

MINUTES OF MEETING
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE
January 17, 2011

A meeting of the Municipal Budget Committee was called to order at 6:38 PM in the Meeting Room at the Conway Town Hall with the following members present: Joe Mosca, Bob Drinkhall, Doug Swett, Bill Masters, Dick Klement, John Edgerton, Ray Shakir and Karen Umberger. Members excused from meeting: Linda Teagan and David Sordi.

In the absence of David Sordi, Joe Mosca chaired the meeting. Chairman Mosca asked Karen Umberger to lead those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Mosca stated he was going to start with a little housekeeping. First, David Sordi will be out for the next two weeks and he would be chairing the next few meetings; however, he would not be here on the 24th which is a week from this evening and asked Karen Umberger or John Edgerton to volunteer to chair that meeting. Janine MacLauchlan is not here this evening and her alternate, Dick Klement, is here representing the School Board. David Sordi spoke with Bill Aughton about his service on the Board and Bill has sent a letter of resignation which the Chairman wanted to read into the record:

"Dear Dave,

"Firstly thank you for your kindly letter. I have given it a lot of thought this last day or so and I believe this is an appropriate time to offer my resignation from the Town of Conway Budget Committee. For health and personal reasons I feel I can not contribute at the level I would like to this winter, and I had not planned on running next year for the same reasons.

"It has been both an honor and a pleasure to share time with you and the present and past committee members and to serve the town of Conway. It has been a great learning experience. I have certainly come home some nights pulling out what hair I have left, but I have also come home feeling very proud of the work the committee is doing.

"I offer my resignation with sincere regret but the time has come. I would appreciate you reading this letter at the next meeting. I will miss you all.

"Good luck and keep up the good work.

"Most Sincerely, Bill."

Chairman Mosca stated that David would like to have it noted that he appreciates Bill's service and what he has done for the Committee and he

will be missed and his insight and advice will surely be missed, so thank you.

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Karen Umberger, to regretfully accept the resignation. In favor: 8; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bob Drinkhall moved, seconded by Karen Umberger, to consider and accept the Minutes of January 3, 2011. In favor: 7; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1 - Dick Klement.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Mosca stated the Committee would be discussing the School Budget and that it would pretty much be an open forum.

Karen Umberger stated she had put together a set of questions that had not gone any place because she thought that someone, Dr. Nelson or somebody else from the School was going to be here to accept these. Just going through the kinds of things that she became concerned about. She knows this is really a big concern, but why is the water and sewer going up and to the best of her knowledge, there has been no rate increases in either sewer school which is John Fuller, the High School and the Middle School and if she is wrong on that, she would like to be corrected. It wasn't a big dollar item, but it caught her off guard.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item concerning the heating oil contract. She noticed the heating oil had gone up significantly for the next year and she just wanted someone to explain what was happening with the heating oil contract. Karen also noted that Conway's share of the SAU 9 Budget went up and, she knows they have had salary increases and so on, but it just kind of surprised her.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item concerning students enrolled in on-line courses. One day last week she was down in Concord and a man was in from what they call a Charter School because they offer on-line courses and it's her understanding that they are at relatively reasonable rates; it's a non-profit; and the reason that they are is because the students that enroll in those courses received State Aid. In other words, the entity receives the State Aid based on the number of students that were enrolled. As she looked at the variety of course offerings, it was dealing a lot with the AP Courses. We don't have as many kids in there to make them cost efficient as well as a wide variety of Math, higher Math and things like that. She understands there are other places, Harvard, MIT, so on and so on, that offer on-line courses and so she is not exactly sure how those on-line courses translate into credits in the School system but this particular organization is recognized by the Department of Education so there must be some way or other that all of that occurs. Karen was primarily looking at this as perhaps an opportunity for some cost savings and a different method of teaching. That was where she was coming from on that particular item.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item and her belief that the School Board has a policy that classes must have 10 students. Dick Klement stated 12 students. Karen further stated that if they don't then they have to come before the School Board with a reason; could these 8 or 9 students take an on-line course to match. She does know that some of the classes that aren't listed are over in the Career-Tech area and that's a very difficult areas to take on-line courses in because of the hands on sorts of things.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item of having someone walk her through the CEA Contract; although she read all the stuff in the Warrant Article business, there are parts of the Contract that she thought were really good and there are other parts that she is not so enthusiastic about, but would like to go through the cost figures.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item of the Technology Warrant Article; they're asking for \$75,000.00 for technology upgrades and then she looks in the Budget and there's over \$900,000.00 for computers, software and all of those kinds of things. She wants to make sure that some how or other that stuff is meshing and if we are going to buy new computers through the Technology Department then that's where we should put new computers, it shouldn't be spread out throughout the School. That's kind of where that question was going.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next item of multiple questions on Special Ed and she knows that the Special Ed person is scheduled to come in and talk to us and hopefully that will be at a time when she will be here. The number ESL "English as a Second Language" students, it doesn't make sense what we are doing. Then the snow grooming if she remembers correctly one night last week, the Town is paying \$3,000.00 for Whitaker and the School is paying \$9,000.00 for Whitaker so her question really is: Is the contract with the organization that does the snow grooming \$12,000.00.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the Student Advocate. The Student Advocate arrived again as a new position and she thought during last year's budget season we had agreed to not fund this position and it had been removed or maybe 2 years ago, and she is just curious to know what has drastically changed in the High School to now fund this position for \$50,000.00.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the next question dealing with \$88,000.00 for the grounds and what does it cover. It was her understanding that when we first made this contract it was going to be for 3 years so that we could get all of the High School grounds in order, but it seems that now it has become part of it and if it is for things like snowplowing on the road and those sorts of things then she doesn't have a problem with that; but if it's still for the Athletic Fields then she just needs to know that.

