

**HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BUDGET COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 28, 2021  
MEETING MINUTES**

A meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School District (COOP) Budget Committee was conducted on Thursday, January 28, 2021 at 6:34 p.m. at the Hollis/Brookline Middle School Library.

Chairman, Darlene Mann, presided:

Members of the Budget Cmte. Present:      Raul Blanche, Vice Chair  
   Matthew Maguire, Secretary  
   David Blinn  
   Tom Enright  
   Brian Rater  
   Lorin Rydstrom  
   Cindy VanCoughnett, School Bd. Rep.

Members of the Budget Cmte. Absent:

Also in Attendance:                              Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator  
   Holly Deurloo Babcock, Chairman, COOP School Board  
   Tom Solon, Vice Chairman, Hollis Brookline COOP School Board  
   Krista Whalen, Hollis Brookline COOP School Board

---

Due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis, and in accordance with Governor Sununu's [Emergency Order #12](#) pursuant to [Executive Order 2020-04](#), this Board is authorized to meet electronically. As stated on the agenda, the meeting was aired live via Zoom (Meeting ID: 971 7060 5597 / Passcode pqi8i0).

Each member participating electronically was asked to state, for the record, where they were, why their attendance in person was not reasonably practical, who, if anyone, was with them, and whether or not they were able to hear the proceedings.

**Cindy VanCoughnett**

Stated she was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, she was alone in the room she was in, and could hear the proceedings.

**Tom Enright**

Stated he was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, he was alone in the room he was in, and could hear the proceedings.

**David Blinn**

Stated he was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, he was alone in the room he was in, and could hear the proceedings.

*The Committee was reminded that all votes would be taken by Roll Call.*

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Mann lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS**

A request was made that the agenda be amended to include discussion of School Board status and Annual Meeting status.

*There being no objection, the agenda was amended as requested.*

**APPOINTMENT OF MEETING OBSERVER**

Chairman Mann appointed Tom Enright to serve as Process Observer.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

COOP Budget Committee ..... December 21, 2020

*The following amendments were offered:*

Page 5, Line 27; replace “is” with “are”

Page 6, Line 1; replace “Plant” with “Plan”, delete “once can see” and insert “is noted” following “items”

Page 6, Line 4; replace “on there” with “in the list”

Page 6, Line 32; replace “are” with “were”

**MOTION BY MEMBER BLANCHE TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED  
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MAGUIRE**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Lorin Rydstrom, Brian Rater, Matthew Maguire, Raul Blanche, Darlene Mann, Cindy VanCoughnett,  
David Blinn, Tom Enright

8

Nay:

0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**PUBLIC INPUT** - None

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

- Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Review – Hollis Education Association (HEA) and Hollis Education Support Staff Association (HESSA)

Tom Solon, Vice Chairman, Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board, thanked all parties involved in what was an entirely remote process. A summary of the monetary changes was provided the Committee (copy attached).

A significant portion of the contract revision is intended to correct language; some put into the last contract on a one-time-only basis and other corrections to clarify current practice.

Under Article V – Staff Evaluation, the current contract has an exceptionally long, articulated process that is not utilized. New language refers to the Professional Growth Master Plan (State-approved), which is also language utilized in the Hollis School District. It moves the evaluation process description outside of the contract to what is essentially a living document (also State approved). Language needing to be preserved for professional rights, etc., remains.

Information concerning the schedule, particularly at the Hollis Brookline Middle School (HBMS) was modified. A new schedule was instituted mid-contract and created conflict with the actual wording around what the periods were called and when the assignments were made. Currently in place to facilitate the existing schedule is a sidebar agreement. That language was incorporated into the contract.

We remain one of the few schools in the State that has effectively a complete in-person education option. This is in large part due to an enormous amount of work done by the Administration and staff to create a process and a comfort level for all. Mr. Solon stated his belief there have been no identified COVID experiences that have been initiated in the school itself. The district has had students and staff affected by COVID, but none tied to transmission occurring in the schools.

