

Notes from the Master Planning Subcommittee Meeting of June 10, 2013

I. Welcome and Introductions:

The meeting was called to order at 9:46 AM. In attendance: Master Planning Subcommittee Chair Cecile Carroll; Dr. Clarice Berry, Chicago Principals & Administrators Assoc.; Sarah Hains, Chicago Teachers Union; (by phone) Valencia Rias-Winstead, Designs for Change; John Keigher, pro bono advisor to the CEFTF.

Since Chicago Public Schools representatives notified the Chair that they would arrive late, the order of the agenda was revised to take Public Comment first.

Public Comment:

Michele H. Villegas: Lives in the 45th Ward, is a parent with students at Walter Payton HS. She is here to discuss the Lincoln overcrowding issue. She had attended all the School Utilization meetings and the Fullerton Area meetings. Her idea: Lincoln Park has a lot of magnet schools so they should move magnet school students around to closer areas. Move the LaSalle School to Trumbull since most are coming from further north anyway. CPS has said it will not spend \$50 million for an addition to Lincoln to relieve overcrowding, which she supports. CPS should not expand Lincoln when there are open seats nearby. Also, CPS should not move Minority students very far – it won't work. They need to keep the magnet school in the neighborhood they serve so that parents can buy-in. Her group made a written proposal to CPS about moving the magnet schools around. Cecile requested a copy of the proposals.

Shauna Reitz: Wildwood is still 150% overcrowded but they don't want their students to move to another school. They are now putting students in newly constructed hallway classrooms. CPS' Chief Operating Officer Tim Cawley has informed the school that Wildwood is high on CPS' list to get an addition. It has 13-year-old temporary mobile classrooms. It is losing part of its library and computer lab. But it is a ground floor school and thus has lots of Special Ed students. She is not aware of Wildwood receiving any new students after the 50 closures, but Ms Carroll asked for confirmation of this, and had the impression that Wildwood may get more students. Ms. Reitz testified that she is happy with the changes that have been made and likes the architects plan. She thinks it will be ready by September 2013.

At 10:20 AM, CPS representatives Mike Rendina and Leonard Langston arrived. The Chair recapped the public comments for them, and went back to the Agenda.

II. 10-Year Master Plan Development

- a. CEFTF Feedback: CPS' Plan for Public Engagement
- b. Next Steps on Intergovernmental Coordination
 - Date to Hold CPS-CEFTF Joint Briefing for Sister Agencies on Master Plan
 - Outreach to, input from elected officials
- c. Report by Pat Taylor, CPS: Capital Improvement Estimates, Facilities Assessments (as requested at 03/11 meeting)
 - Update: Contractors Conducting Facility Condition Assessments
 - Time table
 - Their Scope of Work (review of contracts with CPS – as requested at the May 13th meeting)
 - Process? Notification of, input from schools re: new assessments

- April 17, 2013 FY13 Supplemental Capital Budget Hearings: Sign-In Sheets? How did CPS do outreach for these hearings? (As requested by Rep. Soto in letter of April 23, 2013; and at the May 13th Master Planning subcommittee meeting)
- d. Methods for Public Input on the Draft 10-Year EFMP: Has/when will CPS CEO publish a Public Hearing Schedule and how the public can provide input?
- e. New updates on CPS' real estate transactions from prior year (some properties were to be re-bid – see CPS hand-out from May 13th meeting)
- f. Status of Planning for Disposition of Vacant Schools: Community, public engagement?

Mr. Langston began by stating that he was working with CEFTF pro bono Advisor Jackie Leavy to get a list of sister agencies and trying to set up a meeting. In response to the Chair's question as to whom at CPS is working on this, he stated that Todd Babbitz, Adam Anderson and Phil Hampton were working on this issue.

Dr. Berry raised the issue of the Operating and Maintenance (O&M) budget, and asked who at CPS is working on this? Mr. Rendina replied that CPS' Budget Office is in charge, and someone from that Office would come to the meeting shortly.

Dr. Berry requested that Items "e" (update on CPS real estate transactions) and "f" (disposition of vacant schools) on the agenda be moved up. The Chair agreed. Mr. Langston responded regarding Agenda Item "e": updates on CPS real estate transactions and re-bidding of previously marketed CPS properties by stating that he had no formal updates (i.e., could not provide any new information). As for Item "f," Mr. Langston stated that he is still working with the community. Dr. Berry asked how was CPS working with the community, and through what public forums?

