium, 5 classrooms, music & instrument spaces) which will bring Mill Creek to the district standard relative to space. 2) All future elementary school will be designed with the space configuration identified under district standard. 3) Current elementary schools will not be modified until such time as enrollment numbers dictate additional space requirements.

Jacoby reiterated that modifications to existing elementary schools would be considered if enrollment dictated it.

Selakovich commented that she understood the rationale for going forward with separate cafeterias at Heartland and Western. She expressed frustration as a Board member and taxpayer that a new separate cafeteria was suggested for this new facility and would have hoped that the architect would have recommended that sooner. Regarding a separate cafeteria for Western Avenue School, she felt that enrollment may decline at that facility and we should be cautious about adding space there. She did, however, agree that Western Avenue School needs some updating. (Allard noted that there will be multiple internal modifications at Western Avenue School to bring the facility up to Health, Life/Safety codes.)

Stith commented that she was glad there were district standards and that the topic was being discussed but she felt they needed to decide whether this was the standard we want to live with as a community when all-day kindergarten is still a topic for consideration. (Allard commented this is what we are moving toward with approval of the master plan in June. Jacoby added we will work through all of the facility and cost issues as we move forward.)

Burns, regarding the facility program equity matrix clarified that the matrix recommendations were for the existing Coultrap Elementary School (Yes.); that the matrix recommended the addition of 2 classrooms at Heartland (Yes, for support services.), as well as a full-sized cafeteria. (Yes, but the administration was not recommending the Heartland additions at this time.)

Monday, June 5, 2006, at 7:00 p.m. in Central Office Conference Room, 227 North Fourth Street, Geneva, Illinois.

2. PUBLIC HEARING (Item 2, Agenda dated June 5, 2006)

2.1 Master Facility Plan

Jacoby provided an overview of the year-long Facility Master Planning process and noted that the process had included site committees, task force committee, data gathering, public hearings, and discussions at regular Board of Education meetings throughout the past year. He noted that information regarding the facility planning process is, and will continue to be available on the District's web site or at the Central Office in the Office of Assistant Superintendent Allard. Jacoby added that the goal of tonight's presentation is to present an

overview of the plan and the financial impact of the plan to the taxpayers of Geneva. Following the overview there would be an opportunity for questions, comments, or concerns from the audience.

Allard noted that representatives from FGM Architects (August Battaglia and Terry Owens), and Bovis Lend Lease (Terry Fielden) were present this evening. She stressed that tonight's PowerPoint presentation was a global overview summarizing the planning and discussions from the past year and, specifically, from the past three months. In addition, she emphasized that all site and design plans were, at this point, concepts only.

Allard's presentation included information regarding the following: participants in the Facility Master Plan process (FGM Architects and Engineers, Bovis Lend Lease Construction Management, district administrators, parents, staff members, community members, City, County and Park District officials); examination of existing facilities; assessment of future facility needs; program assessment; integration of facilities into the site;

organization of site parking, traffic and circulation flow; analysis of site development with respect to environmental issues, storm water management and utility connections; reasons for undertaking the facility master planning process (increasing student enrollment, age of facilities, funding needs for capital improvements, keeping the community informed). Allard noted that between 1984 and 2005/2006, the district's student enrollment rose from 2,007 students to 5,723 students. Between 1995 and 2006, the district will have expended \$146,012,093 in capital improvements including construction of the Geneva Middle School North; expansion of Mill Creek Elementary School and site; Geneva Middle School South additions and Friendship Station Preschool renovation. Since the Facility Master Plan presentation in February 2006, the process has moved forward as follows: the adoption of the Facility Master Plan Pathway on February 27, 2006; a geographic analysis of Geneva Community School District 304 on **March 13, 2006, which included a report from the Kane County Regional Office of Education (historical perspective and future analysis of population) and a demographic report by Dr. John Kasarda (historical perspective and future analysis on student population).** **The impact of anticipated new growth on current elementary schools west of Randall Road is as follows:**

Heartland Elementary School

2005 Enrollment - 460

2015 Enrollment - 591

Mill Creek Elementary School

2005 Enrollment - 461

2015 Enrollment - 931

Allard pointed out that the anticipated new growth does not assume any boundary changes; i.e., moving South Mill Creek or Randall Square west of Randall Road. She noted that we anticipate needing additional facilities by August 2009, based on the following assumptions -- east of Randall Road does not experience extensive elementary student enrollment reduction; west of Randall Road we anticipate 941 new single family homes to be constructed by 2010 (741 in Mill Creek and 200 in Settlements of LaFox) with an anticipated elementary enrollment yield of 399 to 517 new students. She added that analysis of our facilities yielded the following data: currently have 208 available spaces (Mill Creek and Heartland); need to house 191 to 209 students by class size increases or busing prior to opening a new school in August 2009; adding three students to each classroom at Mill Creek and Heartland can absorb an additional 144 students; 47 to 165 students need to be housed east of Randall at a minimum; requires full implementation of transitional boundary areas. At the March 18, 2006, Board meeting facility planning discussion included the following: Geneva High School study, possible alternative use of Coultrap facility, target opening dates of elementary schools at Williamsburg site (August 2009) and Fabyan site (August 2009).

Allard reviewed dates for possible referendums and stressed that the District can only construct new facilities with the approval of the community through a referendum. Possible dates included November 2006 and/or April 2007, March 2008 (Phase I - Fabyan site elementary school, Williamsburg site elementary school, technology needs and capital improvement projects at Mill Creek, Heartland, Western, Harrison and Geneva Middle School South); November 2008 and/or April 2009 (Phase II - Coultrap alternative use, Geneva High School expansion, Settlements of LaFox school and technology needs). Possible dates for an Education Rate increase were March 2010, November 2010, or April 2011.

