

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25
Tuesday, February 9, 2010
Board Room at the Education Service Center
1:30 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Marianne Donnelly, Chair	John Sargent, Member
Janie Gebhardt, Vice Chair	Jackie Cranor, Member
Frank Rash, Clerk	Mary M. Vagner, Superintendent

A Special Meeting/Work Session of the Board of Trustees of Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25 was held on Tuesday, February 9, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the Board Room at the Education Service Center, 3115 Pole Line Road, Pocatello, Idaho, as provided in Section 33-510, Idaho Code;

Welcome, Call to Order, and Statement of Purpose:

Chair Donnelly welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. All Board members were in attendance. Ms. Donnelly said the Special Meeting was held for the purpose of a Work Session for administration to discuss with the Board the following topics:

- 1) Convene Meeting**
- 2) 2010-11 and 2011-12 District 25 Calendars**
- 3) Special Education Update** – *Specific Learning Disability State Eligibility Criteria and Implementation Timeline; Report on Disproportionality of Race/Ethnicity in Special Education; Native American Support Program*
- 4) Report on Policy 7141 – Teacher Supervision and Evaluation of Certificated and Professional Staff** – *To Hear on First Reading*
- 5) Education Foundation/Festival of Trees Report**
- 6) School Plant Facilities Renewal Levy Update**
- 7) Budget Preparations for 2010-11** – *Legislative Report; Clarification of Governor’s Hold Back; JFAC’s Economic Forecast; Superintendent Luna’s Proposed Budget as Presented to JFAC 1-28-10; PERSI Rate Increase; Health Insurance Cost Forecasting; Professional-Technical Education 10DX Funding Loss and Alternate Programs; Hiring Timeline; Implementation of New Rules; ISBA Day on the Hill*
- 8) Paperless Options to Support the Working of the Board of Trustees**
- 9) Public Comment**
- 10) Adjourn**
- 11) Convene Special Meeting/Executive Session**
- 12) Adjourn Special Meeting/Executive Session**

2010-11 and 2011-12 District 25 Calendars

Dr. Mortensen said the revised calendar included days as detailed in the negotiated agreement. She reviewed the professional development and instructional days. She said all parameters were met. She said there was one small error on the 2010-11 calendar and would be corrected. She said the committee worked hard to make the calendar fit with the trimester schedule. She said the 3 hour early release was to compensate for the extended day. She said there would be two weeks for winter break. Ms. Cranor asked if teachers could use high school graduation day as a no school day. Dr. Mortensen said May 26, 2010 was a contract day but teachers could take a personal day if they needed to. Ms. Vagner noted that a lot of students needed last minute help to catch

up on credits before graduation and it was good for teachers to be available to help students. Dr. Mortensen said the 2011-12 calendar was almost the same as the 2010-11 calendar. She said school started one day earlier than the previous year. She said if at a later time the calendar needed to be refined, administration would make the necessary changes and bring it back to the Board for adoption. Ms. Donnelly said there almost always was conflict with early release days. Dr. Mortensen said the days were necessary to recoup contract time. She said administration worked to schedule elementary early release days around parent teacher conferences to give teachers time to prepare. Ms. Donnelly asked what some preparation challenges were. Dr. Mortensen said the teachers needed time to prepare children for student led conferences and report cards. She said the days helped with those preparations. Ms. Vagner said the corrected calendars would be submitted for Board approval at the February 16, 2010 Regular Board Meeting.

Special Education Update – *Specific Learning Disability State Eligibility Criteria and Implementation Timeline; Report on Disproportionality of Race/Ethnicity in Special Education; Native American Support Program*

