



Albany Unified School District

Albany Unified School District Board of Education

904 Talbot Ave.
Albany, CA 94706

MINUTES FOR MEETING

August 4, 2009

I. OPENING BUSINESS 6:00 p.m.

- A) Call to Order
- B) Roll Call

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

ABSENT : Vice President Rosenbaum.

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

III. CLOSED SESSION 6:05 p.m.

IV. OPEN SESSION 7:30 p.m.

- A) Reconvene to Open Session

President Glasser called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

- B) Roll Call

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

ABSENT : Vice President Rosenbaum.

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

- C) [Pledge of Allegiance](#)

- D) [Report of Action Taken in Closed Session](#)

President Glasser informed that board approved settlement action for the district with regard to litigation with Jason Lockhart.

- E) Approval of Agenda

Motion by Member Low, seconded by Member Walden to approve Agenda

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

President Glasser welcomed Rebecca Martinez, new district secretary filling in on taking minutes.

- F) [Approval of Consent Calendar](#)

Member Low has questions.

Member Black has questions. On page 8 regarding changes to description of advertisement, change 'is dedicated' to 'are dedicated', and same thing on page 9.

Question on page 16 on the approved surplus ewaste. When discarding computers and hard disks, is care taken that data is completely wiped before getting rid of them, specifically computers in district office that might have confidential information.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that all of the hard drives are wiped.

Member Low also has questions on job descriptions. Asked about possible discussion or information either now or in the future about Albany Music Fund and support of elementary arts. Received letter about amount donated and looking for additional information.

President Glasser suggested that the information could be obtained after.

Member Low asked about ewaste, noticing that most of the equipment is quite old. MacGreggor High School's computer lab was stolen. Asked if there has there been any replacement for them or was any of this property was able to be recycled for them.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that this property is so antiquated that it would not be considered for student use. Indeed, looking at replacement for the computer lab. Waiting for further clarification on unaudited actuals to see what is available.

President Glasser pulled item 3a.

Superintendent Stephenson indicated that item 5e needs correction. 5a is contract with Oak Hill School for 08-09, last year for 778.50. Student came quite late in the year. 5e is 09-10 contract and last line should read, 'at a cost not to exceed \$46,249.00'. Apologize for error.

President Glasser confirmed change in the agenda and reviewed contract itself for the dollar amount. Contract does not have a total dollar amount. Asked where the 46 thousand dollar amount came from and stated discomfort approving contracts without some upper dollar amount. Requested that the 46,000 limit be incorporated into the contract. Concerned that if rates change, board would have to re-approve contract. Not comfortable approving open ended financial commitments on the part of the district.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that there is financial limit on this contract and believes that page was not copied and included. Limit is established under 5e as the 46,249. Will endeavor to see that the final figure of cost is in the contract.

Motion by Member Walden, seconded by Member Black to approve Consent Calendar with corrections noted by Member Black and Superintendent Stephenson, but without item 3a, which will be heard in a moment.

The Board was polled and passed unanimously. Members: Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, and President Glasser voting AYE
Member Black abstained from check number 926913.

President Glasser abstained on item 5d.

3. Curriculum and Instruction

a) Approve Proposed Course Fee Increases at the Adult School

President Glasser presented item 3a, which was pulled from the consent calendar.

Superintendent Stephenson introduced Alison Makela who is here and was just approved via consent calendar as the person who will be responsible for the adult school this year. Offered congratulations.

Alison Makela provided board with preliminary schedule, still needing proof, print, and budget. Adult school recognizes impact of budget changes and sees value of freedom for districts to work collectively as a cohesive whole. Need to cover costs in order to serve the adults in ESL and seniors in the community. Can be done by raising fee based classes from 3.00 per hour to 4.00 hour, feels consistent with surrounding communities although slightly less than some. Incremental enough not to lose enrollment. Example; French class held once per week for 2 hours was 60.00, will now be 80.00. Not a huge jump, but allows covering costs. Other change would be; have never charged for ESL or seniors because they were ADA supported classes and in keeping with other surrounding districts, will now charge a registration fee for those classes. 35.00 for an ESL class and 35.00 for most senior classes with a couple that have longer hours or incur more costs and have been priced at 50.00. Allows balancing of budget.

Member Walden clarified that in a sense there is a senior discount because another class with the same amount of hours would be more than 35, or if they are about at the same level.

Ms. Makela confirmed that it is essentially a senior discount. Priced all ADA classes at one set fee and moved fee based classes from 3 to 4 dollars per hour. Spoke with Director Harden and agreed on need to be tighter on budget at the adult school. Will be meeting quarterly for review. Adjustments may come out of those meetings. Believe can maintain the valued program.

Superintendent Stephenson asked for clarification; now no longer receiving ADA in the same way as in the past, is there an attendance requirement. Very accurate records were required for ADA classes.

Ms. Makela responded that it is not technically required in the same way, however, the advice received suggested keeping attendance knowing that things may change in the future. Want to have things in order in case things go back to previous

situation or other possible scenarios.

President Glasser asked about curriculum. Asked if given the current economy, there has been a need for networking classes, resume writing classes, job search classes, etc.

Ms. Makela acknowledged that these classes are a good idea and is looking forward to building these in the fall. Can add fee based classes to meet the needs of the community. Working one day a week has not allowed that to happen yet, but perhaps in the fall.

Member Walden identified another struggle with adult education as enrollment has gotten tight with K-12 classes access to rooms has been reduced which constrains income. Board has not yet found a strategy to resolve the issue, but has reviewed it and are aware of the problem. Please continue to mention if it continues to be a problem so that board remains aware.

President Glasser asked for questions or comments from the public.

Hsinheoa Kihn, called Cindy, has been a student at Albany Adult School for quite a long time. Found has had tremendous benefit. Very shocked when some courses might continue or be eliminated. Since January has been taking financial investment course which may be discontinued or fee based. According to own experience, if had taken course a year ago would not be in current mess, having lost 50% of life savings because of financial crisis. In normal convention of school this is not taught, but in Albany Adult School it is such a valuable course. It could have saved thousands of people's financial situations if they new this and had taken this course. Was educated too late. Happy to have this information now.

Instructor is such a wonderful teacher. Teaches in a good sequence making financial mystery much easier to learn. Think she has been saving a lot of people's financial lives. Asked that students be allowed to pay in order to have the course continue. Understand that government is in crisis and appreciate that the government has funded for so many years, so if at this time students are allowed to pay so that course can continue, it would be a blessing. The only place to learn this kind of course and knowledge providing the power to handle own financial life.