Although amicable, negotiations were not entered into from the same perspective. The result is a contract that the School Board believes to be fair to both staff and taxpayers. A one-year contract was not desired by either party; very disruptive to have the contract negotiation process take place and to do it on an annual basis would be both expensive and very cumbersome. The desire was for a multi-year contract; however, the uncertainty of future years made the School Board uncomfortable with making strong monetary commitments. The School Board is quite comfortable that the numbers that have been negotiated represent a good deal for our taxpayers and district.

A significant portion of the staff is at the top step of the current salary table. Those on the top step only receive the COLA adjustments to their salary. That group represents over 1/3 of the staff and over 40% of the salary. The COLA adjustments to the table are important and particularly so to the members of the HEA negotiating team who are all on the top step.

It is a sanbornized contract, which was critical to achieving a three-year contract. It is recognized there are concerns about that process. However, it is believed, if there is a fair negotiation, it is a reasonable expectation that, as is done in the elementary districts, we bind ourselves to the conditions of the contract. Objections have been raised in the past concerning binding future boards to monetary commitments. That is done with many things such as bonds and other types of contracts.

There is concern that things could change in the future and the contract could be seen as too rich. The Budget Committee controls the budget, and if believing the expenditure, in any year, needs to change, it should be addressed through the budget. That gives the Administration the freedom to execute the monetary direction as appropriately as possible within the district.

If instead a total budgetary concern is addressed by not approving raises for staff, you take that control away from the district and the Administration and make our most eligible and, in some cases, valuable staff mobile. That is not in anyone's best interest.

The process did not start out offering a sanbornized contract, but in the end, to get the money values that the School Board was holding tight on and to get an agreement for multiple years, that was a step that was agreed to. The dollar amounts associated with those increases are: \$228,316 in year one, \$294,057 in year two and \$330,369 in year three.

Member Maguire questioned if the figures cited as increases represent the total of all contract changes, e.g., salary, healthcare, and was told the figures include salary, FICA, and New Hampshire Retirement System (NHRS), but do not include the healthcare as that is already built into the budget and is not in any way tied to the actual salary paid.

Chairman Mann remarked there was no negotiated change of the current conditions for healthcare. Therefore, there is no incremental effects due to the contract. The basic Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) is estimated and included in the budget.

Vice Chair Blanche commented costs associated with the NHRS will likely be a variable over the next 3 years. The response was that the rates are the same for the next two years. He asked, assuming costs increase, would a sanbornized contract mean whatever is contained within that number is what it is, and the difference would have to be made up. Chair Mann questioned if the current assumption for NHRS was used to continue into the third year and was told it was. Ms. Seeley stated the budget would have to address whatever increase happens.

Vice Chair Blanche suggested if there is an increase it should have to be addressed by the HEA. Mr. Solon noted the way the law is written, the State dictates a portion to the staff and a portion to the district. Whether sanbornized or not, if in year 3 there is an increase to NHRS, both staff and the district will see an increased contribution.

Chairman Mann commented we also use the current staff to project out three years. There will be changes to that over three years; we will have retirees, attrition, we will bring people in at higher salaries and people at lower salaries. It is the best calculation of what the contract will cost over that 3 years, given the information we have now.

Mr. Solon commented on having looked into whether it was legitimate to speculate into that 3<sup>rd</sup> year. The advice received was that we should not. We can only work with what we know.

Asked, Mr. Solon stated the new rate was known before negotiations began and is included in the total increase identified for year one of the contract (\$228,316). That new rate was also used for the estimates in years 2 and 3. As additional clarification, Chairman Mann stated it is the new rate on the incremental amount, e.g., if an individual moves up a step and experiences an increase in salary, that increased salary amount and the FICA and NHRS increases associated with the increased salary amount are included in the identification of the increase in the contract cost for the first year of the new contract.

