



Albany Unified School District

Albany Unified School District Board of Education

904 Talbot Ave.
Albany, CA 94706

MINUTES FOR MEETING

June 30, 2009

I. OPENING BUSINESS 6:30 p.m.

A) Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by President Glasser at 6:37 pm.

B) Roll Call

PRESENT : Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, Vice President Rosenbaum, and President Glasser.

ABSENT : Student Member Mau, Student Member Kang, and Director Marie.

STAFF: Director Hornada, Assistant Superintendent Harden, Superintendent Stephenson, and Secretary Suwczynsky.

C) Identify Closed Session Topics for Discussion Pursuant to Agenda Section III below.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

No public comment.

III. CLOSED SESSION 6:35 p.m.

Moved to closed session at 6:39 pm.

IV. OPEN SESSION 7:30

A) Reconvene to Open Session

Meeting was called to order by President Glasser at 7:30 pm.

B) Roll Call

PRESENT : Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, Vice President Rosenbaum, and President Glasser.

ABSENT : Student Member Mau, Student Member Kang, and Director Marie.

STAFF: Director Hornada, Assistant Superintendent Harden, Superintendent Stephenson, and Secretary Suwczynsky.

C) Pledge of Allegiance

D) Report of Action Taken in Closed Session

President Glasser reported that Board gave some direction to pursue settlement in a litigation matter. No other items were taken in closed session.

E) Approval of Agenda

Motion by Member Black, seconded by Member Walden approve Agenda.

The Board was polled. Members: voting AYE

F) Approval of Consent Calendar

Member Black would like to pull Technology Director description.

Member Low has a question on 3a.

President Glasser has questions on some of the warrants.

Vice President Rosenbaum has a question on the minutes.

*Motion by Vice President Rosenbaum, seconded by Member Low approve Consent Calendar
The Board was polled and passed unanimously. Members: Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden,
Vice President Rosenbaum, and President Glasser voting AYE
Member Black abstained from check number 903521.*

President Glasser abstained from check number 903560.

1. Approval of Board Minutes

Vice President Rosenbaum re 04/28/09 on page 6 paragraph 1 Member Walden asked of full time principal, should be vice principal. President Glasser noted 3 references that should have been vice principal. Superintendent Stephenson confirmed.

Vice President Rosenbaum note spelling correction at the bottom of the page to Memzimer.

Member Low thanked secretary, summaries are clear. Couple of questions. 05/05/09 on page 3, 1st paragraph, Member Walden did describe the older document from 1989, but former member Marsha Skinner provided it. At bottom of that paragraph, Member Low recommended president and vice president go to two by two by two meetings, should also include, and discuss child care issues. Middle of the page under item 7, tears should be tiers. 06/03/09, 1st page, 20 years of service, Sandy Rhodes-Dreyer. At the bottom of page 2, last paragraph, Cathy with a K, not C. 3rd page at the bottom of page, 4 sentences up, Member Low asked about the use of LED lights, not exit signs. On 5th page, middle of the page it says guest speaker, should be spelled Zeph Landau. On 6th page, 4th paragraph at the bottom, would take out 'bring in' and put in 'Cornell had an increase in EL learner students which might effect English language arts test scores.'

Superintendent Stephenson informed board about discussion re asking speakers state and spell name, and address.

President Glasser suggested a stack of speaker cards to be completed by guest speakers.

Member Walden suggested submitting written corrections and approving the minutes assuming corrections are minimal, flagging them if not bot be brought back, or provided prior to meeting to be included.

2. Personnel Assignment Order

d) Technology Director Job Description and Salary Range

Member Black asked about the scope of position, hands on versus management, and how much it will involve network administration.

Superintendent Stephenson explained position will include data base management oversight. Every job, particularly the technology director, must have hands on experience in all areas of those supervised. Expecting that they will have network and database experience and proficiency.

Member Black asked if they will actually be doing technician work.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed that they will on occasion.

3. Curriculum and Instruction

- a) *East Bay Center for Performing Arts, 2009-2010, Grades 1-3 Enrichment Program Providers*
Member Low asked about evaluation, customer satisfaction, etc. at end as part of service.

Director Hornada introduced Eric Engdahl, director from East Bay Center, Public Education Program.

Eric Engdahl informed board that there will be a person on site, rotating between sites, addressing customer concerns right away. Haven't specifically spoken about evaluation, but thinks it is a good idea. Have a lot of experience having done federal grants. Should be included.

Member Low suggested survey at end.

Eric Engdahl agreed.

President Glasser offered kudos to staff and committee.

