GENEVA COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER 304
227 NORTH FOURTH STREET, GENEVA, ILLINOIS
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF A REGULAR SESSION
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Board of Education of Community Unit School District Number 304 met in a regular session on Monday, October 28, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. at Williamsburg Elementary School, 1812 Williamsburg Avenue, Geneva, Illinois.

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Roll Call
1.2 Welcome
1.3 Pledge
1.4 Reminder to sign attendance sheet

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by President Grosso.

Board members present: President Mark Grosso, Leslie Juby, David Lamb, Michael McCormick, Vice President Kelly Nowak, Policy Committee Chair Mary Stith, Finance Committee Chair Bill Wilson. Late: None. Absent: None.

The President welcomed everyone, reminded them to sign the attendance record, and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

District administrators present: Dr. Andrew Barrett, Director Learning & Teaching; Kelley Munch, Communication Coordinator; Craig Collins, Assistant Superintendent Personnel Services; Donna Oberg, Assistant Superintendent Business Services; Patty O'Neil, Assistant Superintendent Learning & Teaching; and Dr. Kent Mutchler, Superintendent.

Others present: Elizabeth Hennessy (William Blair & Company), Marnie Kane, S. Ellis, Donna Potaczek, Helen Klatter, Diane Chapman, Jay Moffat, Geff Carreiro, Dan Garrett, Bob McQuillan, Katie O'Conner, Wynn & Marilyn Church, Tom Anderson, Kelly & Bernie Pallardy, Cookie Olson, Ellen Chalmers, Doris Cleave, Jan Weigand, Jeff & Marline Krug, Brenda Schory (KC Chronicle), Susanna Waston

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Per Board Policy 0167.3, Section C, Attendees wishing to speak at the Board meeting must register their intention to participate in the public portion(s) of the meeting upon their arrival at the meeting. Complete the form found in the <u>Welcome to Our Meeting</u> brochure (print legibly) and <u>give it to the Presiding Officer or the Recording Secretary before the meeting is called to order</u>.

Comments included:
As the Board is aware, last year the District went through difficult teacher negotiations and settled with the teachers for a salary freeze in year one of their contract. In August, five Board members approved a new superintendent contract with a 2.5% salary increase, a $9,000 performance bonus, and an $800 monthly travel allowance; and in separate action, a two-year, $4,300, interest-free car loan for the superintendent. I want each of the five members that approved the contract to explain why they did that; especially for the interest-free car loan for two years, using taxpayer's money, for someone with a total compensation package of over $250,000.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 Regular Session October 15, 2013
3.2 Executive Session October 15, 2013

The President asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There were none but a Board member requested that the minutes be voted on separately. The President asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Before a motion could be made, the audience member who had spoken during Public Comments returned to the podium, and stood there until the Board President noticed him and asked if he could help him. The audience member asked if the five members of the Board were refusing to answer his questions. The President responded that the Board was not going to answer his questions at this time and referenced Board Policy 0167.3, Public Participation at Board meetings (i.e. public comment is not intended to be a question-and answer period, or to respond to accusations or inferences). The audience member commented that he didn't infer anything and that all of the information mentioned was in the contract and in material supplied to the Board. He asked when the time would be to discuss this. The Board President suggested that he send a letter or email, or call him on the phone. The audience member wanted the President to share the response on the District website so that his questions and the response were transparent and answered by every Board member who voted yes. The President responded that the time to have asked these questions would have been when the contract was approved in August. The audience member stated that the superintendent's contract was approved in executive session. The President corrected him and stated that the superintendent's contract was not approved or voted on in executive session. It was voted on and approved in open session. The audience member stated that someone requested the superintendent's contract the day after it was approved, and they were told it wasn't available because it had to be typed; so questions could not have been asked when the Board voted on it because community members would not have had a copy. He added that the superintendent's contract is not available on the website like the teachers' contract. He had to FOIA it, and, supposedly, it took someone thirty minutes to be able to email him the contract, the bill of sale and the information about the vehicle that was already available on BoardBook at a supposed cost of $15.00. The audience member stated that this was a public meeting, and understood that it was the Board's business meeting, but it was open to the public and people are asked to make comments. He added that he'd made a comment, asked for an opinion of each of the five Board members that approved the contract, and the Board was refusing to answer his questions. He indicated that he would send an email and then he would forward the Board's response publicly to everyone in Geneva to see the answer to the questions.

