

**CinMinutes of the
Litchfield Budget Committee Meeting
Held on December 22, 2016**

The Litchfield Budget Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, December 22, 2016 at Campbell High School, One Highlander Court, Litchfield, NH 03052.

PRESENT: C Couture (Chair), K Douglas (Vice Chair), C Pascucci, R Keating, Jen Bourque, A Cutter, D Miller, B Bourque (School Board Representative), J O'Neill (Superintendent), F Markiewicz (Business Administrator)

Absent: K Bourque (Selectmen's Representative)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Couture called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

● **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2. PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input.

3. REVIEW/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions to the agenda.

4. REVIEW/ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

● **December 8, 2016**

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

Move to approve the minutes of December 8, 2016

SECOND: by Mr. Pascucci

VOTE: 4-0-3

The motion carried.

● **December 15, 2016**

The December 15 minutes were deferred to the next meeting.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

Mrs. Couture reported the following correspondence was received object and function accounts for FY18 showing current balances after BC changes; FY18 School District Default budget; FY18 School District Projected Revenues; FY18 School District Warrant Articles; an article from Mr. Cutter for HLN; a letter from Betty Vaughn asking the Budget Committee to support school district budget.

6. SCHOOL BUDGET

Mr. Cutter provided a presentation of his views on conference, travel and salaries and benefits accounts in the district budgets. He compared information regarding these accounts from 2013 to

present. He commented that the Budget Committee has looked at attrition in the past. Mr. Cutter indicated that there are changes in the budget that are not planned for and the Budget Committee should consider an attrition reduction to help better align the operating budget to what is reasonable for taxpayers to afford. He commented that he supports the technology plan, but there is a large delta between the operating budget and the default budget. He added he would like to see the operating budget approved by the voters.

- **Final Votes**

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 110-260, Salaries and Benefits, by \$300,000

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mrs. Couture asked about the percentage of the reduction and how Mr. Cutter arrived at the amount.

Mr. Cutter indicated the average underspend is \$520,000 and there are always funds in those accounts.

Mrs. Bourque asked for the District's response.

Mr. O'Neill commented looking at the actuals over the last four years, it is evident there is a delta. He indicated the Budget Committee has already reduced the budget by \$226,000. He noted he cannot logically argue with an underspend of \$300,000 or more each year.

Mr. Cutter commented the starting point for FY18 was \$21,134,413 and \$224,110 was reduced. He indicated assuming we make an attrition reduction of \$300,000, \$25,000 in travel and conferences, and add the \$106,000 placement for Special Services, the proposed budget total would be \$20,691,303, which is a difference of \$144,315 over the default budget (\$20,546,988).

Mr. Markiewicz indicated last year the unassigned fund balance was \$328,000. He commented of that total we transferred \$100,000 to the Capital Reserve funds and returned \$228,000 to offset taxes.

Mr. Cutter commented that his purpose is to get the budget approved.

Mr. Pascucci commented that Mr. Cutter's analysis makes sense, but he needs to know why anyone believes this reduction should not happen.

Mr. O'Neill commented that the district budgeted within the Special Services budget according to the current situation. He indicated that they brought forth a placement in the amount of \$106,000. He noted in this community any and all special education funds remaining are returned to the taxpayers.

Mrs. Izbicki commented the concern is that as you continue to go through the budget there will be more reductions.

Mr. Pascucci commented we need to go with what is logical.

Mrs. Couture indicated that she likes the broad reduction approach and believes a 1% reduction is reasonable.

VOTE: 7-1-0

The motion carried.

Mr. Cutter noted the reduction should be applied to the 110 through 260 Object Accounts.

LEA Contract

Mrs. Izbicki reported the School Board reached an agreement with the LEA for a 2 year contract. She indicated the impact for Year 1 is \$282,018; the impact for Year 2 is \$293,644.

Mr. O'Neill noted the impact over two years is \$575,662.

Mrs. Douglas asked for a copy of the agreement. Mr. O'Neill indicated once the contract is finalized and the numbers are verified a copy of the agreement will be provided.

Mrs. Izbicki commented that the contract will bring the teachers' salaries closer to the surrounding communities at the end of the two year period.

Mr. Pascucci commented that was stated at the last negotiation. He indicated that it is perpetual. Mrs. Izbicki commented when you go without a contract it takes work to close the gap.

