

**MINUTES**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 205**  
**Thursday, September 2, 2010 (7:00 PM)**

**CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE TO THE FLAG, ROLL CALL**

The Special Meeting of the Board of Education of Lockport Township High School District 205 was duly held at the East Campus, 1333 East Seventh Street, Lockport, Will County, Illinois, and was called to order by President Ronald Svara at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Michael Lewandowski.

**THE FOLLOWING WERE PRESENT:**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

Lou Ann Johnson  
Angela Kamely  
Susan L. Forbes  
Cindy Polke – Absent  
Michael Lewandowski  
John Lukasik  
Ronald Svara

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Garry W. Raymond, Ph.D., Superintendent  
Todd P. Wernet, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel  
K. Brett Gould, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction  
Dennis P. Hicks, Principal, East Campus  
Paige A. Dague, Ed.D., Principal, Central Campus  
Richard A. Lesniak, Director of Business Services  
William J. Thompson, Director of Facilities Management  
Kerri A. Green, Assistant Principal

**Public Hearing and Petitions**

**Members of the public wishing to address the Board of Education under this portion of the meeting can do so at this time. Petitioners must complete all information requested on the sign-in sheet prior to speaking. (A five (5) minute time allotment is allowed for each speaker.) Although the Board does not immediately reply to the concerns presented at the meeting, it does not imply in any way that the public's comments are not valuable or important. The Board's policy is to listen to the public's concerns and then gather adequate information to objectively discuss them.**

Name: Lorie Orban  
Address: 14624 Cinnamon Creek Lane, Homer Glen  
Topic: Referendum

Ms. Orban explained that she has been a Homer Glen resident and District 205 taxpayer since 1987. During the 1995 referendum LTHS gained approval to purchase the Cedar Road property. It was said that the District anticipated the construction of a second high school in 12 to 15 years from that time. There were no promises only optimism based upon potential growth figures at that time. She said she was involved in the referendum process since its inception and made it her business to be informed back then and to know what was happening in her community and to get involved. In her opinion, it was never difficult to find information. Yet, six years later, she is standing in front of the Board tonight speaking about the same issue. She spoke of the Summits that were hosted by the mayors of the communities in District 205 to engage in the will of the stakeholders. She said she was optimistic when a Homer Glen resident created and presented a proposal in which the Village of Homer Glen could possibly build a new facility for Lockport. She was saddened that after much review, many questions and informative discussions, the Board voted not to approve a referendum question vital to the future of the proposal although she understood the Board's reasoning. She stated that the fiscal responsibility of the District rests with the Board and it was her belief was that it may have been imprudent to move forward without everyone's confidence in this plan, and applauded the Board's actions. Although she was unable to attend the August 16 meeting where that vote was taken, it was impossible not to hear the backlash. She explained that she did attend the Village of Homer Glen meeting on August 24, and what she observed was unsettling to say the least. An LTHS Board of Education member speaking explicitly that those Board Members who voted no on the Homer Glen Proposal were all from Lockport. A plan proponent speaking openly that the LTHS Board did not understand the situation at LTHS or they would have voted for that plan—elected officials speaking unattractively of those who may not agree with the proposed plan from Homer Glen. Ms. Orban said that the Homer Glen Plan was a suggestion—one of several—and a good one—but one that contained too many questions and had too little time to be viable for the District at this time. She explained that now, rather than continuing to work together toward an all too common goal, Homer Glen is considering use of its resources to inform residents of a proposal for considering their options of creating a school independently. She asked where those resources were during the five referendum attempts. What happened to “We Are One” in support of District 205? And don't such actions imply and simply validate apprehension of those who continually speak of what happened before, and the myth of the “haves” and the “have nots,” and the invisible and yet seemingly growing community divide? She said she keeps hearing, this is what Homer voted for. She stated that she disagreed. She voted yes for five times to have the opportunity of LTHS and all its stakeholders move forward to construct a new and complete facility. She stated that today, she believes the only current option is to add to the East Campus—another suggestion, and certainly, not the best solution, but it does seem to meet most stakeholders criteria for now—no boundary changes, all students will be availed of it, and minimal tax implication. She explained that she strongly advocates that the Board goes forward with this concept so the addition can be ready for occupancy by Fall of 2011. She felt it was regrettable that what should have been an unremarkable but rewarding process in 2005 has turned in to what is now a modern-day Hatfields and McCoys—many people bitterly feuding over something everyone says they agree on. She thanked the Board for their time.

