



## North River Collaborative Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 15, 2020 2:30PM via ZOOM

**Present:** Stephen Donovan, Mike Laliberte, Clarice Doliber, Alan Cron, Liz Legault, John Marcus, Julie Hamilton, Jeff Szymaniak, Patty Oakley, Peter Schafer, Matt Ferron, Christine Godino, Derek Swenson

**Guests:** Felicia Moschella

**I. Call to Order: The Meeting was called to order at 2:30 PM via ZOOM**

**II. Approval of Minutes April 6, 2020**

**Motion:** Derek Swenson made a motion to approve the Board minutes of April 6, 2020. Liz Legault seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote: Alan Cron-yes, Peters Schafer-yes, Liz Legault-yes, Jeff Szymaniak-yes, Patty Oakley-yes, John Marcus-yes, Julie Hamilton-yes, Matt Ferron-yes, Christine Godino-yes, Derek Swenson, yes.

**III. Discussion-Action Items**

**A. The Impact of the Extended Closure on NRC: Steve reviewed several options:**

**Option I- 85% Tuition/ 80% Services/ 90%/50% Transportation**

The first option is a realistic/best case scenario that would result in furloughs of all drivers and monitors and some transportation support staff for the closure period. It assumes that 90% of transportation payments (100% minus 10% for the cost of gas/maintenance) would be received through April 20<sup>th</sup>. After April 20<sup>th</sup>, it assumes that 50% of the transportation payments would be received because of the reduction in cost of the transportation salaries due to the furlough. The positives of this option are that districts would pay less money because of the reduced cost and NRC would come close to remaining whole. A negative would be that meal deliveries may be affected because we would only keep three transportation FTEs on the payroll in order to complete the meal deliveries and to accomplish the administrative tasks that will be required to reopen. In addition, this could have a negative effect on the retention of staff after the furlough which may very well become an issue when school starts up again. The motion in support of Option #1 would be to:

**Approve MOU #1 (which would include a furlough of all drivers and monitors through the end of the closure period) and the furlough of all staff listed from April 21<sup>st</sup> through the end of the closure period.**

**Option II- 85% Tuition/ 80% Services/ 80% Transportation**

The second option is a best-case scenario that would result in no layoffs/furloughs for staff at this time and would allow for all drivers, monitors, and other staff to be paid through the end of the closure period (May 3<sup>rd</sup>). It assumes that 80% of transportation payments (which includes a 10% reduction in the cost due to less gas/maintenance). I am obviously partial to this option because it helps to ensure a continuity of staff so there are no issues with providing services to districts at the end of the closure period; however, it does assume a high percentage of transportation payments will be received. The negatives to this option would be forfeiting the ability to mitigate financial losses incurred by laying off/furloughing drivers/monitors and other staff, and the potential overestimation of the percentage of transportation and service payments to be received which seems unlikely at this point in time unless there was first consensus by the Board (as well as non-member districts) to pay for full transportation costs minus the 10% for the cost of gas/maintenance at least through May 3<sup>rd</sup>. This option would allow the Board the ability to reassess the situation again prior to May 4<sup>th</sup>. The motion in support of Option #2 would be to:

**Approve MOU #2 (which would extend payment to drivers and monitors through May 3rd and extend the continuity of payments for all other staff through May 3rd.**

### **Option III- 85% Tuition/ 80% Services/ 0% Transportation**

The third option is a scenario worse than the prior two options where districts do not pay for any transportation (even for the time that we were paying the drivers and monitors). I don't think this is a realistic scenario; however, I guess it is theoretically possible. One of the main reasons why I think this won't happen is that non-payment would most likely cause a district to not meet their maintenance of effort and potentially cost them money via their federal 240 grant. The same percentages of tuitions and services payments are factored in as well. This scenario is merely added to provide a snapshot as to what would happen if this were to occur and is not really an option to consider as NRC would very well need to consider laying off large amounts of staff.

### **Option IV- Other**

There may be a combination of options that might be considered by the Board

**Motion:** Patty Oakley made a motion to support Option I. Liz Legault seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote: Alan Cron-yes, Peters Schafer-yes, Liz Legault-yes, Jeff Szymaniak-yes, Patty Oakley-yes, John Marcus-yes, Julie Hamilton-yes, Matt Ferron-yes, Christine Godino-yes, Derek Swenson, yes

**Motion:** Peter Schafer made a motion to adjourn. Liz Legault seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote. Alan Cron-yes, Peters Schafer-yes, Liz Legault-yes, Jeff Szymaniak-yes, Patty Oakley-yes, John Marcus-yes, Julie Hamilton-yes, Matt Ferron-yes, Christine Godino-yes, Derek Swenson, yes

**Meeting adjourned at 2:57 PM**

**Respectfully Submitted By:**

---

**Derek Swenson, Board Secretary**