Mr. Pascucci asked if every town is giving 4% raises to its staff. Mr. O'Neill commented other communities' contracts vary. He indicated when staff goes four years without a contract and salaries are behind by 10%, it takes a number of years to catch up. He noted there are many factors that work against equity with other communities. Mr. O'Neill commented if other communities increase by 2% or 3% in the next two years, we will be 5% below at that time.

Nate Cooper, CHS teacher, echoed what has been said regarding surrounding areas. He commented teachers have been looking at the lack of a contract for a number of years, as well as attracting new teachers and retaining existing teachers. He indicated the LEA has taken into account the cost of healthcare and the contract makes it more cost effective for the district. He believes the contract is fair and equitable.

Mrs. Couture asked if there is a plan for explaining to the community the value they are receiving if they approve the contract? Mr. Cooper indicated that he and Mr. O'Neill discussed the approach. He commented when the last contract was presented we tried to make clear to the community the value they would get and the return on investment in terms of the value of

education. He noted they discussed forging a partnership and the value of staff and student achievement.

Mr. Miller asked if copays would be changing. Mr. Cooper indicated copays will change from \$10 to \$30 for doctor visits; \$50 for urgent care; and \$100 for emergency room visits. He commented in year 2 the premium contribution will change by 1%.

Mr. Miller asked if there would be any adjustment to salaries. Mr. Cooper indicated the salary schedule will be similar to the last contract where the bottom step is dropped, a step is added at the top and no movement on the schedule for year 1.

Special Education

Mr. O'Neill commented that the Budget Committee was made aware of an additional \$106,000 placement in Special Education. He explained since the district has been made aware of three more students: one has a 90% probability of out of district placement; the second has significant changes and an anticipated 75% probability of out of district placement; the third has a lower probability of placement. He indicated if all placements become reality we will have to maximize placements by the middle of January. Mr. O'Neill commented there are real concerns about how tight the Special Services budget is as we removed that cushion in FY18. He indicated these placements could impact the budget by over \$200,000.

Mr. Cutter commented that he understands warrant articles are a matter of discussion this evening and asked about the proposed amount of the Special Education warrant article.

Mr. O'Neill indicated the district is proposing adding \$100,000 to the Special Education Capital Reserve Fund, but will only use the funds if absolutely necessary. He explained there are two ways to approach the additional placements in special education: 1) deficit appropriation, which is borrowing from next year's budget; 2) convening a special meeting. He noted is very difficult to find that kind of money.

Mrs. Couture commented there will be more information between now and February 4 and a drastic adjustment can be made on the floor at Deliberative Session. She noted there were no significant reductions in the Special Services budget.

Mr. Miller commented Special Services has been underspent the last four years by amounts that are higher than the additions that will occur.

Mrs. Douglas commented even with those the district has \$100,000 in Capital Reserve Funds that will never be used. She believes there are built in buffers in that budget.

Mr. O'Neill indicated he asked the Special Services Director to review if any students will be aging out next year and there are none at this time. He commented the district only budgeted for the actual students we will have next year. He noted the district expects more data in the next two months.

Account 272: Conferences and Workshops

Mr. Cutter explained he looked at three year averages of Accounts 272, Conferences and Workshops, and 580, Travel: 2016, \$67,598; 2017, \$65,614; 2018, \$92,671. He made the following recommendations:

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 272, Conferences and Workshops, by \$9,000

SECOND: by Mr. Miller

Mr. Cutter commented the reduction brings the account more in line with the current year and the three year average.

VOTE: 7-1-0

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 580, Travel, by \$16,000

SECOND: by Mr. Miller

VOTE: 7-1-0

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mrs. Izbicki

Move to add \$106,000 to Account 569, Handicapped Tuition

SECOND: by Mr. Cutter

Mrs. Izbicki indicated that the additional funds are for an actual Special Education placement that will be coming into the district.

Mrs. Douglas commented in theory, we already have these funds built into the budget as the Budget Committee did not take any reductions to Special Services. She believes the district can absorb the additional funds.

Mrs. Bourque commented there is a possibility of more placements and we have an obligation to cover the funds. Mrs. Douglas commented the funds can be added later.

Mrs. Couture asked if when we get to Deliberative Session and those placements do not materialize, are we willing to make additional reductions to bring the budget more in line. Mrs. Izbicki commented we need to vote on what we know.

Mrs. Bourque indicated the existing agreement is any non-utilized funds will be returned to the taxpayers. She asked what is the risk to us? Mrs. Douglas commented the budget may not be approved.