Karen Umberger proceeded with the number of teams that they have at the Middle School and she thought, obviously wrong, that there were 4 members of each team. She sees that they have 5 English teachers and she is questioning what that 5th person is doing along with the 2 Reading teachers and how are the Reading teachers integrating with the teams and

what are the benefits of instead of having 4 teams now having almost 5. Her last question is why do the team leaders at the Middle School receive more of a stipend than the Department Heads at the High School; she thought that was kind of different. Those are what her questions are dealing with and hopefully we can get these to Carl for the next time he is in and we can have him talk to us about them.

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Bill Masters, to have Karen Umberger's questions forwarded to Dr. Nelson for response. In favor: 8; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Ray Shakir stated he was going to shut his mouth, but he has been perusing through the book and also reading some of the comments in the newspapers and he is getting very frustrated quite frankly. A couple of things are really bothering him; maybe he just doesn't understand these things and maybe we can clear it up but, for example, he sees that there's a tentative agreement in the Contract and then they came out with savings that the taxpayer will save several hundred thousand dollars. For example, because the teachers are now going to be subject to a \$500.00 deductible and then included in that sentence "paid for by the District". Are we saving several hundred thousand dollars or are we not saving several hundred thousand dollars. If it is paid for the by District, then it means he's paying for it. What does that mean? Does it mean instead of coming out of his left pocket, it's coming out of his right pocket; is that what they're getting at. It's shenanigans like this that he finds throughout the entire situation and it seems to him that the School is being extremely disingenuous and they really don't want to save anything. To him, it's just a major employment agency quite frankly and the thing for example that Karen brought up about the Student Advocate is absurd. He doesn't see the logic in it. There's also another concern that he really doesn't fully understand quite frankly, it's that \$1.3 Million bond that was paid off that was supposed to go away last year but it somehow got back into the budget and, since it got back into the budget, it's staying there so now it's there this year too. Like he said, it seems to him that there's a lot of gimmickry, shenanigans and that type of nonsense going on and he, for one, doesn't like it and he hopes the voters understand what's going on and that they vote accordingly and not get bamboozled by these people.

Dick Klement stated not to rebut, but perhaps to clarify some; the \$1.3 Million last year, a bond did mature, the idea was to return that money to the taxpayer last year; however, they had some increases and other costs that were fixed. He wanted to say they had a \$700,000.00 increase in medical costs which was part of what that \$1.3 Million went to. In effect, that \$1.3 Million was kept in the budget, but it was used to absorb the increases that were mandated: health insurance, retirement, this and that. Would he of liked to see that money go back to the taxpayer? Yes. As far as this year's contract is concerned, unfortunately in the world of today you can't believe what you read in the newspaper nor what you read on-line. He would take what's in the newspaper with a grain of salt in terms of savings/non-savings. They saved several hundred thousand dollars by going to the new medical plan; a lot of that savings is offset by the increase in money the teachers are receiving so that in the end there is a net increase in the \$150,000.00 realm. It is limited

to \$150,000.00 because they had the savings in the medical. One of the questions that Karen has was "you bring the salaries up to \$29,000.00, so you're spending \$100,000.00, that's a lot of money". One of the ground rules was if you increase a newbie's salary to \$29,000.00, the person hired last year making \$27,000.00 should be put to \$29,000.00 and that was the rationale for that increase in money.

