

**Minutes of the
Litchfield Budget Committee Meeting
Held on January 7, 2016**

The Litchfield Budget Committee held a meeting on Thursday, January 7, 2016 at Campbell High School, One Highlander Court, Litchfield, NH 03052.

PRESENT: C Couture (Chair), K Douglas (Vice Chair), B Spencer, R Peeples, C Pascucci, D Vaillancourt, B Bourque (School Board Representative), T Brown (Town Administrator)

Absent: R Keating

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Couture called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

- **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2. PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input.

3. REVIEW/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

Mrs. Couture commented that there was much good debate and discussion at the last meeting. She indicated she would like to make sure everyone gets heard and asked Committee members to wait until the person speaking is finished before commenting.

4. REVIEW/ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

- **December 10, 2015**

The minutes were deferred until the next meeting.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

Mrs. Couture reported the following correspondence was received: tax cap information from the town and legal opinion; warrant articles and default budget from district; information from Mr. Pascucci regarding school budget history vs enrollment; function and object summaries from the district and up to date budget reductions.

Mr. Pascucci commented when reading the tax cap information it does make sense.

Mrs. Couture indicated that it is a percentage tax increase and not a budget increase. She announced the town will hold a public hearing on the tax cap on Monday at 6:45 p.m. at Town Hall. She commented that there was a letter from Mr. Byron regarding the recommended article voting and wording (recommendations) that may be an issue for voters. Mr. Byron noted that procedurally if a motion is to recommend and it fails it brings it back to no recommendation. Mrs. Couture indicated that she researched how the Budget Committee handled it last year and noted that recommendations and voting was recorded the same as this year. She commented that this can be discussed at the end of the meeting. She mentioned that there was a suggestion from

46 Mr. Byron for the Budget Committee to meet with attorneys to hear about the tax cap and what it
47 might mean for the Budget Committee.

48

49 **6. BUDGET REVIEW – SCHOOL DISTRICT**

50 **• Warrant Articles**

51

52 Warrant articles are as follows:

53

54 ***ARTICLE 2 – District-wide Assessment of School Buildings and Systems \$40,000***

55

56 **MOTION:** by Mr. Bourque

57 ***Move to recommend Article 2***

58 **SECOND:** by Mr. Spencer

59

60 Mr. Spencer commented that his experience with most consultants has been that it results in
61 spending more money and when the reports are delivered, nothing is ever done. He indicated it
62 is a waste of money.

63

64 Mr. Bourque commented that he heard the Building Committee say the buildings are a disaster
65 and we never know where we stand with our buildings.

66

67 Mrs. Douglas asked if this would lead to a master plan or inventory. Mr. Bourque commented
68 once the report is received we will know how to break it down.

69

70 Mr. Peebles commented that \$40,000 is not enough money to complete that task.

71

72 Mrs. Douglas commented if the consultant was going to do the assessment and the capital plan,
73 she would support the article.

74

75 Mr. Peebles commented if the money was actually spent on maintenance there would be no need
76 for a consultant or assessment. He asked if the district has contractors that maintain the systems.
77 He added that the maintenance staff should know the buildings well.

78

79 Mr. Markiewicz clarified that the buildings have a custodial staff, but not a maintenance staff.
80 He noted the staff clean the buildings. He indicated the district does not have any certified
81 electricians, plumbers or HVAC technicians on staff.

82

83 Mr. O'Neill acknowledged that \$40,000 is not much to have a direct product. He commented
84 that the district is at a point with buildings that are 60-70 years old and we do not know what the
85 capacity of the systems are. He indicated an analysis of the building systems and envelope is
86 necessary and we have to have someone with technical experience of those systems to do that
87 analysis. Mr. O'Neill noted that he would like to develop a five year capital plan that is solid
88 and accurate and not based on our inexperience. He indicated in order to accomplish that, we
89 have to have an analysis of what the status of our buildings and systems are by people with that
90 type of expertise. Mr. O'Neill commented it is a small amount to pay to get back to the long

91 term plan of the district and is based on the advice of experts. He asked the Budget Committee
92 to consider the request seriously.