Ms. Steenrod said she was providing information on changes directed by the State Department of Education. She said there were previously two methods for identifying students with learning disabilities. She said the two methods were the RTI and Severe Discrepancy methods. She said administration was notified that the two methods would be combined into one method. She said there was an implementation timeline. She said IEP teams could use the two prior methods, but they would also need to use the new process. She said the new process incorporated the RTI method but assessments would also need to be done in psychological processing. She said part of the processing was identifying deficits in any area as assessments were done. She said some deficits included processing, reasoning, and short term memory problems. She said each building needed to submit one test case. She said there was another method for the Alt-assessment plan. She said administration submitted an assessment plan to the SDE on January 18, 2010 and that all buildings must turn in one new assessment and Ms. Steenrod and the school psychologist will review the plans and turn them in to the SDE. She said teams would be very busy reviewing all of the cases. She said any new students suspected of being learning disabled would also have to be assessed according to the new model and submitted to the SDE in May, 2010. She said she would ask for clarification from the state as to whether the correct date was 2010 or 2011. She said the state would allow submission using the old methods from 2010 through 2013. She said administration had requested to be able to use the old methods so as to avoid students nearly ready to graduate from not being eligible according to the new methods. She reviewed the new reports that IEP teams would turn in as well as the new criteria. She said the school psychologists and herself held monthly meetings to ensure that all the school's reports would be turned in by May. She said they would now meet twice a month to review cases as a group and utilize all available expertise to identify a process. She said the SDE was providing webinars and the team would meet with Jackie Hyatt for Q&A on Feb 26, 2010. She said the team came up with their top 20 questions for clarification. She said this would give Ms. Hyatt the opportunity to review questions in advance and prepared to talk about them. Ms. Vagner said the initial impact would affect elementary and middle schools first because 9th grade was exempt this year if students were already qualified. She said any new students coming into the District would be subject to the new criteria. Ms. Steenrod said that was correct. Ms. Vagner said an advantage for the District was already being on board with the RTI model. Ms. Steenrod said the teams were grateful the District was moving in that direction. She said she had met with other District teams that had not started the process and were very concerned about a lack of time to incorporate all of the new requirements. She said District 25 teams had been using interventions and monitoring progress. Ms. Donnelly asked if this was a federal or state requirement. Ms. Steenrod said it was a state requirement. She said it was because the state needed to be able to identify students with a learning disability that matched the federal definition. She said many states were looking to end the use of the severe discrepancy model. Ms. Cranor asked how the process would work utilizing the old criteria for three years. Ms. Steenrod said administration was still waiting on guidance from the state. Ms. Gebhardt asked how many other District's had over identified minority students with learning disabilities. Ms. Steenrod said there were two other Districts in the state besides District 25. The Board noted that District 25s over-identification area was with Native American students. Ms. Donnelly said it sounded like a lot of work but thought it would be a

better process in the end. Ms. Steenrod agreed. Mr. Rash asked if there would be additional costs with the new process. Ms. Steenrod said there were costs associated with the purchase of new materials, additional work for school psychologists and more testing for students. She said several different psychological assessments may also be needed. She referred the Board to the report on disproportionality and noted the report ended up being a lot larger than originally anticipated. She said the report had three sections. She said part of the report included information on Native Americans being overrepresented. She said the state wanted to know how special education had changed since identifying disproportionality. She said administration had taken disproportionality very seriously as evidenced by the number of interventions and the District's Strategic Plan. She said the District had also implemented TIA, RtI, PLCs and Highly Effective Questioning to help students. She said great strides had been made in identifying interventions in Tier 2. She said the implementation of Read 180, Lexia, and Math intervention for Tier 3 had also made a difference. She said a lot of work had gone into identifying the process. She said staff had been added to assist with Tier 2 interventions. She said Tyhee had added a program to help students with attendance issues and that staff members had gone to Fort Hall for parent-teacher trainings. Ms. Cranor asked how the attendance programs were working. Ms. Steenrod said they were having a lot of success and the program included giving prizes to students that were in attendance to motivate them to be there. She said it was a challenge to change a school's culture. She said a lot of training had been done with secondary staff to implement RtI. She said the Whittier trip was very motivational. She said administrators needed technical assistance from the State Department to help students with a second language. She said administrators needed clarification on program requirement and were glad to be having Jackie Hyatt visit with administrators. She said one group was making tremendous strides in meeting expectations. She said administration need clarification on how money could be spent after meeting requirements for two years in a row. Ms. Cranor about the trip to Whittier, CA. Ms. Steenrod said the trip had been taken under the direction of Mr. Devine and said the Whittier District had a defined RtI process. She said there were great interventions, identification, and directed interventions. She said certain programs were required if students met a specific criteria. She said teachers were doing a lot to let students know failure was not an option and additional support was available. She said counselors from each high school and special education staff from the District were in attendance. She said it was a great experience and they learned a lot from the experiences of the Whittier program. She said Mr. Devine had been collecting input from those that attended. Ms. Cranor said she appreciated all of the hard work and effort that had gone into researching the program. Ms. Steenrod thanked her and said she appreciated the support of the Board, Superintendent and the administrative team. She said everyone had been working together very well and provided good feedback and suggestions. Ms. Vagner said she appreciated the efforts of the intervention teams to make the program work and their efforts for individual kids. Mr. Devine introduced Ms. Stevens. He said she had been working with the Native American Support Program for Native American students. Ms. Stevens handed out talking points to the Board and said there was a list of questions that students were asked. She said the program was focused on students that would be "first time" college attendees. She said the program helped to pool resources. She said the Tribe was very interested in increasing college opportunities for Native American students. She part of program included the four C's which were; Courage, Commitment, College and Career. She said students were asked if they were interested in attending college and immediately almost all hands went up. She said the program was built on three principles that created relevancy. She said kids needed to have a vision. She said when students closed their eyes they needed to be able to visualize and administration needed to help them make it relevant. She said students needed to know that their vision was a possibility. She said the third was to demonstrate to students that there was a means to accomplish a vision. She said the Board was welcome to meet with her if they had any questions. She said administration was in the process of getting parent permission and would start adding kids to the program. Ms. Donnelly said it sounded exciting.

