

**NEW TRIER TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 203
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
January 11, 2021
New Trier Township High School
7 Happ Road
Room C234
Northfield, IL 60093**

A **Committee of the Whole Meeting** of the Board of Education of New Trier Township High School District 203, Cook County, Illinois was held on Monday, January 11, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Members Present

Ms. Cathy Albrecht, President
Mr. Keith Dronen
Ms. Carol Ducommun
Dr. Marc Glucksman, Vice President
Ms. Jean Hahn
Mr. Brad McLane
Mr. Greg Robitaille

Administrators Present

Dr. Paul Sally, Superintendent
Mr. Christopher Johnson, Associate Superintendent for Finance & Operations
Mrs. Denise Dubravec, Winnetka Campus Principal
Dr. Tim Hayes, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Joanne Panopoulos, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Mr. Paul Waechter, Northfield Campus Principal

Also Present

Ms. Niki Dizon, Director of Communications; Mr. Michael Marassa, Chief Technology Officer; Dr. Renee Zoladz, Director of Human Resources; Mr. Augie Fontanetta, Athletic Director; Mr. Andy Butler, Kinetic Wellness Department Chair; Mr. Dave Conway, Director of Physical Plant Services; Ms. Jen McDonough, Applied Arts Department Faculty and New Trier High School Educational Association President; Mr. Mike Hill, Technology Department; Mr. Eric Johnson, Technology Department; other administrators, faculty and staff, members of the press and community.

BUSINESS MEETING

***I. CALL TO ORDER – 6:04 p.m. – C234**

Ms. Albrecht called the Committee of the Whole Meeting of January 11, 2021 of the Board of Education to order at 6:04 p.m. Ms. Albrecht then stated that a full in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the Governor's declared disaster.

Roll call was taken, and all members were present.

II. Communications

Ms. Albrecht invited anyone from the audience who wished to address the Board to come forward and fill out a yellow communications request form and give it to Ms. Niki Dizon, Director of Communications. There were four requests for public comment. All comments were to be made in accordance with Board Policy 2-230, including keeping to a three minute or less time limit. Ms. Albrecht noted that public comments would be kept to the thirty-minute time limit as well.

1. Ms. Sarah Ricciardi, parent and president of the New Trier Booster Club, shared the inadequacies of the KW and athletic facilities at the Winnetka campus and spoke in support of the east side project.
2. Mr. Matt Sloan, Science Department Faculty, Head Boys Cross Country Coach and Assistant Boys Track Coach, and Mr. George Esteve, student and one of the Cross-Country captains, shared comments in support of the east side project at the Winnetka campus. Mr. Sloan noted that New Trier has the largest boys and girls track and cross-country programs in the Central Suburban League (CSL), and possibly even the state. Mr. Esteve shared his experiences as a runner in these facilities.
3. Mr. Leif Gamrath, Kinetic Wellness Department Faculty, first introduced himself and Mr. Mark Colegrove, Kinetic Wellness Department Faculty, as New Trier's outdoor education teachers. He explained the history of the course and how it has grown. He spoke of the inadequacies of the space he teaches in and the benefits of the proposed new spaces. Mr. Gamrath noted that a student was set to speak and share her perspective but was not able to attend.
4. Ms. Susie Halpin, parent, shared comments about returning to school.

Ms. Albrecht thanked them for their comments.

III. Special Orders of Business

A. Brief Update on New Trier Reopening and Operational Plan for 2020-2021

Dr. Sally presented a brief update on the New Trier Reopening and Operational Plan for 2020-2021. The agenda included mandated saliva screening and dashboard update, the expanded Track E and attendance, the progress on vaccinations and two tracks starting second semester. He provided a brief update on the dashboard, particularly about the saliva screening, noting that this information can be viewed on the school's website.

In December, New Trier committed to expanding its E track and are students who can attend every week. Since the December Board Meeting, about 100 more requests were received, for an approximate total of 450 students on this track. Attendance was lower this week than prior to break, at Winnetka it was 13.5% and 20.5% at Northfield. This is partially due to self-quarantining. Staff levels have remained the same as before break.