93
94 Mr. Byron commented that he has heard this committee tell people in the past ‘if you do not have
95 a plan we do not want to hear it’. The School Board brings a request for a plan and you tell them
96 you do not want the plan; that there are people who maintain the buildings. He indicated that the
97 Budget Committee says they cannot trust the contractors because they want the business. Mr.
98 Byron noted Mr. Bourque is correct when he says you need the analysis in order to develop a
99 plan and get the schools to a point that is appropriate for our children.

100
101 Mr. Vaillancourt asked if this will be a plan.

102
103 Mr. Markiewicz indicated the \$40,000 will provide an analysis of systems – mechanical
104 contractors who do not have a relationship with the district. He commented we do not have a
105 plan, but rather we are reactionary to the extent that we are able to respond to things that happen.
106 He noted we have been able to do the things we have had the money to do, but we do not have
107 experts in the district. Mr. Markiewicz indicated that there are some talented people on staff who
108 can some work, but not to the extent that, for example, a circulator motor needs to be replaced.

109
110 Mr. Vaillancourt asked how the number was determined.

111
112 Mr. O’Neill explained that the Business Administrator contacted some engineers that provided a
113 range of numbers: \$25,000 to \$40,000. He believes the district will receive the most thorough
114 analysis for \$40,000. He indicated one of the approved goals is to develop a five year plan with
115 specific numbers and enable us to budget more efficiently. Mr. O’Neill reported this past
116 weekend we struggled with a boiler issue as we had no one on staff to appraise the system. He
117 noted that the district had to have an independent expert assess the situation. He indicated that
118 after the information was provided to us we questioned whether to pay for a long term program,
119 replace components of the system or patch the boiler. He commented we do not have any
120 information on that system to make a valid decision. Mr. O’Neill indicated the community and
121 district will be well served with a specific report with data on all our mechanical systems.

122
123 Mrs. Couture commented that from a historical point of view, she does not believe that past
124 analyses were not used. She indicated that a number of analyses have been completed for GMS;
125 however, there have been none for LMS or CHS. She noted that the School Board spoke about
126 wanting to have a plan for several years and this is a good start to getting that plan.

127
128 Mrs. Douglas asked if this is something that will be held with the facilities committee. She
129 wanted to know how w ensure follow through. She commented there was a building facilities
130 committee under the previous superintendent. She indicated that she was a member of that
131 committee.

132
133 Mrs. Couture commented that the Budget Committee was supposed to rubber stamp what they
134 were told. She indicated that she did not agree with it as that was not a committee.

135

136 Mrs. Douglas commented that the facilities committee focused on GMS concerned that there is
137 much work to be done and determine how to do that work. She indicated that committee
138 discussed a phasing plan and a logical sequence of the scope of work. She was concerned how
139 the plan would be implemented if there is no maintenance team.

140
141 Mr. O'Neill commented that it has been his experience to look into the community to find
142 expertise that can be utilized. He suggested that it would be healthy to form a committee for the
143 actual design of the capital plan. He indicated that it is necessary to have a discussion to use this
144 information and develop a capital improvement plan with community members, a School Board
145 member and a Budget Committee member.

146
147 Mr. Spencer indicated that has been discussed in the past and it creates a conflict of interest for a
148 Budget Committee member to be on the committee.

149
150 Mr. O'Neill commented that other people in the community with expertise we need can be
151 recruited. He indicated an unbiased view is necessary to bring to the committee and generate the
152 plan. He noted the plan will be implemented while he is Superintendent.

153
154 Referring to the boiler issue, Mr. Peoples commented that it would be a good decision to replace
155 the expansion tank and not the bladder of the boiler. He indicated a predicted maintenance plan
156 costs more than one would think and is almost impossible to implement. He suggested doing
157 some work on the HVAC and regular maintenance.

158
159 **VOTE: 5-3-0**

160 **The motion carried.**

161
162 *Article 2 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 5-3-0.*

163 *Vote: 5-3-0*

164
165 ***ARTICLE 3 – Technology Capital Reserve Fund \$100,000***

166
167 **MOTION:** by Mr. Bourque

168 ***Move to recommend Article 3***

169 **SECOND:** by Mr. Spencer

170
171 Mr. Pascucci asked for examples for which the money would be used.

172
173 Mr. Bourque indicated that the funds can be used for a situation similar to what occurred at GMS
174 with the addition of a storage appliance due to no memory and systems shutting down.