Karen Umberger stated that her question had nothing to do with bringing the salaries up; her question was how many people were involved in bringing the salaries up. Dick Klement stated Carl (Nelson) would have to give that answer because off the top of his head he couldn't. That was where the money went; now should we have done something else, perhaps. He didn't think there was an effort to hide it; he thought it was just basically the costs.

Chairman Mosca stated in this year's Default Budget, you have \$1.5 Million that shouldn't be there because that money should have been given back to the Town and he thought that was Ray's point. That money was in the bottom line of last year's budget and this year's Default Budget is based off of last year's budget; so that \$1.5 Million is actually increasing the Default Budget higher than it should be.

Ray Shakir stated he fully respects Dick's position, believe it or not he does, but he disagrees because it does hide it. What they should have done is give it back to the taxpayer and been honest about it: "the bond's paid off, here's your money back, but we had these other expenses and these other expenses are adding up to 'x' amount of dollars". That's what you call honesty because you're giving back the money that was paid off, but then you're saying "listen people, we have these other expenses; we're going to try to justify them as best we can, but we have these other expense". You don't go hiding the money under the table because you think it's going to go away and people aren't going to notice it. That's being sneaky. That's the way he looks at it. If he was running a budget in his house and stuff like that, he wouldn't hide anything from his wife and be sneaky because then there's going to be a problem and he is very honest with his wife and that's how come they've lasted as long. All he is saying is that to him it looks like gimmicks and shenanigans, that's all.

Bob Drinkhall stated he had a couple of items. First of all, on the \$1.3 Million, if you recall, he asked Carl if that stayed in the Default Budget and his explanation was that it did due to the fact that it was actually other things that it was spent on as mentioned here by Dick. It's in there and he didn't think logically it could be taken out at this point in time as much as he would like to see it taken out, he didn't think it could be. The other point he wanted to bring out was, he believes, the tax savings was \$345,000.00 regarding the new health insurance with the \$500.00 deductible in that range, but there is a cost and it was so convoluted in the way that he got it, there is a cost to paying the deductible and there is a fund for paying the deductible which he believes, and this was off the top of his head so it could be wrong, but thought it was \$9,000.00 which didn't make sense.

Dick Klement stated he understood the confusion; it took about 2 years for him to understand it himself. They run on a fiscal year basis and the insurance company runs on an annual basis. The concerns of the teachers was if they go for this 6 months, they have their deductible and after this 6 months they don't have the deductible because they've already expended it. The short answer is they could get hit with another thing; but then they said that's not going to happen to everybody. The experience they've had to date with the other contracts that were written like this, you don't need \$25,000.00 in the bucket in case somebody double spends. They figure \$9,000.00 is more than enough; that's why they put \$9,000.00 in there.

Karen Umberger asked if the health insurance runs from June to June and Dick Klement stated the health insurance goes by the calendar year. Karen asked when did that change. Dick stated to his knowledge it has always been that way. The health insurance runs on an annual basis that's calendar based. He didn't know when it changed, it's been that way ever since he's been there. Karen stated this becomes an every year thing and not just this first year. Dick stated it would become an every year thing, but if the money is not used, it's returned so the \$9,000.00 doesn't just get put in the bucket and get used by the teachers. If there's money left, it goes back to the taxpayer. Karen stated the concern that she had is that all of SAU 9 has this same type of insurance. Dick stated no. Karen stated this year health insurance went up 14% because of usage; what's in their new health system that is going to incentivise the members of the group to reduce their usage because even though saving \$300,000.00 by changing over to a new contract, what is incentivising members of the group not to end up next year with another 14% increase. Over the years the School would go from insurer to another insurer and they would get a good rate for the first year and then they would get a real jacked up rate the second year and if usage is driving the problem, then what is the incentive by the School District to change the behavior so that we're not going to see next year another 14% increase because we just can't continue to handle that especially when the Town went up 1% and they're a group unto themselves.