Report on Policy 7141 – Teacher Supervision and Evaluation of Certificated and Professional Staff – To Hear on First Reading

Dr. Howell said he would go over the new language in the policy due to new state requirements. He said the proposed changes were minor. He said the state sent a rubric with guidelines that dealt with teacher

evaluation. He said the rubric was based on the Charlotte Danielson's model. He said he compared the state's rubric with the District's rubric and only minor changes were needed. He said one change addressed the need to review the policy annually. He said another change was renaming Titles to read "Building administrators". He said the state wanted to see that administration was being trained on an annual basis. He said verbiage was included in the District policy that addressed "ongoing training". He said the state would entertain Category 1 changes. He said the changes had not been put into law but administration anticipated they would be. He said this was not a major change. He said the language was directed more towards Category 2 teachers who would have a summative evaluation. He said Category 2 teachers did not have tenure or property rights but the District did offer positions back to them if they performed well and there were no internal transfer requests. He said another change was that previously the District used Pathwise, a program that was no longer supported technologically. He said a PDF format had been developed and would serve the District's needs and was a good alternative to Pathwise. He referred the Board to the District summative evaluation instrument. He said a committee had been brought together and suggested that rather than dictate the sections that were evaluated, to give teachers the option to self select categories. He said another proposed change was for the District to extend the summative evaluation to be completed every four years. He said the state allowed for five years, but the committee agreed that four years was a better timeline. He said all teachers would participate in formative evaluation which included goal setting and walk throughs. He said the summative evaluation was based on a minimum of one formal evaluation for Category 2, and two formal evaluations for Category 3. He said the procedures and forms had been removed from District policy so that if slight changes were needed they would be procedural changes. He said the Board would be asked to hear the revised Policy on first reading at the next regular Board meeting. Ms. Donnelly asked if it would be enough for the state to see that administration was working on the changes. Dr. Howell said yes, as long as administration showed what it was working towards and turned it in by February 26, 2010. Ms. Donnelly noted that it did not vary from the process the District currently had in place. Dr. Howell agreed. Ms. Vagner said Instructional Directors had discussed the process and she and Dr. Mortensen would put together a framework and make it a focus next year for administrative staff development.

Education Foundation/Festival of Trees Report

Ms. Allen said last summer the Education Foundation approved expanding its number of Board members to 25. She said so far there were 20 members. She said that Thursday Education Foundation Board members would meet at Ellis Elementary to see teachers using the white boards. She said Board members met to talk about how Festival of Trees money would be spent. She said an Education Foundation Board Retreat was scheduled for March. She said all Festival of Trees expenses had been paid and the Festival would net \$82,988. She said the Board would recommend funds be deposited into an account to be spent as previously designated. She said the Instructional Technology Committee would review applications for white boards. Ms. Cranor asked what the process was. Ms. Allen said it was an application process that went through the Technology Committee. Ms. Vagner said administration would include the information in Mr. Wegner's report at the regular Board meeting. Ms. Allen thanked the hundreds of volunteers that made the event successful.