Member Rydstrom commented on there being an increase of \$300,000 in NHRS. Mr. Solon stated the budget salary line for FY22 includes the district's contribution to NHRS at the new rate, but at the salaries that the staff is in the current year. What the warrant article will include is the increased salary, the increased federal tax on that increased salary, and the additional NHRS contribution for that increased salary. Member Rydstrom questioned where the \$300,000 comes from between last year's number and the number we are adding back in under the guidance. It was explained it is basically this year's salary level at a higher rate for NHRS.

Asked for additional information on why the healthcare benefit contribution benefits were not addressed, Mr. Solon stated there to have been multiple factors. First and foremost, had we increased the cost portion staff is asked to pay, that would essentially result in a pay cut. However, it would not be a pay cut that would be uniform; depends on what plans they have taken. Looking at who is negotiating, we would be faced with a significantly different demand for pay increase. The second factor is that from an emotional standpoint to start asking them to consider new healthcare costs during the current pandemic was viewed to be a very disruptive process.

Mr. Solon remarked although we all acknowledge that we want to take into consideration ways of reducing healthcare costs across the board, there is a general consensus, at least within the COOP, that we want to take

another cut at options for healthcare in general for the district. At the last meeting of the SAU41 Governing Board he stated the desire for that effort to be done at the SAU level as was done a few years back through the help of the Benefits Working Group.

The amount of money we would have potentially shaved by cost shifting with the ratios, in their estimate, would have been more than offset with demands for increased pay so that people did not go backwards. Again, you are dealing with staff who are at the top of their scale, and the raises that they get in the COLA level, especially the first year of this contract, are not large on any individual basis. The decision was not to make that a sticking point. They looked instead to keep total salary costs as low as possible.

Member Mann reiterated over the 3-year contract it is a 0.75% increase to the table COLA adjustment for year one, which means anyone on the top step of the various lanes only gets the 0.75% increase. The second year is 1.5% and the third year 1.75%. Anyone on the top step gets only those increases. Anyone else receives the step increase as they increase increment through the table. There was a significant compression of what the changes were amongst the staff that was completed by the last contract.

Vice Chair Blanche questioned how salaries compare to comparable districts. Mr. Solon stated there to be old information (not timely filing) and information that comes from those making or considering making moves. We are competitive but remain significantly below the top payers; in some cases, as much as 15-20% below. Many of our competitive districts provide \$0 employee contribution requirements to healthcare for all plans. We only do that for single person plans. We are attracting people, but we are not attracting them based on salary, but on working conditions, logistics and demographics of our school, and the environment created by our Administration. We do not play quite in the same level as the districts that are recruiting heavily, and they tend to be some of the larger districts. As a district falls behind, they resort to high pay to try and attract staff. We try not to get caught up in that game. Within the SAU, it is a little bit of a mixed bag; we do not compete directly with them for most of our staff because of the fact that it is different grade levels, but we try to maintain a certain level of equity between experience in years and credentials.

Vice Chair Blanche questioned if there is an estimate of the number of retirements that will likely occur over the next 3-5 years. Chairman Mann stated a review of the past five years could be conducted. In terms of the FY22 budget, there are no retirees.

Mr. Solon commented in an average year turnover is 2-4. In the early part of the current contract, there was a larger number of retirees. Next year is an unknown because we have not had official notifications. On a national level the changed teaching environment has polarized a lot of communities' staff so that some who have been considering retirement decide to make that move. He believes a lot will hinge on what is predicted for our school environment come September. His personal opinion is seen to be likely there will be a significant amount of remote instruction; you will see a group who may choose to not go that way. Another thing to consider is the way the NHRS system works; it is your last three years of work that determine what you get for your retirement. It plays into those decisions.

Ms. Whalen provided a presentation (copy attached) outlining the details of the tentative Hollis Education Support Staff Association (HESSA) contract. She thanked all who were involved in the successful negotiations.

The Board goals were to arrive at a contract that allows the District to hire qualified staff at competitive wages, to keep insurance caps to allow for budgeting, and discuss cost versus benefit for taxpayers.