175
176 Mr. Spencer commented that he was under the impression the intent of the reserve fund was to
177 build up the funds and use them for tighter budgeting.

178
179 Mr. Markiewicz concurred with Mr. Spencer. He commented this article is ultimately to support
180 the five year technology plan with the fund. He indicated work on the five year plan is in
181 process.

182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227

Mr. Spencer asked if another article will follow in the coming years. Mr. Markiewicz indicated that is the goal.

Mrs. Douglas commented there was a significant increase in the technology budget this year. She indicated there is not a five year plan at this time and we do not know what that amount could be.

Mr. Markiewicz commented we know it will cost more than \$100,000.

Mrs. Douglas commented that we have not yet asked the voters if this is what they want.

Mr. Spencer indicated we know we will have to replace the technology.

Mrs. Douglas commented we do not know if the voters want to replace laptops or if they want to go in the direction of 1:1 computing as it has not be defined and there is no plan.

Mrs. Couture commented we have over \$100,000 of technology in the three schools and it will eventually fail, which is why a plan is necessary.

Mr. Pascucci asked if we are having a problem funding technology. He commented when technology comes to the Budget Committee, we have always supported that budget.

Mr. Bourque indicated there is a concern that technology is increasing exponentially. He noted that Mr. Spencer suggested this type of article.

Mr. Pascucci commented when money is sitting on the side it is easier to use and for that reason he indicated he would not support the article. He note the other reason is building up the fund creates spikes in the budget. He indicated he would support the technology if included in the budget.

Mr. Bourque commented that we direct the Technology Director to include what he needs in the budget, which will result in a budget of approximately \$750,000.

Mr. Peeples commented he would rather see it in the budget. He indicated if you have a five year plan you can budget that plan. He mentioned that Intel has introduced the Compute Stick, which can be used with just a monitor. He indicated technology prices are falling. He noted he will not support the article.

Mr. O'Neill clarified that the 1:1 computers are purchased by the parents of the students participating in the program.

Mrs. Couture commented that historically we have a good plan that designates what will go in the budget each year, but eventually something happens (i.e. loss in state aid), we cannot fund what is in the budget and we fall behind. She agreed with the idea of a reserve fund as you can implement the plan with that fund.

228
229 Mrs. Douglas commented the reason for the warrant article should be for a five year plan. She
230 noted if approved, the money is guaranteed.

231
232 Mr. Markiewicz commented he could support that if you agree once we have a five year plan that
233 those funds in the article would be appropriated funds.

234
235 Mrs. Douglas commented that her support for it is not for implicit support of the plan itself. She
236 indicated it should be a five year cost plan article.

237
238 Mr. Markiewicz commented that he can support that if the School Board comes next year with a
239 five year plan and it is supported by this committee. He noted it still does not guarantee the
240 funds as it would be the wish of the voters.

241
242 Mrs. Douglas commented if a true five year plan was crafted that people can understand then
243 they would support it because they would know what they are paying for.

244
245 Mr. Spencer commented that we keep talking about a five year plan, but all you can sell is one
246 year. He noted each year will come up separately and be voted on separately.

247
248 Mr. Peebles commented at the rate of technology these days, there is no such thing as a five year
249 plan. He indicated we will need storage, equipment, etc. He was curious to understand what
250 was included in the \$27,000 spent at GMS.

251
252 Mr. Markiewicz clarified that the NH DOE requires school districts to have a five year
253 technology plan.

254
255 Mr. O'Neill commented there is much wisdom on this committee. He indicated it is important to
256 have a vision of where we want to be long term given there will be challenges. He noted a three
257 year plan is a good idea. Mr. O'Neill explained we are saying we would like to suggest having
258 some money available for technology. He indicated we have to bring forth a plan and we
259 understand every year is a new year.

260
261 **VOTE: 5-3-0**

262 **The motion carried.**

263
264 *Article 3 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 5-3-0.*

265
266 **ARTICLE 4 – Special Education Capital Reserve Fund Addition \$100,000**

267
268 **MOTION:** by Mr. Bourque

269 **Move to recommend Article 4**

270 **SECOND:** by Mr. Spencer

271

272 Mr. Spencer asked why it was decided to add \$100,000 to the Special Education Capital Reserve
273 Fund. He asked for the current balance of the fund. Mr. Bourque indicated the balance is
274 approximately \$103,000.