Name: Diane Wagner  
Address: 13745 W. Cavecreek Court, Homer Glen  
Topic: Overcrowding Issue at East Campus

Ms. Wagner explained that she has two children at East Campus and has talked to them and their friends who also attend East Campus to get their views. She stated that it's not the classrooms that they are complaining about. It's "K" hallway that is crowded. She said she recently talked to the District and also found out that our classrooms are not overcrowded, enrollment is not increasing over the next three years, and there may be very little increase after that. Also, with adding an addition onto East Campus, the District could remove the trailers and the expense of leasing the trailers, and provide the additional classrooms that are needed to return to a normal schedule. With this information, and hearing the proposals and all three options that were posted, she was in favor of the addition and expansion of "K" hallway. She thought it was great of Homer Glen to give us an option to help with the overcrowding issue. She listened and reviewed their proposal but had some concerns with some of the issues in their proposal. There were no details showing exactly what we'd be getting for the \$85 million that they proposed. The number of classrooms, science labs, fields, music rooms, what were we going to get? Also, there was talk about their administrative offices in the school. She wasn't sure if it was right for the Village to have the general public coming to the public school while students are in the school, around the school, during class time, before and after for activities, and Homer Glen paying the bulk of the costs for a new school. Our taxes in Homer Glen would be going up \$21 and then \$100 per year, while the rest of the District's taxes go down \$300-\$350 a year over 30 years. There would be no vote by the people, it would be voted upon by the Board and the Village Trustees. It was her opinion that building a school for \$85 million should be voted upon by the people because we pay the bills. She agreed with the Board's decision and thanked the Board for not putting a question on the November ballot asking if they should build another school when there are no details on the school or the final cost to the taxpayers. She explained that she is now disappointed to hear Homer Glen talking about disconnecting from District 205. She also understood that Homer Glen's proposal was presented as an option to the Board. She didn't understand the proposal to be that if the District didn't do this that they would be looking into disconnecting. She felt that District 205 had an excellent reputation and does offer a great education for our children along with many great activities, and she did not want to disconnect from District 205. Something does need to be done to help the overcrowding, especially in "K" hallway. She stated that in this economy unemployment is high. Families are losing their homes. So she did not feel that it was the right time to build a second school. She said she was in favor of paying \$5.4 million, instead of \$112 million, or one village paying the bulk of \$85 million by expanding "K" hallway and adding more classrooms. She thanked the Board for their time.

Name: Roy Adcock  
Address: 16356 W. 146<sup>th</sup> Place, Lockport  
Topic: General Comments

Mr. Adcock stated that he has been in the District since 1989. He thanked the school board for voting "no" on the Homer Glen Proposal. He felt that rushing into an intergovernmental agreement is nothing that they should do hastily. He explained that he is on a Sanitary District Board where they do have an intergovernmental agreement with two other districts. It took well over a year to put their agreement together for something that will work properly. Although some may call putting an addition on a Band-Aid—it is! Will it solve everything? Absolutely not! But we have to take some action here, and in this economy, a Band-Aid is something we

can afford. Now with all of the talk in the newspapers of Homer Glen wanting to split off from the District because their proposal didn't pass is not right. He, as a Board member on the Sanitary District, doesn't always agree with everything that is proposed by his Board, but in his opinion, you don't go out and bash other Board members over it. He felt that it's despicable for a Board member to do that, and that's all he had to say.

