

MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION
BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
Special Meeting, April 8, 2008

MINUTES

The Board of School Trustees of the Monroe County Community School Corporation met in a special meeting at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 2008, in the Board Room at the Administration Center, 315 E. North Drive, Bloomington.

Board members present:

Teresa Grossi	President
Jeannine Butler	Vice President
Valerie Merriam	Secretary
Sue Wanzer	Assistant Secretary
Susan Daniels	Member
Lois Sabo-Skelton	Member
Jim Muehling	Member

Also present:

James Harvey	Superintendent of Schools
Tim Thrasher	Comptroller
Mike Scherer	Director of Extended Services
Mike Clark	Director of Transportation
Janet Tupper	Administrative Assistant
Mercedes Rodriquez	Reporter, <i>The Herald-Times</i>

In addition to the above, 28 individuals signed the visitor list (which is included as a part of the official record of this meeting).

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

President of the Board, Teresa Grossi, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. She noted that this meeting was scheduled to consider awarding contracts for bus routes.

2. **CONTRACT BUS ROUTE BIDS**

Mr. Scherer recommended that that Board award contracts for the following bus routes:

175 – Doug Hobbs	138 – Connie Freeman
124 – Sharon Chandler	134 – Gerald Freeman
174 – Regina Cobb	192 – Tony Mullis
144 – Mary VanDeventer	194 – Courtney Mullis
183 – Jim Ryan	151 – Kathy Smith
153 – Paul Richardson	196 – Christine Chandler
133 – Andrew Chandler	165 – Kathe Anderson
125 – Polly Shields	

Mr. Scherer further recommended that the Board reject and re-bid routes 197, 126, 135, 186, 177, 142, 191, 167, 179, 182, 187, 189, 193, 152, 127, 143, 171, 176 and 188.

Dr. Butler moved approval of the award and reject/re-bid of contract bus routes as recommended. Ms. Daniels seconded the motion.

Mr. Scherer reviewed the supporting documents provided to the Board, noting the several ways that

award of bids could have been determined. He referred to the financial analysis and explained the reason for recommending that a 'cap' be established for routes that are re-bid. He said the fuel escalation was based on current prices; if fuel goes up or down it will adjust accordingly. He said if current bids as received (none are re-bid) were accepted, the 2008 budget shortfall would be \$175,177. He noted that the routes to be re-bid were printed in red.

Explaining how bids were analyzed, Mr. Scherer said in addition to the computer-selected bid lists each bid was reviewed by driver name and they kept track of first, second and third low bidders. He said fixed costs such as fuel, insurance, taxes, license plates, depreciation costs, bus payment (if any), etc. must be considered when computing the mileage rate for any route, whether long or short.

Mr. Scherer responded to questions from Board members and confirmed that two bids on the list were under the recommended cap. He said the May 1 deadline for awarding bids does not apply because the bids that were received are significantly over budget. Mr. Harvey noted that even with caps, we will have a budget shortfall. He suggested that perhaps all bids should be rejected. He explained that the state cut off state support for transportation and he must ask where we will come up with \$250,000 in 2009. He said it is not a shortfall in terms of the budget but in terms of being able to pay these bids. He said if we re-bid we do not know if they will come in lower or higher.

In response to a question posed by Ms. Daniels, Mr. Thrasher explained that borrowing is possible when there is a cash flow problem created because of the way we receive money from the county. However, here we are talking about budget shortfall where we do not have revenue to pay the cost of these bids. He said there is no leeway to borrow money for this purpose. He said the state will not approve appropriations and the state controls what the tax levy can be.

Mr. Scherer responded to questions about the differences in bids received. He said we made it clear they can start this second-year contract with a 14-year-old bus and if they choose to extend routes for one or two more years they would have to have a 14-year-old or newer bus to start (cannot run routes with a 16-year-old bus).

In response to Dr. Butler's questions, Mr. Scherer said bids would stay the same for a two-year extension. His recommendation is a two-year contract with one or two-year extension option at the Board's discretion because at the end of two years the Board could choose to re-bid.