4. Business and Operations

- a) *Warrants*

President Glasser asked about 892143 and 892160, what are architectural services for and portables are being rented, not owned? Question re cost effectiveness.

Assistant Superintendent Harden discussed need to look at long term situation. Architectural services were for DSA certification.

Member Walden noted two different groups of portables and asked for clarification re rental or owned. Three were permanent fixtures and one was brought in due to enrollment issues.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed that there are two at Cornell that were rented due to enrollment issues and leasing two at Marin for the Children's Center. Others are owned.

President Glasser suggested further discussion in the future.

V. STAFF REPORTS

- A) *OceanView Park Field Improvements, Superintendent Oral Report*

Superintendent Stephenson updated the Board on current status. Last fall requested commitment of about 120,000 to assist city in improving Ocean View Park with grant monies. About 27,000 of that amount was to help city with an in kind match, hoping to make improvements enough to resolve conflict at Memorial Field, used by softball and little league at same time. Issue is pitching mound. Softball does not allow, little league needs. For past 2 years issue appears around play off time, will we remove the mound for playoffs? Highlights not enough green space, play space for athletics, both city and school. Appeared that process and commitment seemed to be set. Since then, grant money was frozen, additional issues have surfaced regarding the fence height and additional parody concerns that may go beyond amount committed. Given the above, has not gone to City Counsel as anticipated. Believes that it would be in best interest to do engineering study regarding height of fence requirement and cost and to continue discussion between little league, softball, city and school district coming up with field improvement alternatives. Expects this process to go into the fall. City will not address Phase I of Ocean View improvements until the fall, giving us some time.

Member Black asked if Ocean View is AUSD or city property.

Superintendent Stephenson informed that it is split down the middle. The playing surface is on city property and there is some practice surface that is on AUSD property.

Member Walden noted that there is so much background that Superintendent Stephenson might want to provide board a summary and review to provide information, particularly for those who were not here at the time.

Vice President Rosenbaum confirmed that there are ongoing discussions re usage and issues, and that Superintendent Stephenson is involved in those discussions.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that there have been 3 meetings to date. Looking at what needs to happen along with the Parks and Rec Manager.

Vice President Rosenbaum confirmed that there will be an update in the fall.

President Glasser noted that there isn't any more money than previously allotted.

VI. PERSONS TO ADDRESS THE BOARD ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No public comments.

VII. REVIEW AND ACTION ITEMS

A) *Open Public Hearing on the Proposed 2009-10 Budget*
No public comment.

B) *Close Public Hearing on the Proposed 2009-10 Budget*

C) *Review and Approve 2009-2010 Budget (report under separate cover)*
President Glasser noted that there are copies of the budget available to the public.

Assistant Superintendent Harden noted that there are three parts to the budge. Part 1 is more narrative and user friendly, part 2 is what district is required to send to state and county office, and part 3 power point presentation.

Difficult year. budget came together at very last minute. Discussed why numbers change daily. They do and will continue to do so. Since budget was adopted at this time last year, there has been a staggering amount of budget cuts, including latest adoption in history, became clear that numbers were severely overstated. Combined with 08-09 with 09-10 budget, making the 09-10 the earliest budget adopted. Needed substantial amendments. Special election measures failed. Already reduced budget in February was reduced further with cuts to k12, no cost of living allowance, and huge deficit.

Assumptions are good today, but may not be tomorrow. As soon as state finalizes 09-10 budget these numbers will change. No COLA, and reducing by 18%, highest cut in history. 4.5% cut to categoricals, added to 15% n 08-09 brings us to a total of about 20% reduction to categorical. State moved many restricted dollars to unrestricted to bridge shortfall. This is not an option. State is moving it into a semi-block grant. District can track separately or move them out. CSR penalties have been relaxed. Assumptions will likely become worse as budget is adopted.

Largest source of funding is revenue limit dollars, for students, currently short by 4.2 million. Closing of gap was accomplished through cuts to staffing, services and supplies estimated at estimated 1.5 million. 17 certificated FTE, fewer than last year, 20 classified FTE, 5 management/confidential or unrepresented. Utilized categorical flexibility for an approximate 1.2 million, and used parcel taxes to retain staff at 1.5 million.

Multi year picture: Operating deficit, revenue less expenditures, essentially have a balanced budget, miraculous considering 4.2 million less in revenue. Number increases over next two years. Second item to look at is reserve, 3% required: has been some discussion about reducing to 1%, creating other issues. We are able to

maintain the 3% reserve across three years. Maintenance funds are not unrestricted, maintained for unanticipated maintenance expenses. Parcel taxes have less of an increase based on California CPI and Bay Area CPI, both declining. Will be lucky to get 1%. Item 3: Undesignated: Looking at this year's mid-year reduction, increased deficit (about 900,000), will likely happen again, if so, will be struggling to maintain 3% reserve, leaving no room for major state reductions. Right now, with all reductions incorporated, can maintain what we have. Need to be extremely careful, monitoring daily. Will have to be reviewed once state budget is adopted and it will probably not be positive. 4.2 million was necessary and more may be required.

