

# ***Spotlight on the Board***

## **Notes from the District 15 School Board Meetings Facility/Architectural/Real Estate Committee June 10th 2008**

This was a Board Committee meeting of the Facility/Architectural/Real Estate Committee. Those in attendance were: Committee Chairperson Kelly Keenan, Committee Board Member Gerald Chapman, School Board members Tim Millar and Sue Quinn, Superintendent Robert McKanna, Assistant Superintendents Jim Garwood, Mary Zarr and Bob Strande, Environmental Services Manager (Building Maintenance) Craig Phillips, three representatives from the architectural firm of Gilfillan Callahan Nelson and two citizens. The meeting began at 9:58 a.m.

### **Projected Lease–Between the Presbyterian Church of Palatine and CCSD15 Background information:**

**March 12<sup>th</sup> BOE meeting – Keenan** - The committee has been asked by Phillips and Lingel to explore a long-term lease of the First Presbyterian Church's (Palatine) parking lot which is located next to Winston Campus. The last lease expired and it is now leased month to month. If the district loses access to that lot, there would not be enough parking for the school and green space on the other side of the school would have to be used. **Chapman** – Would like this issue (parking lot) to be an extension of the committee's previous charge. **May 14<sup>th</sup> – Keenan** - Looking at the lease between the church and Winston Campus and meeting with them to sealcoat the parking lot this year.

### **Board Committee Discussion -**

**Phillips** – Said that discussions are still being held, there is a meeting set up for August and on a continuing basis. A couple of weeks ago, discussion involved what would be the school use vs. the church's use of the parking lot. Right now, the district is going to do some pavement patching, seal coating, crack fill, etc. this summer. That leads into August/September discussions on the contract/lease negotiations and what the church will be looking for from the district.

**Keenan** – Asked Phillips "that is not the \$200K?" **Phillips** – Replied that the \$200K is different, that is for the whole parking lot next year. Said it is \$250K and then another \$90K to do the south (parking) lot. \$250K is for the entire replacement next year. **Keenan** – Wanted to confirm that the district is just repairing/sealcoating right now, not actually going to do the whole thing until after the lease is signed? **Phillips** – Stated yes, there will be a future meeting as to what the church would like to see.

### **Improving Sidewalk Access to Schools**

#### **Background information:**

**February 13<sup>th</sup> BOE meeting - Keenan** – An idea that came up in committee is that it would like to look at using grants, cooperating with other government entities to make some paths available for walkers. A couple of schools have kids that are literally being bused two or three blocks. The Facilities Committee would like to look at making sure the district has all the paths available that can be available to get as many walkers as it can.

**March 12<sup>th</sup> – Keenan** - Phillips is going to look at all of the walking facilities within a half mile of each school and report back. **May 14<sup>th</sup> – Keenan** - The committee is still looking to improve sidewalk access to the schools. Will have some numbers, hopefully for the next Board meeting, on more sidewalks needed to have more kids walk to school.

Reference: **Cost Projections Sidewalks for Marion Jordan School** (meeting handout)

Click here to view: [www.fcwpta.org/pdf/MJ\\_Sidewalk\\_Cost.pdf](http://www.fcwpta.org/pdf/MJ_Sidewalk_Cost.pdf)

## **Discussion -**

**Phillips** – Spoke with Reid Ottesen, Palatine Village Manager regarding putting in sidewalks along Wilson Avenue at the Marion Jordan school site. Ottesen advised that there were no (sidewalk) funds available in the Palatine Village budget for this year. Ottesen did say that if District 15 wants to put sidewalks on private property and on the public right of way along Wilson, Palatine would not have a problem with the district paying for and doing the work. Ottesen told him that any work that would be in the future where they would have a committee put together to look at these and other areas, the village would be happy to discuss it for their next year's budget.

**Keenan** – Said that this issue ties into the other one at Marion Jordan (triple bus lane) which is probably a bigger scope than this (sidewalks). Asked Phillips if Palatine was going to pay for the lot, the moving of it (median) in order to add the additional buses? Or does the district have to pay?