Ms. Wanzer said she was not sure that everyone was clear they were bidding on a two-year contract; she thinks some were bidding on a four-year contract not knowing what the Board would do. Mr. Scherer believes that the specifications were clear. Mr. Harvey said they did talk about four-year contracts but the feedback they had was that because of student mobility the maximum we could go is three years. He said going four years puts the corporation and drivers at a disadvantage. He said he talked with people at Bloomfield and they have all contract routes awarded for six-years, but they do not have students moving around that we do. He said part of what was done in redefining routes was to try to make them as efficient as possible. He confirmed that a three percent increase will not cover their costs or our costs. Dr. Grossi asked if we can re-bid for a two or three-year contract. Mr. Harvey said two years are guaranteed and at the Board's option the contracts could be for three years or maybe four years; therefore, the bidder must bid potentially for four years. Regarding the age of buses, Mr. Harvey said the General Assembly just changed the school bus replacement plan to permit 12-year-old buses instead of ten.

During ensuing discussion Mr. Muehling noted that fuel costs are covered with the contract although it is hard to predict four years out. He said in the future if caps are set, perhaps they should be set at the outset. Mr. Scherer said additional fuel costs for January and February were around \$4,000-\$5,000 and over \$5,000 for March. He said that cost will be at about \$11,000 for April. Mr. Muehling asked if some bus

routes could be cut. Ms. Wanzer said perhaps some city routes could be eliminated or walk-in distances could be lengthened.

Ms. Wanzer asked how long it would take to negotiate 19 routes. Mr. Scherer estimated that it would take 20 to 30 hours to negotiate. In response to Dr. Grossi's questions, he said we have four bidders more than the number of routes; therefore, four bidders will not get a route. He said that is why he does not want to negotiate, i.e. he may be negotiating with someone who was fourth lowest bidder. In response to Dr. Butler's question, Mr. Scherer explained the negotiation would be for a price per day; we create information about where we feel the route should be and they bring in information. He said we would negotiate only with bidders who bid that route. Mr. Harvey added that if routes are negotiated, bidders cannot change and bid on a route now but if routes are re-bid everyone can submit a bid. Dr. Butler asked how typical it is that we have more bidders than routes. Mr. Scherer said that did not happen on the last two contracts and the last time the corporation had to pick up two routes.

Ms. Merriam asked in the last few years did contracts leave us in a shortfall situation or is it due to fuel escalation. Mr. Harvey said the calendar was changed in 2006 and that was the biggest expense because buses ran 187 days instead of 180. Ms. Merriam asked how we can accept contracts when we know it will put us in a deficit. Mr. Thrasher said we would have to reduce in other areas of the transportation fund, such as field trips, athletic trips, defer buses and maintenance, change length of transportation area, etc.

Ms. Merriam asked if this budget includes funds to comply with the McKinney-Vento Act. Mr. Harvey said those costs are charged to the transportation fund but not to contract drivers. He explained that even if a child lives in or is in a foster home in another county, if s/he qualifies under the provisions of this law we must transport her/him and we use corporation-owned vehicles for this purpose. Ms. Merriam recalled that several years ago we asked athletic departments to pay their fair share of transportation costs. Mr. Harvey said they pay one-half the cost of the driver. Ms. Wanzer questioned whether we should consider asking teams or schools to pay transportation costs for athletic trips. Mr. Harvey said principals have indicated that additional participation fees would have to be assessed for this purpose. Ms. Wanzer voiced concern about that option because some students would be left out. Ms. Merriam said we have been told to expect athletic bus expenses; parents have seen that coming.

Noting these were great ideas, Dr. Grossi guided discussion back to contract bus route bids. In response to Mr. Muehling's question, Mr. Scherer said we cannot use bus replacement funds for maintenance. In response to Ms. Merriam's question, Mr. Scherer said it would be fine with him if a friendly amendment to the motion was made to accept the two bids that fall below the suggested cap.

Dr. Grossi opened the meeting for comments from the public, noting the procedure is to hold comments to three minutes in order to give everyone an opportunity to speak.

Betty Mullis and Lori Snoddy, contract drivers for more than 30 years and 10 years respectively, came forward together and noted that other drivers had indicated they could use their three minutes so that they would have more time to comment.

Ms. Snoddy said '24 drivers voted on this and we would be willing to drive for the cap'. She said if there are some drivers who do not want to accept the cap then the administration could negotiate or re-bid those five or six routes. Ms. Mullis noted that some people were within \$3.00 to \$5.00 of the cap. She said they cannot get financing for a new or fairly new bus on a two-year contract and they were told to bid as a four-year route. She said if the corporation bus has problems they pick them up and do not charge. She said they know kids and neighborhoods and their parents feel they have someone watching over their children. She said if people are willing to go to the cap, she thinks they should get the route. She said they were told they are bidding a four-year contract and always before there were negotiations.