New Trier continues to work closely with Cook County to use the Northfield Campus as a point of distribution for the vaccine. The District is also partnering with local school districts and villages to share resources and planning. Cook County is currently in Phase 1A with Phase 1B slated to start in February, which includes school staff. It would be at this point, assuming this moves forward, where the Northfield campus would be a vaccination site. The District wants to partner with Cook County as best it can and could manage its own vaccination site. New Trier will also be looking for community volunteers, as one bottle neck in the vaccination process, is having enough vaccinators. The school would also extend this assistance to outside of the Township to greater Cook County. Dr. Tim Hayes, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, and Mr. Dave Conway, Director of Physical Plant Services, have done a great deal of work to make sure the school is ready to go when Cook County is ready to deliver vaccines.

As the District moves to two tracks, a parent email will be sent with instructions for choosing all remote or hybrid for third quarter. This will allow for a final count to ensure classroom capacities are appropriate along with lunch and free period spaces. The District currently does not see any hurdles to starting two tracks at the start of second semester. As the two tracks begin, the school will continue to monitor actual attendance and share that with the Board. Dr. Sally noted that there are differences in attendance patterns at both campuses. The District projects that with the two tracks, attendance at the Northfield campus will be close to maximum capacity. It will see what the attendance is like at the Winnetka campus and respond accordingly. Dr. Sally then invited questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Dronen inquired if the Winnetka campus is not close to attendance capacity with the two tracks, will the school continue to expand those tracks to get closer to maximum capacity, which Dr. Sally confirmed that it would. Dr. Sally noted that strategies to expand have been discussed, but first the District needs to get a read for the first few weeks. The survey will assist with this as it will say who is coming in and who is not. By the February Board Meeting, there will be plenty of attendance data for each campus to share with the Board. At that meeting, potential strategies to increase attendance as available will also be shared.

Mr. Robitaille noted that the likely maximum percentage of participation is in the mid-thirties. He went on to note that 50% is the maximum, in theory, with the two tracks, if everyone wanted to participate. He shared additional comments and then inquired if the school could, in theory, go up to 50%, could it accommodate students in classrooms and the lunchroom. Dr. Sally confirmed that the school could support this percentage. Mr. Robitaille then inquired what the strategies are, knowing that the school will be at 35% participation or less, particularly at the Winnetka campus. He asked why the District would wait, knowing it will not be at capacity on day one, and second, inquired if Dr. Sally could articulate what some of those strategies might be. Dr. Sally noted he could share ideas, but not commit to anything as he wants to wait for the data from the parent survey about how many are opting for all remote. Data would be used from first semester and extrapolated; however, he is concerned about that and hopes that a higher percentage of those who opted for hybrid are actually participating. Dr. Sally then shared some potential strategies, noting that area schools have used similar means. One option is to go to three tracks per day. Another option is to allow those students who are part of Track E to attend four days per week. Mr. Robitaille inquired if there is a need to wait until mid to late February. Dr. Sally responded that he needs to wait two weeks after second semester starts, as there is already an increase in attendance due to two tracks, to see how the buildings react and make sure everything is going well. He noted there is a commitment on his behalf and the administration's behalf to report to the Board the strategies if there are seats available. Mr. Robitaille continued with his question of why the wait to increase the attendance percentage if the District will know, given the survey, how many students plan to stay remote. Dr. Sally appreciates the question, but his concern is that the school has been at 15-17% capacity and ramping from that to 35% is doubling the number of students in the building. He would like to watch how that unfolds and get a report from the building committees that it is going ok and can continue. Mr. Robitaille responded that, said another way, the District wants to make sure its systems and processes

are sufficiently pressure tested. Mr. Robitaille also remarked that Dr. Sally is not talking about waiting months, but rather a couple of weeks. Dr. Sally confirmed this and noted that by the February Board Meeting, two weeks' worth of attendance information will be communicated to the Board along with what strategies may be employed for right after that time. Mr. Robitaille stated that the state of Illinois has imposed a 50% limit. Dr. Sally replied that the state has imposed, mainly the six-foot distance between people in a classroom, which essentially gets the school to the 50% marker. In smaller classrooms, it is a little less, but there are strategies that each campus has developed to manage this as there will be classrooms "over-capacity" as second semester begins. The District is constrained to the six-foot distance and lunch continues to be an issue, but the school is making sure that students are distanced at least six feet to keep everyone as safe as possible.