At the April 10, 2006, Board meeting, discussion included conceptual plans for Fabyan site facility and Williamsburg site facility; authorization of the bidding of projects for Mill Creek School expansion and Geneva Middle School South and Friendship Station. At the April 24, 2006, Board meeting, discussion included Phase I projects, Life-Safety Capital improvement needs (i.e., security issues, upgrades to meet building codes, repairs due to malfunction, upgrades for energy efficiencies, replacement of items due to age, ADA upgrades/improvements, and upgrades required by Fire Marshal), and estimated costs for these projects. Estimated costs for the life-safety/capital improvements equaled \$26,557,959.00. Total costs projected for Phase I projects was \$77,056,639.00, and included \$46,498,680.00 for construction of Fabyan and Williamsburg elementary facilities and \$4,000,000.00 for technology improvements/upgrades.

At the May 8, 2006, Board meeting, discussion included district facility standards and equity issues. Estimated cost to address equity issues was \$9,130,345.00. Due to the associated costs, the administrative recommendations regarding equity issues were as follows: the addition of a full-size gymnasium, five classrooms, music and instrument spaces brings the Mill Creek facility to district standards; all future elementary schools will be designed with the space configuration identified under district standards; current elementary schools will not be modified until such time as enrollment numbers dictate additional space requirements.

At the May 22, 2006, Board meeting, discussion included Phase II proposed projects (site planning for Coultrap site and high school expansion, alternative use for Coultrap, Settlements of LaFox facility, technology needs and whether we could afford Phase I and Phase II. Phase II costs are estimated at \$80,039,396 and include the following: Conversion of Coultrap facility to district administrative center (\$12,174,608), Geneva High School expansion (\$38,264,788), technology needs (\$4,000,000), Settlements of LaFox elementary school (\$25,600,000 - - 2011 construction). Allard explained that school boards may borrow money for various purposes but only according to specified Illinois statute (105 ILCS 5/10-11.14). General obligation bonds must be approved by referendum. Debt limit for a school district is based on the percentage of taxable property. In a unit district like Geneva the percentage is 13.8. Allard reported that if approved by the community through the successful passage of a referendum, Facility Master Plan Phase I debt would be incurred in April 2007 at an estimated amount of \$77,100,000. Facility Master Plan Phase II debt would be incurred in April 2010 at an estimated amount of \$80,100,000.

Allard reported that, historically, the district has structured its debt to maintain a level bond and interest tax rate. The rate in 2005 was \$0.7977 per \$100 of equalized assessed valuation. Future projections were as follows: 2006 - \$0.7989; 2007 - \$0.8050; 2008 - \$0.8078; 2009 - \$0.7997. She added that a home with a market value of a \$100,000 would have an assessed value of \$33,333 and the cost to taxpayers would be \$265.98 in 2005; \$266.30 in 2006; \$268.33 in 2007; \$269.27 in 2008; and \$266.57 in 2009.

Allard concluded her presentation and noted that she, Jacoby, and the representative from FGM Architects and Bovis Lend Lease Construction Management would respond to questions, comments, or concerns from the audience.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Martha Brown, Northampton, noted that a comment was made during the presentation that Coultrap was no longer an appropriate teaching space and she asked how that was determined.

Allard, relative to the questions about Coultrap, reported that the school district must meet Health, Life/Safety Codes and requirements. If we try to renovate Coultrap and maintain it as an elementary school, we would need to make renovations that wouldn't have to be made if the facility didn't house students. In addition, as we plan for the expansion of the high school, can we renovate Coultrap, maintain the facility, expand the high school, and accommodate the parking needs? Allard stated that the answer to that question was, no.

Tom Swierczewski, Geneva City Planner and a member of the School District's Facility Master Planning Task Force. On behalf of the City of Geneva he read a brief statement for the record. First, he thanked the School Board, Jacoby and Allard for the opportunity to serve as a member of this important task force. Second, he conveyed Geneva's support for the master planning effort that the school district has conducted and noted this type of planning is important so that the community is kept informed as to what projects are needed

to continue providing first rate education to our children. Third, he offered four concerns that the City of Geneva has with regard to specific components of the master plan. The concerns were:

1) The preservation of the Coultrap school building is a priority for the City and they encouraged the school district in its efforts to preserve that important historic structure. Geneva is interested in participating in the preservation effort and offers whatever assistance the school district needs.

2) There are vehicle access and neighborhood traffic concerns involved in the development of the Williamsburg Avenue property for a relocated Coultrap elementary school. These concerns should be addressed in the early planning stages of that project. Layout and design of this site should also be sensitive to the surrounding mature residential neighborhoods.

3) Parking and traffic flow around Geneva High School is a concern. The various expansion plans for the Geneva High School all include an increase in the number of parking spaces in and around the campus; both in parking lots and as on-street, perpendicular parking. Additionally, a parking deck was discussed at the task force meeting. Adequate planning and design should be undertaken to ensure that this increase in the number of parking spaces is both necessary and that the existing neighborhood street network can support the additional traffic.

4) The high school expansion plans do not address storm water management. Large scale underground storage facilities have not been permitted in Geneva. Small scale facilities are permitted on a case-by-case basis when no other alternative is available. If the school district is considering underground storage, Geneva recommends that the district's engineers work closely with the Geneva Public Works Department to find a mutually agreeable solution. Swierczewski closed by reiterating to the School Board, District staff, and community that

the City of Geneva is interested in working with the School District as partners through the implementation of this master plan. He encouraged community members to contact him with questions about storm water management, setbacks, or other zoning concerns. He can be reached during normal business hours at 630-232-0814.

Karen Kozog, South Mill Creek, relative to the referendum and the money issues commented that when she looked at what is proposed to be spent in the next three-to-five years in the two phases planned, \$157 million of improvements, which is something that hasn't been spent in ten years, she felt that it seemed very excessive. She stated that at the April 24th Board meeting, the Board discussed the budget for the elementary schools and spoke about incrementally only five more students because Harrison would be losing thirty-five students.