The President called for motions to approve the minutes from the October 15, 2013 meeting.

Motion by Wilson, second by Stith, to approve Item 3.1, as presented. On roll call, Ayes, six (6), Juby, Lamb, Nowak, Stith, Wilson, Grosso. Nays, none (0). Abstained, one (1), McCormick. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Wilson, second by Lamb, to approve Item 3.2, as presented. On roll call, Ayes, five (5), Lamb, Nowak, Stith, Wilson, Grosso. Nays, none (0). Abstained, two (2), Juby, McCormick. Motion carried unanimously.

4. RECOGNITION, AWARDS, PRESENTATIONS, PUBLIC HEARINGS

The President announced that the Illinois Association of School Boards has selected District staff member Pam Burgeson as the recipient of the 2013 Holly Jack Outstanding Achievement Award. The IASB award is a recognition of achievement for administrative assistants, secretaries and Board recording secretaries. The award was established five years ago. Ms. Burgeson was selected as the award winner from among thirty-five nominees from all over the State of Illinois. Ms. Burgeson will be recognized at the IASB Conference in November. The President, on behalf of the Board, extended Ms. Burgeson their sincere congratulations for a job well done. He added that Ms. Burgeson has worked for the District for almost 33 years; 25 of them as the superintendent's secretary and the Board's recording secretary.

4.1 District Debt Service Update: Elizabeth Hennessy, William Blair & Company

The President noted that at the last Board meeting he'd announced that the Board would develop an action plan regarding the District's debt. The Board's objectives are to reduce overall indebtedness, smooth debt-service payments, provide long-term sustainable benefit to taxpayers, continue to return excess reserves through abatement, reduce reserve average to nearer 30% as part of debt reduction process, and maintain flexibility and local control - allowing the Board to react to any changes. Planned actions include abatement, identifying debt refunding opportunities, and principal reduction through defeasance. Following Hennessy's presentation, he hoped that the Board could slightly tweak or modify the objections/actions if necessary and then the Board's Finance Committee could develop options to present to the full Board for action.

The Superintendent commented that we are fortunate and thankful to have worked with Elizabeth Hennessy from William Blair for the past several years.

Hennessy reported that the District's restructuring options had been revised since the October 7th Finance Committee meeting presentation to reflect updated financial projections the District had received, as well as suggestions from members of the Finance Committee. She reviewed the District's outstanding bonds and reported that refunding provided savings to taxpayers in 2010 on the 2004 bonds and in 2011 and 2012 on the 2004A Bonds. The 2008, 2007B, and 2007A bonds are the next bonds that will be callable; 2018 for the 2008 bonds and 2017 for the 2007A /2007B bonds. Typically, municipal bonds have a standard ten-year call protection so investors know that they have interest payments for ten years. If you try to shorten the call, you may have to pay a higher interest rate. The 2004A bonds were already refunded as they were callable 1/20/2014. The 2001A & 1998A are Capital Appreciation School Bonds and are non-callable.

Board member question: Is there $8.8 million callable for the 2004A bonds? (No, they are non-callable because it's part of the total of the Capital Appreciation School Bonds.)

It has been the District's strategy to abate surplus in the Education Fund above $15 million. In 2012, the District pledged to abate $4.99 million. In 2013, surplus above $15 million is projected at $5.9 million which could be abated. The projections were updated with PMA's most recent financial projections in the Education Fund. The projections assume full Property Tax Limitation Law Levy allowing CPI and new Property is extended annually. The projections for 2014 out to 2019 are estimates only and the further out you go, the less clear the projection is. However, it appears that it would be possible to continue this strategy to abate debt service to keep the tax payment steady.

Option 1: Continue abatement strategy. While the FY2013 amount may change depending on actual surplus, over three years, FY11, FY12 & FY13, total abatements are estimated at $14,146,467.