Ms. Ducommun then walked through the calendar leading up to the February 16th Board Meeting and inquired if the Board can give blanket authority so as to not lose two weeks of potentially adding in more students if space is available. Mr. McLane stated that the Board has, with Ms. Ducommun adding that she did not want Dr. Sally to wait until the February meeting to implement. She referenced Ms. Halpin's comments from earlier and shared thoughts around that. She would also like the District to think about the items that make it unpalatable for students to come on campus. One of these, which Mrs. Dubravec, Winnetka campus principal, shared at the Parents' Association meeting, is that students are assigned to lunchrooms and study hall rooms. Mrs. Ducommun inquired if there was a way for students to know who will be on campus and sign up to be in those spaces together as this way they could be with their friends as they are accustomed. This would resemble more closely the New Trier that they are used to. She believes that kind of improvement would make students more excited to be on campus. Dr. Sally agreed and Mrs. Dubravec went on to share that school looks very different for students on the Winnetka campus. Mrs. Dubravec noted that Ms. Athena Arvanitis, Assistant Principal for Programs and Operations, has been working to provide additional spaces for students that may feel more normal. Ms. Ducommun asked if students were assigned to study halls, which Mrs. Dubravec responded that they are not. She went on to note that it will be a bit easier as up to 50% of students can be in attendance, but that it has been difficult for some students to be on campus without other peers. Ms. Ducommun noted that the school does not mandate where they go and then inquired about contact tracing, for instance, if students are talking in the hall. Mrs. Dubravec clarified that there are designated spaces that students can go and must swipe in. Mrs. Dubravec shared additional comments about this. Dr. Sally noted that having students in designated spaces has been helpful for contact tracing and so parents know what is going on. Dr. Sally shared additional comments, noting that with more students around there will be more friends around.

Ms. Ducommun then commented that students and staff are not experiencing virus spread in the building. That if someone does contract Covid, it is known that they picked it up outside of New Trier, which Dr. Sally confirmed. She shared that this is a good statement to continue to note.

Mr. McLane commented that the saliva screening is arguably the best high school testing program in the U.S., let alone Illinois. He asked to review why this program is not offered to families or to New Trier taxpayers. Mr. Johnson responded that the District is proud of what has been accomplished with the screening program and the benefits it has brought students and others in the building. He went on to share that it is more of an institutional program than an individual one. Mr. Johnson went on to share details, noting while the District would love to be able to do that, the bandwidth and how the program is set up does not allow for expanding the screening to others. He noted that screenings have increased from 2,000 per week to 3,000 and hitting the necessary targets. Bringing additional people in is hard and there are also capacity issues for the lab. Resources are now focused on making sure the program runs as well as it can for staff and students along with maintaining the educational environment. Mr. McLane inquired if SafeGuard has capacity for other institutions that might approach it as he has received questions about this. Mr. Johnson receives the same question and passes along SafeGuard's contact information so that individual conversations can be had. He noted that the lab has scaled up quite a bit and that New Trier is one of the few schools in session now, but more schools are beginning the screening around Martin Luther King Day, however the lab could answer the capacity question.

Mr. Robitaille referenced a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request by Mr. Horvath, and that there is this idea in the community that the District has already spent \$1.3 million on saliva screening. The actual number is a little over \$200,000 to date. Mr. Robitaille inquired if this continues for the rest of the school year, if the District would hit that number. Mr. Johnson noted that for the next Board meeting, he would update projections. Mr. Johnson shared additional comments and discussion continued between the two. Lastly, Mr. Johnson noted that the District is only paying for what it uses as a school.

Ms. Ducommun has been watching the numbers on the dashboard and in conversation with Dr. Sally and Mr. Johnson, believes that there has been a positive impact on the community with having 2,500 people screened and pulling out

those who are asymptomatic. She noted that Dr. Campbell had made a similar comment to Mr. Johnson about the impact in his own community. While the District cannot offer testing beyond its own population of students and staff, she believes there is a spill-over effect that the community is fortunate to have. Mr. Johnson noted that this would be an interesting study for someone to do when this is over, by looking at communities like New Trier and others around the country who did regular testing and look at the rates over time versus those who have not done regular testing to see if there is a difference. There has been no analysis or conclusions on this yet, but anecdotally there are good stories about catching asymptomatic people. Ms. Ducommun shared that there are a lot of tests being approved for mass audiences and they will start to become more prevalent. Ms. Hahn added that what New Trier uses is a screener and not a test as it allows people to come into the building and participate in the school's programs. Ms. Hahn noted that by offering it to the wider community, it could have the negative consequence of people feeling they could go about their business, which is not the intention. Among other comments, Ms. Hahn noted that it has to remain a screener for those participating in New Trier's programs. Mr. McLane responded that the screener is an RT-LAMP test and does determine results definitively. Mr. McLane noted that it will not be offered outside of New Trier, but hopefully others would approach SafeGuard or one of the other tests coming out.