Mr. Cutter commented he would not be supportive to reduce additional funds from Special Services. He believes there is approximately \$80,000 of extra money in Special Services and Transportation.

Mrs. Couture commented there is a question based on new information, the totality of the budget, and the reality that enrollment has decreased by close to 300 students over the last seven years and the budget keeps increasing. She asked if the School Board is willing to live by the default or another number.

Mrs. Izbicki commented that she has not seen any emails or letters asking the School Board to decrease funds. She indicated the School Board has received many letters from those who do not want to see the budget reduced.

Mrs. Couture commented that the School Board is hearing from people who have a connection to the schools. Mrs. Izbicki indicated she has spoken with many people in the community.

Mr. Pascucci commented in the years when Mr. Spencer was a member of this Committee and we have reviewed the budget, he could give rationale regarding the Special Education budget. He indicated an amount totaling \$80,000 was previously motioned to be reduced and failed. He noted we are now discussing a placement we know about and it is not equitable to discuss what we do not know. Mr. Pascucci asked what is the rationale for the \$80,000 reduction?

Mr. Cutter indicated the total was \$78,000, which was supported by historic underspend (\$38,000 in professional services; \$40,000 in transportation).

MOTION: by Mr. Pascucci

Move to add \$28,000 to Account 569, Handicapped Tuition

SECOND: by Mrs. Couture

Mr. Pascucci indicated since there is extra money in the Special Services budget (approximately \$78,000), he felt that adding an additional \$28,000 would cover the placement mentioned earlier.

Mrs. Couture commented if there is rationale to dropping the amount needed to \$28,000 then there is rationale for not supporting it at all. She indicated the historic number for a reduction would be \$238,000.

Mr. Pascucci commented he is trying to get the consensus of this Committee and find some compromise. He supported the concept of adding the \$106,000, but does not support adding the funds to the budget.

Mr. O'Neill commented that he does not disagree with the argument of historical data or trend, but it is concerning when one looks at that type of data and truly believes we have not made an effort to look at only students we know about. He indicated in any district there have always been placeholders in special education tuition budgets. Mr. O'Neill believes that the district has changed the method of calculating the Special Services budget this year as there are no

placeholders in the current year. He indicated we do not believe this budget is subject to historical precedent at this time.

Mrs. Couture commented the placeholders we have had have been relatively small (\$30,000 - \$50,000). She indicated there would still be room for additional placements.

Mr. O'Neill stressed the methodology used by Special Services is different this year than in others and the budget is much tighter this year than any others.

VOTE ON THE AMENDED MOTION: 2-6-0

The amended motion fails.

VOTE ON THE MAIN MOTION TO ADD \$106,000 TO ACCOUNT 569: 4-4-0

The motion fails.

Mrs. Couture commented the subject can be revisited after the budget hearing.

Mrs. Couture commented that there has been concern in the past with transportation that when a new contract was approved a bus was reduced. She indicated there was a long discussion regarding the reduction of two buses. She noted the bus company did not have the software they needed, but now they do. She suggested looking into reducing a bus.

Mr. O'Neill indicated the Business Administrator has already asked for that data from the bus company and the district has been analyzing bus ridership.

- **Final Warrant Article Voting**

ARTICLE 1 – Operating Budget for 2017-2018: \$21,721,223

MOTION: by Mr. Miller

Move to recommend Article 1

SECOND: by Mr. Cutter

Mrs. Douglas commented that the Committee totally disregarded the will of the voters because the budget includes new spending. She indicated that the direction of the voters is that new spending belongs on warrant articles. She noted if we followed this direction the proposed budget would be lower than the default, and more warrant articles and the budget would most likely be approved. Mrs. Douglas commented we cannot ignore the rules because the process becomes useless and does not follow the will of the voters. She indicated she cannot support the article.

Mr. Miller commented that enrollment is declining and budgets are increasing. He indicated at some point this problem needs to be addressed.

Mr. O'Neill commented that he has been concerned about the enrollment, but is also concerned about uncontrolled items. He indicated what the district can control we have decreased. He explained the state down-streamed over \$1M in retirement costs to the school districts and towns. Mr. O'Neill noted much of the increases are external. He indicated the district will live with what is decided.

