

School Administrative District No. 53

293 Hartland Avenue Pittsfield, ME 04967

(207) 487-5107

Fax: (207) 487-6310

Burnham

Detroit

Pittsfield

Excellence in Education

Michael A. Gallagher
Superintendent of Schools

Board of Directors

Minutes

4/12/10

Members in attendance: R. Downs, B. Basford, R. Basford, P. Williams, M. Wintle, P. Snow, J. Bradshaw, M. Hodgins, J. Laux, B. Poirier, B. Baldwin and Superintendent Gallagher

Item 1. Call to Order. R. Downs called the board to order at 7:02 P.M.

Item 2. Adjustments to the Agenda. One adjustment was made to conduct New Business prior to Old Business.

Item 3. Presentation and consideration of transportation to Hinckley School day program. Superintendent Gallagher distributed a spreadsheet including the current provision for transportation that is provided by Cyr Bus via a minivan at a cost of \$1.75 per mile, 136 miles per day including an additional cost of \$99 for an ed. tech., for a total cost of \$337.00 per day. This, times 175 school days, equals \$58,975.00 for transportation for two students to the Hinckley School annually. He then explained that Administrator of Special Services, Stacy Shorey, worked with the Hinckley School to determine if they could do the transportation at a lesser rate, and negotiated a \$300.00 per day cost which would be an annual total of \$52,500.00. Superintendent Gallagher explained that he had a conversation with board chair, R. Downs, and R. Downs indicated that he felt that an RFP for transportation services could be issued locally and that someone may wish to do the transportation as a part time job. Since the RFP had not been issued and no bids had been submitted, it is unknown what the annual cost for this service would be under this plan.

Superintendent Gallagher then reviewed an idea whereby the district purchase a minivan for this transportation. The cost of the minivan would be approximately \$17,000.00 for a two year old van, registration of \$1,000.00, insurance of \$500.00, and maintenance of \$500.00 per year, plus a driver and an ed. tech. I at a cost of approximately \$15,000.00 for a total annual cost of \$34,000.00 in the first year. He then explained that currently a district employee contracts with the district to run the lunch minivan at a cost of

\$7,922.74 per year. If the district were to purchase a minivan the district would then only have to hire an employee to complete the food distribution in the district and gain an additional savings of \$4,363.00. At the bottom of the spreadsheet it showed cost savings with the district minivan for transportation to Hinckley and use for the lunch van compared to option one, transportation provided by Cyr Bus, option two, transportation provided by the Hinckley School, or option three, an RFP for transportation services to Hinckley. The cost savings for option one would be \$24,975.00 annually plus a cost savings of \$4,363.00 for the lunch van for a one year total savings of \$29,338.27. The estimated savings in year two would be \$46,338.00 since the district wouldn't need to purchase another van in the second year. In option two, transportation to Hinckley would be a savings of \$18,500.00 plus the additional savings for the lunch van of \$4,363.00, for a year one savings of \$22,863.27. The estimated savings in year two would be approximately \$39,863.00. No gas pricing was included since under the Cyr Bus scenario gas would be in addition to the annual cost, as it would be or could be under each of the other ideas.

Chair Downs asked whether this was a recommendation; Superintendent Gallagher recommended that the district purchase a minivan for the purpose of transporting students to and from the Hinckley School. J. Laux moved the recommendation, it was seconded by P. Williams, and the board began a discussion of the motion.

Chair Downs indicated that he felt that the RFP offered an option to the local community to bid on transporting students under a contract with the district. J. Laux indicated that contracting for transportation could lead to difficulties i.e. upkeep of the vehicle, control of employees etc. With the district purchase of a van and hiring our own employees, he felt there was more control. Superintendent Gallagher went on to further explain that the transportation in the past has been covered under state agency client billing and was not a district expense; however, there are no state agency clients who are attending Hinckley School at this time. Therefore, all transportation is at district expense. Mrs. Shorey was asked if this would be a short or long term arrangement. Mrs. Shorey indicated that for at least one of the students, it would likely be long term. J. Laux asked whether or not we would be responsible for students as they get into the high school, to which Mrs. Shorey responded that we still would be responsible for their transportation. Mrs. Basford asked what would happen if a student was sick during the day; Mrs. Shorey indicated that the parents would go to get the child if they were ill at the Hinckley School.

