



**1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports**

At 7:15 p.m. Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. They were also asked to give brief site reports.

**2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda**

**The quorum was approved with 12 voting members initially present**, and 14 voting members present later in the meeting. 12 voting members are required for a quorum.

**MOTION CARRIED (Huchting/Glimme):** To approve the agenda of the February 9, 2016 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 11 hands, no objections, and 1 abstention.**

**3. Chairperson's Comments**

*Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon*

Simon and Perez reminded the committee members to raise their hands to be recognized by name and speak one at a time.

**4. BSEP Director's Comments**

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP 0841 2014/15 Summary: Budget Item Comparison*

Beery noted that at the last meeting there was a discussion about having a joint meeting or possibly a special meeting that would allow the P&O and the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee/PAC to come together to discuss items of mutual interest. She reported speaking with Pat Saddler, Director of Special Projects & Programs, who is the staff liaison to the PAC and discovered that the P&O's next meeting on February 23<sup>rd</sup> was also the next meeting for the PAC. Saddler will discuss this opportunity with the PAC chairs tomorrow, February 10<sup>th</sup>. Beery stated that one option could be to have the P&O meet a little earlier on the next meeting date, noting that Assistant Superintendent Scuderi would be presenting the first draft of the CSR for next year. After that, the P&O could adjourn to the Board Room where the PAC would be meeting. There could be a joint agenda that would include district priorities and how BSEP, LCAP Supplemental Funds, the General Fund and other sources were striving to meet some of those priorities. There may be some questions about where each resource was heading. Beery asked if that sounded appealing to the committee members. She added that the only hitch would be if the PAC would feel short-changed during their meeting. They do not meet as frequently as the P&O, meeting every month or two. If the PAC does feel that way, Plan B would be to find another date. In response to a question about the size of the PAC, Beery responded that it was similar to the P&O. Simon wondered if it would be more of a presentation meeting than a conversation meeting with a group that large. Beery responded that she thought it could be structured to provide opportunities for conversation. Appel said that she thought that it would be helpful for the chairs from both committees to meet to develop an agenda that would allow discussion of the issues. She noted that the District and the Board would welcome the P&O and the PAC getting together to discuss goals and intentions.

Beery stated that the dates for the upcoming “Community Conversations” have been added to the calendar. (See Google Drive, “Shared with me” for *BSEP Planning and Oversight (P&O) Committee Calendar 2015-16.*)

Beery presented the *Community Conversation and Budget Workshop* invitation/calendar flyers and asked members to take some to hand out. She took them to the BHS Open House on February 4, 2016. Beery asked for a volunteer to take flyers to the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Open House (for Berkeley students who have been in private schools).

Beery stated that every year at this time, the Governor releases details about the California State Budget, including the predicted COLA. That is one of the pieces Karam will use in her calculations, which have been remarkably accurate. Each budget manager will be given their allocation based on Karam's calculations so they can work within the means of the new revenue and any fund balance they have.

Karam stated that they were beginning the process for 2016-17 based on the Governor's budget proposal, which is also revised in May. The COLA was important because the language in the Measure allows the Board to approve any increase in the tax rate based on the COLA. This year the COLA was .47%, which was very little. Last year at this time the proposed COLA was 1.58%. It dipped down to 1.02% by the time of the Governor's May Revise. Karam noted that since the budget was developed based on the 1.58% assumption, she decided not to reduce the revenue because she thought there might be enough leeway. She did not increase it because last year's projection was based on more money than we thought we might get. We were only off by \$32K, and it turned out fine. But this year was going to be a little bit different because the COLA was much smaller. Karam understood that the cost of oil has changed the COLA and noted that a lot of factors went into the calculation. She looked at current year receipts, receipts from prior years and noted that it was complicated. For example, if a tax-exempt organization had not filed their tax exemption early enough, they had to pay their taxes and get a rebate. Typically the rebates were around \$100K. One year we got a lot more revenue, but we then gave back \$229K. There was not a pattern of % increase over periods of time, as a lot of things seem to happen. Karam stated that we get money from the City of Berkeley who collects for a building that was sold to the UC Regents, but the Regents pay the taxes on it that come to about \$80K for the two measures. There are City of Berkeley properties they have leased to for-profit businesses that pay the taxes. BUSD received payments in December apattb







IX



really good one. Van Dusen wanted to know about the profile of the electorate, and Beery responded that they will do a voter sample with demographic variables that reflect the electorate.. It was noted that the measure will be on the same ballot as the presidential election. Huchting noted that she had a concern about renters being affected by the tax increase to landlords.