Ms. Hahn inquired if she was correct in understanding that the District does not anticipate going back to mandatory attendance until it is at 100% capacity and Covid is over, which Dr. Sally confirmed. Ms. Hahn added that she has heard comments in the community that students who have no medical reason not to attend have resistance to coming in, but it is a balance that cannot be struck at this point to require attendance.

Ms. Hahn took a moment to recognize the sacrifices that were made in the community over Winter Break. She shared additional comments. As a Board member and a parent, she thanked community members and families, as well as, staff who gave up their normal celebrations so that students could be in-person and stay on track.

Dr. Glucksman shared comments about protecting the community. He noted that students are one of the populations most likely to be asymptomatic and spread the virus. The number of tests that the District proposes it will run when it opens up to 50% covers four to five percent of the entire community. He believes this has an impact on protecting the entire community starting at the family level and then on a greater level than that. Dr. Glucksman also appreciated Ms. Hahn's comments. While physical attendance at school was down the week after Winter Break, Dr. Glucksman noted that those who did travel are cognizant, in a very community-oriented way, and did not send students to school, which he said the community should be proud of. He also appreciates the sacrifices of all in order to help keep everyone well.

Mr. Robitaille inquired, regarding teacher saliva testing, if Dr. Sally was having conversations about this prior to next week's Board meeting. Dr. Sally stated that there have been many conversations with all the associations. Leadership in each association is encouraging their membership to participate in the saliva screening. Mr. Robitaille shared in advance of next week, that if a plan is not presented in getting to 100% participation, he would like them to attend the Board meeting and explain why. He would like to hear from them, why they would not agree to mandatorily test every single teacher. It not only undercuts their argument of safety in the building, but it also puts students at risk. Mr. Robitaille has the expectation that either the associations have a plan to get to 100% or they will come explain why they cannot get to 100%. Dr. Sally responded that he would work with each of the associations on this.

Ms. Albrecht noted that Friday is when the District will know what students' plans are for remote or hybrid. By Saturday, the District will know what the capacity will be for the two tracks and can plan for that and for filling in as available. Ms. Albrecht then inquired as students may need to quarantine if it is possible to fill in with other students during those two weeks. Dr. Sally responded that it was an interesting question and that he would want well established procedures that people can follow. He noted that it could be thought through, but that people are better on their routine, which Ms. Albrecht agreed with. Ms. Albrecht inquired if there was any new information from the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) regarding sports or if the District would expand extracurriculars as ways for more contact. Mr. Augie Fontanetta, Athletic Director, commented that the IHSA Board of Directors will meet on Wednesday and have been working with the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) to try and move sports forward safely. Discussion continued between the two. Ms. Albrecht noted that the goal of hybrid was sustainability so students could return after Winter Break. The District did what it knew was sustainable and continued hybrid learning. The same will happen when the school moves to two tracks. She agreed with Dr. Sally that if the two-track model brings in only 33% of students, that is still a big increase of who is in the school. She also encouraged Board tours when the school moves to two tracks to see the density increase and the efforts to keep everyone distanced. Ms. Albrecht shared some final comments.

B. 15-year Plan Update: Winnetka Campus East Side Academic and Athletic Study

Mr. Johnson began the presentation on the 15-year plan update: Winnetka Campus East Side Academic and Athletic Study. He introduced the architects attending via Zoom, beginning with Wight and Co., Mr. Jason Dwyer, President of Design and Construction, Mr. Kevin Havens, Vice President of Architecture, and Mr. Brandon Spohrer, project architect. Mr. Gene Lund from HOK, who is the athletic facilities consultant, attended as well as longtime District architect Mr. Steve Cashman, who is an expert on the details of New Trier facilities. Mr. Marty Platten, construction manager from Pepper Construction also joined the meeting along with the District's financial planner, Ms. Liz Hennessey. Mr. Johnson provided a brief review of what was shared at the December Board Meeting. The District embarked on this study to meet students' needs of today and tomorrow. The District is thinking about this work as part of its 15-year plan, which is investing the resources that have been generously provided to the District by its taxpayers to do work on an annual basis to benefit students and invest in the campuses. This continues the no referendum commitment. Mr. Johnson shared that the space lacks flexibility and adaptability. He spoke to the lack of physical space for the strength and conditioning program, the facility not being optimal for visitors and increasing maintenance costs. Next, Mr. Johnson shared how New Trier compared to its peer schools.