Chair Downs then called for a vote. The board voted 10 in the affirmative, one opposed, P. Williams.

Item 4. Old Business. Superintendent Gallagher distributed a budget summary page with estimated revenues and expenditures. He indicated that the expenditure budget for FY '11 was located under the 2010-11 column as the first bolded item, an amount of \$9,921,948.03. This is \$255,000.00 less than the current fiscal year budget, yet even though it is lower than the previous year, local assessments would increase to support the \$9.9 million expenditure budget.

Superintendent Gallagher then distributed another spreadsheet that showed the targeted amount to achieve a 4% or less increase to the local education assessment. The target was \$139,612.97. Ideas for reductions included items reviewed at the last board meeting, with the addition of \$30,000.00 in tuition reductions, and the minivan reduction of \$29,338.00. It was quickly pointed out that the minivan reduction would not occur in the first year since the cost for the district to run the minivan would be \$34,000.00, and the district budget for transportation to Hinckley was only budgeted at \$35,000.00; therefore, savings would be limited to \$1,000.00.

In reviewing the cost reduction ideas, Superintendent Gallagher also indicated that for a cost of \$18,375.00 the district could have two after school buses traveling a total of 100 miles per day for three days per week for 35 weeks of the school year, and for \$16,000.00 the district could purchase math text books at the grades 3, 4, 5 level. Both of these additions were discussed at the last board meeting. With the additional reduction of tuition funds of \$30,000.00 and some combination of library ed. tech. I and library ed. tech. III reductions, it was possible to achieve a budget that only required a 4% or less increase to the local education assessment. Superintendent Gallagher then recommended the board adopt a budget not to exceed a 4% increase to the local education assessment over the amount raised for the 2009-10 fiscal year budget. A motion was made by B. Poirier, seconded by J. Laux.

A discussion then occurred regarding the additional costs added to the expenditure budget that were listed on the spreadsheet, and at the same time attempting to reduce taxes to an amount below the 4% increase that was previously targeted by the board. It was noted that the 4% target was arbitrary and that it could be lower than 4%. M. Hodgins indicated that it would make sense for the board to disagree now with any of the reduction or additional cost ideas so that when it came time for the board to adopt a budget at the May 3rd meeting, there would be no last minute changes. Chair Downs agreed and asked if any of the board members had any issues with any of the recommendations provided. B. Basford indicated that her only concern was that the board still needed to negotiate one new collective bargaining agreement with the support unit that includes ed. techs. and custodians. Chair Downs indicated that the negotiations would be a separate issue for which the board would need to address. He then asked Superintendent Gallagher if he needed to have a budget total determined at the meeting. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that he did not need a bottom line dollar amount; however, in preparation of the warrants he wanted to make sure that it would be reflective of a budget that would be no greater than 4% increase to the local educational assessment. Chair Downs indicated that there would not need to be a motion, since the board has already directed Superintendent Gallagher to have a budget that did not exceed and increase of 4% to the local education assessments. Therefore, B. Poirier and J. Laux withdrew their motion and second, and no vote was taken.

Chair Downs asked the board if it was ready to enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing the labor contract proposal between MSAD #53 Education Association and the MSAD #53 Board of Directors pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. § 405 (6) (d). A motion was made by P. Williams, seconded by B. Poirier, and the board voted

unanimously to go into Executive Session at 7:46 P.M. The board re-entered public session at 7:59 P.M.

Item 6. Consideration of approval of Collective Bargaining Agreement between the MSAD #53 Education Association and the MSAD #53 Board of Directors. On a motion by J. Laux, seconded by P. Williams, the board voted unanimously to approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement proposal for a two year contract with the MSAD #53 Education Association.

Item 7. Adjournment. On a motion by B. Poirier, seconded by M. Hodgins, the board voted unanimously to adjourn at 8:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Gallagher