Good news: meet reserve requirements, which many districts cannot do. Parcel Tax funds retain employees and programs. Federal stimulus funds help avoid additional cuts because they help the ending fund balance in current year.

Bad news: State budget will change, budget will need to be spent on required services, not programs we would like to keep. Federal stimulus dollars are one time funds. Fund's intent is to save jobs, stimulate economy, and improve academic performance. District has three revenue streams; Fiscal Stabilization, largest, Title I, very restricted, and Special Education, very restricted. Mid-year cuts could happen due to Fiscal Stabilization funds, without the reduction would have put us into deficit without fiscal stabilization. Intent of those dollars to back fill 08-09 reductions. Title I and Special Education are very restricted with reporting requirements coming.

Concerns: increased revenue reductions, anticipated mid-year reductions, cash flow. State cannot issue school districts IOUs, rather do deferrals, deferring to future months, as much as a year.

Member Walden asked for concrete information. Last time saw cash flow projections, would survive, but by mid-November would have less than one month's expenditures in reserve. As of today, are you still projecting that we will make it through with a positive cash flow? Finds it hard to believe that any district will be able to make payroll in November?

Assistant Superintendent Harden noted that we have an unusual starting balance. Until state adopts budget and defines what will happen, it is very difficult to project cash flow. At this point, yes, we will be able to meet obligations. If there are further reductions, we will be short. We can borrow from other funds to cover until state funds come in. Many districts are having to go to outside sources for funds based on expected revenue.

What's Next?: State adopts the budget, no idea when, not even an estimate. Adopted budget will be analyzed and brought back to the Board for approval. Open to questions.

Member Walden asked by email about what cuts are included and what cuts are not in this budget. Could walk through tiers. Perhaps another way to answer that question.

Superintendent Stephenson discussed 2 layers of cuts. When initial cuts were done, also folded in 05 Parcel Tax to provide flexibility. Just looking at general funded cuts that have stuck: 4 teachers at elementary grade level, 1.1 para-educators at Ocean View, .4 PE specialist, .67 clerk, .5 assistant principal, all at Ocean View. 1.2 para-educators at Marin, .8 clerk, librarian was moved to Parcel Tax and restored, at Cornell 1.0 para-educator, .4 clerk, .9 instrumental music for elementary program, and 10% of all materials and supplies to the elementary. At the Middle School, 10% materials and supplies, .4 counselor, cuts that did not stick due to Title I funds include .8 at risk teacher, .4 EL at risk. Library tech at Middle School 1.0 has been cut, 4.0 7 period day for grades 7 and 8, 1.0 secretary, assistant principal was restored with general funds, full time.

Member Low asked if Title I replacement of at risk at Middle School is one-time monies, or is ongoing?

Superintendent Stephenson indicated that it would be ongoing.

Member Walden stated that we occasionally lose Title I funds as we move in and out of Title I because of the population.

Superintendent Stephenson's continued .6 secretary at Mac which will be back filled by reducing special ed secretary by .5. One full time secretary covering two locations, special services .5 and Mac .5, so it stands as .6 cut. Restored .6 teacher at Mac after WASC accreditation visit, comes out of general fund. At High School 4.0 reduction certificated for the loss of 7 period day. School Care support is providing 7 period day, district is providing 6 periods. 10% materials and supplies, .8 9th grade class size reduction cut, general tightening of master schedule to reflect increased student contacts 1.8 FTE reduction.

Member Walden asked about new target class size?

Superintendent Stephenson said that class size will vary. There is no maximum, although reality is probably 31.8. Continued, .5 book room clerk, restored by ASB account, not paid for from general funds, VP secretary reduction, principal asked for an in lieu reduction, student data clerk for same cost was cut. .2 athletic director, .5 assistant principal cut from general fund but restored by SRO dollars. SRO funds will go directly to school to maintain two full time assistant principals.

Member Low asked about athletic director and previous discussions re safety, is this back filled?

Superintendent Stephenson responded that the position exists but is cut in half, from .4 to .2.