Mr. Havens shared a site overview highlighting the project area. He outlined where people will be able to enter the building, one is a north door on Trevian Way as well as an entrance off Essex Road to the east. Mr. Dronen inquired about accessibility at each door, particularly if elevators would be at each entrance. Mr. Havens responded that the elevator will be adjacent to the Trevian entrance, but both entrances will be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible. Mr. Havens went on to note that the look of the north end would have the same architectural sensibility that was applied to the west side academic addition. He referred to making the north part a "sibling" to the west side addition that simultaneously makes it look like a unified, historic campus, yet does not disguise the fact that it is a modern building. He then displayed pictures of the outside of the current building and the proposed renderings for the renovation.

Next, Mr. Havens spoke of the student experience as they would walk through the interior of the building by looking at the plan levels and providing interior perspective describing the large activities spaces. He began on the entry level noting the Canyon space, the ability to view the indoor track below and the existing KW locker rooms. The locker rooms were redone in 2006 and for the most part, will be kept intact. Mr. Havens then moved downstairs to share details about the fieldhouse. The recommendation is for this space to accommodate a regulation size, 160 meter, six-lane track. He shared further details about the track and the potential for multiple activities in the space. Another accommodation he shared was the interscholastic student locker rooms, coach and staff locker rooms, as well as athletic training space. Mr. Havens shared 3-D images as well as a graphic of the existing track superimposed on the proposed track. Mr. Robitaille noted that the ceiling trusses looked low relative to the track and inquired about the track clearance from the floor to the ceiling trusses. Mr. Havens responded that it is planned for about 17 feet clear, though not tremendously high, is better than the 10-12 feet of clearance currently. He provided reasoning for the 17 feet of clearance, while also noting that as the design develops and depending on potential issues, the floor of the track space could be excavated a few feet more for additional space. Mr. Robitaille inquired about a barrel vault ceiling to which Mr. Havens replied. Mr. Johnson added further context to the graphic of the current track superimposed on the proposed track. After Mr. Havens shared more comments, Ms. Ducommun noted that to say it hugs the perimeter, it is not just the side walls, it is the end wall of the track where students stop themselves by running into pads, and she is glad to see appropriate spacing. Ms. Albrecht inquired what cannot be done with the ceiling at 17 feet. Mr. Fontanetta replied that pole vaulting would not be able to take place, unless in one of the auxiliary gymnasiums. He shared further thoughts on the use of the fieldhouse space as well as other gyms at Winnetka.

Mr. Lund noted that the comments shared by students and parents were powerful, and the design team is approaching this in terms of function, but that function is also about wellness, inclusiveness and making inviting spaces. It is about creating healthy buildings for healthy bodies. He went on to share additional details.

Mr. Robitaille inquired how far off the track are the pillars seen in slide 22 as well as how there are pillars on one side but not the other. Mr. Havens responded that those pillars are supporting the trusses, the same is happening on the other side of the fieldhouse, however those pillars are not seen, but are still there. The pillars are eight to ten feet off the track. Discussion continued between the two. Ms. Hahn wanted to clarify that the more space in the building requires larger trusses. Mr. Havens responded that the longer they span, the deeper they get as they have to carry more load on top of them. Ms. Hahn then inquired if the trusses would be smaller and gain more ceiling height if the four-lane track option was selected. Mr. Havens replied there may be a bit more height, but the usability would be damaged by taking the two lanes out. Mr. Fontanetta shared his thoughts around this. Discussion continued between

Mr. Fontanetta, Ms. Hahn, Mr. Butler and Mr. Johnson. Mr. Butler then elaborated on the fact that during competitions a four-lane track becomes three lanes, and a six-lane track becomes five due to the long jump pits. However, if the pits were placed on the infield, then turf is lost along with flexibility.