**Phillips** – Indicated that the district would pay.

**Keenan** – Feels that they are going at this from two different angles and both sides aren't talking to each other. We have the bus thing, with the moving of the thing and the sidewalk thing. The city (village) is saying this is what we want you to do when they looked into it but they say, you (district) have to pay for it all.

**Phillips** – Said that the village is not saying that they want to do it. They are saying that if the district wishes to do this – Palatine will let you put the parking lot on Harrison. If you want to create a triple bus lane and take up the existing parking lot to do it, you can. You asked the city engineer to come out and give a judgment/recommendation. The district said here is our problem, give us some assistance. The village came out and looked at it with a safety officer. They put together a projected cost estimate which is \$87K.

**Keenan** – Doesn't think that this is the scope of this (committee) meeting. Asked if there was some way to bring the whole discussion to the full Board and decide which way we are going to go? If you put the sidewalks in and take three buses away and get a new transportation director – you might get rid of the problem with MJ. But you have us dealing with it from that way – almost the exact same amount - \$75K to put in sidewalks. But then there is \$87K to get rid of that median (for the triple bus lane in front of school).

**Phillips** – The anticipation was that it would save us a number of buses. From the information gathered, Phillips said that the number of students in that NE quadrant (that would benefit from the new sidewalks) is only 33 which equals half a bus. It may be two bus routes, but it is only 33 kids. Referred to the projected costs and stated that the Wilson sidewalk is \$22K. A walk around the entire parking lot is an additional \$52K. The biggest bulk of that comes from the concrete retaining wall that has to be built between the Tremmeling site (transportation facility) and MJ so kids don't fall over the cliff.

**Keenan** - Thinks that somebody has to get this all together and bring to the Board to make a decision. Thinks you have to put in a sidewalk no matter what. Kids that live two blocks from school should be walking to school.

**Phillips** – The City (Palatine) says that if we want it for this next coming fall, then we the district would have to pay to install it. Then they will give us the granting of the easement and public right of way to do that. That is really somewhat independent of the bus situation. You have a bus problem, with the number (of buses) you have or two less.

**Keenan** – Said it wasn't a problem a couple of years ago because you didn't have the number of people picking up their kids because you didn't have the whole other issues. Thinks we are getting beyond the committee. We were just looking at sidewalks. Is there a way we can put it all together and bring it to the full Board? Asked if Phillips looked into sidewalks at other schools, not just MJ?

**Phillips** – Has not gone into detail with other schools, concentrated on MJ because that was the one that was the most pronounced. **Quinn** – Asked if there were other schools that might need sidewalk improvements that haven't been targeted yet? **Phillips** – Based on his knowledge of the geographic locations and discussion with municipalities last year, there were no other ones that were identified as needing sidewalks other than MJ.

**Keenan** – Asked Chapman how he wanted to go forward with this issue. Keenan would like sidewalks just because they are healthier. Her preference would be to put in sidewalks and crossing guards where possible. However, thinks it is a Board decision. Keenan thinks that the two sides of the MJ issue have to be presented to the full Board. Also go on and maybe get another school to see if there is anything we can do there (for that school).

**Chapman** – Asked (Phillips) if it was practical to think that we could get this done for the fall? Are we already committed to transporting kids at MJ?

**Phillips** – not sure if you are committed to transporting but certainly in order to do the sidewalks along Wilson, he could get that in this summer as far as that sidewalk goes. To get the full walk all the way around the site - if that is what the Board has decided to do - that would take us into the fall because of the amount of work that is required and the staff. If Phillips contracts it out, if we put it out to bid, that wouldn't be done until the fall.

**Chapman** – what he is getting at is – Is it really practical to look at a change in 2008 or would it be a change for 2009? **Phillips** – certainly that would be a more positive situation especially for the fact that we would be looking at an expenditure combined of roughly \$160K.

**Chapman** – Asked what the village budget year was? Because if he understood Phillips right, Phillips said that Ottesen might be open to consideration for additional sidewalks from the village budget. But it is not in the current budget. **Phillips** – that is correct.