Name: Dr. Nancy Cutforth  
Address: 16624 S. Parker Road, Homer Glen.  
Topic: Another Idea to Alleviate Overcrowding

Dr. Cutforth stated that she and her husband have lived here for 35 years and their children have gone through this school system, and they were very satisfied with it. She explained that they also helped with the 1994 referendum that got passed, and their children never did benefit from that, because they had gone through the school before the new addition was put onto East Campus. She said she has been in education her entire career, so she has nothing against kids. She proposed another idea for the Board to consider which might be too late at this point, but she had taught satellite classes that were in shopping centers, malls and in storefronts. She proposed that the District might consider a Band-Aid or solution to alleviate overcrowding at this point by considering the use of some vacant buildings in Lockport—K-Mart, several storefronts next to it, and the supermarket on Ninth Street. Both of these locations have ample parking and room and felt that something could be done with these buildings as a temporary solution. In her opinion, it would be considerably less money and perhaps help the City of Lockport. She expressed that many other Districts have built schools when attendance was high only to have to sell them later or find uses for vacant schools. She said taxes are the main reason that a referendum does not pass. She said both she and her husband are retired and wonder how many years they will be able to continue to live here because of the taxes. She asked the Board to please consider this idea as a temporary solution. She thanked the Board for their time this evening and all the time they spent on the school board.

## **AFT Report**

### **AFT Report - Tom Ducommun, President/Dave Lorkiewicz, Vice President**

Dave Lorkiewicz, Vice President, AFT, introduced himself as a math teacher at East Campus and informed the Board that he is now the acting President for the Union. Tom Ducommun resigned from his post effective today. He explained that the proposed contract failed. The vote was 166 to 104. He said he believed that they were much closer than the vote entails. He said the Union is ready to continue negotiations immediately. Hopefully, they can come up with a fix that is amicable for both sides.

## **New Business**

### **Addition/Referenda Strategies Discussion**

President Svava stated that the Board would be reviewing two items: an addition onto the East Campus and a long-term discussion about a possible referendum in the future.

Dr. Raymond introduced the architects for the District who were here that evening, Eric Sickbert and Bill Templin. He said they were charged with putting together some dollars and cents and some options for an addition onto the current East Campus building. A packet of information that the architects prepared was provided for the Board's perusal.

Eric Sickbert explained that their charge was to put together some ideas for an addition onto East Campus. Their focus was to be on three different areas. The primary area was to resolve the overcrowding that exists now. The second idea that could come out of this addition was to eliminate the mobile classrooms. And most importantly was the expansion of "K" hallway.

He further explained that Option 1 and Option 2 could be stand-alone additions, and if you put Option 1 and Option 2 together, it would create Option 3, which would be one large addition. He asked the Board to remember that what they had put together were conceptual designs. They did not have an opportunity to talk with any of the administrators, teachers, or athletic individuals. He informed the Board that what they received to review were just concept ideas to get the ball rolling to get some conversation happening, and to get some stronger numbers on what the Board was talking about as far as the additions are concerned. There were conceptual plans for each option. In back of that was the pricing for that particular option, and some pros and cons for each option, because they know there were some complications with going one route or the other. He said that he would not be going into each one of them in detail, but they can go through them as he was talking and he'd be happy to answer any questions the Board might have after they have taken a look at it.

**Option 1** was basically the smallest of the additions. It would add 17 classrooms, which would net about five additional classrooms, if you eliminate the mobiles. If you keep the mobiles you get six more classrooms. The cost would be about \$8 million. That was a conservative figure. There were two contingencies with this option. It would net approximately 150 chairs, and it would widen "K" hallway about 80%, but not all the way through. It would be ready by Fall 2011. It was suggested that if the Board chose that option, the mobiles should be kept for at least one year. No additional mobiles should be needed, because the construction should be completed. Construction could be started in Spring 2011 while school is in operation. About 20 additional parking spaces would be added.

**Option 2** was the larger of the two smaller additions and would eliminate both the math and FACS pods, and it most likely would not be ready for students in the Fall 2011. The challenge with this option is where to put the students during construction. It could be ready by the 2nd or 3rd quarter of the 2011-2012 school year. This option widens "K" hallway all the way up to the CAD Department. With the temporary classrooms there would be a total of 26 classrooms—14 permanent classrooms with 12 temporary classrooms. There are pros and cons associated with this option. The "pros" are you get the additional classroom space, but the "cons" would be the extra costs in putting the temporary classrooms within the gymnasium space. He explained how the temporary classrooms would be set up. It can be done but there will be some issues with the temporary classrooms. The expense of the temporary classrooms was built into the \$11.5 million figure. Most of the money will go into the mechanical systems for the gym with modification for feeding the individual classrooms. Additional trailers may be needed for about a year to house the students until construction is done. It was noted that the mobiles cost about

\$56,000 a year in rental for six classrooms. Superintendent Raymond explained that this would need to be done because of the Board's direction to go back to a normal school schedule next year. Option 2 and Option 3 would add about 40 additional parking spaces.