Dick Klement stated the only thing he could think of at this point and he thought it was a valid point, is there is a \$500.00 deductible; when they go see the doctor now, they have a \$15.00 co-pay. If they don't use their \$500.00 deductible for going to see the doctor, this is one of those account things where they will have a Debit Card, and he may be misusing what it is actually called, but they could then go to the Pharmacy and buy over the counter medication, Band-Aids, whatever you have and the Debit Card would pay for that. By not going to see the doctor, or by seeing the doctor less because they have to pony up \$15.00, the thought process is that they will be using the doctors less because they have to pay for it and then they can use that \$500.00 for something else.

Karen Umberger asked if they saw that experience occur with the other two contracts. Dick Klement stated she would have to ask Carl that as he did not know. Karen stated maybe we need to add that because if the other two contracts showed that's what was going on, then that's not necessarily a bad thing; but if it didn't show that, then we haven't gained anything by

switching except for the first year which is common whenever you switch insurances.

Bill Masters stated going back to the \$1.3 Million, there was a point that he thought needed to be clarified. If you look at the basic Budget laws in terms of bond issues, RSA 33.3 permits the legislative body, the voters, to authorize expenditures of the remaining funds for any purpose for which it is lawful to issue a bond or note. The issue here is what are the limitations in issuing bonds and notes; do we traditionally issue a bond or note for health insurance increases, dental insurance increases, retirement increases, Special Education increases. He always thought bonds were dealing with a major project such as the bond for constructing Kennett High School. He didn't realize they issued bonds for increases in normal operating costs. The point that he thinks Ray made right up front was that it should have clearly gone back to the voters and the voters should have said what they wanted that surplus to go to, not a decision arbitrarily made by the governing boards or commissions. Perhaps we need some clarification on that in terms of what is acceptable in terms of use of that money.

John Edgerton stated he was the Treasurer for 11 years; the bonds are issued for capital expense. We are not talking here about anything except the bond was paid off and that payment was no longer made to a bond, then that should be deducted from the bottom line of the budget. The difference here was if it was deducted then the School Department would have said our budget increased by so much instead of saying they had a zero increase with the \$1.3 Million. He didn't care if they spent the money and they had a reason to, it was an increase in the budget by 3% or 4%, that's where the error was.

Doug Swett stated there was concerted effort last fall to turn out voters for the 2nd day of November and it worked, we more than doubled what usually comes out, but we still only had half of the registered voters out. If people are encouraged to go and vote against something, they don't want to wait until they get into that booth because when you vote in there, you vote on one thing and if you vote it down this year, the Default is higher. If they don't go to the two meetings on March 7th and March 9th which is the Deliberative Meetings, that's the only place where figures can be changed up, down or whatever. If the public will not go to those meetings, they're going to accept whatever's there. You have to be there on those dates, not in April, you need to go in April and that's a fact, but you need to be at these Deliberative Meetings or you're not going to do any good in April; you're going to vote up or down whatever's there and if you vote it down, you're going to have a Default Budget that's higher.

Bob Drinkhall stated he thought we're killing the issue on the \$1.3 Million; we lost that. The \$1.3 Million bond was retired; they're not spending that specific money, it just so happens that their budget did go up. What John said is correct, it's creative accounting, in his opinion, to the way it was worded. This is gone and we, the Budget Committee as well as anybody else, let it go last year. It's a done issue and talking about it isn't going to accomplish a darn thing at this point in time, in his opinion.

Ray Shakir stated he disagreed; he thought talking about it was going to do something about it because that \$1.3 Million is not just for that year; that \$1.3 Million is folded into this year too and then they're going to increase it even more so it's kind of like already there even though we lost it in terms of the loan payoff. They snuck it in there and now it's in this budget too as a base line. He thought we should talk about how they've been, to use the euphemism, creative accounting in terms of putting money in there that shouldn't have been put in there without debate.

Bob Drinkhall stated he agreed completely with what Ray was saying, but there's nothing we can do about it. Ray Shakir stated he completely agreed there was nothing we could do about it, but he believes we have a responsibility to the public to let them know just what types of individuals we are dealing with in terms of being up front and straight with the public; that's all he was saying. Ray further stated he didn't believe they were upfront and straight; he thought they were doing gimmickry and shenanigans in order to hide the fact that they were increasing the budget as much as they are, as much as they did and now they start with a base line this year and they increase it even more. Now they are probably going to tell you all that they're going to probably come out with a flat budget. No, they're not going to come out with a flat budget; they're not really trying to save money; they're not showing us things that will really be able to save money that they're really trying to save money, they're just adding some more creative accounting.