**Chapman** – So if we aim for 2009, we might get some financial reimbursement for the sidewalks.

**Phillips** – it seemed to him that it was not immediate for this year and they may be able to do it the next year. They (Palatine) might do it along with some other ones.

**Keenan** – Said that they are also looking at getting rid of this median? Asked do we need to do both? If we put the sidewalk in and get a new transportation director, then get more efficiencies, then we never have to do this. So we could be paying to get rid of that median and it would be a one year solution.

**Chapman** – Right, that is why he is saying - One, doesn't think we need to rush a recommendation to the Board tomorrow night. We don't have a (Board) meeting next month (July). The soonest we could approve something would be August and then be under the gun to try to get it done. In the meantime, we have to notify parents if we are not going to give them free busing. Thinks it would be wiser for us to aim for 2009, take advantage of what our new transportation director can provide.

**Chapman** – His other thought is to talk to the village about not only this sidewalk but other walks. Because we have to separate the hazardous area people from the ones that are paying to really see where the focus is.

**Quinn** – Thinks the additional time can be used to look at all those other schools and not just this one school and this one place. **Keenan** – Wants to keep MJ on the backburner but maybe bring Plum Grove JH and whatever other schools may benefit to the next Facilities Committee meeting.

**Chapman** - Wants to make a suggestion. Between now and the next meeting – asked Phillips if there was a way to separate the pay riders from hazardous riders and concentrate on the hazardous. We are getting income from the pay riders.

## **Facility Audit – Review Preliminary Update to Board**

### **Background information:**

**February 13<sup>th</sup> BOE meeting - Chapman** – The Board approved the contract for the architectural representatives. The committee reviewed the contract and the charge this morning. Wanted to clarify the focus of the charge – one is to ensure quality facilities for all students and staff and two is the quantity issue is to review the available space per student at our schools vs. projected enrollments. Thinks they have an understanding with the architects on the direction they will go.

**April 9<sup>th</sup> - Keenan** – 15 principals have completed their interviews. At the June Board meeting, Phillips is going to bring a preliminary/updated report – the mid-way report that tells us the progress. **Quinn** – Was glad to hear that there will be a preliminary report in June before the full Board. Thinks that the Facilities Audit is so all-compassing and something the full Board needs to be involved in as we go forward. It is going to tie into the strategic planning and everything else. **Keenan** – It will probably go to the Facilities meeting first and then it will be to the full Board. There will be an update and format as to how it is presented to the Board.

**May 14<sup>th</sup> BOE - Keenan** – In June, we are going to get an update from the architects. They have met with all of the principals and have gotten feedback. We should have their report and they are looking for direction. So when the Board gets their report, said to think about what you would like to see in the final report to be able to give the architects some direction.

**Quinn** – Since architects are looking for direction asked if the audit would be brought out of the committee to the full Board. Would like to see whatever is coming to the June meeting in the Board packet so there is time to think about whatever it is that they are going to present.

**Keenan** – Said that it will be, it will be presented to the full Board in June. The architects will be at the meeting and all Board members will have the architect's full report the Friday before the BOE meeting. It absolutely is coming to the full Board – that is the intention.

**Quinn**- Doesn't want to have any screening going on in the Committee as to what will be in the report. Wants everything to come to the full Board, doesn't want it to go through committee first to get screened, and then come to the Board.

**Carlson** – Personally would not like to have the committee structure. Thinks that we should act as a Board of the Whole, given that we have a very large strategic plan - the input must be filtered through all of us. Has concerns about all of the committees. Agrees that she doesn't want anything filtered and would really suggest that this year that we do not have committees.

**Quinn** – Agrees, when we are talking about these larger strategic issues and the Facilities Audit that affects everything that we do, the budget planning, strategic planning, everything – it really needs to be a Committee of the Whole.

**Rowden** – We have some big things to tackle – our strategic plan, our long-range goals. Agreed to spend a lot of money on a Facilities Study Audit. It is important that we all have the same information. The Board had discussions and a lot of concerns about committee work - with different people having different opinions depending on who is sitting on a committee. Going forward with these big decisions, everybody needs to be involved. When going through a committee and possibly having recommendations modified is only going to lead to a lack of transparency and a lack of trust.