275
276 Mr. O'Neill commented historically the district had to plan for a "what if" situation. He
277 indicated we have a potential placement and if we had a reserve fund with enough money we
278 would be able to pay for that placement without going into the budget. He pointed out the
279 district does not want to over spend the budget because that takes money from the following
280 year's budget. Mr. O'Neill explained that having more money in the reserve fund would allow
281 the district the opportunity to be more restrictive when preparing the budget. He commented he
282 has been doing special education budgets for 18 years and has always believed it is wise to have
283 a buffer in special education for potential placements. He indicated if that money is not used it
284 will be returned. He noted historically Litchfield has returned any funds that were not expended
285 in special education.

286
287 Mr. Spencer does not believe an additional \$100,000 will change the preparation of the special
288 education budget because there is always money that is not spent.

289
290 Mr. Bourque commented with an addition to the reserve fund budgeting will be done differently.

291
292 Mr. Markiewicz commented that the special education budget did have a placeholder for a
293 potential placement, but we would have likely omitted it from the requested budget if we had
294 additional money in the reserve fund. He reminded Committee members that many of the
295 special education budget decisions are not made until the spring when IEP interviews are
296 conducted.

297
298 Mr. Pascucci does not believe that the budgeting practices would change if additional money was
299 included in the reserve fund because the process is working.

300
301 Mr. Bourque indicated it will enable us to prepare a budget that will be reduced to a level where
302 we would not have to return money.

303
304 Mrs. Douglas commented she is not sure there would be a different philosophy if money is added
305 to the fund. She indicated it is not a long term solution because we do not know who will be on
306 the School Board in the future. She commented if it has not been necessary to use the fund there
307 is no need to add money.

308
309 Mr. O'Neill believes if we had \$200,000 in the reserve fund this year the Superintendent would
310 have removed the \$160,000 anticipated placement from the FY17 budget.

311
312 Mrs. Couture commented she would not have stated that \$100,000 was sufficient in the past, but
313 with 20 years of experience dealing with special education [with the exception of one year] there
314 has always been money returned. She indicated she was not sure it is right to change the
315 philosophy at the School Board level. She noted adding \$100,000 is not going to serve the
316 purpose you desire.

317

318 **VOTE: 2-6-0**
319 **The motion failed.**

320
321 *Article 4 was not recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 2-6-0.*

322
323
324 **ARTICLE 5 – Building Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund Addition \$50,000**

325
326 **MOTION:** by Mr. Bourque
327 *Move to recommend Article 5*

328 **SECOND:** by Mr. Spencer

329
330 Mrs. Douglas asked why \$50,000 is being requested to be added to the reserve fund.

331
332 Mr. Markiewicz commented that the district is very reactionary. He indicated that the
333 Superintendent made reference earlier to issues we are experiencing at CHS with the broken
334 boiler, which may cost close to \$50,000. He noted at this point the request is our best guess for
335 catastrophic failure in our systems. Mr. Markiewicz explained the repair to the boiler will be
336 paid out of the general fund until we determine if we need to withdraw money from the reserve
337 fund.

338
339 Mrs. Douglas asked why those funds would not be encumbered with unreserved funds. Mr.
340 Byron indicated the funds cannot be encumbered without a contract. Mr. Markiewicz
341 commented until we receive an estimate we will begin to encumber funds in the general fund.

342
343 Mr. Spencer commended the administration for how the situation is being handled by taking the
344 money out of the general fund. He noted the only time the reserve fund was used was for the
345 LMS fire alarm system.

346
347 Mrs. Couture commented that she supports this type of reserve fund. She suggested switching
348 the order of the articles.

349
350 **VOTE: 8-0-0**
351 **The motion carried.**

352
353 *Article 5 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a unanimous vote of 8-0-0.*

354
355 Mr. O'Neill proposed as we develop our capital plan, we may have years that we will need
356 \$100,000 or \$200,000 in reserves. He posed a philosophical question to the Committee: if they
357 would prefer to have a reserve fund reflective of the capital plan or on operating budget.