Chairman Mosca asked if there were any more questions on the School Budget and he thanked Dick (Klement) for his efforts as the Committee does appreciate them.

Karen Umberger stated she thought that was the reason why she wanted to go through the CEA Contract, line by line, so we can clearly have an understanding and, as she said, there are a lot of things about the Contract that she really liked, but there are a lot of things about the Contract that she really didn't like and so she needs to hear it from Dr. Nelson. Chairman Mosca stated we can ask him (Dr. Nelson) to do that and, unfortunately, he didn't know how much Dr. Nelson could get into it until it is actually approved. Karen stated he can get into anything now, it's been approved by the Union and it's been approved by the School Board, it just hasn't been approved by the voters. Chairman stated it's a public document at this point and Karen stated absolutely and open discussion is encouraged.

John Edgerton stated he wished the School Board and the Selectmen would look at his document to get their opinions on it. This is reworded for a town instead of a city; it's tailored after Franklin and Concord and there's an act before the Legislature that says that this is going to be law that a town or a city can have a municipal tax cap. It makes it complicated here because the tax rate is probably closer in line by the Selectmen, but it includes the School Budget which is two separate entities here, where in the city the School comes under the City Council and the Mayor. Dick Klement stated what would make that more complex is that at this point the significant portion of the High School expenses

are paid for by sending towns; it muddies the water in terms of who's paying for what and how you get there. John stated it makes it more complicated, but it does put a tax cap basically at the rate of the Cost of Living Index, the Federal Cost of Living Index and can not exceed that; so you can't have a 15% or 20% increase in any one year even if it is warranted, it can't go through. You lose the expenses when the tax rate's up. This is if the Federal Government and the State default on their payments; the tax rate can't go up then the Town and the School get a cut budget. Dick stated if this was in place, if he is understanding it correctly, and they've had a zero Social Security Index change for the last few years and the health insurance has gone up approximately 30% in the past 2 years for about \$1.5 Million, what would that \$1.5 Million have come out of. John stated the rest of the budget would be cut by that bottom line. Dick stated interesting.

Bob Drinkhall stated that brings up a wonderful point; if you're on Social Security or fixed income of any type and your costs go up, you don't automatically get more income the last time he checked and you certainly have to take it out of something that you already are spending it on and that's something the government doesn't realize or ever practice if they do realize it.

John Edgerton stated Bob was right and the problem is you've already had the penalty for a full year before you get the increase and if the Federal Reserve is looking at Cost of Living Indexes of 6% a year for the next 12 years to balance the inflation they've already built in of 50%, then we're looking at .5% increase in expenses before you get the 6% raise for Social Security at the end of the year.

Ray Shakir stated that the hypothetical \$1.5 Million doesn't necessarily have to come out of the health care budget; creatively you could say that \$500.00 deductible would be a real \$500.00 deductible and that would bring that \$1.5 Million down significantly if not eliminate it all together; so it's not necessarily true that you're cutting the School Budget, you might have to shift the expenses to the employees. Dick Klement stated the one kicker in there that he sees is that they have Union Contracts and they are currently under the Evergreen Clause because it hasn't been repealed yet. The contract with the teachers, and with the other agencies, say that the \$500.00 deductible is funded; if they were to go and have a contract renewed, that \$500.00 would in there for them every year after that; you couldn't take the money away and you can't take the money away from the Union and if they don't agree, then you're under Evergreen and you keep what you have, you can't reduce that money. The only thing you can do would be to fire staff which means you're going to have less offerings for courses. He wasn't saying he agreed or disagreed, he was just saying that's what would result.

Karen Umberger stated Bob made the point about health insurance going up and that's why her concern is not the policy that they have but what are they doing to reduce usage. She was not suggesting that someone who has cancer or a catastrophic problem shouldn't go to the doctor, but she thought that when we looked at it this year they have 2,300 days lost from doctor visits and that's out of 130 people. Dick Klement stated there are 180 teachers, but the total would be about 400.