At district level, 2.5 general maintenance workers with .8 custodian in lieu. Rationale for in lieu cuts is total disruption to classified people. General maintenance worker would have effected every custodian, if .8 custodial cut it achieves the same goal and stands to improve morale. .4 psychologist, 4 FTE special ed para educators, 5% of food services by cutting account clerk, substitute caller at district office at .4, 1.0 additional custodian, 1.0 pool mechanic custodian, .5 computer support person resulting in adding .5 network administrator so it was not a savings, 1.0 skilled maintenance worker, superintendent's administrative assistant but due to reorganization of all district secretaries the office will be hiring a district secretary resulting in approximately 35-40,000 savings, personnel coordinator will need to restore some sort of personnel administrator which was approved tonight, and network administration but in lieu will need director of technology.

In 05 parcel tax lost teacher on special assignment, 1.8 EL support, yard duty has been reincorporated back to general fund due to safety, 135,000 in athletic budget, lost contracts with Berkeley Mental Health, Fly, Writers Coach Connection, all totaling about 1.8 million. All of the tiers, 1,2,3, that you wished to restore will not be restored. All funds will go to core programming and general funding due to cuts.

All of this information is on the budget page. Would like to reiterate that these are not coming back.

Member Walden asked for information to be clear about what is happening. Written on web page and video of budget meeting.

Member Low asked about enrollment projections and another about instructional materials. Has there been a pattern in the accuracy of projections of the last 3 to 5 years.

Superintendent Stephenson responded that no they haven't, there are peaks and valleys. Can anticipate valley this year as all of the apartments came on line last year at the same time. Expect that tenants will be there for the usual two years so not anticipating an unexpected increase in enrollment. Do have an atypical kindergarten class again. Laurie uses some great software. Her numbers match our trend numbers and superintendent's calculations.

Assistant Superintendent Harden noted consistency between typical fall enrollment to period two attendance and enrollment, which is how we're funded, is always at about 96.5%, which is good.

Member Low referred to page 15, of part 1, looking at instructional materials fund. Is there some flexibility?

Assistant Superintendent Harden stated that flexibility is that the dollars have been moved from totally restricted to completely unrestricted. You don't have to adopt for a couple of years. Earmarked 100,000 for unexpected expenditures to replace lost or additional text, etc.

Member Low asked if planning to spend the balance on adoption monies in the next year, plans?

Director Hornada informed currently in compliance with math adoption. Will be forming committee to look at reading adoption for k-8, will be funded in following year. Next year piloting, materials are generally free. Will be some time when not spending monies, will be in 2010-11 school year.

Member Low asked if monies, some of additional 111, will be carried over to next year?

Member Walden understood that there is only 100,000 available for adoption. Last year there was 211,000, we have used 111,000, so now there is only the 100,000, the amount estimated for replacement, etc. There is no money sitting around.

Member Low confirmed that earmarked funds expect to be spent this year and next. When were language arts text last adopted.

Director Hornada responded 2001.

Superintendent Stephenson complemented parents in community regarding enrollment and average daily attendance. Remembering how important ADA is to the district and understanding loss of revenue if a child is out. Hoping to restore ADA to 04-05 of 97%. Moving in that direction, crediting parents.

Member Black thanked Assistant Superintendent for doing budget. Knows that it is both difficult and painful.

Assistant Superintendent Harden confirmed indeed incredibly difficult with number of staff that are no longer included in budget.

Vice President Rosenbaum thanked Assistant Superintendent for narrative section.

Member Walden noted that state gave flexibility which we didn't use in school site improvement monies. Sites will still have access to that money. Think Superintendent's recommendation was good, sites have ability to look at ways that parents and teachers can decide how to fund some things. Noted the benefit of choices and collaboration at site level.

Member Low asked another question, perhaps best discussed after the SchoolCare. Not clear how schedule will look based on donation monies.

Superintendent Stephenson suggested leading with that question after roll call.

President Glasser asked for public comment.

Public comment:

Liz Avery, 3rd grade teacher at Marin, representing ATA as vice president. Thank you for explanation, one that

people can understand, beautifully presented. Thank you to Maria for staff vote to increase student contact for continuing 7th period. ATA agreed to give back 150k parcel tax that was for staff, but now going to medical benefits. Question, do we have flexibility with language arts adoption? Can funds be used otherwise as we have some very nice materials now? Regarding district office cuts, we really need a strong administrator. Please repeat cuts regarding security officers at HS.

Superintendent Stephenson responded .6 security person restored through general fund at MacGregor, do not have the SRO officer at HS, but have restored both assistant principals at HS. We are all concerned about security and will be monitoring. May need to move from MacGregor to AHS, especially at lunch if needed.

Member Walden remarked that it is a smart move having vice principals are first line of security. Preventing problems and providing students support rather than hand cuffs.