358
359

- **Final Votes**

360
361 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas
362 *Move to recommend \$1,216,666 as the bottom line for the FY17 Special Services budget*
363 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409

MOTION: by Mr. Bourque
Move to add \$150,000 to the FY17 Special Services budget for a potential out of district placement

SECOND: by Mr. Byron

Mr. Bourque commented that the motion is in response to the Budget Committee’s comments regarding the Special Education Capital Reserve Fund and the preference of the Committee to keep the money for anticipated placements in the budget.

Mrs. Couture commented that what was said was that the Budget Committee will still take money out based on history, but that the School Board will not change their methodology.

Mrs. Douglas commented the \$150,000 is still in the budget and this would be the same as adding another student.

Mr. Bourque indicated he is adding back what was reduced by the Budget Committee.

Mrs. Douglas commented the Budget Committee did not remove money for a placement, but rather brought the total down to what is likely to be spent.

Mrs. Couture does not believe the School Board should change their philosophy in budgeting for special education. She commented the Budget Committee philosophy is based on history.

**VOTE ON MOTION TO ADD \$150,000 TO THE FY17 SPECIAL SERVICES BUDGET:
6-2-0**

The motion failed.

**VOTE ON THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE FY17 TECHNOLOGY
BUDGET BOTTOM LINE OF \$1,216,666: 6-2-0**

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas
Move to recommend \$121,855 as the bottom line for the FY17 GMS budget

SECOND: by Mr. Peeples

VOTE: 7-1-0

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas
Move to recommend \$102,519 as the bottom line for the FY17 School Board/SAU budget

SECOND: by Mr. Peeples

VOTE: 6-2-0

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

410 *Move to recommend \$57,300 as the bottom line for the FY17 Business/Finance budget*

411 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

412 **VOTE: 7-1-0**

413 **The motion carried.**

414

415 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

416 *Move to recommend \$11,968 as the bottom line for the FY17 HR budget*

417 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

418 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

419 **The motion carried.**

420

421 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

422 *Move to recommend \$239,138 as the bottom line for the FY17 Curriculum Development budget*

423 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

424 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

425 **The motion carried.**

426

427 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

428 *Move to recommend \$436,093 as the bottom line for the FY17 Technology budget*

429 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

430

431 **MOTION:** by Mr. Bourque

432 *Move to add \$100,000 to the FY17 GMS budget*

433 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

434

435 Mr. Bourque indicated the Budget Committee made comments that members will support what is needed in the technology in the budget. He commented the motion will restore the reductions.

436

437 Mr. Peeples commented that he stated he would support the budget if there was a plan.

438

439 **VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADD \$100,000 TO THE FY17 TECHNOLOGY BUDGET:**

440 **2-6-0**

441 **The motion failed.**

442

443 **VOTE ON THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE FY17 TECHNOLOGY BUDGET BOTTOM LINE OF \$436,093: 6-2-0**

444 **The motion carried.**

445

446 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

447 *Move to recommend \$1,291,565 as the bottom line for the FY17 Buildings and Grounds budget*

448 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

449

450 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

451 *Move to recommend \$436,093 as the bottom line for the FY17 Technology budget*

452

456 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

457 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

458 **The motion carried.**

459

460 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

461 *Move to recommend \$138,737 as the bottom line for the FY17 LMS budget*

462 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

463

464 Mrs. Couture mentioned that there was a difference of \$2,290 to the LMS Recommended Budget
465 after the Budget Committee made reductions.

466

467 Mr. Markiewicz indicated the funds were intended to be there and were omitted in error.

468

469 Mrs. Douglas asked if Lego Robotics would still be able to run without this money. Mr.
470 Bourque indicated there would be no funding.

471

472 Mrs. Couture asked if this is the first year of the program. Mr. Markiewicz indicated it would be
473 the first year it was funded through the budget.

474

475 Mr. Lecklider explained that the program has been running with volunteers for a few years. He
476 indicated that registration costs and supplies are increasing and it is becoming more difficult to
477 do.

478

479 Mr. Peeples acknowledged the need and asked if the money is for supplies or a stipend for the
480 advisor. Mr. Markiewicz commented it is the intent of the Board to move this program to a
481 district sponsored program. He indicated it has been funded on donations in the past.

482

483 Mr. Pascucci commented that he is certain it is a great program. He asked why it should be
484 funded through the budget.