Today, during the presentation, it was stated that current elementary schools would not be modified until such time as enrollment numbers dictated. Allard indicated that the statement that "current elementary schools would not be modified until such time as enrollment numbers dictated" meant that they might never be modified. Kozog indicated she was confused about who was going to go to Harrison if we are getting capacity there every year and who would be going to Western if South Mill Creek would be going to the Fabyan

school site? She indicated she understood there would be a huge growth to the west and that LaFox was a concern but she wondered if there was a way that things could be shifted around or somehow utilize the \$9,000,000 more effectively. She felt there were being too many elementary schools built in the next five years. Allard responded the \$9,000,000 pertained to the equity issues and that \$9,000,000 is not being recommended to be spent. Kozog indicated that she understood but wondered if it would be better to spend the \$9,000,000 vs.

\$22,000,000 per new elementary school. Kozog asked what happens to capacity on the east side if we build a lot of schools on the west side? Allard noted the population west of Randall Road still needs schools to go to. Kozog indicated she understood that and understood there would be growth in the west but we are losing thirty-five students at Harrison next year. Battaglia responded that the equity items/issues at each building did not

deal with student capacity, they dealt only with items like number of gymnasiums, cafeteria size, etc. Battaglia added that is part of the reasons the administration didn't feel it was necessary to recommend making those improvements or spending the \$9,000,000 now. Battaglia reiterated the equity improvements would not add any student capacity to facilities.

Kilburg, regarding Kozog's comments, noted that Harrison Elementary School is the only elementary school east of the river in Geneva. There are many homes on the east side of Geneva that are considered "starter" homes that will continue to be purchased by families looking for affordable homes in Geneva and those homes will continue to produce elementary school aged children. He didn't feel that was going to change and there will be a population base on the east side of Geneva that the school district will have to continue to serve. In addition, the Fox Run development and the Highlands are part of the Harrison boundary area and it is reasonable to expect that we will continue to produce 500 to 600 elementary students on the east side into the foreseeable future.

Kozog commented that the first population study stated there were still 208 seats available in the district, yet the plan is to add 1,000. Jacoby pointed out that there is only one additional elementary school being proposed that would add student capacity and that is at the Fabyan site. The Williamsburg site facility would be a replacement facility for Coultrap Elementary School. Kozog noted that another elementary school is part of Phase II and why do we need that. Jacoby indicated that the district would build and elementary school on the Fabyan site and as increased enrollment capacity becomes evident, the second elementary school would be necessary. Kozog asked what happens at the other schools at that point. Jacoby explained that there would need to be boundary changes at the elementary schools to ensure that student capacity is being utilized. He stressed that is what was done during the last boundary changes. Jacoby noted that is why we monitor how the elementary populations trend. He noted that Coultrap Elementary School had declining student population for a period of two years as well but that leveled out with turn-over of homes. Jacoby noted that one of the

things they saw on a macro level is that when the economy tightens, like it did in 2001/2002, we saw some higher levels of "age-in-place" in some of our established neighborhoods; more than we had seen in the years before. Now that the economy is trending differently, with higher interest rates, that can sometimes cause people not to make decisions to move. Jacoby reiterated that the administration and the Board of Education analyze and monitor those trends very carefully in order to respond to enrollment growth appropriately. Jacoby added that boundary changes will have to be made well beyond 2020 because changes will continue to happen even after the community is built out.

Cathy Fechner, South Mill Creek and Coultrap Elementary Teacher, commented that in March they looked at the Kasarda Model of enrollment in elementary schools and then looked at it again after that. She thought that it was said that as of 2010 we would go over our capacity, but only by one student. Allard noted that the report indicated that we would be over capacity by one in the 2008/2009 academic year. Fechner commented that she was still having a difficult time understanding why we would have an elementary school available in 2009, in the year we would expect the elementary population to increase those classrooms. Jacoby reported that when you are dealing with growth, there will be a time period when you are full and a time

period when there is capacity in place and you are waiting for the growth to fill it. There is going to be that ebb and flow. Jacoby noted that by 2009 we will fill to capacity. Then when a new elementary school comes on line and the shift of population takes place into that school from our existing schools, you create available spaces for additional growth in the west to continue to feed into those schools. When that school fills, the district will need another elementary school and another shift in the elementary population to address that growth. Jacoby stressed that one of the goals that was expressed a few years ago during the boundary study was to try to make those boundary changes stand as long as possible because it impacts families when they switch schools. Yet, you have to realize that anywhere in the three-to-five year time frame, it could come to the point where we need to make the boundary change. Fechner felt there was some danger in putting both of the elementary schools (Fabyan and Williamsburg sites) on the same referendum because we have residents that live on Williamsburg that have concerns, we have residents who are concerned about building two elementary schools, we have Mill Creek residents with their concerns, so, based on what she hears in the community, and she said it in March, she feels there is some danger in placing two elementary schools on the same referendum and she urged the Board to consider that when they are looking at referendum planning. She felt that even though we have the numbers, it will be difficult to pass the referendum. Jacoby responded that is why it is very important to communicate the financing plan for the referendum. He stressed it is really future growth that is paying for the schools and that the district is keeping a pretty constant infrastructure of taxes for the community without much change in the tax rate. When the new comes on, that is where you create new revenue that supports the additional resources to pay off the bonds. Fechner agreed that it is important to be able to see the big picture but we know from past referendums that people have a difficult time looking at the big picture.

Holly Jacobson noted that they were talking about new growth in Mill Creek and the only new growth that she knew of planned for Mill Creek was for senior citizens, so, what new growth does the Board and administration see? Allard reported there are 293-297 new, single-family homes to be built just south of the senior citizen development off School House Lane. In addition, there are 250 single-family homes planned adjacent to the Leas of Geneva development, which is just off Keslinger Road. Jacobson commented that she is hearing that

the people in North Mill Creek are not going to want to have their children bused down to the Fabyan school site. Jacoby agreed that nobody wants to have their children move from where they are but they also aren't going to want 950 students in their current school. Jacobson commented that is closer to LaFox, so, why not build the LaFox school first and take care of all of that. Allard pointed out that Settlements of LaFox won't come on board for seven-to-ten years. Jacoby added that there probably won't even be streets and roads in that development until Mill Creek construction is concluded.