Option 1A: Does not contemplate surplus budgets FY2014 or thereafter. Levy Year 11 through Levy Year 15 abatements estimated at $14,146,467. Refunding bonds issued in FY2015 to flatten remaining levy payments. *Advantages*: flattened debt service payments for the life of the bond issue and does not rely on abatements of surplus after FY13. *Disadvantages*: extends debt service for three years after final maturity; total net debt service cost from refunding estimated at $13,467,765 over the life of the bonds and the present value cost of $2,291,653; future interest rate risk. When you refund bonds and extend (this scenario 3 years from time of maturity), it is always going to cost money. This option costs less than the option we looked at a couple of months ago because rates have come down a little and this option flattens the debt at $19.3 million which is a little less costly. If you compare this option to payments on a home, and go all the way out, there isn't a lot of savings in the last three years. By extending the debt, we'd be making payments where we would not have made payments otherwise.

Option 2: Uses estimated surplus budgets FY 2011 - FY 2013 for abatements through levy year 2021. Total abatements estimated at $37,292,371. Good news is that if the projections pan out, the District could do it. The debt payments are around $19.3 million. This doesn't extend any debt than originally scheduled. *Advantages*: flattens debt service payments for the life of the bond issue through levy year 2018 without the cost of refunding bonds; depending on economy and future tax base, growth may not need future refunding issues. *Disadvantages*: not clear budget surpluses will continue in the projection years; relies on operating tax levy funds to reduce debt service.

Option 3 and Option 4 are a combination of abatement/refunding and defeasance. These options were developed with the Board's goal of reducing/leveling the debt service payments but also trying to pay down the debt and save some interest costs on the debt.

Option 3: A combination of abatements/refunding and cash defeasance. Using cash to pay-off, or defease bonds, works best at the bond call date. The next call date is for the Series 2007A bonds January 1, 2017 and for the Series 2008 bonds January 1, 2018. Option 3 shows continuing abatements through FY2016. The cash surplus generated in FY2017 is used to pay down principal on the Series 2007A and Series 2008 bonds at the call date of January 1, 2018, along with the proceeds of refunding bonds in order to flatten the debt service payments. In Option 3, the debt service is extended only one more year. Using cash now to pay down bonds doesn't work very well when you're about three years from the call date. We'd want to wait until the bonds are callable. Money could be set aside to accumulate funds up to the call date, which is what this option represents. Because the cash is not enough to bring the debt schedule down for the life of the bonds, we would also need to use refunding bonds. We would be taking out a total of $19.9 million and replacing it with a bond issue of $15.1 million. We could do that because we'd have an additional $6.52 million in cash to use. While we'd go out one more year, there is a net saving which is significantly lower than any other restructuring options. *Advantages*: flattens debt service payments for the life of the bond issue through levy year 2016 without the cost of refunding bonds; uses refunding and FY2017 cash surplus to pay down and flatten remaining debt payments; lowest net cost of refunding $1,757,568 and present value savings of $151,303 at current interest rates; allow us of FY2018 and forward surpluses, if any, which are not pledged to debt service. *Disadvantages*: not clear budget surpluses will continue in the projection years; relies on operating tax levy funds to reduce debt service; future interest rate risk.

Option 4: Addresses the question of how to get more cash to make refunding defeasance more effective. It continues abatements through FY2015, but puts aside some of the surplus cash from the amount over $15 million in the Education Fund from FY 2013- 2015, and the entire surplus in FY 2016 to use towards paying off debt at the January 1, 2017 call date. In January 2017, the accumulated cash surplus, plus refunding bonds, are used to flatten the debt service payments. *Advantages*: flattens debt service payments for the life of the bond issue through levy year 2015 without the cost of refunding bonds; uses refunding and portions of surpluses FY 2013-2016 to pay down and flatten remaining debt payments; net cost of refunding $4,118,923 and present value savings of $379,320 at current interest rates; allows use of FY2017 and forward surpluses, if any, which are not pledged to debt service. *Disadvantages*: not clear budget surpluses will continue in the projection years; relies on operating tax levy funds to reduce debt service; future interest rate risk.

Hennessy commented that she believed that some combination like this would help achieve the Board's goals of 1) flattening the debt service and 2) saving interest costs by paying off debt at the call date.