Mr. Pascucci commented that you say 'out of your control', but it is not really out of your control. He indicated almost everything can be controlled, but we let it get out of our control. He noted the Budget Committee has no control other than saying 'no' to the budget. Mr. Pascucci commented the loss of students was not as much as we thought, but spending has increased. He asked if we lose students steadily and spending continues to increase, what will happen when enrollment increases?

Mrs. Couture remarked to Mrs. Douglas' point regarding the 2003 warrant article. She indicated that we have followed the warrant article. She commented that the rules mean different things to different people.

VOTE: 4-3-1

The motion carried.

Article 1 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 4-3-1.

ARTICLE 2 – Litchfield Education Association Collective Bargaining Contract: \$282,018

Mrs. Couture commented this is for discussion only.

The Budget Committee did not vote on a recommendation for the article.

ARTICLE 3 – Litchfield Support Staff Collective Bargaining Contract: TBD

Mr. O'Neill reported the district and the Support Staff union are still in negotiations. He indicated the next meeting is January 5, 2017.

Mrs. Couture asked what will happen if the two sides do not reach an agreement. Mr. O'Neill indicated there was impasse, which went to mediation and the two sides could still not reach an agreement. He commented they agreed to meet again and hammer out some common ground. Mr. O'Neill indicated he was hopeful to have a resolution on January 5. He reminded the Committee this is the first contract being negotiated for this group and there is no language to work from. He commented if the School Board and the Support Staff do not ratify a contract, there will be no article going before the voters. He noted deadline is January 10 and the School Board would have to meet before January 10 to ratify.

ARTICLE 4 – Special Services Coordinator: \$92,885.21

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move for the Budget Committee to recommend Article 4**SECOND:** by Mrs. Bourque

Mrs. Douglas commented we are adding one and one-half positions if this article is approved.

Mr. O'Neill indicated the part time position to which Mrs. Douglas is referring is a grant funded position and due to changes in the IEP the position is being restored to full time.

Mrs. Douglas commented we are already adding significant staff. Mr. O'Neill indicated these are different positions. He explained one is mandated by IEP; the position in the warrant article is a position to help manage the department. He commented the number of special education students is growing and there is a need for a position to focus on grades PreK-8.

Mr. Cutter commented he supports the article because students in special education are increasing and the position is necessary.

Mr. Miller commented he supported the position until we left the increase of the part time assistant principal to full time in the budget.

Mrs. Bandurski explained the purpose of this position is to help manage the programs and ensure the requirements of the IEPs, evaluations, compliance and to work with the teachers. She provided data from other districts that have added administrative support to their departments. She indicated we need another set of eyes to ensure what we are providing to our students is met.

Mrs. Izbicki commented there is a very different set of laws for special education students and regular education students. She indicated often there is a need for another set of eyes with transitioning, instruction, evaluations, and IEPs.

Mr. Keating asked if one principal will still attend all the IEP meetings. Mrs. Bandurski indicated there always has to be an LEA representative at the meetings and the principal will still be covering the meetings.

Mrs. Douglas commented it appears we need this position and that it will be beneficial in the long run. She commended the School Board for putting the position in a warrant article.

VOTE: 8-0-0**The motion carried.*****Article 4 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 8-0-0.******ARTICLE 5 – Security Equipment and Enhancement Products: \$61,645*****MOTION:** by Mrs. Douglas***Move for the Budget Committee to recommend Article 5*****SECOND:** by Mr. Keating

Mrs. Couture commented this is the first time the Budget Committee has seen this article and asked for more information and a breakdown of items.

Mr. Markiewicz indicated that the district cannot be specific because of confidentiality. He commented \$15,000 would go toward enhancing exterior cameras and internal monitors. He noted Homeland Security recommended the monitors be visible to all office staff.

Mr. Markiewicz commented \$5,000 will go toward the installation of security film to slow down intruders. He indicated enhancements for proximity swipe cards and fencing for the portables is included in the cost.

Mr. Pascucci asked if this is part of a larger plan. Mr. O'Neill indicated that it is part of a larger plan. He reported that he met with Homeland Security and discussed recommendations and what we can do to make the students and staff safer. He noted we are doing a much more detailed study of the buildings at this time as well.

Mrs. Douglas commented as we see enrollment declining, is there a plan for the portable classrooms. Mr. O'Neill commented we received from NESDEC a real time analysis of demographics in Litchfield. He explained a number of home sales increased and many homebuyers are younger families with children in school. He indicated one of the suggestions from the analysis is that we may find the original thinking about enrollment may be changing as enrollment may be holding steady and not declining in the long term. Mr. O'Neill noted the data shows that LMS and CHS will experience smaller enrollment over the next 4-8 years.