**Option 3** essentially combines Option 1 and 2. This option would provide additional PE space, another gym, and 26 classrooms and net 14 classrooms, and if the District would eliminate the mobiles, you would net six additional classrooms. With Option 3 the District could offer additional activities for students and possibly expand the concept of the Community Wellness Center. More intramural activities could possibly be offered. An additional entrance would be added to the back of the building and more parking spaces would be available. This area could also be used as an extra bus drop off for students because that area allows for a bus turnaround. In the future with synthetic turf for the football field, more activities, especially for spring sports, could be held outside. The long-term solution is another campus on Cedar Road, and with Ron's (Svara) plan as well as the Homer Glen plan, the freshmen would all come here to East Campus. The Freshman Center would be a school within a school concept. So, the buses could drop off and pick up freshmen at that entrance to create a better flow of students. In Option 3, you could actually have another competition gym. Also with this option, the math pod or the FACS pod could remain for a period of time during construction, and you would only lose one or the other for a year. Superintendent Raymond stated that with Option 2 and Option 3, we would need additional mobiles if the Board would still want to go back to a normal schedule next school year. Eric Sickbert reminded the Board that all diagrams provided were conceptual drawings.

Dr. Raymond stated that Rich Lesniak obtained information for the timeline to have Fall 2011 occupancy. If the Board decides to go with the addition route, the District would like to access the Build America Bonds that expire in December in their current form. With an addition or combination of additions, if the Board could decide on that direction soon, the District could make that happen within that timeline by getting all that paperwork completed. Eric Sickbert interjected that the sooner a decision could be made, they could set their timeline too because they have a lot of work both on the drawing and construction sides and would like to have some decision from the Board by the end of this month.

If the Board went with Option 3 and completed it in two phases, there would be a considerable cost savings. The architects could start construction while school was still going on in the Spring of 2011.

Superintendent Raymond stated that the Board did not have to settle on an option tonight but hopefully be able to give the architects more sense of direction to start moving forward and also have more serious conversations with department chairs and administration, and at their regular meeting on September 20, he felt that the Board would need to be prepared to go, if the Board is ready for that, because that was really kind of your "drop dead" time to do all of the things to make it work. Eric Sickbert agreed that the 20th would be the critical date for a decision because that way they could get the Board exposed to what they are thinking, get some feedback from the Board, and then move forward from there if they wanted to get it done for Fall of 2011.

Superintendent Raymond asked the Board for consensus tonight if there was a particular option they were interested in, and then be ready on September 20th. Superintendent Raymond said

that the concept really was to get some information tonight and kind of a consensus direction from the Board if there was a druther there that the Board liked, and then get serious and be ready on the 20th to move forward.

Member Lewandowski stated that he knew we could do Option 1 without a referendum, but asked Rich Lesniak if Option 3 could be done without a referendum. Rich replied, yes, the District could do that; however using the Build America Bonds (BAB) would save about 35% of the interest payment. So, whatever the interest is, the District would receive a rebate at 35% of the interest portion. Superintendent Raymond explained that rumor has it that the BAB will probably be continued after the first of the year but probably at a lesser percentage, more like 20-25% category. Also, the information we are getting out of Springfield regarding the School Construction Grant is that this addition would also be eligible once those funds become available too. Although there is no guarantee, we could also gain about 35% of the costs of the addition with this grant, plus the savings we could get from the BAB. Superintendent Raymond stated that timing is pretty good right now. Also, he said that Eric Sickbert has been very fiscally conservative with these figures too. What drives the costs of a building are the bids for the materials, and it's a pretty good market for that right now.