**Chapman** – Appreciates the comments because he was the one that argued against having committees because it is basically disenfranchising part of the Board. Thinks we have learned that by going through the process. There have been issues that have been handled in committee that all didn't have the information.

### **Facility Audit Presentation -**

Representatives from the architectural firm of Gilfillan Callahan Nelson present at the meeting were: Pat Callahan, Brian Osgood and Steve Nelson. Mr. Pat Callahan, Partner led a detailed PowerPoint presentation for those in attendance.

***Click here to listen to the audio portion of the Facility Audit presentation:***

[www.fcwpta.org/audio/audit\\_presentation\\_061008.wav](http://www.fcwpta.org/audio/audit_presentation_061008.wav) (27 minutes)

***(Audio begins at this point and continues through the PowerPoint presentation)***

**Callahan** – Stated that the purpose of today's meeting was really designed to be more of a working session with the group to get some input. The breadth of this study can really be overwhelming. For you as the owner to understand what we can provide back to you as good information moving forward to make decisions. The basis for doing a study like this is to do just that, give you good baseline information to proceed and make decisions. The process is broken out threefold – one is us doing a lot

of data gathering which we have started and will show you today. Two is to interview the principals because they understand and know how the building reacts to students, how it may or may not serve their needs. Those are the intangibles that are very difficult to get from a life safety study. They approached this to be able to give the Board more substantive information to be able to generate questions in order to make better decisions.

**(PowerPoint Presentation)**

**Committee questions/discussion followed:**

**Callahan** – At this point, he would like to briefly talk about Capacity Based Issues in terms of the Industry Standard which is 130 sq ft per elementary student, 150 sq ft per junior high as option 1. Option 2 is Core Capacity which is library, learning media center, multi-purpose room. Multipurpose capacity is usually the driver – it is the number of lunch periods you want to have. Lake Louise has a lot of kids in that multi-purpose room, that was one of the things that the principal raised as a concern. He is managing it, it is not a problem, but again the Core Capacity at Lake Louise would be the limiting factor, not the number of students in the classroom. The last option would be the Contractual Obligations for Classrooms as a limiting factor in terms of number of students. We would run this any of the three ways. When the audit is finalized, we really should pick one and say this is the capacity for that building. So the question for dialogue purposes is which of these methods to use.

Said that the first option is probably the one with the most fault. You will never be at 100% efficiency in a building. Tried it for one of their other clients and ended up with the actual being 89 gross square feet per student for an elementary building as opposed to 130 sq. ft. which is the national average. It is difficult to do that option because buildings have to be set up from the start and designed that way. District 15 buildings are not because they have some age to them.

The other two options (Core and Classrooms) are the better ways to do it. It is typically driven off Contractual Obligations. Thinks that Core is the most limiting factor in a building since our students typically don't go home for lunch anymore like they used to when these buildings were built. They stay in the buildings in the multipurpose rooms and it is really the number of lunch periods. When do you want to start, when do you want to end.

Callahan wants to throw the discussion back to the group now so he can stop talking.

**(Audio of the Facility Audit Presentation ends here. – Total time 27 minutes.)**

**Garwood** – Said that another limiting factor with the multipurpose rooms (Core) is that they are used for secondary gyms.

**Phillips** – Said that also correlates with safety. His custodian staff is being told that they have ten minutes to clean up after lunch, his directive is to make sure it is sanitary and clean. There are buildings where they are putting back tables that haven't been sanitized. That is an issue. Phillips thinks that the information presented is good towards the end results and something the district would certainly want to have. Some of what was said is already available. Asked - Where do you take and segment this as in regards to the demographics? Classroom population? Coordination of assets? Age appropriateness? Dollar evaluation? Showing me three suggestions for expansion sounds great but if I have a building that is underpowered and if I'm going to put \$4M into it - the Board needs to know that is warranted or not warranted against what a new facility would cost.

**Keenan** – That is exactly where she was going. Maybe if we decide what our end result is, what we are looking for in the end product is and then you could tell us which one of those options fits us the best?