School Board Meeting June 12, 2006

6.1 Master Facility Plan Recommendations

Jacoby noted that the Board had received a summary of the information that has been discussed over the past several months. He informed the audience members that all of the information regarding the master facility planning is available on the district's web site or in the office of the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services. He added that it is important for the Board and the community to understand that following adoption, the Master Facility Plan will be used as a template for future decisions by the Board of Education relative to facilities, maintenance, technology and funding needs for the next ten or more years. The target date for adoption of the Master Facility Plan is June 26, 2006.

Jacoby reviewed the two recommended phases of the facility plan and the possible timelines for referendums, construction and maintenance projects; cost to the taxpayers; and how a constant tax rate can be maintained for the taxpayers through the timing and structure of the bonds. **Jacoby emphasized that the school district has no control over the value increases of individual property values/assessments. Statement is not true, property taxes are based on the levy requests of each taxing body plus debt repayment.**

Phase I would include the construction of an elementary school on the Fabyan Parkway site (open August 2009); an elementary school on the Williamsburg site (open August 2009); health, life/safety capital improvements at Harrison, Western, Heartland, Mill Creek and Geneva Middle School South; and technology updates. Estimated cost to implement Phase I, \$77,056,639.

Phase II would continue to address increasing enrollment at the high school level and continue to maintain our high school program.

Phase II would include expansion of Geneva High School; relocation of district offices to Coultrap site which would be larger in square feet than the current Fourth Street location; removal of the 1960's additions from the Coultrap facility and construction of a new maintenance facility; remove current McKinley

maintenance facility and use space for additional parking for the high school; construction of an elementary school on Settlements of LaFox site (open August 2012); and technology updates. Estimated cost to implement Phase II, \$80,039,396.

Jacoby reported that the recommendation for moving the district offices to Coultrap would maintain the Coultrap facility and allow for the expansion of Geneva High School and additional parking for the high school. Jacoby emphasized that all of the plans are still conceptual at this time. Target referendum dates were 2007 for Phase I projects and 2009 for Phase II projects. **It was felt that there would probably be a need for an Education Rate referendum in 2011 to address programmatic needs as the district continues to grow.**

Jacoby reiterated that the Facility Master Plan will be placed on the June 26, 2006 agenda and recommended for adoption.

Stith commented that she felt the master planning process went well, especially once they got a pathway and timeline for decisions and she thanked the administration for developing that pathway. Regarding the Coultrap facility, she wondered what the status for possible shared use with the ROE or another agency was. (Jacoby indicated it was not all determined yet but he felt the greater question needing to be asked is whether there is greater value in sharing that facility or in using it only for district needs. The administration felt the greater value at this time was to use that facility for school district needs.) Stith asked what we would do with the Fourth Street facility if the Central Offices were moved to the Coultrap facility. (Jacoby believed that the Fourth Street facility

could be sold and become an asset for another group or agency in the community. We could also explore other types of marketing of the Fourth Street facility if the Central Offices were relocated.)

Shivers commented that she thought that when the preschool, which is housed at Fourth Street, was moved to Geneva Middle School South, there would be more space in the Fourth Street facility. (Jacoby agreed the preschool's move would free up space but the question to consider is whether it was enough long-term space for the Central Offices. Since the square footage in the original portion of Coultrap is larger than the Fourth Street facility, the Board will need to decide which space to renovate and keep, or sell. Jacoby believed that the first decision the Board needed to make was which is the better use of district space and facilities. The Coultrap facility is closer to the high school and includes additional parking and that is why they were recommending the relocation of the Central Offices to the Coultrap facility. Shivers commented that she still wants Coultrap to remain an elementary school.

Stith requested and received clarification regarding the technology needs. (The recommendations are for maintaining what we have and keeping it up to date.) Stith questioned whether \$4 million was enough to meet our needs even with having technology included in both phases. (Jacoby indicated they felt the amount was adequate to do what could be accomplished within the suggested timeframes. It also allows for monitoring technology growth needs in our curriculum integration.)

Burns commented that last week's public hearing on the master facility plan was an "eye opener" for her relative to some of the community member comments. She felt we will need all the help we can get to pass a referendum and there were many important concerns raised and that could impact decisions relative to Coultrap, high school parking, playground loss at Coultrap, etc. She felt the Board needed to address these issues soon. Relative to the Fourth Street facility, she wondered whether discussions with other governmental agencies had occurred. (Jacoby reported, yes, there have been discussions with other local governmental agencies and that the Library is still looking at the County's Sixth Street facility but nothing has happened with that yet. If the Library's purchase of the County's Sixth Street facility didn't occur, the Library will need to develop alternate plans. Jacoby added that he felt the recommendation to relocate the Central Offices to the Coultrap facility was consistent with discussions that have occurred with the other local governmental agencies. Jacoby stressed that the goal of all the governmental agencies is to achieve their mission and goals but the School District has to maintain its own primary goals.)

Burns noted that the representative from the City who attended the public hearing had indicated that the City wants the Coultrap facility to be maintained and not demolished. She added that she still has many questions and needed more time before adoption of the Master Facility Plan.

Jacoby agreed there are still many questions to be answered but the Board needs to decide what the plans are before we can go any farther in the design and development of facilities and sites unless they want to spend resources prior to plan decisions. He felt we need to have a "big picture" to work from, which is the Master Facility Plan, and then make incremental decisions. Once adopted, there will need to be further discussion and decisions on every component of the Master Facilities Plan. Jacoby felt the Board needed to look at our Master

Facilities Plan as the same as the City's Comprehensive Plan, which changes as it is required to change over time. He added that additional studies will be required along the way in order to provide information requested by the Board.