Member Kamely asked if it was feasible to rent out space, as Dr. Cutforth suggested earlier in the Public Hearings and Petitions portion of the meeting. Superintendent Raymond explained that they had done some preliminary investigation of using the K-Mark empty space, and the cost to bring it up to code, e.g., sprinkler systems, increasing ingress and egress to meet the needs, etc., we would end up spending a very large amount, plus the rent that was being quoted which was very substantial. Square footage-wise, it would have been cheaper, we think, to build a brand new structure rather than to rehab and bring a building like that up to school code. Eric Sickbert interjected that this was one of the issues they run into quite a bit when dealing with school districts because the municipal codes are very different from school codes. School codes are more restrictive on the school side, and a lot of modifications have to be done to make it safe for kids.

President Svava's concern with Option 3 was that there would be 26 classrooms that would be permanent. But Members Kamely and Johnson interjected that out of those 26 you would be losing some classrooms and only netting eight classrooms if you eliminate the trailers. Superintendent Raymond stated that the idea would be to keep the capacity at East down at that 3000 mark. He stated that with the current Board the ideal solution would be to eventually have two, four-year standalone schools at about 3600 student per site. Originally the thought was to have three schools at 2600 to 2700 students each but that has changed. It still could go back to that if the Board so desired. But the last referendum or two were to go with two sites that could eventually grow to 3600 each. Member Johnson asked, if there was additional growth, would there be more room to expand East even more? Eric Sickbert replied that there was room to do that in addition to the possibility of putting on a second floor to the academic side. Member Johnson asked Eric if he could bring information back to the Board regarding putting a second floor onto the addition. Eric said that he would bring that to the meeting on September 20. Member Kamely asked Eric if they typically build schools that big for many districts. Eric replied that to build a new school straight off that size, is pretty costly, so they don't do that a lot. She also asked if there were reasons that architects don't build schools that big too. Eric replied

that the philosophy of the district goes a long way as far as large schools, and there are ways around it, like to build a school, in-a-school, but typically, you don't want to be over 4,000 students in a building. She asked, don't architects typically like to keep that at 2700 students or less is ideal? Eric replied that it depended on the district. Some districts don't like larger school and some like to keep them pretty small. He said that was a choice of the district as to what they feel is most efficient for teaching their kids.

Member Lukasik asked what Superintendent Raymond needed for the Board to do today. Dr. Raymond replied he would like consensus from the Board if any one of these options was more favorable so they could zoom in on it, because we need to prepare the actual resolution documents and the hearing procedures and all of that for September 20, because September 20 was when the Board would need to actually land on something.

Member Lukasik stated that he liked Option 3, allocating within the design for potentially adding on a second floor. Member Johnson stated that she like Option 3 with a second floor. President Svava liked Option 2 because he doesn't want the school to become a mega-school. He said we keep getting bigger, and bigger, and bigger, and would like to keep it around the 2700 size. Member Lewandowski liked Option 1 and Option 3, as long as we can do Option 3 in two phases so we can get our students in there by the Fall of next year, and deal with the additional space that we don't necessarily need right now, but would be nice to have in case we need it. We don't want to have to crunch, because we are going back to a regular schedule, so we need to get it done. Member Forbes said she liked Option 3 because it seems to be more cost-effective. Member Kamely stated that she appreciated the work, but to her, \$8 million for five classrooms or \$15.5 million for eight classrooms—she didn't agree with any of it.

Superintendent Raymond stated then, we have one none, one Option 3 with a two-phase approach. Member Johnson interjected that she'd like to see what the cost would be for building a school with a second floor right away and the cost for building the addition that would allow for a second floor in the future. Superintendent Raymond stated because with Option 1 or Option 3—two-phase, we could open that wing in time for next Fall, so we probably wouldn't need another set of trailers. We could survive without them, and then DLA would just design them as a single floor that would take another stack in the future, if the Board ever needed to do that. Member Lewandowski stated that he didn't feel we needed to have a second floor right away, but would like to have it built ready for a second floor if we needed one, and would like to keep the trailers, because we are going to need space. Member Johnson agreed. Member Forbes stated that the "K" hallway would be widened and that was a big issue and that she would like to focus on having something ready for the Fall. So, President Svava liked Option 2. Member Forbes liked Option 3-Two Phase, Member Johnson liked Option 3-Two Phase, with the concept that it can be expanded. Member Lewandowski also liked Option 3-Two Phase, with the concept that it can be expanded, and Member Lukasik also liked Option 3-Two Phase, with the option to expand.