Mr. Muehling asked if they were suggesting if there is an empty route that the administration go to the low bidder and ask them to accept the cap. They said yes and if the low bidder will not accept it for the cap then it would be re-bid. In response to Dr. Grossi's comment, Ms. Mullis understood that four bidders did not get assigned a route because the computer did not accept their bids on any routes. Ms. Snoddy mentioned that new buses cost \$54,000 in 2003 and her payment was \$1300 per month. She said now a new bus costs \$84,000 and that is important to know when considering bids.

Matt Floyd, contract bus driver, said the computer assigned him to route 165 at \$349.90 and he could come down but if 15 routes are awarded and the others re-bid he would not have that option. He said that he is willing to negotiate but cannot drive that route for the cap. He added that if the Board accepts bids on 15 routes and rejects 19 routes he cannot afford to negotiate on some of the other routes.

Donna Ooley said she has been a contract driver for 18 years and has driven a bus for a total of 35 years. She noted that Kathe Anderson's bid is the highest on the sheet but she is lower on other routes. Ms. Merriam noted however that her bid is the lowest on route 165 while others are substantially higher.

Ms. Merriam said she appreciates the time that Mr. Scherer spent talking with her. She said the more she listened she has to ask how can we accept any bids that will cause a shortfall and with no money to pay for it. She said we cannot do that with teachers' contracts and asked where we will get the money. Mr. Scherer said he has not computed the shortfall if the Board decides to accept the bids that are below cap. During ensuing discussion it was determined that bids for routes 127 and 167 are below cap.

Dr. Grossi asked what options are available. She said she agrees with Ms. Merriam but noted that we must run routes and she would have to look at the administration and ask what will be cut since we have to get kids to school. She asked for summary comments.

Mr. Muehling noted that we have the lowest bids accepted by the computer and we could go to each of those bidders and say this is the cap and we will pay no more. He said if they accept, okay; if not, then it goes back for re-bid and they know the cap. Ms. Wanzer said another option is to negotiate what is left over. Mr. Muehling asked who you will negotiate with; you are opening back to the bid option. He said if re-bid they know the cap and it should be a simple process. Ms. Wanzer noted that there will always be four people who will not get a route and that seems unfair. Mr. Muehling said although the cap is \$258, a bid may come in at \$261.

Dr. Grossi said she understands a desire make sure all bidders were included; however, four people will be left out and she felt that had been decided by the original process and rules established. Mr. Muehling suggested that others also over-bid and this is a new process now.

Mr. Harvey said to some extent the discussion was back to Ms. Merriam's question. He said he respected comments shared but if the Board accepted the proposal from the bus drivers they are in fact negotiating. He suggested that the Board either reject all bids or none. He said if the recommendation is approved the Board would still have awarded 15 bids that we cannot afford. He advised that the Board should open negotiations to all bidders or none.

Dr. Butler understood that the Board should either negotiate or re-bid. Dr. Grossi asked if the Board was saying re-bid all 34 routes. Ms. Wanzer suggested that the Board award bids as recommended and accept the two bids that are under cap and negotiate with low bidders for the other 17 routes. During ensuing discussion, Mr. Scherer responded that to keep us at budget, we would have to reduce all 34 routes by \$5,000 to \$6,000 per year.

Ms. Daniels reviewed bids on a few of the routes, for example she noted that the cap for route 175 is \$242 but \$242 was the bid recommended so that is the cap. She noted other caps that were more for fewer miles driven and said it seemed the cap should be set by the school system and not by the bidding process. She proposed the Board set the caps and everybody could bid knowing those caps. In response to a question, she said she was suggesting that caps be set for every route. She said she understood the principle but that is not how people were asked to bid. She referred back to the question about how we will pay the bills.

Ms. Merriam said she would have trouble going back on our proposal to the bus drivers. Ms. Wanzer asked if Ms. Daniels was saying reject all bids because some were high and then start over with caps. Dr. Butler understood Ms. Daniels was suggesting set a cap and re-bid all and if the bid is lower than the cap that person would get the route but a bid over the cap would not be accepted. Ms. Daniels confirmed that was her suggestion. She said we cannot let drivers create a cap for some routes and the corporation creates caps for others. She suggested that this would establish a maximum for the budget and would be a more acceptable and fair way to award bids. She noted that now someone would be getting \$24 per day more for less than one more mile. Dr. Grossi noted that about all the contracts and bids she submits to the state (for her job) have parameters. Ms. Daniels agreed that they set the parameters but the Board did not set these for everybody. Ms. Wanzer said the idea was to set the parameters only for those that bid too high. Ms. Daniels said but by what calculations; is it the same formula.