**Callahan** – This is a building of information. We (architects) are continuing to put more in in order to be able to get more out of it. We are at a point where we are prepared to pull out those age appropriateness square footage (info) available for classroom space, specials, itinerants, lunch, gym, etc. The demographer is currently working on and assembling the demographics. That will then be driven into a further discussion. Frankly doesn't know if he can answer the demographic question because these are really three distinctively different limiting factors on a facility.

**Keenan** – Her understanding of what they (Board) are all looking for is we are trying to figure out the best way to use our facilities. And we gave you a couple of models such as keeping the system as is, and how to use our facilities and land the best way possible. As Phillips said, does it make sense to expand a building by \$4M when it is underpowered or would it make more sense in the long run to take down that building and put up a new one? Asked - Which model (Capacity Based Issue) will get us to that end?

**Callahan** – His opinion is that “Core” is the limiting factor in your (D15) buildings. It is your multipurpose rooms, the number of lunch periods, the number of gym turnovers. That really limits how the buildings are operating efficiently. The classroom limitations you can put anywhere from 22 to 30 kids in a classroom. But whether you would actually have enough “Core Space Capacity” is in question. Which is what we will drive out of the report.

**Phillips** – Thinks the driving factor is between #2 (Core) and #3 (Classroom). Need to look at on a combined basis to come up with the rationale.

**Callahan** – Stated that Winston Campus Elementary is an example of taking advantage of the building by sharing it with the junior high. The other elementary schools don’t have that advantage. For them, their classrooms and core are fine more than average elementary. This obviously has to be done on a building by building basis. Some buildings might have core as more of a driver and others by classroom. This is why principal interviews are so important.

**Garwood** – Asked if Callahan was taking into account our declining enrollment? **Callahan** - Yes  
**Nelson** (architect) – D15 has a very good internal demographic document. Not many districts have that level of detail. His demographer is on 4 to 5 week turnaround and will look at that demographic piece, declining enrollment and how that breaks out per building. Also where you might gain efficiencies on boundaries and different breakdowns that you currently have with the structure of your district.

**Keenan** – Will the final report take that information and this info and say, if you choose to do Kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade buildings; this is how it would best work?

**Callahan** – Said they used Pleasant Hill as an example in the presentation to show the breadth of information. This will be done for each building and then the demographic info gets overlaid on top of that. Then we run simulations - What if it is a K-2 building? What if it is a middle school building? What if it is a preschool building? Whatever the case may be. Then run those simulations so that the ability to compare that information across the district so that data is available to the Board to make some good decisions.

**Millar** – So you are actually looking at splitting to a K through 2? **Callahan** – what he is saying is that you have the ability. **Keenan** – That was part of our (Board) packet. Not saying we are doing that just trying to have different scenarios to segregate the population.

**Callahan** - Once the data is overlaid, we have the ability to sort it any way.

**Keenan** – Actually when we voted to do it, that was on the information sheet. Different ways to segregate – K through 2<sup>nd</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>, all that stuff.

**Millar** – Asked Callahan - that is not your primary focus? Your focus is to find the best utilizations?

**Callahan** – the short term is, let’s make the best use of what you have because you have to operate it tomorrow. And then provide you with whatever scenarios you may think that you want to consider/pursue and have those run alongside the base information to make some good decisions.

(In response to a citizen’s question, Callahan replied that the final report is coming in September. Referred to the final slide and stated that the Balance of the Facilities Assessments should be completed by June 16<sup>th</sup>, Models built by August 5<sup>th</sup>, Final Draft August 28<sup>th</sup>, Final report submitted August 29<sup>th</sup> and projected to be concluded in September so we can have discussion.)

**Callahan** – His goal is to have a few more of these sessions with you because again, this is so much information that can be pulled out of this. He wants to make sure that they are not only putting in the information that you want but also have the ability to extract it back.

**Millar** – Thinks it would be beneficial for the whole Board and also possibly the Public to get a buy-in to the process. Because this has the potential to affect a huge segment of the population and we want to be getting the information out early and often. To get them understanding what the process is so you don't have problems later on. **Phillips** – What is being presented now is being presented tomorrow night (BOE meeting). **Callahan** – Said that is entirely up to you.