Selakovich commented that she could agree with comments made by both Burns and Jacoby. She felt that while we don't have all the answers yet, we do have a Master Plan. She added she was pleased to see that the recommendation for the Coultrap facility would maintain the original building. She would also like to see the Fourth Street facility used by another governmental agency. She expressed frustration that the Board doesn't get the kind of turnout at all of its regular meetings that they got at the public hearing for the Master Facility Plan. However, she felt this has been a good process overall. She wondered how quickly enrollment growth will occur and asked to have the administration get information on the number of building permits issued recently to help the Board make referendum decisions based on recent economic changes. (Jacoby felt the Board would need to look at that information yearly in order to see what the actual, new enrollment is. He also felt the demographic reports from the Regional Office of Education could provide richer data for the Board as they move forward.)

Moran commented on the projections relative to market value and what would happen if the trend were to reverse itself - the difference would be captured at a decreasing rate and increasing to the taxpayers. (Jacoby agreed but noted that projections on the bond schedule and value step way down regarding property value and growth. He added that trending is still going up but it we will have to continue to monitor and anticipate changes and slow downs.)

Jacoby indicated the Facility Master Plan would be brought to the Board for consideration on June 26th and comments received from the community would be incorporated into the document.

BOARD MEETING MINUTES JUNE 26, 2006

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Item 5 The superintendent commented/reported on the following: we are on target and on time with the construction of Geneva Middle School North; the opening day for Geneva's schools is one week later than the other Kane County districts in order to facilitate moving to the north building; renovation work has begun at Geneva Middle School South and the mobile classrooms have been removed from the Middle School South campus; certified staffing update; completing end-of-year activities; on June 23rd, met with administrators from twenty-six states and all indicated they are facing similar problems with the adequacy and equity of state funding for education, expressed concerns about pension funding and the unfunded liability in many states, including Illinois, which may result in higher bond interest rates for future referendums; Illinois is one of the lowest states in the country relative to school funding and the reason Illinois has received a grade of "F" for equitable education funding and a "C minus" for adequacy. Jacoby reflected on his twenty years of service in the Geneva School District and noted the following: he has worked 7,390 days; has attended over 600 board meetings; has more positive memories than negative ones; and has especially enjoyed working with the

community members to resolve problems. He wanted to leave the Board members with some thoughts expressed in author Jim Collins' book "Good to Great" regarding three important findings among key leaders in any organization and which are true in education, as well: 1) Great leaders exhibit a spirit of approval not criticism. 2) Great leaders have a contagious and positive attitude for the organization and organizations are most successful when everyone is cheering on the team. 3) Great leaders have a high level of respect for the other leaders on the team. Jacoby added when these three key findings are in place in an organization that is when the most is accomplished and he hoped the Board would embrace all three of these findings.

PENDING ACTION CONSIDERATIONS (Item 7, Agenda dated June 26, 2006)

7.2a Facility Master Plan

Selakovich noted that the Board started this process over a year ago when they hired FGM Architects to help develop the district's facility master plan. She thanked all those who worked to complete this plan, especially, the 150 teachers, the administrators, the staff members, the community members, the FGM architects and staff, and Bill Wilson, the Board's liaison on the Community Task Force. Jacoby commented that this was the most comprehensive and thorough facility study since 1986 when the district started to experience growth. He added that it is important to note the following: this study contains important data relative to Health, Life-Safety projects; there will need to be many more discussions and decisions by the Board of Education along the way; this report is dynamic and may require changes as we move forward; more data will be available to the Board in the future when other decisions are required, i.e., traffic studies, referendum decisions, high school expansion plans; playground and site issues, etc. Jacoby stressed that all of the work by everyone involved to this point has been and will continue to be important and that is important to remember that this Facility Master Plan is a pathway which will require many more decisions along the way. He recommended that the Board adopt the Facility Master Plan as presented and he extended kudos to all of the school district staff and community members who have worked to bring this plan to this point.

Burns commented that she understood the need to have a plan and pathway but she still has concerns about Phase I and wondered if it could be revised or adapted if the enrollment isn't there. She added that she wanted the community to be aware that this is just a plan and it is flexible.

Jacoby agreed that it was important for everyone to understand that as more data becomes available, the Board will have to be flexible and make their decisions based on future data.

Burns stated that she wants everyone to understand that the Board will be adaptable as necessary. She added that everything will be tied to referendums and the Board is paying attention to input from the community.

Shivers stated that she has the same concerns that she has previously expressed - she doesn't feel this needs to be adopted with the outgoing administration and that she felt a need to have the new superintendent review this. She agreed with some of Burns concerns relative to enrollment growth. She felt there was no plan for what to do with the Fourth Street facility if central office were relocated to Coultrap and she has concerns about the underground water retention plan proposed for the Coultrap site, and that the concerns of the City have not been addressed.

Stith commented that this is not a Jacoby or a Mutchler plan. Rather, it is a community plan and if changes need to be made to the plan, they will be made as necessary. She added that she has been a resident of Geneva for eighteen years and the school district has always made the necessary changes in our construction plans.

Stith thanked the administration, school district staff, and members of the community for developing this plan and added that she has faith that we can do this.

Wilson reported that he spent ten months working with the Community Task Force. The Task Force determined their goal and developed the master plan. He thought the group probably spent thousands of hours during this process and made recommendations that were reviewed by all the committee members and modified and refined by FGM. We now have a final comprehensive plan, similar to the City of Geneva's and other organization's comprehensive plan. While he agreed there are still "holes" in the plan, he felt they would be "filled in" as the Board moves forward and gathers more data and details as necessary. He added that while he didn't know and couldn't guess when that time would be, he was confident that the issues and questions will be addressed as the Board moves forward. He stated that this plan as it stands today is a road map for the future and the new superintendent will help the Board move forward successfully because it is a good plan.

Selakovich agreed with Wilson and added that this is not the end of the discussions, it is only the beginning. She extended thanks to the administration and everyone who worked to develop this master plan and she, too, expressed faith and trust in the administration and the Board to work through whatever is necessary in the future.

Moran indicated he concurred with Wilson. He noted this master plan is not binding. It is only a plan and that there would be plenty of opportunities in the future for community input and data gathering. However, we can't move forward without a plan. He added the community had input in the development of this plan and will have input again as we move forward.