Regarding competitive wages, three years ago the District focused on Paraprofessionals as we were struggling with hiring and retaining those positions. One of the issues that has been faced is hiring of custodians. In surrounding districts, they have their own union, and are paid a lot more.

Being proposed is a change to Appendix A and position categories; Custodian would move from category 1 to category 2, Maintenance Worker and Grounds Maintenance Worker from category 2 to category 3 and Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor from category 3 to category 4. Building Maintenance Supervisor and Grounds Maintenance Supervisor positions remain in category 5.

Currently, Brookline pays \$14.99/hour for a starting custodian. The COOP pays \$11.86/hour and Hollis \$11.42/hour. The proposal would provide for an increase in the custodial category of 2% for those on step and 2.5% for those off-step. In year one, a starting custodian would earn \$13.23/hour. For the rest of the table, the proposal calls for a 2% increase for those on-step and a 2.5% increase for off-step in years 2 and 3. The negotiating team looked at a number of ways to try to change this and were held back by the costs. In addition, they got into situations where in years 2 and 3 we would have a number of people on the step earning more than those off the table.

The 2% increase in year one results in an average overall increase of 7% (or \$1.37/hour) (due to custodial category shifts). The on-step cost increase would be \$51,980 and off-step \$47,085 for a total increase in year one of \$99,065. In year 2, the increased cost for on-step is \$42,484 and off-step \$28,039 for a total year 2 increase of \$70,523. In year 3, increased cost for on-step is \$41,178, off step is \$27,549 for a total year 3 increase of \$68,727. The total average increase over the three years of the contract is 5.7%, and the total increased cost for on-step is \$135,642 and off-step \$102,673 for a total increase cost, over the three years of \$238,315.

Regarding insurance, caps remain in place. With the GMR increasing significantly (10.9%), it was felt an increase in the caps was needed. Proposed is an increase of \$50 to the cap for both single and 2-person plans and a \$25 increase for family plans. The total increased cost to the District over the 3 years of the contract would be \$54,000.

A Flexible Spending Account is being offered, which has no financial impact on the District.

Total Warrant amounts (wages and healthcare); year one \$117,065, year two \$88,523, and year three \$86,727 for a total contract cost of \$292,315.

The responsibilities of the Custodian position have increased significantly in the last year. These new responsibilities are anticipated to continue.

Chairman Mann questioned if there was any change to the caps associated with dental coverage and was told there was not.

Vice Chairman Blanche questioned if the contract is sanbornized, and how the proposed salary changes might change if the minimum wage becomes \$15/hour on a national level. Ms. Whalen responded the contract is not sanbornized. Should there be a change in the minimum wage requirements, there would be an impact; however, she is uncertain what the result would be in terms of overall increased cost.

Ms. Deurloo Babcock stated she reviewed the salary table in terms of next year with regard to the \$15 minimum wage scenario. In category 1 of the salary table, it takes 8 steps before reaching the \$15/hour range. Category 2 takes about 6 steps. A change in the national minimum wage to \$15/hour would be a large change in overall salary cost.

Noted was that the proposed changes are moving to \$15/hour by 2025. We do not know what the change in the law would be. There is time to adapt to that.

Vice Chair Blanche suggested efforts be taken to identify an initial estimate of the overall increase to support the discussion of how the district would address a mandatory increase should that occur.

The sentiment expressed by several members of the Committee was that the salary for these positions should be well over \$15/hour before such a change occurs on a national level.

Asked what last year's warrant article amount was, Ms. Whalen stated her recollection it was \$82,000. Mr. Enright remarked, for what has been accomplished, he does not find the proposed costs that onerous.

The Committee expressed appreciation for the negotiations concluding in a timeframe to allow for their review and discussion in advance of the public hearing.

Asked if he had any concern over the loading of the HEA contract on the back end; costs loaded in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year instead of more evenly distributed, Mr. Solon stated it was uniformly high with what the teachers wanted. They were willing to back away further for the current year. The middle year was a compromise. He believes they would have been concerned if they were larger numbers but the difference between the 1.5% and the 1.75% is around \$15,000. The bigger change comes from the fact that there are clumps of people moving up to the top step in that 3<sup>rd</sup> year. They are aware of it, but it was what they could get.