Mr. Rendina responded that CPS has sent out notices (not clear to what stakeholder groups, clarification needed); and that CPS has posted something on its website (again clarification is needed, along with link to specific CPS webpage). Ms. Hains pointed out that CPS' website has contradictory and unclear information on the process for determining the repurposing of closed schools. Ms. Hains also asked how CPS establishes the value of the properties. Mr. Rendina replied that he does not have the answer to Ms. Hains' question, but will follow up with CPS' real estate department.

The Chair Ms. Carroll asked whether CPS' FACE department (Office of Family And Community Engagement) is working with anyone on the planning for the re-use of vacant school building. Mr. Rendina replied that CPS is approaching this as a comprehensive process. CPS is taking some proposals from the community, and giving some consideration to community services is "in the works". CPS is also considering some proposals that won't use the entire buildings. For example, City Year is already using part of Price while another part of the building is used by a church. The Chair Ms. Carroll asked if CPS is collecting rent. Ms. Hains followed up by asking whether any such leases are online on CPS' website. Ms. Carroll also asked if any recently closed schools are not suitable for use. Mr. Rendina replied that yes, Belmont-Cragin, which came from the archdiocese, is not suitable for re-use.

At this time additional CPS representatives arrived: Facilities Dept staff Pat Taylor, Matt Janoski, and David Favaro; Matt Walter, Todd Babbitz, and Laura Farr.

Ms. Taylor responded to Ms. Carroll's question about the condition of some of the facilities by stating that Lane Tech HS's exterior is in bad shape (however, Lane Tech is not one of the closed facilities). Ms. Taylor stated that some vacant land owned by CPS is simply up for sale.

Discussion then turned to Dr. Berry's question about the O&M funds.

Mr. Walter replied to the O&M funds: O&M will be budgeted centrally. In FY 14, it starts the same way but money is moved out to schools as repairs are requested. This is more of a facility-based system for dividing money.

Ms. Taylor brought written materials that were distributed. Ms. Taylor stated that now, the building engineers are reporting requests to MESA, and we need a better way to get the money out to the principals. There will be 2 sets of funds: (a) for building engineers to use, and (b) for principals to use at their discretion.

The reduction of funds should not be a problem as schools got a 4% cut this year to help close the budget. So starting last year, O&M was set per school and sent to schools as a "nut" but not based on needs. Ms. Taylor also stated that all principals have her cell number and she says that she tries to reach out to them. If someone is not getting a response, she wants principals to call her directly.

Ms. Rias-Winstead asked, how will CPS communicate to principals, and how will Local School Councils be able to monitor who gets what?

Ms. Taylor responded that the big question is about the assessments, the contracts and process. All of this should be done by the 12-31 deadline.

Mr. Janoski added that we (CPS) got off to a slow start but we are moving fast now. It took 6 weeks just for fact checking. Ms. Taylor stated that CPS wants to use the best data possible before creating the plan. Additionally Mr. Janoski commented that the 10 year plan is just a draft – not all the schools have been visited yet.

The Chair, Ms. Carroll asked: What kind of feedback have you gotten on the 10 year plan? Ms. Hains asked if CPS has held a webinar, and what results did CPS get?

Mr. Janoski's response was that it's better to get things going sooner, it's still a process.

Ms. Taylor reported that the facility assessment consultants are looking at every classroom, taking photos of the windows, and inspecting the heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC) systems in the schools. Not many schools have actually sent in their capital improvement request forms.

Dr. Berry asked: How did schools get those forms?

Ms. Taylor stated that the forms were sent out by Central Office (via email? Clarification needed); and that CPS will send them out again. CPS has received only about 90 capital improvement request forms back. CPS has 4 priorities:

1. Air Conditioning in each classroom
2. Repair water damage and peeling paint
3. Repair any heat issues
4. Make any safety changes – comply with codes

As for Welcoming Schools identified as part of CPS' recent School Actions, Ms. Taylor stated that there will be a library and computer lab in the new school if the old school had one. But Ms. Taylor stated that "the most important issue" is signage.

Ms. Hains asked, what percentage of students has CPS used as likely to enroll in the designated Welcoming School for the closing school?

Mr. Babbitt replied that CPS assumed 100% of the students from closing schools would enroll in their respective designated Welcoming Schools.

Ms. Carroll asked, how do schools prevent libraries from becoming classrooms?

Mr. Favaro responded that CPS wants to know if a school is losing a library or any programming tools. The transition team is working with Ms. Taylor to ensure that rooms are used for the best educational environment.