Board discussion, comments, questions:
What should we do with non-callable bonds, which are at a higher interest rate? (The only way would be to get the bond holders to agree to sell them back to the district. We've talked to some of the investors and the price they would want to charge the district for the transaction would out weigh the benefit to the district. While it isn't completely impossible, we are constantly monitoring to see when investors want to sell, but it doesn't happen very often because the district has strong credit. If the district's credit goes down that could negatively impact the district and a lot of investors would want to unload their bonds.) So, it would be cost prohibitive. (Yes. But, not impossible.)

I appreciate that when you come, you give us options but don't tell us what to do. Why is defeasance more of an option this year? (The difference in this option is that you accumulate cash until you hit a call date. If we did defeasance right now, it would cost about $11 or $12 million cash. But if we accumulate cash and are at the call date, you could just pay them off.) The last two options are basically the same -- how we are accumulating cash. Why does one option use 1/1/2017 and the other the 1/1/2018 date? (In Option 3, we'd use as much cash for abatement as possible and the option works well because you are waiting longer to pay down one debt; don't have as much to refund; and you're at the call date. Option 4, provides a way to get more cash to pay down bonds, and the only way to get more cash is to use less for abatement, and accumulate it for debt payment. When you do that, you don't have as much for abatement, so you'd have to do a refunding and call in bonds sooner. There are pluses and minuses to both of the options. In my opinion, if you can wait until 2018, it might be better and less costly.)

Thanks for taking the time to update the presentation. Before the Finance Committee takes this up, I'd like us to look at the $15 million and continue to do abatement, if there is anything over $15 million, but as long as we have debt, we should consider cranking that back next year; continue to abate and hold some in reserve. We'll have to decide how much below the $15 million we want to drop to.

Agree, and if we can set more aside to pay off debt, it's a good option. (Yes, but it is a finite period of time because we don't want to have our bond rating drop.) It seems that everything is predicated on having more revenues budgeted and having more revenues than expenditures. I understand having goals and a smooth rate for taxpayers, but based on that we need to be clear that most of these are not out-of-pocket savings for our taxpayers - they are based on $3.5 million to $4.5 built into all of the projections and would collect more revenue than expenditures for these years. Also, it is assuming that it is a full property tax levy; so how do we get any savings? (It's predicated on the strategy that the Board has used so far - you feel that $15 million is what you need, and if expenditures come in lower than revenues, that money is then used to abate to taxpayers in the next year.)

Are there any strategies where we could flatten the levy now so current taxpayers don't have to pay more. (Our debt service is levied by the County. If we didn't have money to abate back, and we levied for exactly what we have in the Education Fund, that covers education dollars, but the County will still levy the full amount to cover the debt payment. The money that we save, whether you call it over levying or under spending, is used to keep the debt service down. We levy for an amount that we feel we need to operate. If we under spend in our budget, we can then use the surplus for abatement, which offsets some of the increase that the taxpayers would incur. When the Board adopts a resolution to abate, we set that amount aside in the Debt Service Fund, so when the payments come in, we use those dollars, along with the levy dollars to make the payments on the debt service payment. The County doesn't hold the money, we hold it in the Debt Service Fund until the payments come in and then combine it with the levy dollars. The resolution the Board adopts tells the County to ask for less.)

Our operating budget for the last few years is relatively flat but our debt service costs are laddered so they increase. When the economy tanked, housing starts stopped in Geneva. We've talked about it with every employee group during our negotiations with them. We continue to try to flatten out the steep increases that our taxpayers would see.

But the excesses aren't ours, they are the taxpayers and I don't see any options that don't push this down the road. Our schools are going to be here for a long time and savings on the increases aren't really savings at all.

I feel that the entire Board understands that the money, whether we go down now or later, is taxpayer money and we are all taxpayers. I think that the Board decided philosophically that we want level tax rates. We could give our taxpayers momentary relief, but what we're looking out to 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, and do we want to give our taxpayers a level rate or give momentary relief and have the tax rate skyrocket in those years?