485

486 Mr. Bourque indicated that Mr. Lecklider mentioned Lego Robotics is a stepping stone to high
487 school robotics and the program has grown significantly as it has with Destination Imagination at
488 GMS. He commented the School Board would like to see the technology grow.

489

490 Mr. Lecklider commented there are certain competitions that volunteers can put time into. He
491 explained that the program has not been run every year due to the lack of volunteers. He noted
492 he would like to continue to expand the opportunities for the students.

493

494 Mr. Pascucci acknowledged that volunteers are hard to find. He commented it is a great
495 program, but it is the process that is an issue. He indicated people cannot volunteer yet they
496 want the program. Mr. Pascucci believes this should be before the voters.

497

498 Mr. Bourque commented the reason we do not have volunteers is because there is a core of
499 people that volunteer and some many more can volunteer, but do not.

500

501 Mrs. Douglas asked if the money would fully fund the program. Mr. Lecklider indicated it
502 would fund the stipend for the advisor of the program.

503

504 Mr. Spencer commented stipend for co-curricular are set by the teacher salary schedule. He
505 asked why it is being funded separately.

506

507 Mr. O'Neill explained that recently he discussed issues and concerns about raising money with
508 some citizens and more parents are becoming apprehensive about their children raising money.
509 He commented there is a more difficult path to collect the money. He indicated as you develop
510 educational programs there is a saturation point to raising money in the community. Mr. O'Neill
511 believes the district should fully fund the program so that children can have that opportunity and
512 equal access to all the programs the district offers. He noted that STEM is a major program and
513 robotics is a component.

514

515 Mr. Peeples commented that co-curricular has already been decided and funded.

516

517 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

518 **The motion carried.**

519 *(Note: the FY17 LMS budget will not include the requested \$2,290 for Line 1021141000-890).*

520

521 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

522 ***Move to recommend \$494,681 as the bottom line for the FY17 CHS budget***

523 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

524 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

525 **The motion carried.**

526

527 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

528 ***Move to recommend \$519,355 as the bottom line for the FY17 Transportation budget***

529 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

530 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

531 **The motion carried.**

532

533 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

534 ***Move to recommend \$15,727,751 as the bottom line for the FY17 Salaries and Benefits budget***

535 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

536

537 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

538 ***Move to reduce the FY17 Salaries and Benefits budget by \$32,100 to reflect the removal of the***
539 ***salary pool***

540 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

541

542 Mrs. Douglas commented that there was discussion to treat the town and school district the same
543 with respect to salary plans. She indicated her motion is to remove the salary pool from the
544 district as the Budget Committee did with the town wage plan implementation.

545

546 Mr. Bourque commented that the Budget Committee is saying people do not deserve a raise. He
547 indicated the Budget Committee directed the Town to put the wage plan in a warrant article, but
548 then you do not support the article.

549
550 Mrs. Douglas commented the School Board should put the salary increases in a warrant article.

551
552 Mr. Pascucci commented that some people may deserve a raise. He indicated there are people in
553 this town that can afford the increase in taxes and those that cannot. He noted you are
554 representing the people you work with, but this Committee needs to represent everyone.

555
556 Mr. Spencer commented he was going to suggest the same reduction.

557
558 Mr. O'Neill commented that he understands Mr. Pascucci's argument. He asked the Budget
559 Committee to understand that he believes the public school system is a major asset. He indicated
560 in order for districts to remain excellent they have to remain competitive. He noted as we
561 become less competitive in compensation the result will be a loss of capacity to attract the best
562 people.

563
564 Mrs. Couture explained this compensation has been in the budget for at least 15 years. She
565 commented that the School Board developed schedules for administrators and for non-union
566 positions. She indicated everyone is saying that the school district and the town should be the
567 same [with regard to raises and increases]; however, the town added a pay scale, whereas, the
568 schedules for school district administrators and non-union employees have been in existence for
569 15 years.

570
571 Mrs. Douglas believes the HR Director already stated the increase for non-union employees is
572 included in the budget. She commented that the Superintendent provided a good summary. She
573 indicated the school district used the same argument as the town and the Budget Committee
574 stood by the reduction. She noted if the Budget Committee is to be consistent both the town and
575 school district budget need to be supported or the reductions to both need to be supported.