It was moved by Moran, and seconded by Stith, to adopt the Facility Master Plan, as presented. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes, five (5), Stith, Wilson, Burns, Moran, Selakovich. Nays, one (1), Shivers. Motion carried.

Selakovich reported that President Kilburg, had hoped to be able to call in and participate in the meeting via telephone this evening. Since that had not been possible, he had asked her to note for the record that he supported the adoption of the master facility plan as presented.

8.2a Facility Master Plan Update

Mutchler reported that he had reviewed the comprehensive Facility Master Plan with Allard and representatives from FGM Architects and Bovis Lend Lease this morning.

Allard provided a summary of the facility plan process. She reported that following a year of discussion, the Board adopted the plan at its June 26, 2006, meeting. The next phase of the discussion should focus on the implementation of the plan. While the plan calls for a two phase implementation, the administration suggested that tonight's discussion focus on Phase I.

Phase I of the plan calls for the construction of two elementary schools, funding for technology, and repair and maintenance of existing facilities. The funding of Phase I will drive future decisions. Funding of Phase I, \$77,000,000 in general obligation bonds would require the district to pass a referendum. Timelines associated with a referendum were provided by Attorney Whitt.

Option I: The district can submit a proposition to its voters at the general election held on November 7, 2006. In order to do so, the requisite resolution must be adopted no later than September 1, 2006, and submitted to the County Clerk no later than September 5, 2006. Timeline proposed for consideration of Option I was July 17th meeting - discussion; August 10th meeting - discussion; August 24th meeting - action/adoption of a resolution authorizing \$77,000,000 to build two elementary schools, equipment, and repair existing facilities.

Option II: The district can submit a proposition to its voters at the consolidated election held on April 3, 2007. In order to do so, the requisite resolution must be adopted no later than January 26, 2007 and submitted to the County Clerk no later than January 30, 2007. Timeline proposed for consideration of Option II was July 17th meeting - discussion; August 10th, 24th, September 11th, September 25th, October 10th, October 23rd, November 13th, November 27th, December 11th, and January 8th meetings - discussion; January 22nd

meeting - action/adoption of a resolution authorizing \$77,000,000 to build two elementary schools, equipment, and repair existing facilities.

Allard noted that while the Board may look at and consider many factors, she looks at it from a construction standpoint. She added we are looking at a five-to-ten year timeframe for planning and construction to meet **projected enrollment growth which is consistent with past district history relative to planning**. She asked what information Board members need in addition to what has already been provided in order to help them make a decision regarding a November 2006 or and April 2007 referendum.

Mutchler commented that he is coming to Geneva from a district that was also dealing with significant growth. He added the administration had also provided updated enrollment information for consideration in the next agenda item to be discussed and that these decisions are tied to enrollment growth projections.

Kilburg asked for comments/questions from each Board member.

Selakovich's comments included the following: feel Board needs to be cautious; she's not ready to support November 2006 referendum due to continuing unknown variables - housing slow down, higher gas prices, stock market downturn; would like to have additional information relative to number of housing permits issued; concerned about the Fabyan school due to uncertain housing growth in that area; would like to see administration develop a back-up plan for moving things around if growth isn't as projected; enrollment projections for Mill Creek and Heartland are not at this point as anticipated for this year; would like to see housing sales numbers from developers.

Allard noted that 293 homes are planned for the area west of Mill Creek and the development's streets have been graded. According to the developer, those houses will be completed within the next two years. In addition, the development located near the Leas is moving forward. Allard stressed that a successful referendum gives the district the authority to build, not when to build. The district would have five years to determine if we needed a second elementary school. If the enrollment numbers aren't there, the bonds wouldn't be sold.

Burns' comments included the following: Selakovich voiced concerns she also had; what if we get approval, don't build immediately and then construction costs go up; she's concerned about moving too fast and also feels we need to be cautious; she didn't want to have under utilized facilities; she also felt it was important for the Board to have more data on Geneva High School's enrollment projections.

Allard noted that both Coultrap Elementary School and Western Avenue Elementary School would be impacted by new enrollment growth. She added that the timing for planning, constructing, and opening an elementary school is always a juggling act because we are trying to avoid overcrowded buildings and classrooms as well as under utilized buildings.

Shivers' comments included the following: she felt the additional information requested by Selakovich and Burns would be helpful; feels the community will support a referendum when the need is there; until that time, she would like to wait and was not in support of a November 2006 referendum.

Allard noted the comprehensive Facility Master Plan is a community plan. It was developed with community input and she would not like to lose that momentum.

Moran's comments included the following: not in favor of a November 2006 referendum date; didn't feel the economic downturn would affect the Mill Creek development's growth but it could affect Settlements of LaFox; it is important to inform our community of exactly what Phase I entails and what it will cost; it is very important for the community to know when both phases of the comprehensive plan are completed, it is the end; he didn't feel it was possible to inform and educate the community before April.

Stith's comments included the following: she shared Moran's thoughts; while she appreciated Allard's information regarding timelines for referendum options, she, too, felt the Board needed more time to develop a plan to inform and educate the community than the November 2006 option would allow; she felt that while some answers couldn't be had prior to referendum approval, the Board needed to continue to discuss what they need to do from now until an April referendum to communicate the comprehensive plan to the community.

Wilson's comments included the following: he agreed with Stith's comments and concerns about needing a plan to educate and inform the community about the district's comprehensive plan; he felt the Board needed to decide issues like the reuse of Coultrap, what will be done with the Fourth Street facility if the district offices were relocated to the Coultrap facility; he felt the Board needed to have 100% transparency of what they plan for the district; he was concerned that the cost projected for

the two elementary schools seemed high and wondered what the design standards were; he didn't want to design a facility to a dollar amount; he felt we should design our elementary schools to meet our needs; he felt that we need to ensure that the dollar amounts for each phase are accurate and that we are able to justify the costs for each phase to the community.

Allard noted that the designs and materials proposed for the new elementary schools were consistent with the levels the district had used in past construction projects. The district has historically designed and constructed facilities that will last for a very long time. She added that an inflation factor had been built in to the dollar amount and that the building was designed to function similar to all the other elementary buildings in the district.