Unless Geneva experiences a tremendous amount of growth, there is not a lot we can do. Much of our old debt isn't callable. We are trying to flatten out the rate and have consistent debt service payments over the next few years so that it doesn't spike up drastically. (I want to point out that for another year we'd be in the negative and then increasing again at 4%. We're not sure that's going to happen and if the EAV doesn't come up, we're not going to have the excess amounts estimated in these projections. We could go back to levying CPI or levying for what we need for our operating funds and just letting the debt service fund go. Maybe we need to prepare a scenario that shows what it would look like if we did nothing for our taxpayers now.)

As we've said previously, several years ago this Board committed to try to flatten out the rate for all of our taxpayers. Additionally, any amended or reduced commercial/industrial taxes have an impact on all the rest of the taxpayers. Even if we keep our operating costs exactly the same each year, people will continue to see an increase. The problem is that people will see significant increases every single year if we do nothing. If we can give back some money every year, we could keep the rate flat or level for a number of years. People have told us that they could budget for small increases but they couldn't afford to keep paying and additional $1,000 more a year in taxes. The Board still needs to collect enough every year in order to pay the debt; do we keep the number small or let it go; or, do we try to balance the two so that every year there is just a slight growth in the taxes. We also need to remember that when we took on this debt, it was with the belief that more people would move to the school district to help pay the debt in future years. But growth has slowed. If we do extend the debt out two or three years, we may have new growth to help pay.

I get it but we're still relying on our current taxpayers.

We are looking at really high rates in 2016, 2017, and 2018, which is only a few years out. I am also concerned about health care costs. We've already asked all of our employee groups to take pay freezes - and it started with our administration, who took a two-year freeze. That's our reality. Our employees are also our taxpayers. So, it's time to figure out how to balance this and figure out what we need to do.

These options assume a 4% EAV increase and we've seen options based on that. I'd like to see options based on 2%, 1.5% or other options. If we don't take in enough money, then it looks like none of these options would matter anyway. We wouldn't be able to do any of these things if we don't have the extra money. I'd like to see options/projections with a smaller EAV percentage. I want to see what impact a lower EAV has on these options. (It's not a problem to run options with a lower EAV. I think the lowest here is 2%.) The Finance Committee has discussed changing the projection amounts and the Committee will look at lower amounts for the next few years. Revised numbers will start coming in at the next Finance Committee and recommendations will come to the Board from the Committee before the Board votes on the levy.

The 2013 levy decision is a separate issue from the debt restructuring decisions; it's based on what we think we are going to need for our operating funds for next year. We know this is not a savings, it is an amount that was not spent in the budget. There is uncertainty in the levy process and we're trying to project into the future to determine what we'll need to budget to operate the District. But we don't know the actual levy amount until March, three months after we have to adopt the levy, and the amount is always lower than what we predict. I understand that it shouldn't be a strategy to levy CPI just to carry an excess, but before last year, we did levy CPI. However, out of the entire Education Fund budget of $52-53 million, and the funds we are discussing, any new tax dollars that funded that budget were only about $80,000. We've been coming in under budget for about the last five years and in that time we've reduced our operating budget by about $7.5 million. Through a combination of our austerity, holding off on raises and asking our employees groups to cooperative with us to do that, we've been able to drop our expenses over the past five year. We're now trying to credit back to the taxpayers. While we understand the projections, we're not hopeful about them. We're we have a surplus, we plan to return some to the taxpayers. The benefit to the taxpayers is it will help smooth out their payments so they won't see huge spikes in the coming years.

The EAV doesn't increase taxes. It's only used to calculate what the tax rate is. It's the amount of the levy each year that will impact how much the District receives. When the EAV goes down, the tax rate goes up. When the EAV goes up, the tax rate goes down. The levy amount is what will determine how much money the school district will receive year after year.

We looked at extending the debt further but the cost was offset by what that we could save. (That's correct. When developing these scenarios, we looked at not using any of the surplus for abatement and only trying to restructure the debt of the bonds. But even the most efficient way to structure it would still stretch the debt out and incurs a significant cost for the negative arbitrage over time. That option is still available for the Board to consider. Part of the reason we chose to do abatement was because we didn't want to extend the debt further out. We'd like to get it paid off. Nor did we want to incur additional cost to the taxpayers because extending the debt would cost millions of dollars.)