#### - Metrics for Public Hearing

Chairman Mann noted the Committee would take positions on the warrant articles following the Public Hearing. An example was provided of the format that would be used for and the items included in the presentation. Asked if the petition warrant articles would be included in the presentation, Chairman Mann spoke of the requirements for public hearings to be conducted in each of the communities. One of the four petition articles was received/posted in time to be included on the same evening as the public hearing on the budget.

Chairman Mann spoke of substantive changes to revenue from State aid, e.g., elimination of one-time aid funding to Brookline. Last year's tax rate was reduced by those funds. The absence of that revenue in FY22 will result in an increase.

Noted was a significant sum from the Unreserved Fund Balance (UFB), which was returned to the tax base, and is not included in the estimate.

Vice Chairman Blanche suggested including discussion of funding through the CARES Act and other COVID-19 related funding that has been received by the district. Chairman Mann noted those funds have an impact on the current year. Vice Chairman Blanche suggested the Committee be prepared to answer any questions relative to the amount received and how it was utilized. Member Rater suggested that discussion would be most appropriate during the year in review provided by the School Board during the Annual Meeting.

Asked if the language of the article to establish athletics revolving fund is contingent upon passage of the article to discontinue the Athletic Expendable Trust Fund, Ms. Seeley was uncertain. The language in the articles was approved by legal counsel; however, she will look into that.

Member Maguire stated his belief there will be a lot of questions around the costs associated with remote learning. Chairman Mann remarked the only way that can be addressed, in terms of the FY22 budget, is to identify how the Administration anticipates moving forward. From an operating budget perspective, an in-person environment is assumed. Any adaptations that might need to be made would have to occur within the constraints of the approved operating budget.

#### - Annual Meeting Update

Member VanCoughnett stated the School Board is interested in an in-person Annual Meeting. The district is utilizing the current schedule that is in line with a regular meeting on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. However, the anticipation is that date will be moved. The question is whether the new date would be in April (non-renewal of contracts has

to be noticed by April 15<sup>th</sup>) or later. It is hoped the Annual Meeting will be conducted as an in-person outdoor meeting.

There is a Bill in the Senate that would permit the Town and District meetings to occur after March 25<sup>th</sup> date.

Mr. Rydstrom commented on discussions over the potential for a bond issue to address some of the larger maintenance items and questioned if that has been shelved due to COVID. Member VanCoughnett stated it has been discussed, but the hope is to get through this budget season. Another reason for postponing was the belief that Hollis would be looking at a bond article. There is agreement it may be the best way to address all of the issues that have been pushed down the road for some time.

- School Board Updates

Timothy Girzone, Principal, Hollis Brookline Middle School (HBMS), has been named as the Principal of the High School, replacing Rick Barnes. The district is in search of a Principal for the HBMS.

Member Maguire questioned the status of the policy around rental fees for the turf field. Member VanCoughnett stated the policy is being reviewed by legal counsel.

Member Enright questioned what the Hollis School District is doing in terms of a bond article, and was informed, if going forward, it would be to address the property at 4 Lund Lane/SAU Administration. Ms. Kelley stated that is not on the Warrant this year.

- Pending Legislation

Chairman Mann spoke of several Bills currently being considered by the House and referred to Municipal and County Government Committee.

[HB71](#) relative to school district emergency special meetings - the Bill identifies what would not be allowed as a special meeting, e.g., you could not hold a special meeting and consider it an emergency meeting if addressing a warrant article that was voted down at a regular meeting, contract voted down at a regular meeting including a contract modified after the regular meeting or any item in the budget that was not approved at the regular meeting.

[HB415](#) relative to municipal estimates of expenditures and revenues – talks about how information is shared and how draft budgets and revised versions need to be made available in full line-item detail in CVS and PDF format.