Superintendent Raymond said then consensus-wise, the Board would probably want to take a vote just to formally direct us to get serious and bring back to you on the 20th what you are looking for. Superintendent Raymond stated then there were four Board members who wanted Option 3—Two-Phase concept; one who wanted Option 2 priority; and one do nothing. Member

Lewandowski reiterated that he wanted the Option 3 designed to take a second story, like Member Johnson suggested, as long as it didn't exceptionally increase the figures too much. Eric Sickbert stated that once they get a direction from the Board they would refine their designs and the numbers would be adjusted. Member Lewandowski asked if that number would be available by the next meeting. Superintendent Raymond stated that at the meeting on the 20, the Board would then actually vote on the hard resolution; the BINA Hearing would be held at the beginning of the meeting, and the Board would actually "start the ball rolling." Member Lewandowski interjected that the understanding was that we need the classrooms by the opening of next school year. Eric Sickbert replied "Correct."

Member Kamely stated that she would like to clarify that she did not mean to do nothing, but felt that there might be some other option out there for the Board to consider—something else. She reminded the Board that John (Lukasik) said he would support any plan that the voters could vote on; and the voters can't vote on this.

Superintendent Raymond recommended to the President that a motion and a second be made to at least give direction to move toward Option 3 with the two-phase approach, as noted in the consensus, in order to get that paperwork done, get the numbers honed, and everything back in time for the September 20th meeting.

**MOTION:** Member Johnson made the motion to focus on Option 3 in two phases. Member Lukasik seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Ayes: **4** Nays: **2**. Absent: **Polke**. The Motion **CARRIED 4 – 2**.

John Lukasik	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Angela Kamely	No
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Ronald Svara	No

## **New Business**

### **Addition/Referenda Strategies Discussion (Continued)**

President Svara distributed Draft 4 of his proposed plan. He stated that he thinks the Board agrees that the District has a short-term and a long-term problem, and the Board had just finished discussing the short-term problem. It was his belief that sometime down the road, we will need a second high school. He explained that his second draft evolved after he got some input from speaking with people after his first draft, then he thought about some other things that needed to be changed/added, and Draft 3 was created. Then after speaking with some more people and listening to the public at the Board meetings, his proposal is now Draft 4.

He stated that what he was recommending is that if we were going to build a new high school, then Central Campus would be closed. On Page 1 of his proposal, there is a list of a number of things that need to be done at Central Campus, and the revitalization costs would be prohibitive. Five years ago, the revitalization costs were estimated at \$15 million—probably more by now.

At the bottom of Page 1, the questions was, What would happen to Central Campus, and the answer was, that in the past, there was interest in changing its use to light commercial or living units or some combination; effectively, it would be sold. When we sold Central, we would need a competition gym at East Campus. So, both Option 2 and Option 3 did address a competition gym. How much would a new school cost? President Svava stated that he visited the one on Gougar, and it was like \$105 million, but they had expenses that he does not think we would have here, so he was recommending \$90 million for a new school and \$10 million for some work at East Campus. What would the Cedar Road School include? Answer: A building to house a 1900 student population with the ability to add on in the future. The building would include a pool and a field house. It would not include a Freshman Center. All freshmen would go to East Campus. The new building would not have an Academy. The Academy would be at East Campus. Half of the school's sophomores, juniors and seniors would be housed in the new building. They could pick the school they wanted to attend. If over 1900 students select the new school, a formula would be used which would be boundary neutral. The building will not have an auditorium but would be designed for additions in the future.