Abatement allows the Board to level the rate vs. having it fluctuate up and down. We appreciate the freezes that our employee groups took but the Board also made a commitment to maintain our curriculum and high level of education in Geneva. Most people in Geneva don't want to give up the excellent education we offer, so we have to balance that and operating our schools in an efficient manner with servicing the debt.

I think that we can do both educational excellence and financial responsibility. (We are doing both.) I understand, we just trying to figure out give the taxpayers a break. For the record, I agree that the district is excellent.

The President thanked Hennessy for the presentation and noted that the Board would be considering the options presented.

4.2 Communications Coordinator Presentation: Kelley Munch

The Communications Coordinator provided an overview of her area of oversight that began with the creation of the position in 2007. Parents, students, staff and community members receive information about the District through a variety of resources including newsletters, 304Connects, emails, website, public forums, Board meetings, newspapers and blogs, online Board documents and meeting videos, a notification system, and as of today, a Twitter account. The Communication Coordinator is also the District's FOIA compliance officer. Since 2008, the website has been redesigned, Board meetings are available on Comcast channel 10, Board agendas/documents and meeting videos are available online, a climate survey has been conducted, the newsletter has been redesigned, Online Backpack was created, a mobile District website was launched, Home Access Center for both the elementary and secondary levels was created, the goals booklet was redesigned, and in the fall of 2012, Board member election information and materials were available online. A survey revealed that Geneva's staff and parents obtain most of their information from the District's web site and 304Connects. The Communication Coordinator is a member of the National School Public Relations Association, the Illinois Chapter of the National School Public Relations Association, and the Kane County Public Relations Council.

Discussion, comments, questions: As a member of the Superintendent's Communications Task Force, have seen the changes and improvements by the addition of this position.

4.3 Common Core Math Curriculum: Dr. Andrew Barrett & Donna Potaczek

The Board received an update on the implementation of the Common Core Math standards for the District's elementary schools. Planning for the standards began in 2011-12 for District-wide implementation this year. The key themes are focus, coherence, and rigor. Using Eureka Math, the focus is more conceptual and less computational, which is a benefit for students. Eureka Math consists of six, in-depth units that are written for teachers by teachers still using computation and the base ten system. Barrett and Potaczek reported that presentations on the Common Core Math curriculum for parents have been very well attended and that the evaluation of programming and resources, as well as support for students, teachers and parents is ongoing.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

This year's Red Ribbon Week activities were successful. Fall extra-curricular programs are ending, as is the first quarter at the secondary level and the first trimester at the elementary level. For the seventh consecutive year, , the District received the SchoolSearch Bright A+ Award for academic excellence in education. The All-Day Kindergarten Committee has been meeting and is planning a presentation to the Board in the near future.

6. BOARD DIALOGUE TOPICS & PENDING ACTION CONSIDERATIONS

None

7. WORK-STUDY TOPICS & FUTURE ACTION CONSIDERATIONS

None

8. INFORMATION

8.1 FOIA Requests
8.2 Suspension Report
8.3 HLERK Newsletter, October 2013

No discussion.

9. CONSENT AGENDA

9.1 Monthly Financial Reports and Interfund Transfers
9.2 Personnel Report: Resignations, Retirements, Leave Requests, Changes in Assignment/FTE, New Hires

<u>Reclassification Certified</u>
Miles, Sheri, HSS, Speech Language Pathologist, 0.70 FTE to 0.75 FTE
<u>Leave of Absence Certified</u>
Bain Biegaalski, Cindy, FES, Grade 3, 1.0 FTE, 4/29/14 to 5/30/14
<u>New Hires Support</u>

Koester, Clover, HES, Classroom Assistant, 9 Month, Start Date 10/29/13
Richardson, Jean, District, 2nd Shift Custodian, 12 Month, Start Date 10/29/13
Rodriguez, Angel, District, On-call Sub Custodian, 12 Month, Start Date 10/29/13
Secor, Bruce, District, On-call Sub Custodian, 12 Month, Start Date 10/29/13
Vozza, Christy, HES, Kindergarten Booster Classroom Assistant, 9 Month, Start Date 10/29/13
<u>Resignations Support</u>
Flannery, Erin, HES, Special Education Assistant, 9 Month, Effective 12/20/13
<u>Dismissals Support</u>
Kelly, Anne, GMSS, Technology Assistant, 10 Month, 10/28/13