Mrs. Douglas was concerned that if enrollment declines the children have to be brought inside the buildings. Mr. O'Neill commented the administration does not agree that portables are a good instructional space. He indicated at this point, given the numbers, we will need the portable classrooms at GMS. He noted we do not want to spend money we do not have to spend.

Mr. Pascucci asked if the items in the article are the most important recommendations or the least expensive. Mr. O'Neill indicated these are the recommendations Homeland Security made at the meeting. He explained these measures are capable of slowing down intruders until police respond. He noted they district is looking at low cost items and yet providing an increase in security.

Mrs. Couture asked if the costs are estimates or if the project will go to bid. Mr. Markiewicz indicated the district cannot go to bid because bid prices are only held for 30 days. He commented this is a quote from the current vendor.

VOTE: 8-0-0

The motion carried.

Article 5 was recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 8-0-0.

ARTICLE 6 – Special Education Capital Reserve Fund: \$100,000

MOTION: by Mr. Keating

Move for the Budget Committee to recommend Article 6

SECOND: by Mr. Cutter

Chris – why did one SB member vote against

Paula – because of the amount of the budget –

Chris – statistics prove the money we have in there we never used – understand one child coming in can wipe it out – so far it has not happened – always said want to be fair as possible about funding sped – hear we need more every year – hear if we had more in there we could be tighter with sped budget – don't believe it – do not believe that if we put another \$100K in there someone is going to reduce the sped budget – based on statistics and never used it –

Paula – argue that there is mistrust – there is tighter budget this year – you could say may not use it – do not know until you try – as you can see there are 3 placement possibilities – not about if it happens, but when it happens

Andrew- agree – had the \$150K passed, would likely not support this article – however because it failed I am in support of the article –

Keri – if information changes we can add money back in – when are we going to stop hearing we need a little more – believe if the other kids are more definite we can add money back in –

Andrew – disagree with your philosophy – we have heard there are increased students in sped – 258 students is alarming –

Keri – we have less kids coming in – those students are factored into the budget

Cindy – if we had catastrophic occurrence and not enough in the reserve fund, the process is you can go for deficit appropriation – you can cover and not impact regular education – happened once about 13 years ago – the problem is the reserve has never been used or if we had more we can cut sped more – that has never happened – the philosophy makes sense but reality does not

Jim – will send you more info about that process – get permission from DRA to borrow against next year's budget – or have special meeting through DRA and DOE and ask for levy of additional taxation – deficit appropriation means that we would have to cut that amount across the board or borrow money from the following year's budget – having a good reserve fund is a good thing – the town has significant reserve – that fund never gets spend down to zero because not wise – the amount given the current circumstances we have already defined for you regarding additional students and the method of budgeting this year is different –

Cindy – research process and get info to me – will ask committee to reach out to NHMA about process –

Dennis – in RSA there is condition for SB to add article to be considered for deficit reduction – in order to get there, the BC has to approve the expenditure, the DRA has to approve – come in March with article – if that fails you are stuck with hole in budget –

Chris – there is a remedy – have to cover it by law –

Cindy - would like more info

Bob – insurance policy – we have one on our homes – does not cost anything –

Keri – why stop at \$100K –

Bob – the professionals know what they need – last year got taken off – always hear let the voters vote –

Cindy – going to vote against the article until receive information

VOTE: 4-4-0

The motion fails.

Article 6 is not recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 4-4-0.

ARTICLE 7 – Building Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund, \$50,000

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

Move for the Budget Committee to recommend Article 7

SECOND: by Mrs. Bourque

Mr. Markiewicz commented from a budget management standpoint, it is recommended to maintain a certain level in reserve should a catastrophic event occur. He indicated it is more fiscally responsible to have this type of reserve.

Mrs. Douglas mentioned that there is an ongoing building assessment and when the report is completed we will have a better idea of the condition of the facilities. Mr. Markiewicz indicated it will be a question of prioritization.

Mr. Miller asked how much was spent in the 2016 unreserved fund at the end of the year. Mr. Markiewicz indicated approximately \$160,000 was spent forward to reduce the 2017 budget.

VOTE: 7-1-0

The motion carried.