President Glasser thanked Ms. Khin and commented that this is a good testament of the value to the district.

Roger Schmidt, a continuing student. Regarding this particular class, can no longer depend on the types of retirement that used to exist. The interesting part of this class is that Lydia has very good hands on experience, is the sort of instructor that puts prickles on the back of your neck when she makes things very clear, is exciting to listen to. Hope to take third class from her this fall. Unfortunately she is only doing three. Anyone here could learn a great deal about finance from this class. Class is made up of some very young students, some seniors, some retired,

some hopefully retired, very interesting mix, international. A very worldly discussion on finance. If had taken this class years ago, would be far better off today, not having made some of the mistakes made in the past. Hope board continues process.

Jane Holmes, new to the East Bay. Found Albany Adult School and the theatre exploration class and then on to music appreciation. Have learned so much about the area, the theatre, the music. Have made wonderful friends. Please continue.

Alda Bird, lived here all her life. Discovered Marion Fay and can not express how much she has given to her pupils. All are seniors and some would be stuck at home without adult education classes. Hope that they will continue and ask for strong consideration.

Bonnie Stiles with music appreciation and theatre arts class. What they didn't say is that they have really benefited from the classes. Appreciates working out a financial solution for that. It may impact some people, but feels like a good solution to be able to charge a registration fee. Thank you.

Member Walden commented that this sounds like one of the rare things in budget problem where there is some good news in that courses can be kept even though cost does go up for the participants. There is a possibility of making this work and have a good person to help do that. A lot of school districts are ending adult education, proud of district for keeping that going. Appreciative that people came out and spoke tonight, especially in front of TV cameras which is very hard, but will let a lot of people know how great these classes are so that they'll come. Have taken and appreciated some of these classes. One of the great things is that this is a place where the school district intersects with the whole community and offers a sense of a bigger community.

Motion by President Glasser, with no seconder required to approve Approve Proposed Course Fee Increases at the Adult School

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

No second was identified and item will be brought back on a future agenda per the board on October 20, 2009.

V. STUDENT BOARD MEMBERS

President Glasser asked if student members will be present at the first meeting in September.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A) Parks and Recreation Commission Bi-Annual Report

President Glasser asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Superintendent Stephenson suggested that item be tabled. Parks and Recreation Department asked that it be put on the agenda, but no one is present.

Member Walden confirmed that there is not something in writing.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that it is an oral report.

President Glasser anticipates that it will be one of the commissioners reporting on that.

Motion by Member Walden, with no seconder required to table Parks and Recreation Commission Bi-Annual Report until the next available opportunity.

The Board was polled. Members: voting AYE

No second was identified and item will be brought back on a future agenda per the board on October 20, 2009.

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

President Glasser asked if there are persons to address the board on matters not on the agenda. There were none.

VIII. REVIEW AND ACTION ITEMS

A) Open Public Hearing on the Proposed Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-01 and 2009-10-02

President Glasser opened public hearing.

Superintendent Stephenson referred to information available including; revision to what was posted on the web site resolution 2009-10 01a which is a change to what is in the board packet tonight, for the first time an alternate resolution 2009-10 01b which is not in the packet, and an amended 2009-10 02. Will also find a hand out that gives the current level of funding of parcel taxes broken out by the specific parcel tax, and on the reverse side, the proposed resolution 2009-10-02 would bring to the district and some alternates. Also available is the actual original language for the 87 parcel tax, 99 parcel tax, and the 2005 parcel tax. Board should have those packets.

Member Walden clarified that the basic concept of the 01a and 01b is that, based on board's discussion last time, two alternatives needed to be presented to the board. Sounds like the board would like to put two items on the ballot in November and the question is which two. The one that was pretty much drafted as discussed is the emergency parcel tax on blue 10-02. The green and yellow are two different versions of what might be done with the older parcel taxes. Yellow, 10-01a, is taking all three parcel taxes and combining them into one tax which would

have the benefit of extending exemptions for seniors and low income in the older taxes that currently don't have all of the exemptions and would have the affect of making the 05 tax a permanent tax rather than having it expire in 2012 and otherwise is an attempt to keep the language and the meaning and the affect almost exactly the same. The alternate was rather than address the older taxes simply to make the 2005 tax to add an additional 8 years on to its term, phrased as a new tax that will begin when the 05 tax ends at what ever the 05 tax base rate plus inflation and can continue for an additional 8 years. The purpose is written exactly as it was in the 05 language, but the rest of the language has been updated a little bit. If the board prioritizes simplicity of language on the ballot, transparency of the total value of the total cost of the taxes, and if the board highly values the opportunity to give seniors and low income families an additional reduction in their taxes in this difficult economic time, then the choice is the yellow one, 01a. If, however, the board does not want to make the 05 tax permanent at this time and would prefer merely to extend it for 8 years, and that is the priority above all else, then the choice is 01b. Felt that the idea of adding the exemptions to the old taxes, making the 05 tax only a little bit longer but not making it permanent, and adding the new emergency tax was not workable and the option has not been presented. Asking for alterations as wanted in the language, then chose between revamping all three taxes with 05 becoming permanent or making 05 extended by 8 years but not taking this opportunity to revamp the old taxes. If you look at the language in the short version, it reflects what was heard at the last meeting to please make it simple and clear. Were able to achieve that with the combination of all three, the most simple and clear language. However, it does have the 555 dollar figure which people are going to know eventually, but is presented directly here, which some people have been concerned about.

Superintendent Stephenson suggested asking for public comment and then closing the hearing.

President Glasser asked for public comment. As board moves toward adoption or rejection of the resolutions, would like to first decide what board wants to do and then focus on the language of each resolution.