Ms. Wanzer noted that we started the bid process by asking for the lowest bid but some were not low enough. She felt that rejecting and re-bidding all routes would be changing the rules. Ms. Daniels said but we are giving them a cap.

During ensuing discussion, Mr. Muehling explained that the process is applied on a computer program and the lowest working bid was selected. He said some of these bids are way too high according to Transportation and they are saying cap if we are going to re-bid. He said his idea is to accept the acceptable bids and then negotiate with those that were deemed the lowest; if they do not accept then re-bid and open the new bid to all. Dr. Grossi asked how that would work if she was assigned to route 100 because she was the lowest bid but she would prefer another route. Mr. Muehling said the question would be whether to go to the next lowest or open to re-bid; he suggested that it goes back to re-bid and anybody could bid on it. He suggested that in the future we need to look at caps at the front end of the process. He understands that all routes are not the same; for example, some have more stops, more hills, etc. and we cannot expect to receive bids for the same per mile/per day cost.

Ms. Wanzer said she agreed with Mr. Muehling. Mr. Muehling said he believes his suggestion works within the process, although he agreed this is after the process and caps should have been set going in. Dr. Butler said she thought this was a fair suggestion and she would like to say that caps will be set when the routes are re-bid. Ms. Merriam said if there are that many who are willing to negotiate for the cap it should not be that time consuming to do so. Mr. Muehling said he would like to hear from Mr. Scherer and Mr. Clark as to whether his suggestion is workable.

Mr. Scherer said he thinks from a cost standpoint it would be better to re-bid rather than negotiate for the cap amount because many of the bids would probably come in under the cap. However, he said it is a competitive process from day one and either way is acceptable. He said just offering the cap locks us into the deficit and if we do that we are accepting that deficit. He said if a cap of \$280 is set, we will not accept over that but will consider those under it; the low bidder established the cap.

Mr. Harvey explained that simply because you are involved in the bidding process you get the lowest bidder but you are not obligated to take it if you cannot afford it. He said we always have a right to accept or reject. He cited the example of building a new Fairview and said if the bids for Fairview come in \$2 million over budget, we will not accept the bids. He said Mr. Scherer was trying to honor the Board's

wishes but the reality is that we cannot afford the cap.

Dr. Butler said in reality we have two choices – no buses or provide buses. She said if we provide buses – corporation or contract – we are going to run a deficit. Dr. Grossi said part of the question is how much in the red to we want to run it. Dr. Butler said she is concerned about fairness when we do not set caps for others. She said it is too late to go back and set caps but on the other hand she thinks that re-bidding 19 routes with caps creates a problem with fairness. Ms. Merriam said if we set caps on everything would we go to those who were to be given the route and ask them to accept the cap. Dr. Butler said to be fair she thinks we would have to re-bid all routes. Mr. Harvey said that is an option or all routes could be negotiated.

In response to Dr. Grossi's question, Mr. Harvey said if the Board rejected bids but instructed the administration to negotiate, negotiations would take place with everybody that bid on that route. He noted that all routes are too expensive in that the process did not produce low enough bids. He said the Board could instruct the administration to negotiate with all people in hopes to get closer to budget. Dr. Grossi said the reality is if we go to one driver and negotiate a route then we have fewer drivers to negotiate on each route.

Ms. Wanzer pointed out that nothing is totally fair. She said she would like to accept 15 bids and ask the others to drive for the cap. Ms. Merriam said she would want to make it a two-year contract. Dr. Grossi noted that it is a two-year contract unless the Board extends it.

There was a call for the vote on the motion to accept the recommendation. Aye: None. Nay: Butler, Daniels, Grossi, Merriam, Muehling, Sabo-Skelton, Wanzer. Motion failed to carry.

Mr. Muehling moved that the Board accept those bids deemed to be the lowest and acceptable, 15 routes, and on the other 19 routes the deemed lowest but unacceptable bidder would be given an option of accepting or rejecting the cap price. If not accepted, the route would be re-bid. Ms. Wanzer seconded the motion.