576
577 Mr. Bourque commented the Budget Committee is saying that both the town and school district
578 employees do not deserve increases.

579
580 Mr. Spencer commented that the Budget Committee is not saying we do not agree, but simply to
581 put it in a warrant article.

582
583 Mr. Pascucci commented that employees can unionize if necessary. He indicated he consistently
584 hears that districts and towns have to be competitive. He noted people for the most part are not
585 getting raises.

586
587 Mrs. Couture commented these are two different situations. She noted that we draw from
588 surrounding towns. She indicated we cannot say we do not give raises because we do not want
589 the town next to us to give raises. Mrs. Couture commented we do not want a union because it
590 costs more.

591

592 Mr. Peebles commented that the Budget Committee has been accused of not being consistent by
593 Mr. Byron in the minutes. He indicated voting in favor makes it consistent across the board.

594
595 Mr. Markiewicz commented that it seems the district is being somewhat punished because it
596 adopted a plan that is consistent and that has been in use for some time. He indicated that the
597 schedule is used in recruitment as well. He noted putting it in a warrant article cannot be
598 supported because it take away our ability to attract good administrators and we cannot find that
599 money in the budget.

600
601 Mrs. Douglas commented when we were reviewing the budget the HR Director stated that 3%
602 increase was added. She indicated that she summed all the non-union salary expenses and the
603 increase is well over \$300,000 in which the \$32,000 would be included.

604
605 Mr. Markiewicz indicated that the \$32,000 is not included as it is a pool for administrators only.

606
607 **VOTE TO REDUCE \$32,100 FROM THE FY17 SALARIES AND BENEFITS BUDGET:**
608 **4-4-0**

609 **The motion failed.**

610
611 Mr. Spencer commented that the Budget Committee does not have the correct numbers for the
612 Superintendent's salary.

613
614 Mr. Markiewicz reported that the Superintendent has been in negotiations to extend his contract
615 through 2017 and we do not yet have the specifics. He assured the Budget Committee that the
616 numbers that are per diem would be almost the same number that has been budgeted. He
617 indicated there was a question of health insurance, which the position does not include, but he
618 offered to check with the HR Director.

619
620 Mr. Spencer commented that he would like to see the 'work up' on the Superintendent's salary.
621 He indicated that the health insurance line in the SAU Administration line increased by \$12,000,
622 which has the appearance of being budgeted for the Superintendent position.

623
624 Mr. O'Neill commented that a specific number cannot be provided at this time. He indicated the
625 Budget Committee can choose to reduce some of it, but it is good accounting to budget the full
626 amount for the position.

627
628 Mr. Markiewicz indicated once negotiations are ratified between the School Board and the
629 Superintendent the information will be provided for the Budget Committee.

630
631 **MOTION:** by Mr. Markiewicz
632 ***Move to reduce Line 1090232000-211 by \$12,621***

633 **SECOND:** by Mrs. Douglas

634
635 Mr. Bourque asked what will happen if the increase you are reducing is found not to belong to
636 the Superintendent' health insurance. Mrs. Couture indicated it can be added back.

637

638 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

639 **The motion carried.**

640

641 Mrs. Douglas believes the retirement line should be reduced as well, but she does not have the
642 rates. Mr. Markiewicz indicated that information can be provided to the Chair.

643

644 **VOTE ON THE REVISED BOTTOM LINE OF \$15,715,130 FOR THE FY17 SALARIES**
645 **AND BENEFITS BUDGET: 4-4-0**

646 **The motion failed.**

647

648 **MOTION:** by Mr. Pascucci

649 *Move to recommend a bottom line of \$15,715,130 for the FY17 Salaries and Benefits budget*
650 *subject to changes after the budget hearing*

651 **SECOND:** Mr. Spencer

652 **VOTE: 3-4-1**

653 **The motion failed**

654

655 **MOTION:** by Mr. Spencer

656 *Move to reduce Line 1000290000-110 by \$30,000*

657 **SECOND:** by Mrs. Douglas

658 **VOTE: 5-3-0**

659 **The motion carried.**

660

661 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

662 *Move to recommend a revised bottom line of \$15,685,130 for the FY17 Salaries and Benefits*
663 *budget*