Loring Barker, President of Albany Teachers' Association. Had a change to be a participant in some of the parcel tax committee meetings which went very well and gave the community a good chance to look at the parcel taxes. Not able to be in town during the final compilation of these. First, would agree with Member Walden that the 2009-10 01a does provide the most transparency, letting the public know what is really happening with their parcel taxes. Showing the total amount could be dangerous, at the same time have an educated community that, if a solid selling job is done, will understand that they are not getting more put on. That this is what they're paying and the transparent amount so that they know what they are actually voting on. Would probably support that as a community member and as a teacher in the district. It combines them all together to a permanent parcel tax so

that not continually coming back to renew them. A very strong selling point. Just renewal, even though 8 years is a long time, creates this problem of renewal. In either of those two sets of language, would suggest that the board consider making the language... In years of attending board meetings, has seen the board struggle with trying to manipulate funds to accommodate the language of the parcel taxes, so that when the parcel taxes become too specific it really constrains the board in moving money to poor areas that have to be cut due to state funding whims, etc. For example, in the last round of cuts, it specified librarians, so that becomes difficult to react to future issues as well as might be able to because board has to stay with the communities vote. Would argue that possibly saying something like 'categories such as' rather than 'these specific categories'. Not necessarily something that will be funded specifically rather a possible funding source.

President Glasser commented that there will probably be some questions about that a little later on. Needing to be clear about types of language.

Member Walden making a list of all of the language issues so that board can come back to them and address them one at a time.

Mr. Barker suggested stating somewhere in the language that these are not listed in priority order so that what is listed first is not necessarily the first funding level. There was some confusion during the last round of parcel taxes about that. Third thing is, as a community member and person that plans to go out and help sell these parcel taxes, thinks adding the emergency tax could be confusing to people in the community and might get people saying will vote for one, but not both. Has seen this happen in many types of elections, when people are confused, they split their vote. In a parcel tax election when 20 votes might be the difference between the 2/3 majority needed or not, if 25 people are confused and split their vote they may both be defeated. Sees necessity of emergency tax, perhaps can do this in a different way, could be very dangerous to put up two parcel taxes at the same time.

Saul Strand, resident for over 32 years. First opposed flat regressive taxes about 20 years ago. Believes that there have been at least 5 areas, for schools this is the 4th parcel tax, there are 5 areas that have had a minimum of 2 flat taxes; landscaping, paramedics, libraries, and sewers in addition to schools. Have had a couple of dozen elections, including all of the restructuring and extensions and adding inflation protection over the past 2 decades and all of these are focused on regressive flat taxes. Neighboring communities do it on a square footage basis for residents so that you don't have someone in a large home paying the same amount as someone in a small studio. To have this sort of regressive taxation in Albany has just gotten unconscionable over these past two decades. Just keep adding more and more. If you take a mortgage calculator on a financial web site and add in 125.00 extra in taxes for a small studio versus a 1.3 million dollar home, it doesn't have any impact on property values at the 1.3 million dollar level, but the small properties are devastated in that the value goes down below the replacement cost.

In effect no developer is going to build any small units in Albany any more because they aren't going to sell things below cost, resulting in an exclusionary zoning impact. This is what Alameda county and state legislators tried to address in fair housing laws. This is being wiped out by this very right-wing, very inconsistent with the progressive values of Albany as stated. When look and hear about 16% of kids out of district, some million heirs in Kensington that don't want to send their kids to private schools send them to Albany, free in Albany. Not even asking them to make at 700.00 in lieu payment to the foundation if you want to re-enroll your kids. If you cap out of district students at 10% and give priority to those who have made an in lieu donation of 700.00 a year, you could get a lot of revenue that way and restructure these flat taxes to be on a square footage basis just as our neighboring communities do. Searched for a city anywhere in the state of California that has these kind of aggressive taxing policies and cannot find one. For all of the committees that have been added in Albany are just missing the whole point, doing the opposite of what the community says they believe in. This has to stop and can not just keep coming back and restructuring every single parcel tax on a regressive basis. Thank you.

- B) [Close Public Hearing on the Proposed Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-01 and 2009-10-02](#)
President Glasser closed the public hearing given no further public comments.
- C) [Approve Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-01](#)
Member Walden presented a couple of terminology issues. The parcel taxes as written use a square foot calculation for non residential properties, but try to make it so that a small business would end up with the same flat fee that a typical home would. It is flat on residential properties. That is in fact, all though it is regressive, it is the reason why parcel taxes are the only kind of tax school districts can raise under prop 13. If there was a totally progressive tax it would be considered property tax, which the district is not allowed to raise more than 2%. The parcel tax loop hole is the one that the district has. There are other districts that have a more square foot based calculation on all properties. Looked at what it would be like to move to such a calculation. The trick becomes historical that there are these three taxes in place and if method of calculation was changed everybody in town would be affected by that, requiring knowing square footage for everybody's house and everybody's taxes would change a little. Realized that especially for the older taxes there is no politically viable way to have everybody's taxes changed and pass something on a 2/3 vote. To try to make the taxes less regressive, although they are regressive and it is unfortunate and is part of the nature of prop 13 and the legislation that followed after it, that this is the only thing that school districts can do. Have been able to include exemptions and one of things about the rewrite of the old taxes is that it would extend those exemptions to the older taxes that were passed when people weren't ready to put exemptions in place for low income families and seniors. This is an awkward way to do it, but provides the chance to help some people out in an otherwise difficult position.

Did investigate, not necessarily because of the regressive issue but because of case law, the idea of going to a straight square foot measurement system and found that it would both be very expensive to make that transition and that it would be very difficult to explain to the voters. Proposals here stick with the existing method of calculation which is flat on residential units and square foot based for commercial units.

President Glasser added again that this is a consequence of prop 13, how for those communities wishing to maintain a certain level of services, for the district this is one way of doing it. To the south of us Berkeley has probably the worst offender of using this method for funding specific purposes, but it also helps communities maintain specific purposes. Things like paramedic services are no longer funded because they can't be funded because of prop 13. We have talked at several of the meetings about the state's cutting local funding for services to plug holes in the state budget. Unfortunately, this is one of the things given up with prop 13, gave the state the ability to take some of our local revenues.

President Glasser asked board to first decide between resolution 2009-10-01a and 01b. 01a essentially combining all of the three existing parcel taxes and making permanent the 2005 tax. 01b combining all of the taxes, but making the 2005 tax extended for eight additional years.

Member Walden clarified that 01b does not combine the previous three taxes. It just extends the 2005 tax because of issues of overcomplicating the ballot.

President Glasser asked that these two be addressed first and then talk about the proposed new parcel tax second in order to focus the discussion.

President Glasser open to discussion on board's preference between these two, 01a and 01b.