[HB454](#) relative to the requirement that certain governing bodies submit recommendations to the budget committee – talks about providing detail and information to the Budget Committee as requested.

Chairman Mann commented she is uncertain what the impetus for HB454 was. She remarked the Administration and School District do a great job providing the COOP Budget Committee with information. She is not sure if that is the case in other districts.

[HB459](#) prohibiting a transfer of funds within an adopted budget to a general ledger line item in such budget that contains an entry of zero dollars.

[HB484](#) relative to budget committee recommendations on warrant articles - prohibits a budget committee from providing a recommendation next to the affected warrant article unless the warrant article includes an appropriation or expenditure.



Vice Chairman Blanche questioned the logic behind restricting a recommendation to warrant articles having financial implications. Chairman Mann suggested the best way to have that question answered is to pose it to the sponsors of the legislation.

[HB374](#) relative to the official ballot referendum form of town meetings - amends the method of adopting official ballot referendum form of meeting. Requires a vote on SB2 to be within established procedures, on a ballot, that would allow for absentee voting at polling places and within the regular polling hours. Based on recent legislation that was passed within the last year or two, the vote on SB2, since it would come at an annual meeting, would be before towns or school districts that have an annual meeting format that the vote has to take place within the annual meeting format and not the ballot. This would change it so that it could be voted on in an official ballot.

Omnibus Bill - Part 4 is a change to RSA 33:8, which is related to bonds and notes. It basically changes the threshold to pass bonds or notes in an SB2 community from a 3/5 majority to a 2/3 majority. Currently passage in an annual meeting format requires a 2/3 majority. The proposed change to RSA 33:8 would change the threshold in an SB2 community to be consistent with that.

As part of the Omnibus Bill, there was capital reserve fund language that would permit paying for lease purchase agreements through capital reserve funds.

[HB623](#) relative to education funding - provides that education grants to municipalities in 2022 and 2023 will not be less than the prior year's grant. This Bill was referred to the House Finance Committee.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** - None

**PROCESS OBSERVER READOUT**

Member Enright commented it was a model meeting. He thanked the Chair for the Zoom component.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MEMBER BLANCHE TO ADJOURN**  
**MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER RATER**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Lorin Rydstrom, Brian Rater, Matthew Maguire, Raul Blanche, Tom Enright,  
Cindy VanCoughnett, David Blinn, Darlene Mann

8

Nay:

0

**MOTION CARRIED**

The January 28, 2021 meeting of the COOP Budget Committee adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## MONETARY CHANGES IN TENTATIVE AGREEMENT FOR 2021-2024

### Article 8

- For school year 2021-2022, the current salary table will be increased by 0.75%, and those employees who are eligible for a step increase will advance one step;

Estimated cost \$228,316

- For school year 2022-2023, the salary table will be increased by 1.5%, and those employees who are eligible for a step increase will advance one step;

Estimate cost \$294,057

- For school year 2023-2024, the salary table will be increased by 1.75%, and those employees who are eligible for a step increase will advance one step.

Estimated cost \$330,369

### Article 10.6 (4) (Teacher Substitute Pay)

- Teachers who substitute for another teacher will be compensated at \$35/hour (\$25/hour in current contract).

Note: There are currently 39.5 of 114.13 FTEs (35%) on the “top step” of the salary table. They represent about 40% of the salaries paid. Ignoring turnover, this will increase to 48.5 (43%) by the third year of the contract with a corresponding increase in the portion of total salaries they receive.

-- These staff members will receive only the COLA adjustments made to the tables as noted above.