Vice President Rosenbaum noted that this was primary in the site plan approved.

Vice President Rosenbaum noted irritation that we are required to establish a budget based on unknowns and the state cannot do the same.

Motion by Member Black, seconded by Member Low to approve 2009-2010 Budget

The Board was polled and passed unanimously. Members: Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, Vice President Rosenbaum, and President Glasser voting AYE

D) Approve SchoolCare 2009-2010 First Round Funding Allocations

Superintendent Stephenson thanked Theresa Barnett in particular for making SchoolCare happen and extraordinary fund raising.

Theresa Barnett noted that community is very committed. 9th year of funding Albany schools. Very excited that information on page 3 of budget summary is already outdated because have been working so hard since letter was sent to district earlier this month. Always continue to raise over the summer. Will commit to fund 288,000 so far, fully committed for the coming year, working hard to get the figure up. Elementary schools 1.5 FTE reading specialist, now listed as intervention reading teacher or specialist, .5 each for 3 schools. Next focus over summer will be in arts enrichment. For AMS .4 for counselor, bringing school to 2 full time, down from 3, but strong. Had committed to 3 sections for electives, now can commit to 4, .8 FTE, will add another section of art. High School .8 career coordinator, 5 elective classes or 1 FTE, principal confirmed that this will allow 7 period schedule, particularly classes providing creative outlet. MacGregor .1 to complete counselor position and some funding for culinary arts program. www.albanyschoolcare.org site to make contributions. Thank you to all of the staff, principals, teachers, and those who have had the hard discussions in addition to making contributions. Evaluation was difficult, but brings out the best in the community

Member Walden thanked donors. People are unemployed or underemployed and are still writing checks which is admirable and reflects priorities.

Member Low thanked Theresa and entire committee. Question about middle school, 8th grade will have additional electives or spread out?

Theresa Barnett is not sure. She will see what FTEs she has and spread out as much as possible, hoping for 7th and 8th grades for electives.

Superintendent Stephenson noted that there maybe combo class, but only for one quarter.

Member Low asked if at High School they are driven by student choice?

Theresa Barnett confirmed.

Motion by Vice President Rosenbaum, seconded by Member Black to approve SchoolCare 2009-2010 First Round Funding Allocations

The Board was polled and passed unanimously. Members: Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, Vice President Rosenbaum, and President Glasser voting AYE

VIII. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A) Parcel Tax Committee Report (power point under separate cover)

Member Walden will provide overview, speaking as participant of committee not as a board member. Hopes people had a chance to review advance packet. Three things to look at, survey results, report in board packet, handwritten notes looking at a mathematical decision tree. This is a discussion item. Staff needs from each board member a sense of interest in moving forward with parcel tax for November ballot and preferences for language and structure so that language can be drafted with the attorney for presentation on the 4th. Looking for concerns, direction, etc. Second thing is to thank committee plus a large group of people who participated in survey. Special thank you to John Lacey, Theresa Barnett and others listed on last page of report in the packet. More than 70% of SchoolCare board or their families worked on the survey.

Member Low would like to recognize that one of Miriam's goals was to save funds by taking this on as a volunteer poll, and recognize her family and other volunteers for their participation.

Miriam Walden reminded the board that this survey cost 0.00. Last survey in 2004 cost about 10,000, current costs would be about 20,000. Reached 148 likely voters. Assumed that there is a bias when conducting a survey, especially when talking face to face. Assume that the positives are overstated. Does not predict election. Helps us know what voters are thinking about and what is important to them.

The first couple of slides show voter population and who is likely to vote. Many people wonder if homeowners and renters have differences. 1/2 of people in Albany are renters, not necessarily same percentage as voters.

Survey asked about general feelings about schools. When asked what people think the problems schools have are, answer clearly was budget/money, 67%. Some concerned about out of district transfers and overcrowding. Issues of bond money and the pool did not come up.

Big issue for us, asked people to agree or disagree that schools are carefully managed. Primary response was, "I don't know." People want more information.

Member Black considers this a positive, means that people are willing to accept a positive.

Miriam Walden said people wanted more information before answering, very positive. People agree that schools support property values, but not most important.

Asked people how much money they would be willing to spend on parcel tax, without discussing how it would be spent. Did inform them that superintendent thinks we need 250. The less people were asked for, the more positively they felt about a parcel tax. Almost 60% would support 250, but not enough for initiative to pass.

Member Low reviewed previous poll provided and percentage of increase at 150 is higher in this poll than in the last.