Member Black has not yet decided and is hoping that people will make arguments that are convincing on one side or the other. Thinking that preference would be to combine all of the taxes and make the 2005 tax permanent. Thinks that the other has a better chance of passing. If it didn't pass would be in the same place, not having lost anything. Do really want to extend the 2005 tax. Mr. Barker had a good point that some people are going to see two parcel taxes on the ballot and not vote for both. If assured that anyone put on the ballot would pass, would certainly go with the one that combined the previous taxes and made the 2005 permanent.

Member Walden was looking at some of the material used to sell the 2005 tax in the campaign and noticed that in almost every flier, put out the figure including the figures for neighboring communities. Wonder how totally shocked people will really be. Not sure that community would be shocked at the 555.00. Given the

fact that it was openly used last time, not sure it is not something that can be explained.

Member Black has same concern as last time that people will say that tax is being presented as temporary, but district will just come back and make it permanent, like the 2005 tax.

Member Walden stated that people will make that argument whichever resolution the board chooses. Part of that is, in an environment where people are going to say that you can never trust government, they always sneak something in and make it permanent, some people are going to believe it and some people aren't. What is the most ethical, personally clear way to talk so that presenting what envision a government official should be. Thought that while may have been able to last year just do without it, if the public chose not to renew it, now a known fact that cannot do without it. Would be a horrible reduction of services in Albany. Know now that 2005 parcel tax is absolutely essential for the operations of the district. Therefore, best can do is say that it is needed permanently. Regarding emergency tax, governor says that this level of cut will go away and if it does, can survive with the 05 tax and not need this emergency tax. Hope that people hear the honesty in that. Difficult to say that 05 tax is only needed for 8 years when know that not to be the case. Not difficult to say that about the emergency tax because it is true, for now. Very difficult question about how to operate in an environment where the government has been untrustworthy and people have a right to be suspicious, and then how to be trustworthy.

Member Low actually still torn. Honestly would support the combination and the the permanent 2005 but concerned about it passing and the ethical nature of its permanence. Understands Member Walden's argument and concern, but struggling that not quite completely there. Read all of the winning parcel tax descriptions in California and a number of papers on parcel taxes, and still did not find one essential piece of information, which is, how many of the parcel taxes that have been passed in California are permanent? Almost all of the descriptions read were not permanent. Some had 8 years, longest listed. Was not happy that it was not clear that option 01a the 2005 parcel tax would become permanent, but if it is going to be clear and transparent in the campaign, would feel much more comfortable. Would like to hear some additional thoughts.

President Glasser coming at this from a practical standpoint as well as a fairness standpoint. Practically speaking, agrees with Member Walden that while 2005 was considered something optional under the current funding streams for the next decade or so, if board wants to maintain the level of services and curriculum at the district now, will be relying on the 2005 parcel tax to maintain those services. It is no longer an optional piece. To extend it out another 8 years is to assume that there is going to be someone on the board or someone in the community out there that in

5 years from now will be able to do what Member Walden and other members in the community do. Practically, yes just acknowledge that and homogenize the existing parcel taxes and add in the exemptions for the seniors and low income folks. Was actually one of the advocates in 2005 for keeping it at a sunset because at that time the thinking was that could do without it at some point. Reality is that district can't. 2005, while probably maybe having a better chance at approval, really doesn't solve the long term problem. Need to do a good job of educating the public that in order to maintain these services will need to keep 2005 in place for the foreseeable future. Can not do without it now. Does not have political sense, as some people do, at looking at what the approval pieces are. Think that 2009-10-01a, that combines and makes permanent the 2005 is what would be most comfortable with long term. If thought that could do away with 2005 in 8 years would consider it. Have an educated public that will be on both sides of this issue. Reality is that next year state will have additional problems and will be looking at taking away additional monies. Cannot say, but the next board may have to make this new parcel tax a permanent one. Have seen a continual failure to address fiscal realities at the state level, and governor has acknowledged a budget hold next year, so can anticipate further cuts and erosion on city, county, and school district funds on the local level because the state needs to keep their budget adopted on a balanced budget as well. From a political approval standpoint, defer to pundits on that. From a fiscal prudent standpoint going with 01a. Therefore supporting 01a unless someone convinces that the only way to get 2005 extended is with 01b.

Member Walden stated that no one can predict what will happen in an election and has a hard time being a political guesser, even after running all of these campaigns, because still believe campaigns are about work, not about luck. Try to imagine chances. Can do a lot of work to educate the public, etc. Some people will come in to polling booth and look at the ballot and make their decision that way. Looking at the ballot, if you have the emergency tax and the restructuring, 01a, in one you have 555 dollars and the other 142, so can do the math. One says that it is not an increase, so you realize that you're already paying the 555 and the 142 is the new part. What is the upside of the restructure? It has the 555 tag, but it lowers taxes for seniors and low income by giving them exemptions to taxes that they are currently paying. Has an upside in addition to being a restatement of the 555. May be a shock if you didn't realize that you were paying this amount. In the poll saw that people are worried about others, so this has an upside. Now looking at just the extension of 05, 01b. You are looking at 250 dollars as something that you already pay that is being extended, and 142, the new amount. The advantage is that the number has gone down. Sure that opponents and board will state the amounts in the ballot language and materials. There is no upside to 01b, although it is a smaller number. Wonders about chances. One has an upside, although the number is larger, and the other does not.

Member Black commented that the downside to the first one is that it makes something permanent that was promised not to be permanent. That will be pointed out.

Member Walden agrees. When writing 2005 materials promise was not that it would not be made permanent, rather that it would come back to the voters in seven years to show what has been done with it. It was not framed as temporary.

Member Low stated polls show that people understand very clearly how the budget cuts from the state have affected the district and the situation it has put the district in.

President Glasser asked board to decide if 01a or 01b. Will then move on to language.

Member Black noted that two people have made a decision and two people are unsure, which weights it over to the two that have made a decision. Willing to be persuaded in the interest of moving this forward.

President Glasser stated that there is a risk. If don't receive extension and 2012 is the expiration, will be three years out on the budget and will have to start dealing with it.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that district will go back again and again. Original intention was to go back in November of 2010 allowing one additional regular election, although could call a special, but will go out again and again until the 11th hour because this must be in the budget. Would say as superintendent, after spending a long time looking at past budget, current budget, and prediction for the future, have to have the 05 parcel tax revenue to be able to operate at this level, and this bare bones. This is with huge concessions from the bargaining units, a 6 period day at the middle school, etc.

Member Black believes there is a lot more work to do and is willing to go with 01a.

Member Low has considered and is also willing to go with 01a.

