

Nippersink School District 2 & Richmond-Burton Community High School District #157
Special Joint Board of Education Meeting
June 11, 2009

MINUTES

The Special Meeting of the Board of Education, Nippersink School District 2 and Richmond-Burton High School District #157, was called to order by President Patty Anderson and President Dennis Holian, respectively, at 7:01 P.M. in the Richmond-Burton Auditoria.

D2 Members Present: Bianchini, Bushing, Maurer, Anderson, Samuel, Callaby, Langlois (arrived at 7:04 P.M.)

Members Absent: None

D157 Members Present: Schleibinger, Wisinski, Thomas, Bushing, Busch, Holian

Members Absent: Holtz

Also Present: Dan Oest, Superintendent

Additions to the Agenda

None

Public Input

None

Re-organization Feasibility Study

President Anderson explained that the Feasibility Study had been discussed at both districts' May Board of Education meetings. Mrs. Maurer shared a concern about the accuracy of the report regarding the GSA dollars. Mrs. Maurer and Dr. Oest contacted the ISBE for verification and requested that ISBE provide a scenario for funding D2 and D157 as a unit district as opposed to individual districts.

The GSA calculation rate for D2 for FY08-09 .0230

The GSA calculation rate for D157 for FY08-09 .0105

The GSA calculation rate for D2 and D157 as a unit District would have been .0300

The information received by from ISBE is contrary to information in the Feasibility Study. As a unit district, Nippersink and RB would have received an additional 1.175 million dollars in general state aid for FY08-09.

Dr. Oest contacted Dr. Johnson of Johnson Associates. Apparently, the information initially given to Dr. Johnson by the ISBE was incorrect. Dr. Johnson re-ran the scenario using the appropriate calculations and confirmed the ISBE run scenario for a unit district. An addendum was provided to the original study and tables 22 and 26 were updated.

Based on EAV, the unit district would not be eligible for the GSA incentive, but all other incentives offered would be available. Fund balances could be sustained for a longer period of time and bonding power would increase to 13.8 %.

Discussion followed with some opinions being shared, questions asked related to contract negotiations, referendum time lines, shared service options, and the need for more data being requested, including an analysis of existing teacher contracts and possible financial implications. Dr. Oest confirmed that he would obtain the following:

1. An incentive schedule for re-organization from the ISBE

2. Research based data on the benefit of a K-12 curriculum

Mrs. Anderson reminded Board Members that “The Board” does not make the decision to form a unit district, the voters do. The Board merely determines if there is cause and enough information available to request that the question be put on the ballot. Hearing no further questions, Board Members were instructed to forward all questions and requests for additional information to Dr. Oest.

Village of Spring Grove proposed “Grove” Development Plan

Mrs. Anderson and Mr. Holian had previously met with development promoters and Mike Lee and Dell Houghton, Spring Grove Village Trustees, to discuss the “Grove,” the development being considered for the Intermatic property. Since that time, the development has been relocated to the Johnson property, located further west on Rte. 12. A letter from a village resident, Leif Anderson, was also received in support of the development. Mr. Lee and Mr. Houghton presented an overview of the project.

Mr. Lee began the presentation by outlining the 4 components proposed for the project.

- (1) A family entertainment complex (movie theatre, farmers’ market, game arcade, and themed restaurants)
- (2) An American music theme area (a 2500 seat venue for commercial artists, both regional and local, and opportunities for school students to perform)
- (3) A hotel (a Midwestern company is interested in building a “lodge” type hotel)
- (4) Shopping Area (Boutique shops, specialty shops, and restaurants)

Projected construction costs are expected to be \$85 million. The development is expected to bring \$10 million in new property tax revenues. The request by the developer is for the schools to return \$3 million of tax revenue to the developer, while the district would expect to receive and keep approximately \$6 million over the course of 7 years.

Dr. Oest shared a table listing 10 years of contribution to the schools. Mrs. Maurer had prepared a table showing the effect of the increased EAV on the General State Aid Foundation Formula and its net effect on the Nipperisnk School District. As proposed, this development / request will actually put District 2 into a revenue loss situation. There are likely options and strategies available to prevent the loss for D2.

In closing, Dr. Oest and Mr. Lee will research the options available to insure a positive outcome for the school districts. Mrs. Maurer will run the GSA numbers for District #157, as well.

Adjournment

Motion by Maurer and seconded by Langlois to adjourn the Joint Board of Education Meeting for Nippersink District 2 at 7:50 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: Bushing, Callaby, Bianchini, Maurer, Samuel, Langlois, Anderson

Nays: None

Motion Carried 7 – 0

Motion by Maurer and seconded by Langlois to adjourn the Joint Board of Education Meeting for Nippersink School District 2 at 8:21.p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: Bushing, Callaby, Bianchini, Maurer, Samuel, Langlois, Anderson
Nays: None Motion Carried 7 - 0

ATTEST:

Board Secretary

Board President

July 28, 2009