



WOODRIDGE
SCHOOL DISTRICT 68

memo

To: The Board of Education
From: Dr. Patrick Broncato, Superintendent
Date: September 18, 2026
Subject: Recommendation to Approve Second Amendment IGA Between Woodridge SD 68 and Woodridge Park District

This month, Jenny Knitter from the Woodridge Park District approached me with details on installing and celebrating the Challenge Course behind Jefferson Junior High's Track and Field. To maintain the Challenge Course and our current playgrounds, she proposes updating our 2018 Intergovernmental Agreement to reflect these changes. We collectively believe this is a great opportunity to formally recognize and strengthen many of the cooperative practices that have been in place for years.

For ease of reference, I have attached the original IGA approved in 2018, as well as the proposed Amendment #2 to the IGA. There exists an Amendment #1 pertaining to access to the Park District parking lot across from DAC and an adjoining sidewalk, but that Amendment #1 is not relevant to this discussion, so it is not attached.

With regard to the Challenge Course, the Amendment #2 provides that the District is required to contribute an amount equal to 50% of the charges to purchase and install the Challenge Course, not to exceed \$60,000. As a reminder Representative Stava has pledged \$400,000 to the Challenge Course, dramatically reducing the previously estimated amount of contribution the School District was previously budgeting for the project.

The proposed Amendment #2 is also intended to establish a long-term framework for jointly funded playground and recreational improvements located on School District 68 property. The goal is to use taxpayer resources thoughtfully and efficiently while creating high-quality recreational spaces that serve both District 68 students and the broader community.

One of the key components of the proposed amendment is recognizing that these shared facilities are different from the Park District's traditional park playgrounds. School-site playgrounds experience substantially more concentrated use during the school day while also serving Park District residents and the community outside of school hours. In recognition of this

memo

increased use, the proposed 50/50 cost-sharing model would allow the Park District to establish more proactive planning and evaluation cycles for these facilities.

Under the proposed framework, the Park District would plan around a 14-year evaluation/replacement cycle for play equipment and a 7-year evaluation/replacement cycle for surfacing, compared with the Park District's typical 20-year playground equipment and 10-year surfacing planning cycles.

The Amendment #2 adds that 14 years is now the beginning of the formal evaluation and capital-planning process, rather than a mandatory replacement date. Beginning no later than the 14th year following installation, the Park District and School District must periodically confer regarding the condition and remaining useful life of the equipment, anticipated replacement costs, potential funding sources, and the anticipated replacement schedule. This should allow both entities to incorporate their respective shares of the anticipated replacement costs into their long-range capital planning.

The Amendment #2 also establishes 22 years as the outside replacement point. The parties are required to cooperate in good faith to plan, approve, and complete replacement no later than 22 years after installation, unless both parties agree in writing to a different replacement date based upon documented circumstances relating to the condition, useful life, or continued safe operation of the equipment. Funding availability alone cannot be used as a basis for indefinitely postponing replacement beyond 22 years.

The Amendment #2 continues to recognize that actual expenditures remain subject to each entity's applicable budgeting, appropriation, procurement, and governing-body approval requirements. There is language so those requirements do not eliminate the parties' obligation to cooperate in good faith in planning for and providing replacement within the agreed replacement period.

In addition, the Park District would continue to pursue available grant opportunities and, when appropriate, leverage those resources to reduce the financial investment required from both agencies. The Amendment #2 also formalizes the Park District's willingness to have their Planning and Development team take the lead on these projects when appropriate, including design, bidding, contract management and project oversight through completion. When outside consultants or professional services are necessary, those costs would be shared equally between the Park and School District.



WOODRIDGE
SCHOOL DISTRICT 68

memo

Another important component of the partnership is our shared commitment to maintaining safe, welcoming and high-quality recreational spaces for students and community members. The Park District will continue to provide regular playground inspections conducted by a Certified Playground Safety Inspector and share their staff expertise and resources to help ensure these facilities remain safe and well maintained.

Ultimately, I believe this amendment provides a strong framework for continuing the partnership we have built over many years. It allows us to plan more proactively for these jointly funded facilities, recognizes the unique level of use they receive, and gives both agencies flexibility to make sound decisions based on the circumstances when each project is considered.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of the Administration to approve the Second Amendment To Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Woodridge Park District and Woodridge School District 68 For The Cooperative Use and Maintenance of Buildings And Sites.