Mr. Havens shared information on level two which is the main event space and is a full story above grade. This lines up with the second floor of the existing building and is a clean connection compared to accessing the Gates Gym today. Included in these renovations are a new weight training/cardio center, new competition gym and a new auxiliary gym. The Canyon is a two-story space up to a skylit roof and is the assembly space for spectators. On one end of the Canyon will be a climbing wall. Also included on this level will be classrooms, an office suite for KW and Athletics along with multipurpose conference spaces and small group rooms. There will also be concessions or a health bar that would serve items during the day as well as during competitions. Ms. Ducommun noted that it is also a smooth transition from this level to the pool. Mr. Johnson added that the space allows for better supervision of students as well as more welcoming for parents along with better accessibility. Ms. Albrecht inquired if this will be the visitor entrance for swimming, which Mr. Fontanetta confirmed and shared additional details on. Mr. Butler also shared comments about the space, particularly the KW/Athletics office suite.

Mr. Havens then shared details about the competition gym. Mr. McLane inquired about the clear-story windows and how the daylight streaming through them will be managed so as to not interrupt play on the courts. Mr. Havens noted that light control will be important, and sunshades will be used as needed. It will also be important to be mindful of the Winnetka campus' neighbors and the amount of light that will escape at night due to interior lighting.

Next, Mr. Havens displayed the existing competition gym and the proposed competition gym and shared the issues and improvements of the spaces respectively. In the proposed competition gym, the cardio loft would be between the top of the bleachers and the trusses and overlook the court. There is a possibility to have tiered barrel vaulted trusses in the competition gym which is reminiscent of the Gates Gym. As the design develops, the study will be on cost efficiency and daylight control effectiveness. Mr. Havens asked the Board for their preferences between the two, with Mr. Robitaille noting he would be a strong proponent for the barrel vault trusses given the openness, air and light compared to the other graphic of a flat ceiling. Mr. Fontanetta noted that the tiered vaulted ceiling mimics the current Gates Gym and offers some nostalgia. Ms. Hahn inquired, who is a big proponent of barrel ceilings, if it changes the outside aesthetic of the building. Mr. Havens stated that part of the barrel roof would be seen. There will be revised exterior renderings provided. Mr. Lund then provided other pieces about the competition gym, focusing on inclusivity such as ADA accessibility. He also shared further about the cardio loft and the potential versatility of the space. Mr. Fontanetta added that much work was done to pay tribute to the current facility, while also having an intimate setting for spectators at games. He highlighted that there is seating on all four sides of the court, which is unique for a high school gym. Mr. Butler noted the flexibility in the retractable bleachers compared to the concrete ones that are in the current gym. Mr. Robitaille commented that part of the view of the Canyon would be blocked by the scoreboard or video wall. He inquired about the placement of smaller screens on the north and south walls and then eliminating the video wall. Mr. Fontanetta replied that the wall has a few functions, which he expanded on. Mr. Lund shared additional details about the 360-clear story. Ms. Albrecht inquired if the Canyon was level with the gym floor, which Mr. Havens replied it was and one could walk straight out onto the floor.

The weight training area, north of the gym, was shared next and is a vast improvement over the current Fly Solo space. Mr. Lund then shared the functional details of the weight area. He shared about resistance training research as well as trends for the use of this space. This area will provide flexible teaching/exercising space, a functional fitness track, weight racks with a direct connection to the cardio area. Mr. Robitaille inquired if the graphic displayed was of the erg machines, but Mr. Fontanetta responded that they are the double-sided weight racks. Mr. Robitaille went on to inquire about what is being done with the rowing program as well as which programs will not be affected by these renovations. Mr. Fontanetta noted that all programs will be impacted by these improvements. In terms of a single space for rowing, a new spaced was carved out a couple years ago in loft space above rooms 109, 110 and the Bickert Gym. He shared additional comments and discussion continued between the two. Mr. Lund added further details about the weight area.

Mr. Lund then described the cardio fitness center which will include cardio equipment, a stretching area, weight machines, synergy machine and flexible classroom/group fitness space. Ms. Hahn noted that Ms. DeDe Kern, New Trier Extension Manager, submitted a letter in support of this project. Ms. Hahn asked how New Trier Extension (NTX) currently works as well as what has been envisioned with this space for them. Mr. Fontanetta shared that NTX has used fitness spaces in the mornings for workouts. He shared discussions he has had with Ms. Kern about potential use for the new spaces such as open community track hours or the use of the classrooms. Mr. Lund spoke to

the connectivity of the space while not compromising function. He noted there would be sufficient space around machines in case a person fell. There is also an eleven-foot clear between the floor and trusses on both levels. Ms. Albrecht inquired if the balcony in the cardio fitness center would always be staffed, which Mr. Fontanetta replied that it would. The barrier wall will also be an appropriate height.