Wilson added the following: enrollment numbers appear to indicate that Coultrap will continue to require a four-section school; Western Avenue's enrollment numbers are increasing and if that continues, Western will fill up; Mill Creek development's last phase is continuing to be built out, so the Board needs to get the planning process going as soon as possible.

Allard reported the following: Western Avenue currently only has one extra classroom; regarding funding, **we don't want our taxpayers to think that it won't cost them anything. The bond sale would be structured so the tax rate won't go up, but home values will continue to go up and each home's value is different and its assessed value will go up.**

Shivers added that our community supports referendums when they have trust and confidence in the Board and the superintendent. Dr. Mutchler has only been here a short time and the community will need to get to know him.

Allard reiterated that an April 2007 referendum requires that the requisite resolution must be adopted no later than January 26, 2007, however, the Board could adopt the referendum question sooner which would allow those who support the referendum to start working now to inform and educate the community.

Kilburg's comments included the following: district enrollment trends have historically been very accurate; while a downturn in the economy could impact support for the referendum, he felt the community will continue to grow; a well-run referendum campaign takes time; he recommended that the administration provide the additional information requested by Board members within the next month or two so the Board can have it as they make their decisions; regarding informing and educating the community, he stressed that there may always be a segment of the community that will not support any referendum but if we are to do a good job of educating the community, he asked the Board to make a decision within the next two months in order to start preparing for an April 2007 referendum. Kilburg added that it appeared from the Board's comments tonight that they were prepared to support an April 2007 referendum date.

Stith added that she didn't feel the Board needed to jump to a decision on the referendum and that waiting until spring was okay. **However, our supporters** feel there needs to be ongoing communication with our community. We have a ten-year plan and we need to get the information out to the community

Burns confirmed that we would have the same targeted opening date with either the November 2006 or April 2007 referendum date. (Yes.)

Wilson noted that once the Board decides on an April 2007 date, questions from the community will start coming and we need to be prepared.

Allard pointed out that the local media has consistently reported on the process and progress of the district's Master Facility Plan and the probability of an April 2007 referendum.

Kilburg noted that discussion of this topic will continue at the August board meetings.

Kilburg thanked Allard for the information and the Board members for their questions and comments.

8.2b Elementary Enrollment Update

Mutchler reported that the administration is continuously monitoring enrollment figures and new, updated information was provided to the Board tonight. **What numbers were provided on July 16, 2006**

Allard reported that following spring kindergarten registration, the administration recommended that a section of kindergarten be added at Western Avenue Elementary School. Based on historical registration patterns, it was felt that kindergarten enrollment at Western Avenue could reach 104 students. To date, only 91 kindergarten students have registered at Western Avenue. Consequently, the recommended addition of a .5 FTE kindergarten teacher has been transferred to the staffing contingency and this class will continue to be monitored. It was noted that if a section was added at Western, the average class size would be reduced to 20.50 and that there is only one available classroom at Western Avenue School.

Four other class sections are being closely monitored at this time. They are:

Building Grade Reported in April As of July 10: Coultrap 4th, Coultrap 5th, Western 5th & Heartland 3rd

Allard added that the elementary buildings report new enrollment data every Monday and the data changes weekly. Building principals will make any staffing change recommendations they feel are necessary in late August.

Selakovich requested that in addition to the information requested during the facility plan discussion that Allard also provide enrollment projections for each elementary school for the next 3 to 5 years.

Stith commented that as we continue to monitor enrollment figures, it is also important to have feedback from the building principal and the teachers.

Allard reported that she, the new principal at Western, and the superintendent had all reviewed Western's enrollment data today.

Mutchler added it is also important to look at the historical enrollment data as well.

Kilburg commented that the community needs to be assured that enrollment numbers are continually monitored and that the Board will do what is in the best interest of the students.

School Board December 11, 2006

PENDING ACTION CONSIDERATIONS

6.2a Resolution for the April 17, 2007 Election for the Issuance of School Building Bonds Kilburg noted that the Board members had reviewed a draft referendum resolution at the November 27th meeting and had requested revisions be made to the draft. The

resolution has been revised by the attorney. While attorney Stuart Whitt would be late due to his attendance at another school district's Board meeting, his associate, Josh Whitt, was present to respond to questions or comments from the Board.

Mutchler read the proposed resolution prepared by the district's legal counsel. The proposed proposition follows:
Shall the Board of Education of Geneva Community Unit School District Number 304, Kane County, Illinois, build and equip two new elementary school buildings and a maintenance building, alter, repair, equip and make site improvements to existing school buildings and issue the bonds of said School District to the amount of \$79,990,000 for the purpose of paying for the costs thereof?

Shivers noted that the attorney's correspondence indicates that technology improvements was deleted from the question's language but she didn't recall discussing it being deleted and \$2 million will be earmarked for technology improvements. (Mutchler indicated that "equip" covers the technology improvements without being repetitive in wording. Attorney Josh Whitt agreed that the language was changed to avoid being repetitive.)

Stith noted that she understood Shivers' point but noted there are many projects that will be December 11, 2006, Adjourned to Reconvene on December 14, 2006, completed if the referendum is successful and they are not itemized in the proposition's wording. Kilburg noted that the Board has spent two years studying and discussing this issue and they are now at the point of needing to make a decision. He asked for Board member comments.

Selakovich stressed that it is the Board's responsibility to do what is best for the students of the school district and it is time to move forward and be proactive to meet the growth needs of the school district. She thanked prior Board members for their wisdom in purchasing and keeping the Williamsburg school site to meet the district's growth and enrollment needs. She noted that growth continues in the western portion of our school district. The County is ready to approve the Settlements of LaFox development and that development and others west of Randall Road will bring students into Geneva's schools by 2008 that will impact our elementary school enrollment and we need to be ready to house those students. She added that during the last boundary discussions, we told the community the boundaries would last for three to five years and that we would need to build new schools to accommodate the new growth. We have historically gone to our community every two to three years when we can show a need for more space. The Master Facility Study was completed, presented to the community, and recommended addressing our buildout needs in two phases. While \$79,990,000 is the largest amount the Board has ever requested, she was concerned that if we don't ask for approval now, the construction costs will continue to increase by as much as 12 % every year. She added that she felt that our Master Facility plan makes sense and it's time to move forward with that plan.