School Plant Facilities Renewal Levy Update

Ms. Allen said Levy information had been presented to 11 schools and the remainder of schools would receive a presentation before March 8th. She said the Levy informational DVD had been revised and completed. She said presentations had been given to eight community groups. She said Mayor England had supported the levy in his Newsletter. She said the School Plant Facilities Renewal Levy Election was scheduled for March 16, 2010 and emphasized it was a renewal levy and would not increase taxes. She said Ms. Vagner had met with Mayor Blad and the support of community leaders was appreciated. She said administration would continue to give presentations as invited. She said levy facts were posted on the District's website. She said the Board would be asked to approve levy election workers at the February 16, 2010 Regular Board meeting. Ms. Allen showed the completed levy DVD for the Board. The DVD showed

various maintenance projects that were completed over the summer. Mr. Sargent said the DVD was very well done.

Budget Preparations for 2010-11 – Legislative Report; Clarification of Governor’s Hold Back; JFAC’s Economic Forecast; Superintendent Luna’s Proposed Budget as Presented to JFAC 1-28-10; PERSI Rate Increase; Health Insurance Cost Forecasting; Professional-Technical Education 10DX Funding Loss and Alternate Programs; Hiring Timeline; Implementation of New Rules; ISBA Day on the Hill

Ms. Vagner said the first topic was a legislative update with updates from the IASA and ISBA. She said both organizations talked about State Land Board meeting. She said 5 elected officials sat on the Land Board. She said during Superintendent Luna’s budget presentation he suggested the state draw on the land board money to offset reductions that were underway for education. She said there was a great deal of discussion regarding anyone being able to access those funds. She said all of the earnings would have gone to public schools but the fund had been created due to unequal earnings. She said Superintendent Luna suggested taking \$52.8 million from the fund. She said when the fund was established it was agreed that funds could only be used if there were more than 5 years of established earnings available. She said Superintendent Luna was asking for the Land Board to draw down on those funds. Ms. Vagner said Governor Otter did not believe this would happen. She said this had been discussed all week. She said there would be a meeting the next day at 2:00 p.m. to decide. She said she suspected if any funds were drawn down for education it would only be about \$10 million to public education. She said a diagram was included in the packet that explained the use of the reserve fund for public education. She said there were a number of rules that would be covered in the legislative report. She said there was some thought regarding relinquishing graduation requirements but the state did not have the authority to make those changes and they would need to come from the executive branch of the government. She said this would most likely not happen. She said there had been a lot of talk about phasing out the IDLA. She said the IDLA program was very effective and was serving the needs of children across the state. She said Donna Boe wanted to know the number of kids IDLA served and why the District’s numbers were low. Ms. Vagner said District was large and had good programs in place which reflected less usage of IDLA. She said there were a number of kids that were involved in concurrent enrollment classes and the District had flexibility to meet student needs where other Districts may not. Ms. Donnelly said the District still utilized IDLA quite a bit. Ms. Vagner said this was true, but the numbers may not compare with other Districts. Ms. Vagner said there was a posting from IASA that dealt with the Medicaid fund match that needed to be maintained to qualify for funding. She said the funds were approximately 22 % of the District’s revenue and the state required a match. Mr. Reed said the coming year’s budget was a moving target. He referenced the pie chart in the packet. He said last year there was \$1.7 billion dollars for schools which had been reduced by \$130 million this year and could be reduced even more in the future. He said this represented a 7.6% reduction in funding and was a significant loss to schools. Mr. Reed said it would be very difficult to figure out where cuts could be made. He said administration hoped conditions improved but and would keep the Board informed. He said the next attachment was Superintendent Luna’s recommendation for public education. He said the first budget cut proposed was \$135 million for education. He said proposed additional revenues would come from the Land Board Reserve funds. He said there were also two smaller proposed cuts that dealt with Driver’s Ed and Safe and Drug Free Schools money which was about 4.2% of funding. He said if the state was unable to draw on the Land Board Fund that would result in even more cuts to the District. He said last year Superintendent Luna had posted the Top 10 Worst Ideas which had been reduced to 6 this year. He said some of the suggestions on the list related to field trips, salaries, supplies, etc. Mr. Reed noted the District had not needed to use the enrollment backup for the past 4-5 years. He said previously technology and textbooks had separate accounts but it was suspected they would be combined and reduced by 3% to balance the budget. He said there were varying opinions in the legislature. Ms. Vagner said there was a lot of discussion occurring, but there appeared to be two absolutes. She said number one was time would not be reduced, and the second addressed the earmarks in place for textbooks, supply money and ISAT remediation. She said Superintendent Luna was adamant about keeping the earmarks on those budgets. She said his presentation did not allow flexibility to Districts in providing resources. Ms. Vagner said the challenge at the local level was how a District would pay its bills. She said Senator Cameron