Member Walden reminded board how there came to be two in the first place. The conversation included the decision tree. If just the emergency tax and do not do anything about 2005 right now, know that have poisoned the water a little bit for the renewal of 05 by asking for more money on something else. Made it necessary to put some version of something about 05 on this ballot. If it goes down, still in same position. This way something is done about 05 now, if possible, using the volunteer energy and momentum from the emergency tax.

Member Low suggested moving on to discussion of language. Tried to find all of the ways to clearly explain that the 555 is already what is paid.

President Glasser asked John Hartenstein to come up and provide an overview of the language on 01a and some of the things to be cognizant of while fine tuning. Mr. Hartenstein was very instrumental in drafting the language.

Mr. Hartenstein referring to summary on exhibit a, 75 words. Have a black-line showing what has changed since drafted. Member Walden had some refinements. Concerns include; not certain can say 'statute requires' or 'case law requires'. The word fairness was used earlier. Sense of fairness incumbent upon all involved. Has to clearly say what it is going to do, including the rate of the tax. If doing something different, there are different ways to say it. Overall picture of combining three things. Not just combining rate, also combining formulas, exemptions, changing a number of things. All of the text of the old measures fall away, which is a good thing, much cumbersome problematic text. Have to state the rate. Really is a new tax, a new measure, not because the amount is different, but because the features are different, the purposes will be stated differently. Does not have to be emphasized too strongly, but in the end has to be a new tax. Clearly has to say the rate, has to say that it is an annual rate. Important to indicate the differential rate on commercial and residential, so that people who do not own residential units understand that they are affected by this and how. Do not have to mention the senior exemption, although it is generally thought to be a positive thing and so it has been mentioned. It should be stated in a clear way. Maybe this is okay, maybe say age 65 and over, which is more accurate. Reference low income tax payers. Do not reference the rebate to the low income renters which is not critical to describe in the 75 words. It is there in the full text of the measure. Very important to point out that the district is paying that rebate and that landlords are not paying that rebate.

Member Walden clarified that as written it states that the low income renter has to prove that they are in a unit where the landlord pays the tax. Most people assume that if a renter not a tax payer. Low income tax payers does include renters because the way it is worded rebate happens if in a unit that pays taxes.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that the measure does not have to address that. Have the purposes and some room for some embellishment, statement of purpose, statement of impact, so long as don't over-politicize. These are key things to keep in mind. This is a summary. There is a lot more flexibility in the summary of a parcel tax than in a bond measure. Stating rate and major impacts are enough, then can talk about the kinds of things it will do without having to be very specific. In the full text of the measure more specifics about how funds might be used. Asked for questions from President Glasser.

President Glasser referred to rate on page a3, and discussions with Dr. Wong about why using April as benchmark for that year. Noticed a very specific series, CUURA. Asked if that is something that will not change and why April rather than just the yearly CPI index. April could be a big blip up or down from a 12 month average.

Mr. Hartenstein stated not aware of origin of this language, essentially carrying forward what was done before.

President Glasser stated that there is a bit of smoothing with a 12 month average rather than one specific month.

Mr. Hartenstein referred to the US all consumers index, which was stated as default if for some reason San Francisco index were no longer published, etc., would get a monthly rate that could be smoothed or averaged. The San Francisco index is not as frequent as that. The purpose is to say that every year the rate will be set on July 1 and the most recent index will be the April index.

Assistant Superintendent Harden stated that in addition it involves budget planning.

President Glasser understands the timing, but suggested that using 12 months versus one month could have... People pay their taxes in April. Have not reviewed the behavior of the CPI over time in April versus the 12 month might illicit a number that is too high or too low based on the actual average cost increase over the previous 12 months. If could have and average of the index over the previous 12 months, would provide a smoother number.

Mr. Hartenstein stated would be fine, would result in a lower number. By the time April, June, July, if inflation has been significant over that year, taking an average over that year rather than where it has got to is going to cause a lower number until the next year's average. There will be a lag.

Member Walden stated that it goes up over the year always and pick it at the last possible moment before you have to set your budget knowing that will be the highest overall for that year.

Superintendent Stephenson noted that otherwise it will move to the next collection cycle.

Member Low asked what is typically used in parcel taxes.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that the impetus to use something like the all urban consumer San Francisco is, one, it looks like it is more accurate for Albany cost of living, second, it tends to be higher than the US index.

Member Low commented that cost of living does tend to be higher than US.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that it is not always higher in rate of increase. If housing is hit harder here than elsewhere, there may be a lower rate of increase in San Francisco than elsewhere. Because of the way it is done, believes that because of the sample it will be somewhat less statistically accurate than the US all

consumers. Not certain. Typically, from what have seen in measures that have an inflation index, it is just CPI.

Member Walden recalls watching some board meetings where this was discussed before a member and remembers that the committee that wrote the 99 parcel tax spent a considerable amount of time trying to figure out how to get the very highest inflation number possible and having researched all of the options, came up with this specific statement as the one that would most reliably get the highest number available given all historical data. Worked very hard on that very little piece of language. Would tend to give it up to senior advisors on that one. Fine if want to change to average.

President Glasser stated that board needs to come up with a number that reflects the increased cost of doing business from the previous year. If you exclude the December months where inflation might be higher because of consumer activity, and people spend money because they want their tax credits at the end of the year.

Mr. Hartenstein asked if they tend to go up and down or if they tend to go up at a slightly higher rate in some months than in others. Plus they do adjustments for a lot of these kinds of things.

President Glasser believes that not a lot of spending goes on in April. Thinking is a bad month other than closest to when adopting budget. Why thought an average would reflect what it actually cost to do business the in the San Francisco metropolitan area over the past 12 months.

Member Walden is willing to go with a change that lists the year prior or the year ending in April.

President Glasser believes that one of the parcel taxes did have that language.

Member Walden is fine with change. Believes talking about a tiny percentage.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed 'for the year ending in April'.

President Glasser stated 'for the 12 months ending in April'.

Mr. Hartenstein added the average for those 12 months.

Member Walden referred to two issues brought up by Mr. Barker about not too specific and about priority order.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that 'by priority order' was not included because it does say 'to the extent of available funds'. On a3, 'in accordance with priorities established by the board of education', basically says not in any priority order. 'To

the extent of available funds including, but not limited to' gives the maximum degree of flexibility as to how the board wishes to use the funds.