# HESSA CONTRACT HIGHLIGHTS

## 2021-2024

# HESSA AND BOARD TEAM

HESSA	COOP BOARD
Ann Robinson – Hessa President	Holly Babcock – Board Chair
Lisa Heney – Para Professional at HBHS	Kate Stoll – Board Member
Lorri Hayes – Uniserv Director NEA-NH	Krista Whalen – Board Member
	Kelly Seeley – SAU Business Director
	Bob Thompson – SAU Assistant Superintendent

# Board Goals

- Contract that allows district to hire qualified staff at competitive wages
- Keep insurance caps to allow budgeting
- Cost vs Benefit for Taxpayers

# CHANGE TO APPENDIX A

- Category 1: Office/Clerical Assistant, Instructional Assistant, Library/Media Assistant, ~~Custodian~~, Food Service Worker
- Category 2: ~~Maintenance Worker~~, Cook, ~~Grounds Maintenance Worker~~, Receptionist , **Custodian**
- Category 3: Para-educator, Special Education Para-educator ,**Grounds Maintenance Worker**, ~~Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor~~, Head Cook, **Maintenance Worker**
- Category 4: Secretary, **Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor**
- Category 5: 504 Para-educator, Building Maintenance Supervisor, Audio Visual Technician, Senior Secretary, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor, Registrar

# Wages

YEAR 1:           Custodial Category Shift with  
                      On step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off step – 2.5% wage increase

YEAR 2:           On Step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off Step – 2.5% wage increase

YEAR 3:           On Step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off Step – 2.5% wage increase

(Custodial category shifts in Year 1 are maintained going forward )

# Wage Breakdown

	<b>Step</b>	<b>Overall</b>				
	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>OnStep</b>	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>OffStep</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Year 1:</b>	2.0%	7.0%	\$51,980	2.5%	\$47,085	<b>\$99,065</b>
<b>Year 2:</b>	2.0%	5.4%	\$42,484	2.5%	\$28,039	<b>\$70,523</b>
<b>Year 3:</b>	2.0%	4.9%	\$41,178	2.5%	\$27,549	<b>\$68,727</b>
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>\$135,642</b>		<b>\$102,673</b>	<b>\$238,315</b>

The 7% increase in Year 1 due to Custodial category shifts



# Insurance Changes and Costs

	<b>Single</b>	<b>2-Person</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>District Cost</b>	<b>GMR</b>	
<b>Year 1:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	10.90%	
<b>Year 2:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	8%	Estimated
<b>Year 3:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	8%	Estimated
				<b>\$54,000</b>		

# Current District and Employee Cost

CURRENT	PREMIUM/MO	DISTRICT COST/MO	EMPLOYEE COST/MO
Single (23)	\$753.79	\$753.79	\$0.00
2 – Person (7)	\$1,507.59	\$1,210.00	\$297.59
Family (0)	\$2,035.24	\$1,260.00	\$775.24

# Contract District Cost & Employee Cost

YEAR 1 - 10.9% GMR	PREMIUM / MO	DISTRICT COST/MO	EMPLOYEE COST/MO
Single (23)	\$836	\$810	\$26
2-Person (7)	\$1,672	\$1,260	\$412
Family (0)	\$2,257	\$1,285	\$972
YEAR 2- 8% increase estimated			
Single	\$903	\$860	\$43
2-Person	\$1,806	\$1,310	\$496
Family	\$2,458	\$1,310	\$1,128
YEAR 3 – 8% increase estimated			
Single	\$975	\$910	\$65
2-Person	\$1,950	\$1,360	\$590
Family	\$2,633	\$1,335	\$1,298

# FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT

The District will create an IRS Section 125 Flexible Spending Account Plan (FSA). These funds may be used to offset medical, dental, childcare or expenses as allowed by law. Employees will be allowed to voluntarily contribute by payroll deduction to Section 125 plan up to the limit allowed.

# TOTAL WARRANT AMOUNTS

	<b>Wages</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Year 1:</b>	\$99,065	\$18,000	<b>\$117,065</b>
<b>Year 2:</b>	\$70,523	\$18,000	<b>\$88,523</b>
<b>Year 3:</b>	\$68,727	\$18,000	<b>\$86,727</b>
	<b>\$238,315</b>	<b>\$54,000</b>	<b>\$292,315</b>

Thank you

Questions?