

**Public Meeting**  
**NEW SHORES SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

Thursday, November 13, 2008

6:30 PM

**LOCATION:**

Conference Rooms: Oak Conference Room  
San Mateo County Office of Education  
101 Twin Dolphin Drive, Redwood City

**A. ROLL CALL – Joseph Foust, Committee Secretary**

Representing Advisory Committee:

Joe Foust, Pete Hughes, Bonnie Wolfe, Lawrence Pon, Doug Crisman, Scott Miron

Representing Belmont-Redwood Shores School District:

Nellie Hungerford, Assistant Superintendent; Joe DiGeronimo, Consultant;

Linda McDaniel, Sandpiper Principal

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Meeting convened at 6:40 PM.
- Minutes of 10/23: Error noted that Dr. Orta-Camilleri was not at meeting. Approved as modified.

**C. MEMBER REPORT/COMMENTS**

- L. Pon met with County Superintendent J. Holbrook. It was noted that the Superintendent and the County Treasurer are only accountable to the public, not to the Supervisors. Three things going on: Eshoo attempting to get some of the bailout; legal counsel hired to possibly file lawsuit to Lehman; and legal counsel investigating filing suit on behalf of the Counties. What we can do: communicate to Mike Murphy, County Counsel; respond to RFP to provide consulting services to county; letter writing campaign to legislature.
- Noted that there is another open Board of Trustees position. Catherine Bonnar has resigned. Applications are due by Friday, 11/14.

**D. PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Dave Parrent: Noted that he has some school name suggestions.

**E. DISTRICT REPORT – Nellie Hungerford, Asst. Superintendent, Bus. Services & Operations**

- Budget Update
  - Working on second interim update to go to Board by mid-December. Ms. Hungerford covered the guidelines for district solvencies and when outside organizations would come in to help. The BRWS District is at risk of being qualified for having County or State to come in to help manage district. The 2008-09 actuals are coming in at ~\$800K over adopted budget, but is currently balanced. The 2009-10 estimate is balanced but only has about \$500k allocated for Special Ed. School force donations are budgeted for \$250K. The 2010-11 budget is showing ~\$200K deficit.
  - Capital budget: Within operating budget, 3% is set aside for continued maintenance. Then there are deferred maintenance fees which are matched by state funds. There are developer fees that cover other capital improvements, currently running about \$24K per year.
  - All sites have been directed to save 10% of electrical costs. Turning off computers and lights are encouraged.
  - Special education budget was noted as having larger percentage of burden to the our district when compared to other districts.

- Update on New School
  - Report from Design Committee Meeting  
Design committee meeting held November 3 to support the November 6 Board meeting. Minutes of Design Committee meeting were distributed. Focus was on prioritizing the buildings for the “add alternates”. Order of priority after the required items: Multi-purpose building, Library, Learning Center, Kindergarten Classroom Buildings.
  - Report from November 6 School Board Meeting  
Also, the need to have a back-up plan just in case the school is not ready to be opened due to weather or severe budget constraints. Back-up plan being considered is to possibly keep Kindergarten at Nesbit and may have to keep a couple of 1<sup>st</sup> grade classes at Nesbit as well.
  - Timeline Update  
All parties are working to the August opening.
  - Timing of Selection of Final Finishes  
District is in discussions with RSCA for approval on color schemes. No delays due to RSCA reviews are expected.
  - Other  
Reported utility hook-up fees were not correct. City fees will be less than \$100K.
- Update on Measure U  
Measure was passed. District can expect ~\$900K per year. The Senior Exemption must be renewed every year. There are 276 seniors in the District which will be notified in advance of this fact.

## **F. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

- Contingency if school does not open August 2009
  - It is clear a contingency plan is necessary. There is pressure to make decisions in December/January so the Board and parents can plan. Additional school brings additional operating expenses.
  - B. Wolfe stated that any thought to not open the school in 2009 should bring a complete re-evaluation of the entire district’s operating budgets. Taxes are already being collected to pay for the school so it is problematic to have empty classrooms sitting there and not having the school open.
  - S. Miron noted that the only plausible reason to post-pone the opening is if it is weather related. Even if it is one grade, we should open the school. If necessary, a mid-year opening should be considered.
  - Crisman noted that reluctance for a mid-year move was based on moving from an established Sandpiper environment. If the situation is coming from an overcrowded Nesbit, then the parents would be more open to it.
  - Dave Parrent noted that you should plan for the opening but if a delay occurs, the teachers and students should go in mass.
  - Sue Ahn-Kim noted that there is a perceived inequity with the new school already, including with possible Kindergarten teachers. There may be a lot of advantages to waiting one year to have a complete school. Mid-year opening was also noted as not desirable.
  - General conclusion is that the school should be opened as soon as it is ready, even if it is a partial opening in January. The plan should be to open in 2009 but if there is a delayed opening, the kids should be grouped in their interim facilities (i.e. Nesbit or Sandpiper) and moved all at once. If delayed, two options for moving: move in

January or wait till August 2010. Either way, District must have facilities plan to accommodate students if there is a delay.

- Boundaries

Crisman attended meeting with Jeni Benilli, Dr. Orta-Camerilli, Andrew Stulbarg, Penny Weaver, and Nellie Hungerford to discuss three options recommended by NSSAC.

Results of demographers assessment are on the District web site and are as follows:

- Scenario 1 - Areas 1-79 to New school: 331 students; areas 80-98 at Sandpiper: 384 students.
- Scenario 2 - Areas 1-79 except 78 to New school: 298 students; areas 80-98 plus 78 at Sandpiper: 417 students.
- Scenario 3 - Areas 1-80 to New school: 362 students; areas 81-98 at Sandpiper: 353 students.

- Fundraising

Meeting with Dr. Orta-Camilleri is scheduled for Nov 21.

- Ground Breaking Ceremony

NSSAC recommends that a ground breaking ceremony be held in January, possibly on weekend of January 10. Hughes suggested the RSCA sponsor the ground breaking ceremony. H. Irwin, D. Crisman, and P. Hughes volunteered to be on sub-committee.

- School Opening Discussion for Timeline Assignments

This issue is more for the Board, not for NSSAC.

- Is there a need for another Community Forum

Board should solicit community input on various issues including school naming, school configuration.

- Process for School Naming

Dave Parrent suggested getting a naming convention based on selling naming rights. Joe DiGeronimo noted that school naming can be contentious. Sandpiper naming was done via suggestions from the community.

## **G. NEW BUSINESS**

- Planned Future Meeting Dates: December 2 - 7:00 PM
- Recommended Future Agenda Items:
  - Fundraising committee report
  - District update
  - Boundaries
  - Groundbreaking sub-committee report

## **H. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM. Next meeting is scheduled for December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 7 PM, (County Office of Education, Pine and Oak Conference Rooms).