Member Black asked about 3 different lists; under exhibit a, under fundings, and under purposes and they are all different. Asked if that is significant.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that it does matter. Want to avoid contradictions and inconsistencies. First, the abbreviation of the measure on a1 is meant to be nothing more than that and it should not introduce any new concepts that do not make this a summary of what follows, it should just be a summary.

Member Black asked if rather than 'all funds for' could list 'funds for'.

Mr. Hartenstein agreed that would be better because if say 'all funds for' then should list all things.

Superintendent Stephenson confirmed that Mr. Hardenside recounted summary.

Member Walden confirmed that Mr. Hardenside did recount it and it is 74.

Member Low asked, "Did you put in John's change about exempting homeowners of, over..."?

Mr. Hartenstein stated that has not been done yet. This counts to 72.

President Glasser confirmed that square-foot is one word.

Mr. Hartenstein considered abbreviations, but thought they might consider it two abbreviations rather than one. Had 71 with that. 65 and over adds 2 words.

Member Low confirmed taking out 'all'. Asked about lists being different in different places.

Member Walden stated that this is a copying error and suggested that the list that is in the original whereas in the first page of the yellow one, which includes business, was trying to make a general list that summarized all three taxes purposes, only leaving out things that are truly no longer relevant. List has the word business in it identifying it as one of the early lists. Should be the same on the purposes of the full text of the measure, which has somehow been altered here. Should say exactly what is stated in the whereas to be consistent.

Member Black endorses the 'including but not limited to' wording.

Member Low agrees.

Superintendent Stephenson summarized the board's direction to take the 6th

whereas on the first page of 01a and list those out under the bullets under purposes.

Mr. Hartenstein confirmed that this includes 'business' which thought had been removed at some point.

Member Walden stated that it would be fine to include. Was specifically in the 87 language. Should be consistent.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that business is fairly general.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that this recital does not make mention of the state average class size. It does say 'preserve small class sizes'.

Member Walden stated should be that way because state average was introduced in 05 language. Trying to be loyal to the 05 language which uses the below K-12 average as a way of being specific about goal of class sizes.

Superintendent Stephenson suggested keeping it 'preserve small class sizes'.

Member Low asked about Mr. Barker's question about 'categories such as' and if in summary implying a priority.

Member Walden stated that by virtue of the sentence that says, 'According to priorities established by the board and to the extent of available funds' that was designed to deal with the priority issue. There is no order here. Then 'including but not limited to' was designed to give wiggle room to boards in the future.

Member Low understands particular order does not really matter in the list of specific items in the summary. Wonder if should put up front things that polls show public is very supportive of, like arts, music, etc.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that is how they are typically done.

Member Walden had used list as presented in original 05 language.

Member Low asked Member Walden about those recent poll results.

Member Walden stated that the only question asked in this recent poll as about arts and music. Did not ask about library. In previous polls items that were asked about received a positive response, even though different things were asked. Believes that important things are class sizes and the attract and retain and a list of the things that have tried to have and the state is messing with.

Member Black asked if the definitions of residential unit and non-residential property are confusing, particularly issue of one kitchen. Asked why that is there.

Knows of houses with more than one kitchen.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that this is not exactly the language that has been used in the past, but is very close. 'Only one kitchen' was not touched. Was repeatedly concerned about use of this text and possible unintended affect such as exempting people with two kitchens, or do they become a non-residential property and fall into the other classification.

Member Black does not believe that they do because it says 'non-residential properties not used for dwelling purposes'.

Member Walden know that the purpose of the 'one kitchen' was to capture apartments, which frequently is not done. The 'one kitchen' is designed so that even if an apartment building is on one parcel, each and every apartment is charged a parcel tax. As pointed out, unintended consequences exist.

Discussion about listing the number of kitchens.

Member Black wondered about 'assisted living' properties, which are clearly for dwelling purposes and therefore does not fall under either of these definitions. People are dwelling there.

Member Walden stated that they are charged as one parcel.

Superintendent Stephenson asked if they are not a business and should be listed as a commercial property.

Member Black agreed, but under this definition it is a question. It seems that some people are falling through the cracks.

Mr. Hartenstein agreed that there are some problems with these definitions. Did very little to the old ones. Tried to fix many of these, but it became too problematic. These definitions have existed for a number of years.

Member Black does not understand what would be lost if the number of kitchens was removed.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that the 'not more than one family' is the defining factor.

Member Black asked if, according to the laws of Albany, can there be more than one family living in a house and if there are, is that property exempt.

Mr. Hartenstein believes that there is a supreme court case that says that the city cannot say how many families can live in a unit like that or if they have to be related. Therefore it is problematic.

Discussion about the definitions.

Mr. Hartenstein discussed the problems arising from the tax applying to parcels for commercial and units, not parcels, for residential. Not consistent and very confusing to define. It generally works because everyone knows what it is meant to say. Generally not many disputes.

Member Walden recalls only one discussion with an individual tax payer was when someone had a parcel that was partly used for residential and partly used for commercial. An agreement was struck and they are listed in the books as required.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that, as cumbersome as it seems, the key was stability of tax collections. This way there will be no change to the way that taxes are collected, that the tax payers pay this. If this language is changed, there may be unintended consequences before this must be passed. Would feel more confident if language was kept as is, as cumbersome as it is.

President Glasser stated that the people at the county who interpret this sort of thing have an average tenure of about 25 to 30 years in that office and are very experienced in dealing with these issues.

Member Walden stated that they like sticking with the way things have been done.

Member Black asked for explanation for language under accountability provisions, 'for so long as any proceeds remain unexpended', which sounds like if then money is spent before December 31st, an audit is not required.

Member Walden stated that the intention was to keep reporting on the funds.

Mr. Hartenstein suggested that he should probably look back at the statute. Thinks that the statute is not all that good in this context, but may be wrong. Will check to see if this is bond language or the statute.

President Glasser suggested changing December 31st because that assumes that the audit will be done by December 31st each year and usually there are about seven months.

Mr. Hartenstein believes, and asked for correction if wrong, that audit has to be prepared and filed with the state by December 15th and then have until the 31st of January to approve, receive, or discuss it at the board. Thinks that there is another statutory provision that states by January 1 of each year. Realized that confused people and so wrote it as December 31st.

President Glasser knows that audits have been in January and February.

Assistant Superintendent Harden stated that they can happen in January. February can be a problem, if board approved audit is not submitted by the end of January.