**Phillips** – This is not to say this is for the Committee meeting, this is what you get to see and we will show whatever (tomorrow night). No. What you are seeing now, is what is being presented tomorrow night. **Quinn** – Would like to see a hard copy of the presentation ahead of time.

**Callahan** – Absolutely. the purpose of today's meeting is to be more of a working session. We expect to do an update at the Board meeting. But he is happy to present this in the same capacity at the Board level tomorrow.

**Keenan** – Doesn't know if you can put everything out because she doesn't want floor plans out.

**Quinn** – Floor plans are available to the Public. Agrees with Millar in the sense that, we need to have this be a full Board discussion. The full Board should have access to the presentation that you (architects) just made in depth and also on an ongoing basis as we go on because she believes that the architects are looking for input from the Board. Asked Callahan - What kind of input are you looking for tomorrow night?

**Callahan** – Probably the same that we are looking for today – it is to get some consensus on the direction that we are going, this being one important category (Capacity Based Issues) that we came to the conclusion today. Because this is going to be a lot of – what he will call the "demographic baseline" somewhere. Asked if there is other information the board is concerned with and that they want to see part of this? **Keenan** – Said that floor plans are not public information, doesn't want them out there, can't do that. **Quinn** – Asked Phillips if floor plans were part of the life safety study? **Phillips** – yes

**Millar** – Need to get the full Board buy-in because you don't want to start something and have someone disagree with the premise and everything after that.

**Chapman** – Wait a minute, we have to get consensus here. This was a working session out of the Committee. The Board goal is for you (architects) to give a status report from where we are at, not to rehash what we have done here. From Chapman's perspective - the Committee discussed the three options relevant to looking at capacity - one relating to Industry Standards, one to Core areas and one to Classrooms. The sense of the committee is that the focus should be on the Core areas and the Classrooms and with the complete report with all of the detail - we are still on target to get it in September. To him that is the important part. That's what we need to hear. And then if we have Board members that say, wait a minute, we want to consider the Industry Standards or if they have questions, that is perfectly logical. Doesn't have any objection if Quinn wants to distribute your (architect) copies to the Board members, that is fine too.

**Phillips** – (directed to Chapman) the other thing, if he understood from the last Board meeting, is that this is the last Committee meeting. **Chapman** – No, I don't think you understood it correctly.

**Quinn** – That was her understanding. There was a majority on the Board that thought this should come out of committee and be a Committee of the Whole for the full Board.

**Chapman** – Said that there wasn't any action taken on that (at the last Board meeting).

**Quinn** – Perhaps we do need to take action on that (tomorrow). As she stated several times, the level of importance of this is large enough that she thinks it does need to be a Committee of the Whole. Thinks we need to have as much transparency as possible with the Public as well and to have that be a part of the process. Doesn't think it is just Committee work. Doesn't think that this is overwhelmingly complicated that it can't be done as a Committee of the Whole.

**Phillips** – Said that the reason that we had this in the foundation of a committee was to have in-house discussions without causing undue alarm to the general populace. If Phillips says that a building should be demolished because it has reached obsolescence, he doesn't want that on the street because we haven't made that determination. So then it limits you in terms of a discussion that you can present to the Board in a positive basis without causing undue alarm. If we start talking about redistricting - because the population is different, we don't have population going down, we have an ethnicity that is going up so we have to redistribute that. Is that something we want to bring up at an early stage at a public hearing at a board meeting? That again is why you have a committee. He'll leave it up to you guys to make that final determination. But just wants to caution you that there are some things we may not as a Board and/or Administration want to be openly discussing prior to having all of the facts. And yet, they (architects) need answers or direction in some of these categories to produce the information we would be looking for.