Miriam Walden informed that the committee came up with difficult language to see how people would respond, to test responses. Not enough people would vote yes to pass. Compared to same amount asked in 2004, fewer people were willing to support, but greater intensity of those voting definitely yes, and larger undecided. Suspect greater intensity of definitely yes is related to budget crisis.

Member Low asked, maybe for later, has there been a demographic breakdown of who supported 2005 parcel

tax?

Miriam Walden noted no exit pool. In campaign survey after pitching showed 60% yes, which made us nervous. Were campaigning at the time which changes things.

Primary Concern: asked open ended question.. What is your reasoning for your opinion and the other side? Biggest concern was cost and their current financial situation. 21% said that they would be concerned about use and accountability, benefiting those that are not paying for it. Questions regarding equity. Unfair that state does terrible stuff and we have to fix it locally, letting the governor off the hook. Others were afraid that others couldn't afford it, elderly, etc. The issue of permanence was important. They liked language removing the tax after fiscal crisis was over, needed to see more language confirming that it won't be permanent.

Asked why you would support it. Responses included believe in schools, kids, responsibility of community, etc. 18% mentioned quality in their answer.

After those questions ran positive and negative arguments and asked if influenced by arguments. Spent hours trying to write positive and negative statements in neutral way. Wanting not to present as supporting either side. Trying to make calm statements that might come up in campaign. People were really effected by knowing that it was to replace budget cuts and exclusions for elderly and underprivileged, including temporary status of increase. Pollsters thought that property values were obviously important and didn't need to be said.

Negative arguments: In reviewing, need to look at undecided voters changes in opinion, rather than those that already support district.

Even after simulated campaign, had more people ready to vote yes and and would have passed. Many probably yes moved to definitely yes. One negative statement was that teachers and administrators make too much money, which people strongly disagreed to. People respond strongly in opposition to the negative comments.

In summary learned that voters are very motivated to support schools and are aware of state budget crisis, but they need more information about how cuts effect Albany. Amount of the tax is important, 250 is probably too much to ask. Concerns regarding permanence and exemptions. Suggest taking survey information with a grain of salt given possible bias.

Looking at the decision tree, if we do nothing, no campaign work, more cuts, will need to show loss of loss of 05 Parcel Tax, 2 million. Staff feel we need to put 05 Parcel Tax back on ballot. Potential legal problems, lists residential property, rather than parcel. Alameda has current case re differentiation between residential and commercial. Language issues may come up for us if judge in Alameda finds that differences are not allowed, impacting all three parcel taxes, requiring going to the voters. Cannot predict environment of future campaign. Current 87 does not exempt seniors, and 87 and 99 do not include low-income exemption.

We could go to the voters with an emergency tax. Would face loss of revenue at some point. Believe that this would pass. If ADA met 08 levels then tax would cease. If we go to voters with emergency tax, may spoil likelihood of renewal 05 tax, if not some amount of delay, one to two years. If you fail, the same as doing nothing.

Idea that the community liked the best after much discussion, restructure and emergency tax. Way to minimize risks and maximize advantages is to put two separate initiatives on the ballot: 1, restructuring 87, 99, 05 as one tax, with no new tax, will exempt seniors and low-income. 2, asking for emergency tax, suggest 150 range. Think restructuring will be hard thing to pass as people will see total amount of tax and it may be complicated, not necessarily a sure win. The emergency tax may be lower likelihood next to another initiative. If they pass, you can restore programs, have the problem of losing the emergency tax at some date in the future, lower

taxes for seniors and low-income, but the base revenue from 3 parcel taxes will be stable for the future. If concern is loss of 05 parcel tax in the future, will benefit from also having some sort of emergency measure as it won't generate a lot of interest on it's own. If fail, same as emergency tax only or do nothing scenario.

Last option, raise new money by restructuring. Could restructure three parcel taxes and re-base the 87 tax, increasing by about 1 million. Not likely to succeed as asking for new money along with confusion of restructuring.

Conclusion, to maximize possibility of success and minimize the consequences of failure option c provides better chance. Restructure and emergency both is best option.

Concern is where are board members with issues and what language would you like to see that might be brought back on the 4th.

President Glasser asked about importance of the 4th.

Miriam Walden stated that deadline for putting something on the ballot is th 7th. Must be in county office. Can use time in July to meet with lawyers. Review on the 4th would be last change to put it on the ballot. Some discussion with committee about mail in ballot etc., but would cost more money. Personal bias that running a solid campaign regular election makes best use of volunteers, best chance to educate both volunteers and community, and costs less. Have the option of mail in ballot at another time or waiting until another election.