Member Black has a question under protection of funding and reduction of other funding. Could have a situation where the other funding would not be as much as would be losing by producing the parcel tax. Wording should be such that whatever happens, the district comes out with the most money.

Mr. Hartenstein asked for an example.

Discussion on the text and intent.

President Glasser suggested that 'shall' could be changed to 'may'. The action could be taken if favorable, but would not be required.

Board agreed.

President Glasser asked for vote on c-2009-10-01a with proposed amendments, unless there is discussion or comments from the board or public.

Motion by President Glasser, seconded by Member Walden to approve Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-01a

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

D) [Approve Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-02](#)

Member Black thinks it is fine because of change in wording to 'included but not limited to'. Under purposes on page a3, 'only to restore programs and services cut from the district's budget as a direct result of a reduction of state funding for schools'. This text is for 5 years. If 3 years from now the state were to restore funding, would be required to collect the tax, but prohibited from spending.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that collection is not required. Can reduce the rate. Thinks the word 'only' is a bit funny given the text that follows the bullet points, which is to expand some flexibility there.

Member Walden suggested removing the word 'only'. Thinks the intention was to reassure voters that this really is an emergency tax.

Member Black understands intention, but does not want to include wording that will tie the board's hands.

Board agreed to remove the word 'only'.

President Glasser asked to make the CPI consistent with the 2009-10-01a, the 12 month average.

Member Black suggested that this one had many of the same questions as the first one, so any changes made there should be included here.

President Glasser mentioned that given the turn around time is so quick, should be specific about what needs to be done.

Member Low discussed the short version of the emergency parcel tax and email received where one of the parcel tax committee member was commenting that should we make clearer that this emergency parcel tax will not completely restore the programs. Does not know if that would make it more likely to pass or less likely to pass. For example, to say would partially restore programs would be more honest, but may confuse people.

President Glasser stated that some programs may be fully restored and others partially restored.

Superintendent Stephenson suggested 'to restore to the extent possible'.

Member Low agreed.

Member Black asked if there are enough words for the change.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that he has 66 for this one.

Member Walden suggested 'to help restore to the extent possible'. The promotional material will say 4.2 million was lost, are asking for whatever number is decided on. Asked if board agrees on 142 number.

Member Low mentioned committee member's other comment adding 'deep and unprecedented'.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that it is in the text.

Member Black would like to discuss the number.

President Glasser referred to page a5 for protection of funding, second to the last line, change the 'shall' to 'may'.

Member Walden referred to the back page of the white sheet, which shows how much money 142 would raise versus other numbers. The parcel tax committee's recommendation was that it should be less than 250 and that the number should be not a round number. Beyond that they left it up to the board's discretion as to what amount, given that the voters can not afford to fully restore the state cuts. What is the value of programing given the trade off of difficult economic times.

Member Black read that there is something 'magic' about ending a price in 9. If going to try to hit something close to 150, would suggest 149 rather than 142. Cannot imagine a single person in Albany that would vote for a 142 tax that would not vote for 149 and that 7 dollars. The survey listed 250 and 150, not anything in between. Possible could ask for more.

Member Low mentioned that there was a big jump in the survey from 250 to 150.

Member Walden was thinking about the tiers of things that were lost. Important to come up with a number that is not upsetting. Also important to think about what it is being spent on. Thinking about the tiers for restoring services and then the state budget got worse which meant that none of the tiers were restored and they came in 200,000 increments and the sum of those things that were most upsetting was around 1 million dollars. That was the amount of money aiming for. Where that number came from.

Member Black commented that Superintendent Stephenson's number to restore everything was 250.

Member Walden referred to the most critical services versus all services lost.

Member Low is good with 149.

Member Walden wondered if anyone wanted to go with 127 because it is close to 1 million and is so much easier to sell.

Member Low is okay with 127.

Member Black asked if 127 would be that much easier to sell. Would like to restore as much as possible.

Member Walden stated that 149 probably restores another tier because it comes to 1.2 million.

Board agreed to 149.

Member Walden mentioned to Superintendent Stephenson that the .05 number is incorrect. That number was tied to 250, so it would be less at 149. Method of calculation is available. Should be much less.

Member Low asked if change to '65 and over' was to be applied here as well.

President Glasser stated that it is already here.

Mr. Hartenstein stated that 'per year' should be included after the dollar amount so people do not wonder what it is tied to.

Member Walden summarized the addition of the word 'help', the word 'and' between 'deep' and 'unprecedented', the number 9 in stead of the number 2 in the number 142, the words 'per year' after the number, and some number of cents to be calculated.

President Glasser commented that the extra 7 dollars amounts to about 33,000 based on 4500 parcels.

Member Low asked about 'age 65 and over'.

Board agreed.

President Glasser asked about the number of cents to be included.

Superintendent Stephenson was talking with Director Harden about pinning that number down by morning.

Member Walden confirmed that it can be done, that the formula is available, and that it is close to 3 cents. Information is in the email.

Superintendent Stephenson asked Mr. Hardenside if after approval of resolution 2009-10-02 and the changes are made they will be emailed to Superintendent Stephenson. Will call to provide cents per square foot, Mr. Hardenside will update and email, and Superintendent Stephenson will distribute.

President Glasser would like to be included in the email. It has both Superintendent Stephenson and President Glasser's signatures.

President Glasser confirmed that Mr. Hardenside is clear on all changes, except for the cents which will be provided.

Mr. Hartenstein agreed.

Motion by Member Black, seconded by Member Low to approve Parcel Tax Resolution 2009-10-02

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

- E) [CEQA Notice of Exemption - Albany High School Pool and New Classroom Construction](#)
Superintendent Stephenson stated that if only a couple more things are to be accomplished at this meeting and defer the rest, would cover 8E, this item, and need to get a first reading of 9B, the text book.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that this is the district's best advise, after talking with Benson Lee and the city. Do not believe that the pool facility as described to board on the 30th will have significant impact to the neighborhood in terms of

parking, noise, or lights. Upon consultants recommendation to provide community notice of exemption and then move forward.

Member Black asked if the community has had a period of time to review.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that they have 35 days.

President Glasser asked what the risk would be if adopted and then challenged.

Superintendent Stephenson stated would go through the challenge process. If can be addressed expediently, would be one way to address it or could do a negative declaration. This is the beginning of the process.

Member Walden stated if this is not approved, have to do a CEQA.