would meet with the IASA leadership to discuss presenting other options to JFAC. She said some proposals included no holdbacks this year, but increase the following year's reduction to between 7% and 10%, loosen the rule of 90 to 85, and freeze the salary index next year. She said the District expressed a need for flexibility in budgets and asked JFAC to be considerate of that need and to provide block grants so Trustees could make decisions about what was best for the District and not to have zero flexibility with earmarked funds. Ms. Donnelly said flexibility would help, but Districts were already forced to decide whether to pay the water bill or the light bill and that was before further reductions. Ms. Gebhardt noted that Districts were expected to maintain current programs even though funding support from the state was being removed. Mr. Reed said even though the Governor had called for further holdbacks they would still need approval from the legislature. He said this was looming over the District's head until a decision was made. He said if further holdbacks were ordered some Districts might not be able to pay its bills. He said some Districts did not have the fund balance to maintain open doors with reductions of this size. Ms. Vagner said as the budget was reviewed it was evident that flexibility was critical. She said Districts needed discretion as to how the money was spent. She said this critical issue still needed to be addressed because District's could not do what was expected without flexibility. Ms. Vagner noted there were increased workloads in the Business Office, Special Education, Curriculum and Human Resources departments as well as others and the capacity of what people could do was being stretched to the point of stressful work environments. Mr. Smart said when administration heard about the possibility of additional holdbacks it met to see how the District could cover the shortfall. He said line item budgets were identified to be frozen which were approved by the Board in November in anticipation of holdbacks. He said administration thought the frozen budget amount would be enough to cover the shortfall but ended up not being enough with further budget cuts coming from the state. He said some line items could not be reduced any further. He said administration was working to identify where the money would come from to cover the new cuts. He said administration identified \$1.7 million to fund the shortfalls and was still \$50,000 short. He said the handout included in the packet reviewed the holdback history. He said in the beginning funds had come out of the stabilization fund but when those funds were gone cuts were coming directly out of the District's budget. Ms. Vagner said if the District was subject to a 10% cut the following year that would relate to \$7 million to the District. She said administration was recommending that the Board freeze the next set of identified budget line items at the regular Board Meeting the following Tuesday, realizing the District would still be \$25,000 short of meeting the total holdback amount. Ms. Cranor asked what non-reimbursable activity mileage was. Ms. Vagner said it was activity travel expenses. Mr. Smart said there were challenges ahead and reviewed the budget timeline and said the District needed to prepare for not having the kind of money next year as it had this year. Mr. Smart said an early retirement meeting was scheduled for February 23, 2010. Ms. Cranor asked about ARRA funds. Ms. Vagner said the funds were for a two year time period only and would not be reallocated. She said ARRA funds could not be used to offset the general fund. Mr. Reed said they could only be used for certain programs. Ms. Vagner said there would not be a lot that the District would have to deal with to bring program support back under the general fund. Ms. Donnelly said the funds were pretty much gone for those programs. Ms. Vagner said there was \$33 million left in the state's stabilization fund that had yet to be allocated and was part of what the state would use to offset holdbacks for the current year. She said the funds were still accessible but the concern was the funds were originally intended for year three. Mr. Reed said the initial problem was how it was set up; the state was hopeful of new revenue and growth and used the funding heavily early on and now with the economic picture not looking as bright, the state did not have as much as it originally thought it would. Ms. Vagner said if the funds were used now there would be nothing for the following year. She said several forecast numbers were presented to JFAC, which chose to go lower than the governor's revenue picture. She said there was debate as to how low to go. Mr. Smart said administration received information that the retirement board would increase PERSI rates for July of 2011 which would affect 2011-12 and would be nearly a 1% increase. He said this would most likely end up coming out of the District's budget. He said unemployment rates were going up again. He said the national unemployment rate was 27.5%. He said Idaho's unemployment rate could double. Mr. Reed said that most state's reserve funds across the nation were almost at zero if not depleted. He said it would be a long term turnaround and states would increase rates to make up for the lack of funds. Dr. Howell said the District was trying to balance hiring with its budget. He