During ensuing discussion, Mr. Muehling explained that the rejected routes deemed unacceptable still have low bidders but they are too high. His suggestion is that we go to that lowest bidder as deemed by the computer and ask them to accept the cap price. If rejected, the route would be open for re-bid.

Regarding timeliness for making decisions, Mr. Harvey said the administration will need to know which routes will be rejected by the April 15 meeting and it would still be May 20 to re-bid. In response to Ms. Wanzer's question, Mr. Harvey said you would negotiate only with the lower bidder and if that person said no, the route would be re-bid. Mr. Muehling confirmed that was the motion. He said the computer deems one person to be the low bidder. Ms. Wanzer asked if we should go to the next person. Dr. Grossi invited public comment regarding the motion now under consideration.

Ms. Mullis and Mr. Floyd asked questions for clarification. D. L. Hollingsworth said if the administration was going to negotiate with people on a certain route, if the lowest bidder does not want it but he is the next bidder, he may want to negotiate on that route. He suggested that if there are three other people who are bidders and if the lowest bidder does not want it, then they should have a chance. He thinks if he bid on a route he should have an opportunity to negotiate and asked if he could do that. Mr. Muehling said the low bidder on every route would have a chance to negotiate. He explained that some of the low bidders were too high and a cap has been established so now the administration goes to the person who is the low bidder and negotiates. He agreed that it is not a perfect process but every route has a low bidder.

Ms. Snoddy used route 188 as an example and asked if Mr. Hollingsworth were the lowest bidder on that

route and he refused the cap, would the cap be offered to the next one and so on. Dr. Grossi said the motion is that it would be up for re-bid if not accepted by the lowest bidder. Ms. Merriam noted that sometimes the true low bidder is not the one highlighted (on the sheet provided) because the computer program does the best combination.

Julie Hollingsworth asked why there could not be an amendment made and involve the same people who placed bids instead of throwing it out if not accepted by the low bidder. She asked why not negotiate with all bidders who bid on that route. Mr. Muehling explained that every route has been assigned to the lowest bidder in this process as per the computer but some of the bids are too high and the lowest by the computer would be given an opportunity to accept a cap. He said people already low enough have their routes. He said she was advocating a process up for re-bid because there may be four people and why cannot they be given an opportunity to negotiate. He said if she is the lowest bidder, she would be given an opportunity to accept the cap. He said if she says 'no' then it is up for re-bid.

Matt Floyd mentioned that Kathe Anderson is placed on route 165 and Mary VanDeventer would be the next person on 142 but she is the low bidder on 144. He said Dan Blake would be the next low bidder but he will be negotiated with on route 197. Dr. Grossi said the motion is to look at routes that are open and the lowest bid as deemed by the computer. Mr. Floyd said there would not be anyone to negotiate with on route 142.

Dr. Butler said she understands the concerns expressed by drivers. She said it seems the Board either has to accept the motion on the floor or throw out all bids and re-bid. She said she did not think we want to do that but it is a difficult process.

Julie Hawkins said she has been driving for 18 years. She said she did not think it is fair to put caps on the remainder of the routes. She said they knew there were more bidders than routes. She said it would take less time to negotiate with all 34 bidders and ask them to come down a certain amount per day; she thinks most would come down on their bid. She suggested this be done by taking the first 34 from the computer list and asking all to reduce their bids. She said they bid for four years instead of two. She said she has an older bus but thought it would be easier for the Board to negotiate.

Gerald Freeman said he has been through many of these over 31 years. He said it is not a perfect scenario but he thinks what Jim Muehling suggested makes sense. He said he bid and he had a copy of the specifications and he will honor his bid. He said he was placed on route 134 and he does not feel it would be fair to say that he would have to go back and negotiate. He said they had specifications to go by and they honored that. He said he did not bid with the idea to negotiate; he bid the best that he could and he was prepared to do that. He said that is what he does, but to say he will have to come back and negotiate again does not seem fair. Mr. Freeman said he just wanted the Board to realize that down through the years we have had too many bidders and sometimes there are not enough bidders. He said he has friends that may not get a bus route but down through the years he has seen people get a bid because of ten cents. He surmised that this seems to be the best way to go. Mr. Freeman expressed his respect for Board members and said they (drivers) need to look at what they were given to work with; he said the downfall is that there are 34 routes and 38 bidders and four people will not get a route. He suggested that in the future we need to look at establishing more routes, knowing that competition is what bidding is all about. He said some routes have more mileage and some roads may be gravel. He said another consideration is how far a driver has to go to start a route. He said when he considers these things he bids on that and he will honor his commitment, but he does not want to negotiate for what he did right.