President Glasser asked if there has been any negative feedback from the neighbors.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that there was one comment from a neighbor that was delivered to the city about some dust during the demolition of the foundation of the pool. Immediately addressed that by watering that area extensively as the demolition continues.

Member Walden stated that it has already been abated so that is not an issue with the current dust.

President Glasser asked for questions or comments from the board or public.

Member Black asked how the public was notified that this negative declaration is up for review.

Superintendent Stephenson stated that it is actually advertised posted at the county office, in the Journal, and any other postings chosen. Usually the libraries and city offices.

Member Walden stated that Mr. Lee is a very thorough person and would not just take anyone's word, would really have thought about whether this exemption applies. Feels confident taking his advise.

President Glasser asked for any additional questions. There were none.

*Motion by Member Walden, seconded by Member Low to approve CEQA Notice of Exemption - Albany High School Pool and New Classroom Construction
The Board was polled and passed unanimously. Members: Member Black, Member Low, Member Walden, and President Glasser voting AYE*

IX. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

B) [Conduct the 1st Reading of the Text - Environment - 6th Edition - For the Albany High School AP Environmental Science Course](#)

Director Hornada stated here to conduct the first reading of the textbook Environment, 6th Edition. Has a copy here if board would like to look at it. For the Albany High School environmental science course which was approved in February 2009. This will be a new course for 2009-10. There was a small committee consisting of the science department chair and two teachers who met and discussed what they were looking for in a text series in order to support this course. They ordered 5 or 6 different qualifying text for review, which were all on the college board's approved list. They also talked with other environmental science teachers and got ideas about beneficial texts for students. They reviewed the text, rated them and all came to consensus on the book Environment, 6th Edition. There is no pilot for this given that this is a new course for 2009-10. Went on display at the district office. There were no significant comments from the public during that time. Recommendation is to conduct the first reading and bring it back for a review and action item at the next board meeting in August. Asked for questions or comments.

Member Low confirmed that this is an AP course.

Director Hornada confirmed.

Member Low confirmed that this text is preparing them for an exam. Asked how long the test has been in existence.

Director Hornada does not know. Would have to find out. Understands that it is just a few years. Wanted to move forward because feel it is important for students to have choices and to do something that is current and relevant to our world today.

Member Black asked if this is a lab course.

Director Hornada believes that it is. Would have to confirm and get back to board.

Member Black asked if there is a separate book for the lab requirement.

Director Hornada stated that there is not. This would be the only text for the course.

President Glasser asked if the text is available in alternative formats.

Director Hornada stated that almost all are.

Member Black asked if there are supplemental materials that come with the text, computer exercises, etc.

Director Hornada stated that most text now have a technology component. Not given that information from the high school. Can bring that information back for

the second reading.

Member Walden stated that the first reading is to ask all the questions and the second reading is to get all the answers.

President Glasser does at some point want to look at electronic versions of text trying to figure out how much is spent per pupil on text versus something like a kindle (??). Something to consider moving forward to include technology and potentially save dollars, if it makes sense.

President Glasser asked for additional questions. There were none.

Member Walden stated conclusion of the first reading and looking forward to second reading.

X. BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

President Glasser brought up Member Low's question about the music program. Asked Superintendent Stephenson to address.

Superintendent Stephenson has a commitment funding letter from the Albany Music Fund. Have been working closely with them and the current music staff, Craig Bryant and Kara Revina in order to establish a fairly comprehensive music program to include, at the elementary level music for all 4th and 5th graders, a choice of choir or instrumental music. That funding will be provided by Albany Music Fund. They are also going to round out, upon the board's acceptance of the funding, a choir class at the middle school, will continue funding Tim Highland's intro to rock and roll. Feel fairly confident can provide music from elementary through the 12th grade. Not as comprehensive as would like, but does restore some level of music at the elementary levels.

Member Low thanked Superintendent Stephenson for the update and President Glasser for remembering the question.

Member Walden suggested thinking carefully about how to talk to parents when they first arrive to school and what type of materials need to come out from the district to make it clear to parents what services they are receiving because of donations and what services were cut. Do not want people to be under the impression that those programs are stable or funded when they are not. Thinking about that opening letter to parents.

Superintendent Stephenson considering a series of both budget presentations and letters to parents and community to really differentiate what true core programs are and what is being supported by the general funded, and what is being enhanced by the community.

Member Walden stated that way the rules work on a parcel tax is that essentially at this moment, with the exception of one item, the parcel tax is out of the board's hands and discussion of the campaign or any kind of effort to support the parcel tax is in the public's hands and when board members are doing that they are acting on their own, so from now on the board itself does not talk about, discuss, or take action.

Member Black stated that the board has an official position.

Member Walden stated that the board officially supports it. Noticed in the language that the argument in favor in the ballot is understood to be an official document from the board and that is the board's campaign statement. Within a week from Friday, by the 14th, must publish, give the county clerk an argument in favor in a certain number of words that explains reasons for each initiative. That document can be signed by all members of the board and is an official communication from the board and that is board's campaign and endorsement. Traditionally that document is also signed by other people in the community who support the issue. The campaign may be looking for others to sign on. Previously that work had been done by the campaign without the board's involvement. Since it really does say that it is an official communication from the board, will have Superintendent Stephenson circulate something for individual review and changes. All will sign. Campaign may have others sign. Wait for a while and then have an opportunity for rebuttal.

Member Low wanted to suggest topic to put on the table for discussion. Barbara Grady had sent idea about communication on Albany Today by an individual board member or board members. Ties in with discussion haven't had yet about kinds of communications coming out from the board, notes, blog, etc. Asked board to consider. Thought since Members Black and Low are already doing some writing, might share some of that with Albany Today but because there have been discussions about communications coming from the whole board that the ones that were put in Albany Today would need to be circulated among all of the members for approval.

Member Walden suggested need for an agenda item about electronic communication and other surrounding issues, including legal issues. Remembers lawyer saying there is a way to have good public outreach, but need to discuss how to do that.

President Glasser stated need to be sure staff has been briefed that because this is a public campaign they can provide information, no district resources for facilities can be used for supporting the measure. Cannot be criticized for using public resources to support the campaign.

Superintendent Stephenson will review at management team meeting and be sure

that there are clear directives to all staff.

President Glasser asked for other items. There were none.

XIII. [ADJOURNMENT](#)

President Glasser adjourned meeting at 10:10 p.m.