Burns agreed with Selakovich's comments and added that while growth is coming from the west, this referendum will touch every building in our district and it is very important to make the community aware of our needs and to ask them for permission to do what is needed. She supported moving forward with the referendum process.

Shivers asked if there were any updated enrollment projections from the County or Kasarda. (Kasarda projections were updated last week but there wasn't any other updated information to share.) So on December 4, 2006 updated Kasarda figures were available... what were the figures given on 12/4/2006 and where did they come from? Shivers asked if the relocation of the central administrative offices was part of Phase I. (No, it is part of Phase II.) She commented on the following: she had made it clear that she had wanted to keep Coultrap as an elementary building, or if that wasn't possible to use the space for the high school's expansion; that while technology isn't identified specifically in the referendum proposal, she would have liked more specifics on costs; the high school is over crowded and we need to expand it, which required the relocation of Coultrap Elementary School; while \$79,990,000 may be a shock to the community, requesting approval for both phases of the Master Facility Plan at the same time would also have been a shock to the community. She agreed it was time to move forward and put the question before the community.

Moran commented that while he has had mixed emotions about relocating Coultrap Elementary School, the facility does have problems and the architects and district staff have answered the questions he had. He added that the district can complete the Phase I projects and keep the bond rate stable, so this is the best way to go. He supported moving forward with the referendum process.

Stith commented that the Board has completed the Master Facility Plan and it has been communicated to the public. This referendum proposition is Phase I of the Master Plan. **The growth projections continue to be consistent and to show the need for the new elementary schools and the expansion of the high school.** Additionally, the long-range facility planning and discussions have included two superintendents who also agreed that it was time to move forward and take the proposal to the community. She felt that if the Board doesn't move forward now and ask the community for its support, they are delaying meeting the needs of our school district's children. She, too, was in favor of moving this process forward.

Wilson noted that we have conducted facility and enrollment studies. Growth and more students are coming at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. He was concerned that the Board can't meet the high school's needs for expansion until we have the space, which is the land currently used by Coultrap. While he, too, has an emotional attachment to the Coultrap building, we need to move forward now in order to meet our students' needs in the future. While he was concerned that the amount being requested for the construction of the elementary buildings seemed high, we may get more for our dollars in April than if we wait longer and that may positively impact the Phase II costs. He added that he, too, felt it was important to move forward in this process now.

Kilburg commented that he felt that the Board has done a good job of conducting the studies and obtaining the information that has brought them to this point with a plan for the district's final buildout. Growth and development continues to impact our school district and he felt the Board has developed a well-thoughtout Master Facility Plan which included input from the community and staff. He felt as a district, we've historically been ahead of the growth curve and have been able to meet our students needs while keeping the bond tax rate level. He stressed that any funds remaining at the closeout of these projects would go toward reducing the costs of Phase II. He stressed that as a Board and a district, we need to not just build new facilities, we need to maintain our existing facilities as well and 40% of these referendum funds will be used to maintain and preserve our existing facilities. He added that he, too, supports moving forward with this referendum.

It was moved by Selakovich, and seconded by Wilson, that the Board of Education adopt the Resolution providing for and requiring the submission of the proposition of issuing School Building Bonds to the voters of Community Unit School District Number 304,

Kane County, Illinois, at the consolidated election to be held on the 17th day of April, 2007, as presented. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes, seven (7), Selakovich, Shivers, Stith, Wilson, Burns, Moran, Kilburg. Nays, none (0). Motion carried unanimously.

School Board Meeting January 8, 2007

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Burns reported that she and Selakovich will be the Board member liaisons for the referendum. She reported that three couples have come forward to lead the April 2007 Referendum Campaign; David and Glenda Creighton, Dave and Sue Erickson, and Gerry and Cathy Ostergard. The referendum Steering Committee held its first organizational meeting last Thursday, January 4, 2007, and they will begin meeting regularly this week. She encouraged Board members to contact her or Selakovich with questions or comments. Shivers asked if the Board would be getting regular reports/updates on the Referendum Committee's activities. Selakovich reported that in the past, the Board had received updates in their board packets and that could be done again. (Consensus was that the Board will receive Steering Committee meeting agendas, summary notes, etc. in their board packets.)

Kilburg commented that January is a busy month as we move into the second semester of the school year and prepare for school board elections and the referendum on April 17, 2007. He stressed that the Board will work hard to keep the community informed.

11. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION (Item 11, Agenda dated January 8, 2007)

Nancy Rasmussen commented that while she fully understands that the proposed referendum will not impact the tax rate due to the structuring of the district's bond debt, it is still an increase and we will need to work hard to inform the community about this.

Kilburg agreed that the Board and the Referendum Steering Committee will need to work to inform the community about all aspects of the referendum but he added that the public needs to take the time to become informed so they can make informed decisions on April 17th. He added that the better informed the voters are, the better it is for the entire community

School Board Meeting January 22, 2007

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Burns reported that the Geneva Citizens for Excellent Schools had their second meeting on January 18th. The Committee decided on a campaign slogan for the referendum which is "Building our Future / Preserving Our Past." The Committee is working on the development of publications and web site (www.stronggenevaschools.org). Burns added that the Committee is very enthusiastic and supportive.

School Board Meeting February 12, 2007

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Burns provided an update on the Geneva Citizens for Excellent Schools. Their information web site is up and can be accessed at stronggenevaschools.org. The group is moving forward and is still very enthusiastic. The first informational public forum is scheduled for 7:00 p.m. this Thursday, February 15th and will be held at Geneva Middle School South in the cafeteria. Kilburg thanked Burns, Selakovich and Stith for their work on the district's behalf.