Superintendent Stephenson noted that it has always been board and staff's intent to go out in 2010, allowing another opportunity in 2012 if 2010 fails. Concern is that if we wait, climate may be more difficult. In for a long haul of economic misery. Cannot overstate importance of maintaining 05 parcel tax. It must be extended or made permanent.

Miriam Walden stated that committee was surprised that they came to a strong opinion as a group. Apologize for making a recommendation, intention was to inform.

Member Low noted that it is interesting that group looked at things so realistically, and ended up with option that is less, no gains on restructuring and lower number on emergency tax.

Assistant Superintendent Harden inquired about tying proposed emergency tax to state revenue. Difficult identifying which numbers, how to track, at what time is it achieved? With revenue limit dollars we frequently don't know until later, funding may come after the fact. Tying it to that may back us into a corner.

Miriam Walden noted that it will be tricky and that Assistant Superintendent Harden will need to be involved. Attorney suggested picking a very clear number. Think we would want to be an over time thing, not only meet, but perhaps hold for a year. Administratively may want to create a sinking fund, as numbers change start a small reserve in anticipation of loss of funding.

President Glasser noted difficulties, timing is difficult, might be on ballot and then have money come up after the fact.

Miriam Walden suggested taking all of those considerations to the lawyer to see what they can work out. Voters see the emergency and are very concerned about permanence. Responding to what voters want, not what needs to be on the ballot.

Member Black concerned about permanence issue while making 05 permanent on same ballot.

President Glasser noted gamble with both. Would have to be a June 30th number that we would have so that

when adopting budget, would have the information.

Miriam Walden suggested that there are indefinite risks.

President Glasser noted first practical use of decision tree he has seen. Trying to solve a few problems, one emergency funding, and other 05 funding piece. 05 originally used for not so essential services, but now needed for essential services. Would like overall sense from board about 1, permanence for 2005 and, 2, an additional parcel tax. What is preference?

Member Black suggests rather than ask to make 2005 tax permanent, ask to extend it for same reasons. There is an emergency. Would make Marla's point that we're going to have to explain where the money is coming from if we don't have that extended. Here is the emergency. We need to do two things, extend the 05 tax and need additional funds on top of that due to incredible cuts. Impressed by how complex it will be to come up with a number for the new tax. Perhaps list an anticipated date. There has been talk of rolling back the 2/3 requirement. Noted that taxes in recent years all had majority, even if not 2/3 and didn't pass. If move to majority, good chance that it would pass.

President Glasser clarified that Member Black is in favor of extending 2005 for 2-3 years and add emergency tax with potential end date.

Member Black confirmed and suggested that we say we need 250 and ask for 150 because we understand their situation, as opposed to saying we need 150 and asking for 150.

Member Low asked if we try to extend 2005 parcel tax, but it doesn't expire for two more years, you're talking about asking voters to extend for 3 more years?

Member Black confirmed. We will probably have to come back again in the future. If we ask to make it permanent, we will jeopardize approval of emergency tax.

Member Low asked if extension is not more difficult.

Member Black stated that both of these things can be stated as needed for emergency. If both arguments are the same, it weakens both arguments.

Member Low would like to think on it further.

Miriam Walden prefers restructuring to just renewing 05 tax because it adds two additional benefits, reducing taxes for seniors and low-income if they apply for exemption, and issue of legal language re definition of a parcel.

Member Black would support making it a restructuring, but rather than making 2005 permanent within the restructure, would extend it.

Member Low asked, in restructuring you would support including parcel language exemptions, but not permanence? How common is an extension on parcel tax?

Vice President Rosenbaum stated not an extension, but a restructuring.

President Glasser stated extension for two years would be part of restructuring.

Member Low asked how common that is.

Miriam Walden stated that the usual way to make tax permanent is to put it on ballot again but without expiration date. From legal perspective, discussing permanence directly is more difficult in terms of language, but is more transparent. Not normal until very obvious that it is going to expire.

Member Low confirmed that we couldn't put tax on in exactly the same way because of concerns about the parcel language.

Vice President Rosenbaum stated not necessarily saying two years beyond, rather a suggestion from Member Black.

Vice President Rosenbaum noted that decision tree is very helpful. Reluctant to ask voters for any more money or anything permanent. Think that we have to. Agree that we need to ask for restructuring and emergency tax. Looking at c. How he has been looking at it all along. We need to restructure all of the parcel taxes into one bundle, don't think we should ask for permanent tax.

President Glasser confirmed Vice President Rosenbaum is thinking in terms of 2005 extension rather than permanent.

Vice President Rosenbaum agreed about permanence, not even sure about extension given the climate. If economy turns around, public may be looking for removal of extra taxes.