The auxiliary gym would be south of the competition gym and replace both the Stage and Peso Gyms. This gym will be regulation size for basketball, volleyball and badminton and include storage space. It will also house the high ropes course. Mr. Fontanetta provided further observations about the benefits to the space, noting it can be opened or closed off to the main gym, which is important for special education physical education classes. Mr. Butler shared additional comments.

At the southern end of the Canyon space would be the climbing area. Mr. Lund shared the possibilities of the area which includes seating space for instruction as well as to observe climbers. He shared details of the area as well. The goal would be to also incorporate the high ropes course. Mr. Havens shared that one of the big themes is the contrast to the existing Gates complex where spaces are hidden, where the new design allows for activities to be on display. There is a balance needed as well between a degree of privacy and the ability to put an activity on display. Discussions around this are ongoing as the design develops. This space would also hopefully lead to an outside deck for the outdoor education program. Mr. Butler shared further comments including that this is an exciting opportunity for Mr. Gamrath and Mr. Colegrove to expand their curriculum.

The next destination was the third floor where the academic offering could be expanded. This is an opportunity that needs to be seized during construction as it cannot be an addition afterwards. Conversations are still occurring around a number of layout options for the academic suite.

Next, Mr. Havens presented on safety and security, noting that there would be control over the new entrances. The facility can also be locked down in a few ways if needed.

Environmental considerations were also shared such as the LEED scorecard and light studies, further details will be shared at a later time.

Mr. Johnson shared the connection of the project to the 15-year plan. He noted that the plan has five areas of focus: academics, athletics and KW, mechanical/infrastructure, safety and environmental. This project touches on each of these areas in different ways. He went on to share the project impact, especially on the overall classroom modernization plans.

Mr. Dwyer shared the potential project timeline. Currently, the project is in the schematic design phase which will conclude by the end of the month. He shared the steps that would be taken between the end of the schematic phase and when the bidding would wrap up prior to construction at the end of 2021. The goal will be to have the project completed by August 2023.

Mr. Fontanetta and Mr. Butler shared the project impact on the student experience during construction. All athletic programming and opportunities will remain the same. The Northfield campus would host some competitions. Mr. Fontanetta has been working with Mr. Butler, Mr. Pete Collins, KW Department Coordinator, Mr. Paul Moretta, Athletics Coordinator, and Mr. Jim Burnside, Assistant Athletic Director, to prepare the spaces at Northfield and Winnetka for competitions. On the KW side, Mr. Butler shared creative solutions for those classes. Ms. Ducommun commented that while she is appreciative that the school will not suffer during this time, it detracts from people who might be skeptical about the need for these facilities. She went on to share that while the school can accommodate during this project, it is not ideal and there are shortcomings with the substitute spaces that will be used. Mr. Fontanetta and Mr. Butler responded to her comments. Ms. Hahn inquired if Mr. Fontanetta will work with the Booster Club to accommodate their programs during construction, which Mr. Fontanetta confirmed.

Mr. Johnson shared financial information and then introduced Ms. Liz Hennessey, the District's financial advisor, from Raymond James. This project will use existing resources that the taxpayers have generously provided to the District. The District is not seeking a referendum. There is a three-part funding plan, the first is using a projected \$10 million of the fund balance. The second part is issuing debt certificates or alternate revenue bond, with an annual estimated payment of \$3.1 million that is paid from the District's operating funds or the funds that are levied each year. The third is using the District's debt service extension base (DSEB) and is part of the levy that the District uses to issue debt for capital projects. It would replace expiring debt with new debt with about \$14 million in proceeds to

fund the project. Ms. Hennessey shared further comments about the recommended funding sources. She noted that the DSEB has been used judiciously by the Board for many years such as funding projects with the 15-year capital plan without extending the bonds for more than ten years. Ms. Hennessey shared details around this particular source of funding. Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Hennessey to briefly comment on how issuing debt certificates or alternative revenue bonds that are paid from operating funds has become a more common way for districts to fund facility capital projects within their existing tax base, which Ms. Hennessey did. Ms. Ducommun noted that Sunset Ridge School did this, which Ms. Hennessey confirmed. Mr. Robitaille commented that the \$3.1 million is based on a certain interest rate assumption that Ms. Hennessey estimated higher than the current interest rate environment, he inquired how much higher, which Ms. Hennessey shared. She went on to say that funding for this project, if one is looking at the 21-year option, is close to two percent.