said administration had a tentative schedule which would depend largely on what happened with the legislature. He said the timeline was based on current law. Ms. Vagner said the timeline had not been revised since 2008 because the District had been unable to hire. She said the intent was to have 100% staff in place as soon as possible. Mr. Smart said administration was in the process of getting insurance costs. He said the big concern was health insurance. He said the District would have a 2% discount on the following year's premiums because of employee participation in the Regence Health/Wellness program. He said there had been significant changes to the benefits plan and did not want to have to change it further. He said the District needed to balance the benefit and what was affordable. Mr. Reed said administration received notification from the state that two PTE programs would have reduced or no funding the following year. Mr. Reed said most likely more programs will receive reduced funding in the future. He said the governor's budget for PTE was under funded by \$2 million and the state required a certain threshold to receive federal funding and the state might not meet the qualifications. Ms. Vagner said this was a big concern. She said there were a number of rules that needed to be reviewed. She said the first was incorporating new content standards for social studies, health and humanities to keep us on a six year cycle. She said if this many content areas were updated the District would fall behind. She said the second were teacher evaluation changes. She said allowing PTE teachers to add content endorsements in core areas would create a greater blending in core areas but would cost teachers more. She said there were some changes in certification categories from provisional to interim. She said there was another that dealt with speech and language pathologists. She said they were better off being contracted by a District than on a teacher's pay schedule. She said this was due to the state requiring a master's degree in order to be certified. She said the next rule dealt with having a social studies endorsement. She said it was no longer adequate for a teacher to have an endorsement covering government, economics, geography and history and the state would probably require a new Praxis for those teachers. She said teachers with a college degree could go through traditional course work to become HQ or could take a master's course in content area or pass the Praxis. She said the next was a new endorsement required for those that offered online courses. She said the next dealt with the middle school promotion requirement which had been covered in the last meeting. She said other rules dealt with the alignment of private providers for driving instruction that would disallow trainers with multiple driving violations to become Driver's Education teachers. She said the math initiative required all teachers including elementary teachers to take 1 of 3 new mathematical courses and would need to be completed by 2014. She said math coaches would also be required to have an additional endorsement which would cost more time and money. She said the next clarified Special Education rules. She said the Special Ed manual was the official guide and the new rule clarified that. She said the Idaho Content Standards had been changed to the Idaho Achievement Standards. She said the last portion was about the ISBA Day on the Hill agenda and four Board members were planning on attending. She said they would leave in time to register that morning. She said they had 6:00 dinner reservations with its legislators. She said they would meet with the House Education Committee the next morning.

Paperless Options to Support the Working of the Board of Trustees

Ms. Johnson reviewed her research into the cost savings measures of going paperless for all Board and administrative meetings. She said there would be a minimum savings of \$2,500 per year on print and mailing costs if the monthly Work Session and Regular Board Meeting agendas were no longer printed for the Board. Ms. Vagner said if the Board was agreeable administration would look into various netbook and laptop options for the Board and administration to go paperless for all future meetings. The Board agreed this was a good option and directed administration to proceed into looking at electronic options for all future meetings.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at the time of the meeting.

Adjourn

The Board adjourned the Work Session at 3:46 p.m.

Convene Special Meeting/Executive Session

Chair Donnelly called the Special Meeting to order at 3:54 p.m. A motion was made by Ms. Gebhardt and seconded by Mr. Sargent to adjourn to Executive Session. The roll call vote was unanimous in the affirmative; Mr. Rash, aye; Mr. Sargent, aye; Ms. Gebhardt, aye; Ms. Cranor, aye; Ms. Donnelly, aye. The Board adjourned to Executive Session at 3:54 p.m.

Purpose: To Discuss in Accordance with Idaho Code, Section 67-2345(1) (c) To conduct deliberations concerning acquiring an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency;

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bart Reed, Director of Business Operations
Rena Johnson, Board Secretary

Adjourn Special Meeting/Executive Session

A motion was made by Ms. Cranor and seconded by Mr. Sargent to adjourn. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative. The Board adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

BY:

Chair

ATTESTED BY:

Clerk

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Secretary, Board of Trustees