Christine Chandler said she has been driving for 12 years and she agrees with the motion. She said when drivers bid these routes they bid it for what they think they can run them and that is the bidding process. She said she does not think she should have to negotiate when she met the conditions of the bidding

process and the cap.

Karen Cain, a driver for 15 years, said she currently has a bus and for her to bid was a hard decision. She said at the last minute she decided to bid because her bus will be good for three more years. She said it was her decision and it is fair. She said everybody else made their bid – sometimes she helped and sometimes she needed help. She asked the Board to take into consideration that contract drivers work hard for the corporation and she hopes the Board will realize what they are going through.

Betty Mullis said she did not get a route but she is okay with that. She said she did not think her bid was out of line. She said when you bid you know there is a possibility you may not get a route. She said the 15 people who already have routes got them because they bid low and they should not have to negotiate for less than that amount. She agreed with Mr. Muehling's recommendation.

Mickey Duncan said she has driven for 33 years and she has never had to negotiate or re-bid but she would come down to the cap.

Julie Hollingsworth said she bid \$320 for a route that is 119.2 miles. She said she currently receives \$2.46 per mile for fuel and she would have to bid over the cap to meet expenses.

Tony Mullis said he is one of the 15 (route 192) and he bid for \$239, which he thinks is more than fair. He said he agreed with the motion to approve awarding 15 routes and work with the others. He clarified that bus drivers are considered to be part-time contractors but he has often spent four to five hours per day working on his bus in addition to running the route.

Mr. Muehling reiterated that although the process is not perfect, from his perspective it seems appropriate to award the 15 low bids and then give an opportunity for low bidders on the other 19 routes.

Ms. Wanzer thanked everybody who contacted Board members. She said those who contacted her were very decent and helpful. She expressed appreciation to the drivers who came forward.

Dr. Grossi said this process has probably been the most gut wrenching except for realignment. She understands that this is the drivers' livelihood. She agreed that all were pleasant and yet it is impossible to not take some of this personally. She admitted that she had lost sleep thinking of numbers and possibilities. On behalf of the Board she thanked the drivers for their time and commitment and for coming to the meeting.

Ms. Daniels expressed appreciation that the Board allowed her to veer as she struggled to be fair to everyone.

Ms. Merriam asked for clarification that the motion is to accept the 15 bids according to the 'Contract Route Assignments' sheet dated April 4, 2008 which includes route 165 given to Kathe Anderson whereas Matt Floyd is listed on another sheet. Dr. Grossi said yes, Matt will have an opportunity to re-bid those routes that are not accepted. Ms. Merriam said she did not want people going away thinking they are guaranteed a route. Other Board members discussed and confirmed Ms. Merriam's summarization. Dr. Butler said she was concerned for all of the drivers. She said she had known many of them in many ways. She said she agrees that they are often lifelines for parents and kids and she has struggled with this. She said this is a difficult decision and she has not been on the Board long enough to have gone through this before. She said she thinks the motion on the floor is the fairest the Board can come up with at this point in time. She agreed that there should be caps next time and people can bid based on that information. She said we did not do that this time and this is the next best thing.

Dr. Sabo-Skelton thanked Board members; she said it is difficult but one thing we must remember and keep in mind is gasoline prices. She thanked drivers for coming and indicated that she appreciates that parents trust their drivers as they hold our children's lives in their hands. She wanted to make sure the drivers know that they are appreciated. She acknowledged that the gas situation continues to be a stressful situation and said we will do the very best we can to keep things going as fairly as we can. She said this motion is as efficient as it can be. She asked drivers to please be patient as we work through these problems.

Clarifying the motion prior to polling, Dr. Grossi said the motion is to award bids to the 15 routes as recommended plus those bids under cap now if those drivers have not already been assigned a route. She said on the other routes the deemed lowest but unacceptable bidder would be given an option of accepting or rejecting the cap price. If not accepted, the route would be re-bid.

Aye: Butler, Daniels, Grossi, Merriam, Muehling, Sabo-Skelton, Wanzer. Motion carried.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, Dr. Grossi declared the meeting to be adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Teresa Grossi, President

Jeannine Butler, Vice President

Valerie Merriam, Secretary

Susan P. Wanzer, Assistant Secretary

Susan Daniels, Member

Lois Sabo-Skelton, Member

Jim Muehling, Member