Article 7 is recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 7-1-0.

ARTICLE 8 – Technology Capital Reserve Fund, \$25,000

MOTION: by Mr. Miller

Move for the Budget Committee to recommend Article 8

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Pascucci asked if this article is to help reduce the technology budget. Mrs. Couture indicated that originally it was presented for that purpose, but at Deliberative Session it was presented for equipment repair.

Mrs. Douglas commented that much was spent on technology. She asked why the reserve is needed. Mr. O'Neill indicated that the district has developed a replacement cycle with an annual cost of approximately \$150,000. He commented the real intent of this is not for operational issues, but for capital issues.

Mrs. Izbicki indicated the School Board is in line with that.

Mrs. Couture asked what types of things we are saving for. Mr. O'Neill commented that there are areas of replacement in the technology plan such as servers, memory, or large types of capital equipment that may have to be replaced. He noted this fund is not for repairs.

Mr. Pelletier explained some things will become obsolete. He indicated the reserve could be used in the event of some type of unforeseen failure on the servers that was not included in the budget.

Mr. Cutter commented he cannot support the article because he believes \$50,000 is adequate for a major failure. He indicated all the technology is in the current budget.

Mrs. Bourque asked if any of the reserve fund would be used replace the 1:1 technology. Mr. O'Neill indicated that is not the purpose of the fund. He commented items such as an unanticipated storage event or modular connectivity would be more in line with use of the reserve fund as those types of events cannot be projected in a budget.

Mr. Pascucci commented if the reserve needs to be used we always support replacing the funds.

Mrs. Douglas commented she can justify adding money to the reserve funds for Special Education and Facilities, but cannot justify adding another \$25,000 for technology.

VOTE: 1-7-0

The motion fails.

Article 8 was not recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of 1-7-0.

7. REPORTS

- **Town**

There was no town report.

8. MEMBER INPUT/MISC. BUSINESS

- **Hearing Preparation**

Mrs. Couture mentioned that the HLN will expect an update to the budget process. She offered to prepare the presentation for the hearing. She noted we are waiting for information regarding the LEA and LSS contracts. She commented that the next meeting will be after the hearing.

Mr. Miller commented that there is no way of knowing how the support staff contract will play out and the teachers' contract is new. He indicated that he is not comfortable voting on the contract the same night as it is received. He noted he would feel more comfortable receiving it in advance.

Mr. Cutter suggested scheduling a tentative meeting on January 10 and voting on January 12.

Mrs. Couture asked if the School Board will meet on January 9. Mr. O'Neill indicated there is not meeting scheduled at this time and is dependent upon what occurs on January 5. He commented if a resolution is reached and the contract is ratified by both parties, he will inform the Budget Committee Chair immediately.

Mrs. Couture commented that there will be communication as she drafts the presentation.

There was a brief discussion about the town budget.

Mr. Pascucci commented very few people have approached him to say they want their taxes to increase. He indicated different groups want different things, but they still do not want their taxes to increase.

Mrs. Izbicki commented she is not representing herself personally, but five people who make decisions,

9. PUBLIC INPUT

Robin Corbeil, 4 Nesmith Court, indicated she is speaking for a good group of people who are not comfortable sitting in front of the Committee and having these conversations, and that do not attend Deliberative Session for the same reason and are frustrated with what happens there.

Mrs. Corbeil agreed that some things should be placed on the warrant, but asked that they not be zeroed out. She commented it is not fair to the people who come to vote. She indicated there are reasons behind the warrant articles. She noted if we do not have that money other children are impacted as well. Mrs. Corbeil commented that the Budget Committee tells the School Board to come forward with an honest budget and the School Board says we want to put money aside to budget conservatively. She indicated she would rather see the money put aside so it does not have to come out of pocket because it is already saved. Mrs. Corbeil indicated if the servers go down and we cannot replace them right away then we cannot instruct without it. She commented if you are going to ask for real budgets on special education then you cannot say "no" to the reserve fund. She noted they are trying to bring better budgets to you by using new methodology. Mrs. Corbeil encouraged the Budget Committee to give the district the opportunity to return the money if there is any remaining.

10. ADJOURN

MOTION: by Mrs. Bourque

Move to adjourn

SECOND: by Mr. Pascucci

VOTE: 8-0-0

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Next Meeting: Thursday, January 12, 2017

Recorded by: Michele E. Flynn, Recording Secretary