He said the primary issue for the new building was how much it would cost; boundary was an issue; and disconnection was another issue. He talked with about eight or ten people, and the big, No. 1 issue was how much it would cost. What would the \$10 million be spent on at East? He said he spoke with a number of department chairs and what came out of it was a list of 14 different items: tutor center, writing lab, remote terminals, competition gym, synthetic turf, press box, new scoreboards, technology in pool, auto shop expansion, radio station (his suggestion), industrial kitchen, music—orchestra, black box 300 seats, and an NHS office. He went into detail with each of these items. He explained that he believed that our top students could compete against any students in the world; but students that need the extra help are paying the price for our overcrowding. Ron felt that as we expand and get some more space here, and get the extra assistance that someone who can't go home and get help, they could get help right here at school. Being he did not interface the two proposals, some of what he was suggesting would disappear, such as the competition gym. He said he would be updating this proposal again.

How would the new school be paid for if approved by the voters? He explained that as the current bonds mature, if the voters approve, these bonds would be extended, as shown in Table 1 located on Page 4 of his proposal. He also explained in detail each of the columns in Table 1: Year Collected, Column A, Series 1995 Bonds Amount, Column B, Series 1996 Bonds Amount, Column C, Series 2008 Bonds, Amount, and Column D. What he was proposing was that if we go for a bond extension, then there would be no increase in taxes for the high school. There would be no decrease in taxes. When the \$5,935,000 amount disappears from our tax bill in 2015, there would be about a \$235 a year reduction in taxes on a \$300,000 fair market home, out of that \$5.9 million. Don't pass it and don't get the \$235 a year reduction, or do pass it and get the \$235 a year reduction. There were two other bonds out there, and the last amortization schedule he saw, we could get about \$200 million with this. But that would be a variable because it would depend on what the rate is at the time, and if we can get any BAB, etc. He always proposes we could get flat payments every year, there would not be increases. Bond people use your expansion of bond payment in previous years, and then extrapolate it onto the current EAV, and as that EAV goes up, they recommend increasing the payments. If the EAV doesn't materialize, then you would be paying more taxes. He explained that he made some time

line changes and explained capitalizing interest. If all of that took place the completion and occupancy of the school would take place in the Fall of 2015.

He said this proposal is not something the Board would have to vote on at the meeting on the 20th, because there was a lot of time line that could absorb a delay and review. So that was his proposal and perhaps the Board could discuss it on the 20th. Member Lukasik thanked Ron for his work on this proposal. He would only ask for one other item in his proposed time line that the Board needs to consider, and that is simply looking at the Fall Housing numbers, and then base our decisions based on the projections, and not painting ourselves into a corner with dates on this calendar, because we have to wait to see what the data shows us before we start committing ourselves, as a District, to what we are going to do and when. Member Lewandowski agreed with John's suggestion. Ron said he thought the data shows us that information already. He said we have 900 students at Central. He stated that eventually, we will need to close Central and that will force us into a new school. He said he would put these two things on the next agenda to discuss. Member Johnson said she would like some feedback on some of the suggested options on your expenditures. He said he would do that. She also suggested not to do remote terminals but issue out some laptops for those students who need them. Superintendent Raymond interjected that they were looking at the concept of iPads for the Board to replace our more expensive laptops, because they are getting to be 3G, so you don't necessarily have to have WIFI in the house if you have 3G. Part of what Ron was talking about came out of the Citizens Advisory Council. It was kind of a kiosk format because then if they needed to print hard copy they would be able to do that, whereas with the iPad they are a little bit limited with that.

### **Closed Session**

**Closed Session to confidentially discuss collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives, or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); and Litigation, when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11)**

**MOTION:** Member Lewandowski made the motion to enter into Closed Session for reasons noted above. Member Kamely seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Ayes: **6** Nays: **0**. Absent: **Polke**. The Motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. Closed Session was called at 8:32 p.m. but convened after a short recess at 8:38 p.m.

Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

### **Reconvene Open Meeting**

President Svara asked for a roll call. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Ayes: **6** Nays: **0**. Absent: **Polke**. The Motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. The Open Meeting reconvened at 9:25 p.m.

Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

**Action Considerations - After Closed Session**

**Action Consideration regarding Union Contracts, if needed**

None

**Action Consideration regarding Lockport Area Special Education Cooperative (LASEC) Matter, if needed.**

None

**Adjourn**

Member Lewandowski moved, Member Lukasik seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. By voice vote, all members present voted, aye, and the motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. The meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

---

Ronald Svara, President

---

Lou Ann Johnson, Vice President

gkm