President Glasser comfortable with amount less than 250, 150 makes sense. Valid argument that this is what we need, but in light of economy, this is what we're asking for. With restructure, difficult language may cause it to be voted down, and if one voted down, than likely all three. Preference would be to have clean up language at future time. See issue re permanence, but doesn't solve problem. We cannot do without those funds. Would have to go back to voters at another future time. Would rather solve that issue now, making it permanent. Perhaps take restructuring at another time so that we can address emergency issue. Clear arguments for emergency and permanence of 05.

Member Low understands that all three agree with emergency tax. Is President Glasser saying that we need another measure to make 05 permanent?

President Glasser confirmed. Must acknowledge that it is now part of core funding.

Member Low confirmed that in putting in initiative and explaining to public, President Glasser does not want to involve the other language.

President Glasser doesn't want to include senior and parcel language as they can be cleaned up later.

Member Low asked if seniors and low income would attract voters.

President Glasser noted that it will be part of the 05 and emergency pieces. If people don't understand, will vote down.

Vice President Rosenbaum asked about possible change in law regarding 2/3 majority.

President Glasser noted that it will not change by August 4th.

Miriam Walden summarized that it sounds like board places very high premium on transparency and clarity with voters. We need to come back to you with something super clear, simple, emphasizes advantages not the complexity. First work with attorney to write super clear 75 word version, and then give some detail language that can be flipped. Probably better to provide some different language, a couple of different options then

board can review and make choices. Issue remains, are you supportive of emergency tax and at what amount? Hearing yes from three in the amount of 150 and concern about the definition of emergency from two.

Member Low sees some consensus about the emergency, but not yet agreement about making 05 permanent or trying to extend. If we ask for extension or permanent 05 and we loose, we could wait two years and try again.

Motion by Vice President Rosenbaum, seconded by Member Black to approve extending meeting by 10 minutes

The Board was polled. Members: voting AYE

Miriam Walden noted that sometimes it comes down to language. Often what is done is to go out to renew them. Possibly discuss as renewal rather than extension or permanent. Was put on because it was needed. Important for stability of district. Don't want to set up to do this again and again. What may pass and provide stability? Language for emergency tax might include years.

President Glasser noted that they usually are renewed just before sunset. However going for it in advance would be the more fiscally prudent thing to do.

Marsha Skinner, previous board member, noted experience with renewal of 87 parcel tax was to back up from election where it absolutely had to have it pass to an election or two ahead so that we could come back again if needed. Suggested maybe talking about three ballot measures, simple measure about language with no fiscal impact, probably not even developing an opposition. On emergency tax going to voters with time certain is simple and can be understood easily by voters, as opposed to deficit factors.

President Glasser asked if one of the flips could be either a trigger or time certain.

Miriam Walden will take question to attorney.

Member Low interested in having attorney consider third proposition idea. Feel more comfortable about what Marsha said about renewal, in thinking about what voters will consider, renewal makes sense given the time line and things said about financial prudence, etc. Less than what I would want but makes sense.

President Glasser hearing three extensions on 2005.

Miriam Walden finds it conceivable that we can come back on the 4th with options a, b, and c. Sounds like when you see the final language, you'll go with cleanest. Will make for messy meeting.

Member Black asked if we should we consider Marsha's suggestion about three ballot measures. Would it be more complicated or less?

Miriam Walden certainly can review with attorney.

President Glasser asked if there is enough clarity for language to come back on the 4th.

Superintendent Stephenson requested acknowledgement from the board, looking potentially at three measures. 1, emergency tax with a time certain date in vicinity of 150 dollars, 2, clean up for parcel versus square footage issue and exemption language, 3, either renew or extend 05 parcel tax. Renewal is de facto for permanent. Anything missed?

President Glasser confirmed.

Member Low asked if Member Black feels comfortable with renewal?

Member Black thinks can say renew with or without expiration date. Concern isn't with the language of the proposition, but what opponents will do if or if not a date.

Member Low thanked parcel tax committee.

Superintendent Stephenson thanked committee on behalf of the Board.

B) Strategic Plan External Facilitation

Superintendent Stephenson updated board on directive. Used criteria on page 111 to find a good match for Albany. Mary Townsend and Lynn Perino are seasoned veterans trained by Bill Cook. Mary Townsend will be here on the 4th of August at 4:30 in a special board session to go over the process, to make board aware of dates and do some work to help to craft and formalize ideas to take into strategic plan meeting including community, staff and board.

Vice President Rosenbaum commented that Lynn Perino is a great choice.

Member Low asked if she'll be presenting possible process and timeline at that time.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed.

XIII.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by President Glasser at 10:20 pm.