Dr. Berry asked, will the money follow the kids?

Ms. Taylor responded that CPS is moving furniture and intends to repurpose as much as possible.

Mr. Walter stated that requests for instructional funds can be placed now. CPS will share access to the budget in early July. Principals have until the end of June to make purchases.

Dr. Berry pointed out that principals have been told that requests for instructional funding closes on June 14.

Mr. Walter responded that CPS will open up this request process again in early July.

The Chair then raised Item "c" on the agenda, the April 17th capital budget hearings, and called on CPS representatives to tell the CEFTF members about the hearings.

Mr. Walter stated that those hearings were on the FY2013 Supplemental Capital Budget. Notice was posted on the CPS web page and in the Tribune at least 5 days in advance.

Dr. Berry pointed out that the general public and most schools and principals were not aware of the hearings, and that additionally CPS should inform and notify the CEFTF. Ms. Carroll asked if the LSCs had been informed of the hearings.

Mr. Rendina responded that information about the hearings was shared at the other school meetings.

Ms. Taylor added that there was a sense of urgency in order that the "Welcoming School" component of the capital budget could get approved. CPS had to get it done.

The Chair stated that much more needs to be done to inform and notify the public, and suggested that capital budget hearings be held in September. The public deserves more advance notice and greater input for the hearings to be effective and inclusive.

Ms. Taylor acknowledged that CPS does need to get the Capital Improvement Request forms out early and also needs to send a follow up letter. She stressed again that CPS' priorities are capital improvements to address "Warm, Safe, and Dry" conditions/needs in the schools. A simple receipt letter would be good. Ms. Taylor stated that she has made a note to communicate better about maintenance request forms, as per Dr. Berry's concerns.

Ms. Hains asked why CPS contracted with 2 new companies to conduct the facility condition assessments. How does this relate to section f of the contract?

Ms Taylor stated that CPS put the work out to competitive bids and saw a value in using 2 teams. URS is the program management team; the other consulting firm is a conditions assessment team. CPS wanted experts

to do the actual facility assessments, not the managers of the overall capital program. The priority is different now. Ms. Hains questioned why needs assessments came in at \$12 million for each school? Mr. Babbitt stated that the methodology CPS' consultants were using always exposed inoperability more than the cost of actual needed repairs such as playgrounds, AC, Labs, etc. Ms. Hains pointed out that the figures in the Draft Master Plan seem to show huge increases in facilities needs per school since the last condition assessments. Yet CPS' contractors haven't completed updated assessments on all the buildings. So when CPS decided to close 50 schools, how did CPS generate these numbers? Mr. Rendina responded that CPS will get back to the Subcommittee on these questions.

The Chair announced that the next CEFTF Master Planning Subcommittee meeting is July 8. She stated that it's imperative to keep discussing these issues. She specifically requested that Mr. Hampton and the CPS F.A.C.E. Office should attend the next meeting and provide a written report on public input and be prepared to discuss it with the Subcommittee. Dr. Berry requested that the next meeting's agenda also have a specific item regarding the principals' requests.

Follow-up items for the next meeting agenda and information needed from Chicago Public Schools:

- CPS to provide details on public input and stakeholder engagement in developing the final 10-Year Educational Facilities Master Plan, including plans for public input into CPS' capital spending plans and priorities (as contrasted with April 2013 FY2013 Supplemental CIP hearings); written updates from CPS and F.A.C.E are requested.
- CPS to provide details on how and from whom CPS is seeking input on the re-purposing of closed school facilities, and how CPS is establishing the "value" of these facilities (Mr. Rendina stated that he will follow up with CPS' Real Estate Dept. regarding the property appraisals, "value" determination)
- CPS to provide the previously requested updates on CPS' recent real estate transactions and re-bidding that CPS was not able to provide at the June 10th meeting.
- New Agenda item: Discussion and review of principals' requests for O&M budget information and principals' requests for facility improvements
- CPS to provide clarification of how the school district arrived at its facility needs assessment figures for closing schools when the new assessments had yet to be completed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 AM. The next Master Planning Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Monday July 8th, 2013 at 9:30 AM. The Bilandic Bldg meeting will be requested.

###

PLEASE NOTE: Due to schedule conflicts that arose following the June 10th meeting, the July 8th, 2013 Master Planning Subcommittee meeting did not take place. Instead it was re-scheduled for:

MONDAY, July 15th, 2013, 9:30 AM (Tentative Location: Bilandic Bldg, 160 N. LaSalle, Chicago, IL).