664 **SECOND:** Mr. Peeples

665 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

666 **The motion carried.**

667

668 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

669 *Move to recommend a bottom line of \$353,872 for the FY17 Food Services budget*

670 **SECOND:** Mr. Peeples

671 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

672 **The motion carried.**

673

674 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

675 *Move to recommend a bottom line of \$253,976 for the FY17 Food Services Salaries and*
676 *Benefits budget*

677 **SECOND:** Mr. Peeples

678 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

679 **The motion carried.**

680

681 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

682 *Move to recommend the bottom line of \$21,445,770 for the FY17 budget for the Litchfield*
683 *School District*

684 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

685 **VOTE: 6-2-0**

686 **The motion carried.**

687

688 Deliverables to the Budget Committee include information on the Lego Robotics/Destination
689 Imagination budget number; the Superintendent's contract for 2017; retirement amount budgeted
690 in the SAU Administration budget lines.

691

692 **7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS/OLD BUSINESS**

693 Mrs. Couture announced that Mr. Byron has concerns regarding the recommendations and non-
694 recommendations of warrant articles. She commented that his concern is that the wording is
695 conflicting with the votes. She indicated that the Budget Committee has always recorded the
696 recommendations and non-recommendations the same way. She noted that people see the
697 numbers as how many people supported the article (the first number), how many did not (second
698 number), and how many abstained (last number).

699

700 Mr. Byron indicated the RSA states all votes of the body shall be recorded subject to the votes
701 and shall be printed. He observed that the Budget Committee votes are not being listed. He
702 explained you need to have an affirmative vote to state the position of the Budget Committee.

703

704 Mr. Spencer noted the School Board lists the tallies the same way as does the Budget Committee.

705

706 Mr. Byron commented you took a vote and it failed which means you have no position. He
707 noted you did not vote not to recommend.

708

709 Mrs. Douglas commented people are accustomed to the way we list the tallies and believes we
710 should not confuse them.

711

712 **MOTION:** by Mr. Byron

713 *Move for the Chair to call the NHMA regarding the Budget Committee's position on the*
714 *warrant recommendations*

715 **SECOND:** by Mr. Bourque

716

717 Mr. Pascucci commented that he is comfortable with the way the recommendations and tallies
718 are listed.

719

720 Mr. Spencer asked if it follows that the Budget Committee must vote not to recommend after
721 taking a vote to recommend something.

722

723 Mr. Byron clarified that the Budget Committee needs to have an affirmative position to show if
724 they recommend or do not recommend.

725

726 **VOTE: 3-4-1**

727 **The motion failed.**

728 Vote: 3-4-1 fails

729

730 Mrs. Couture reminded the Committee the Budget Hearing is next Thursday at 7:00 p.m. She
731 indicated the Town budget will be presented first and then the School District budget. She
732 offered to prepare the presentation and send out a draft for Committee member feedback.
733

734 Mr. Bourque was concerned that there is not always a full committee when considering the
735 budgets. He suggested reviewing the budgets on a Saturday or Sunday.
736

737 Mr. Peeples commented you will need to have the administration present that will deliver all the
738 answers to our questions.
739

740 Mr. Pascucci commented that it is not the obligation of the Budget Committee to ensure all
741 members are present.
742

743 Mrs. Couture indicated this is determined in the spring and members who miss meetings cannot
744 be foreseen.
745

746 Mr. Peeples thanked Mrs. Couture for the meeting calendar.
747

748 Mr. Bourque commented some of the votes from Tuesday night and tonight would have had a
749 different outcome with a full committee.
750

751 Mrs. Couture indicated there is further opportunity at the budget hearing and at Deliberative
752 Session.
753

754 Mr. Bourque complimented the school district for reducing six meetings out of the budget review
755 process and complimented the town and School Board on presenting more streamlined budgets.
756

757 Mr. Peeples agreed that the budgets were better as there was more information and less
758 resistance with questions being answered.
759

760 **8. PUBLIC INPUT**

761 There was no public input.
762

763 **9. ADJOURN**

764 **MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas

765 *Move to adjourn*

766 **SECOND:** by Mr. Peeples

767 **VOTE: 8-0-0**

768 **The motion carried.**
769

770 The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.
771

772 **Next Meeting:** Thursday, January 7, 2016
773

774 **Recorded by: Michele E. Flynn, Recording Secretary**