9.3 Amend 2013-2014 Board Meeting Calendar
9.4 Bid Summary/Award: $69,100.00, Vortex Commercial Flooring, Floor Replacement CESC
9.5 Bid Summary/Award: 2013-2014 Snow Removal
    Bid Package 1, $2,500, LawnBoyz Landscaping, Inc., Fabyan & Mill Creek
    Bid Package 2, $1,800, LawnBoyz Landscaping, Inc., Heartland & Keslinger Bus Garage
    Bid Package 3, $4,050, BLP Construction, GMS North, GMS South, Friendship Station
    Alternate to Bid Package 3, Not being awarded

Motion by Stith, second by Juby, to approve Consent Agenda Items 9.1 through 9.5, as presented. On roll call, Ayes, seven (7), McCormick, Nowak, Stith, Wilson, Juby, Lamb, Grosso. Nays, none (0). Motion carried unanimously.

10. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION

Relative to Item 4.1, William Blair's options use 3-3.5 % levy increases for 2014 - 2019 and accumulates to a 20% tax increase with $28 million going into surplus. Feel Options 1-4 use optimistic revenue and surplus and we need an option based on more realistic data and less costly to us. Just looked it up online and Geneva's credit rating was downgraded yesterday. I'd like the Finance Committee to consider a fifth option; i.e., buying back our own bonds with reserve funds and investing in ourselves. I'd caution the Board that defeasance creates fees for Williams Blair. I'd be willing to run the numbers and meeting with the Finance Committee before their November 11th meeting.

Elizabeth Hennessy always has a good presentation but caution the Board about the disclaimer on the last page of the presentation. William Blair's interests may not be in our best interest. The Board needs to consider best, worst, and unlikely options.

It was difficult to hear Hennessy's presentation and am disappointed that the audience was not given an opportunity to ask her questions. People have given up on this Board and am also disappointed that there was no response to audience questions.

11. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Policy Committee, Finance Committee, Boundary Task Force, Communications Task Force, Facilities Task Force, Joint PTO, Geneva Academic Foundation, Geneva All-Sports Boosters, Geneva Music Boosters, Geneva High School Theater Boosters, GEARS, K-12 Discipline Committee, Geneva Coalition for Youth, PRIDE, Fox Valley Career Center, IASB/Legislative, IASB Kishwaukee Governing Board, REMS Grant Advisory Board

Board members attended meetings of the Geneva High School Theater Boosters, Geneva Academic Foundation, Finance Committee, Facility Task Force Committee, Senate Committee for Education Funding Reform, and the Governor's P-20 Council.

12. NOTICES / ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

13. EXECUTIVE SESSION TO CONSIDER MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE APPOINTMENT, EMPLOYMENT, COMPENSATION, DISCIPLINE, PERFORMANCE, OR DISMISSAL OF SPECIFIC EMPLOYEES OF THE PUBLIC BODY [5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1); COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATING MATTERS BETWEEN THE PUBLIC BODY AND ITS EMPLOYEES OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES [5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); AND PENDING LITIGATION [5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11)]

At 9:25 p.m., motion by Wilson, second by Stith, to go into executive session to consider matters pertaining to the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body, collective negotiating matters between the public body and its employees or their representatives, and pending litigation. On roll call, Ayes, seven (7), Nowak, Stith, Wilson, Juby, Lamb, McCormick, Grosso. Nays, none (0). Motion carried unanimously.

At 9:35 p.m., following a break for the Board to relocate to the Williamsburg conference room, the Board moved into executive session.

At 10:13 p.m., Juby recused herself from the executive session

At 10:15 p.m., motion by Wilson, second by Stith, and with unanimous consent, the Board returned to open session, moved back to the Williamsburg auditorium and Juby rejoined the Board in open session.

14. ACTION POSSIBLE FOLLOWING EXECUTIVE SESSION

No action was taken.

15. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:18 p.m. motion by Wilson, second by McCormick, and with unanimous consent, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED ____________________________ ____________________________ PRESIDENT

SECRETARY ____________________________ ____________________________ RECORDING SECRETARY