**Millar** – Agrees with Phillips. It was the same with other committees when we were talking about contracts with unions. But again, the Board felt that that wasn't effective and the challenge here is getting all of the Board to make decisions on things that they feel are being made behind closed doors. Thinks that is the problem that we (Board) haven't been able to overcome. And this, this is major correction – you don't want to have one or two people directing a huge push. Again, you will have nothing but problems later. He understands, doesn't have the solution for you (Phillips). Not disagreeing. **Phillips** – No one is trying to exclude Board members from the direction of what the committee does. He just has a concern with what and how we present it in front of the Board. How do we get that information across and then – how to determine that this is acceptable, that is not acceptable? Because going in and saying to these guys and say "present it all". And then all of a sudden, this comes out and the Superintendent is getting phone calls.

**Millar** – Any Board Committee meeting is a public meeting.

**Quinn** – Thinks it should be a part of the Public conversation. Maybe not at the stages where we are just beginning to think about things but when we are getting close to implementing anything and making those decisions. When decisions are being made, the community needs to be able to give input. Thinks we could have a Committee of the Whole at a different time than the Regular Board meeting. Have it specifically targeted to this. Any Board member that wants to come can come at a scheduled reasonable time that everyone can make it. Thinks it is important to do that, feels strongly about it.

**Callahan** – in the shorter term issue we have to deal with, what happens tomorrow night at the Board meeting? They have 12 copies of this presentation with them today that we can provide you. We have five copies of the preliminary principal interview drafts so we can drop off 5 more today so that the Board can have copies of all of this information. Does believe that perhaps because this is more Committee, this group driving this at this point – that we can at least say that we have a springboard for what we are going to do for the rest of the facilities. That is really the direction we are looking for today. Perhaps tomorrow it can maybe be more of a simplified report. Also has this information in an electronic format if the Board members want to get it electronically. Knows that there is not a lot of time between now and tomorrow.

**Keenan** – Is completely against handing out floor plans. Thinks if you want to FOIA it then at least you have the person's name. Is not trying to hide anything but doesn't think that the general public needs children's floor plans at their school. Doesn't understand what the greater good of that is. Uncomfortable with giving floor plans to the public, okay for the Board.

**Quinn** – The floor plans is not the issue here, can always block out the floor plans, she is fine with that. We need to have the full information, we need to have the full direction coming from the Board to you guys (architects). Quinn is not comfortable with the direction given in Committee.

**Keenan** – Let's back up a little bit. First of all, the Board has given this Committee, at least at this juncture, the authority to make that decision. So we are going to go ahead and make that decision for now. **Quinn** – disagrees. **Keenan** – That is the charge of the Committee. You can disagree but her understanding is that is it. So let's go ahead with that. Give the presentation tomorrow night and

when Chapman comes back in August and makes his decision about Committees, we can do it at that time. She agrees with transparency. Not trying to hide anything. But we are elected officials too. You cannot have the entire committee or the entire community making every single decision. When you are talking about redistricting, when you are talking about buildings closing, or building new buildings, - sometimes "too many cooks can spoil the pot". And she totally agrees that everybody should be informed. Nobody in the public should be surprised by this or anything else, but you are also an elected official and you have to make some of these decisions. Doesn't think it is advantageous to put out every piece of information as soon as you get it. Floor plans would be one of them.

**Quinn** – Thinks we need to discuss the charge of this Committee tomorrow. Also thinks we need to go with the presentation that we have. The Board needs to have access to your (architects) presentation and if you can't put it up on the overhead; at least we can have it on a hard copy so that everyone knows what was presented in the Committee today.

**Keenan** – Asked Callahan - okay, so maybe like 10 minutes?

**Callahan** – What do you want me to present? Just wants to make sure he is doing the right thing.

**Mary Zarr** – Suggested that after seeing this presentation, hearing the discussion and knowing what we are mentally trying to get to – thinks that if the Board has the five points that Chapman made, if there was a slide that condensed the information and told the story. Also the last slide with the dates. If there were about five slides – four that told the story, one ending with the dates and if the Board had their full copy, she thinks that would be appropriate.

#### **Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.**

**Note:** Citizen in attendance was able to ask her questions after the meeting adjourned. She was advised by Committee Chairperson Keenan that this was not a public meeting but rather a committee meeting held in public, so therefore questions could not be asked during the course of the meeting.

*Written by: Jennifer Mondy  
Spotlight on the Board*

*Posted: Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2008*