Mr. Marty Platten, Construction Manager, from Pepper Construction shared the estimating process and where it has been and what is next. The cost versus needs analysis will be discussed along with continuous review and feedback between the District, Wight, and Pepper. There is also a need for Pepper to understand the unique conditions associated with the project. As the design develops, methods and ways are investigated to determine the best plan from a logistical standpoint and the design perspective that will affect the financial outcome of the project. All this will develop over the course of the next several months.

Next, Mr. Platten walked through the estimated project cost summary, noting that project total would be about \$75 million. A couple of options have been shared that would reduce the cost of the project. Mr. Johnson noted that there was not a cost alternate for adding the barrel vault ceiling, but that it would be shared in the coming weeks. While not an advocate for this, Mr. Robitaille remarked that the classroom area is the part of the project that the school could possibly do without. Enrollment is declining, there is also the ongoing project to convert classrooms through the North and Tower buildings to bring the West Side project model into those buildings. In theory, this could be done over time and would result in more classrooms, while determining if there is even a need for additional classrooms. Dr. Sally responded that one of the parameters that has been used for the 15-year plan is a capacity of 3,300 students at Winnetka. He does not want to be short-sighted and have to change course later on. Mr. Conway has done much work on room counts and shared that after the remodeling is done, the room count is not increasing the number, but rather the quality while the number of classrooms is actually declining. Ms. Albrecht inquired about the net of six classrooms, which Mr. Johnson explained. Mr. Robitaille said it answered his question as he thought as one went out past the projection horizon, the school would pick up classrooms, however, the work being done in the North and Tower buildings, takes three existing classrooms which are then renovated into two. Ms. Albrecht noted that this information should be included in the report as it would be helpful to see where the District is at with the entire 15-year plan. Mr. Johnson agreed and noted that that information would be included. Mr. Dronen followed up noting that if the classrooms are not added during the East Side project, there will not be an opportunity to do so in the future. Also, costs are being amortized over twenty years. Ms. Albrecht inquired what the interior buildout or shelling would cost or what part of the cost is the structure, which Mr. Johnson will share this at next week's Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Ducommun noted that the \$7 million is a clever way to build out the North and Tower buildings to modernize them and the District needs to think more holistically about how it thinks about the numbers. Discussion continued from Ms. Ducommun and Ms. Albrecht. Ms. Albrecht then inquired if Pepper would have some estimates by next weekend. Mr. Platten explained the process and hopes to have a deliverable to the District by January 22nd. Mr. Johnson shared further details that the cost estimates are being done continuously as choices and trade-offs are made. The District wants one more estimate before it commits to moving forward and this is the estimate that one typically has when committing to a project. Discussion continued between Ms. Albrecht and Mr. Johnson about having the options that were discussed delineated as well as dialog about the light study. Mr. Dronen inquired, as far as light pollution, if there is consideration for additional exterior pole lighting on Trevian Way or Essex Road or will only existing lighting be used. If more lighting will be used, Mr. Dronen suggested looking at Ryan Field at Northwestern University where they did a tremendous job with shorter pole lighting with no light pollution. Mr. Johnson shared additional comments around this.

Mr. Johnson then went through the benefits of continuing the project for a 2023 opening. He also went on to share the timeline for continued review, discussion, and outreach. Mr. Johnson thanked the team – Mr. Fontanetta, Mr. Butler and Mr. Conway as well as Mr. Steve Linke, Facilities Manager at the Winnetka Campus. He also thanked everyone at Pepper, Wight, HOK, and Mr. Cashman. Many of the same people both externally and internally were present and helped to lead the West Side Project. Mr. Johnson shared additional comments. Ms. Albrecht noted it was interesting to see the chart comparing New Trier to its peer high schools. Mr. Johnson noted that Mr. Fontanetta and Mr. Butler created that. He shared other comments, noting now is the time to do this work for the next

generation. Ms. Albrecht commented there may be a need for an additional meeting between the January and February Regular Board Meetings.

***IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Ducommun moved, and Mr. Robitaille seconded the motion, to adjourn. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the members voted as follows:

AYE: Mr. Dronen, Ms. Ducommun, Dr. Glucksman, Ms. Hahn, Mr. McLane, Mr. Robitaille, Ms. Albrecht

NAY: none

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsey Ruston, Secretary

Cathleen Albrecht, President