John Edgerton stated his view all along has been that we are not micro-managing anything and that we are here primarily for the taxpayer and the only thing we can consider trying to save people is an increase in taxes beyond that which they can pay. A 20% increase in the tax rate, no teacher is going to get a 20% pay raise and as far as the Evergreen Clause is concerned, a majority of those people he had talked to turned down the last contract mostly because it would put them in the Evergreen Clause which they are not in now. They don't go in to Evergreen until they get a contract within the Evergreen law.

Doug Swett stated that's what he brought up the other day; this contract will be voted on in April and he's been told that if the Legislature is going to do anything about the Evergreen Clause it won't be until June; although they've said they've got something written here that will take care of the situation. Karen Umberger stated the contract doesn't go into effect until 1 July. The fact that it was voted on in April, it's effective day is 1 July. Chairman Mosca stated if there were to be Legislative action prior to 1 July to repeal the law, then the Evergreen wouldn't take effect in the new contract. Dick Klement stated the language in the contract is that if Evergreen is repealed, there is a sunset clause built into this current contract. If the folks down at the Legislature repeal it, then they are not held to it. Some contracts have inserted Evergreen into it so even if you repeal it, they're still subject to Evergreen; that's not so with this contract.

Bill Masters stated he just wanted to make it clear that the funding that was appropriated by the voters, the \$1.3 Million did not increase the budget, it just increased the amount of spending within that parameter. That did not increase that budget because "x" number of dollars was appropriated and that's what they had to work with. The point he is getting at is the budget wasn't increased at all, they just burned up that surplus, that's the point and did they do that within the parameters of what legally can be done with bond money, that is the issue.

Chairman Mosca stated he appreciates the discussion but at this point it really is moot because it's done and it's over and he agrees that we need to let the public know our feelings and our positions; however, you can only beat a dead horse for so long so. Chairman stated if the members could move past that, he would appreciate it.

John Edgerton stated he would like to know how much the Warrant Articles are going to increase the tax base.

Bob Drinkhall stated he would like to make one point that Doug made because he didn't think it could be said enough because it hasn't worked in the past and that's the reason for attending the Deliberative. To use a quick example, the Town's budget is basically \$8.8 Million; the Default as suggested, which we haven't yet set, but is suggested by the Town Manager of \$9 Million and more than likely we'll come out with some figure probably around that, but let's just say we do come out with that figure, if, at the Deliberative somebody adds in \$100,000.00 that they've already taken out, that makes the new budget \$8.9 Million and when you get to voting day in April, you either vote for the \$8.9 with the

\$100,000.00 added in or you vote it out and end up with a Default Budget which is even greater. So, you do need to attend, if you care, the Deliberative because a lot happens there that you have no control over after.

Ray Shakir stated he would like to know, if anybody could tell him, how is the formula for the Default Budget arrived. He knows what the verbiage is, who established this verbiage so that the Default Budget equals this type of criteria. Bob Drinkhall stated the State DRA.

Doug Swett stated there has been people arguing for and against this and there's been a standard answer of "nobody's ever taken it to Court" so until somebody is willing to spend the money, you'll have to accept what we put in front of you; it's never been tested.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Mosca advised that the next meeting would be Wednesday night at the Police Station at 6:30 PM for those who are unaware or thought they were coming here and he believed we would be going over the Conservation Commission and the Police Department at that point in time.

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Mosca stated there was a sheet for meetings of who can attend and who wasn't going to be at what meetings. Chairman asked who was going to be at the meeting on Wednesday evening and found that there should be a quorum if everybody shows that is suppose to show. Bob Drinkhall asked if all would still be at the meeting even if it snows. John Edgerton stated with freezing rain and ice he thought it would be cancelled; if it rains, nobody's going anywhere. Chairman stated if it was a disaster, there's no sense in having a meeting.

Bill Masters thanked Dick Klement for coming and sitting in the hot seat; we really appreciate that and would like to see him more often. Chairman Mosca also thanked Dick for being present.

Dick Klement stated this is probably not quite old business, but it's relevant business he thought, they had 300+ people show up at for one of the School Board meetings when they were discussing reducing some programs, the \$1 Million/\$1.5 Million cut. There are a number of people in the community that are very, very active when it comes to certain things; some people like Music, some people like Art, some people like Mathematics, and some people like Football. If a budget were to come forward and reduce Football and Music, you wouldn't have a room big enough to put them all in. If these people come to the Deliberative Session to build upon what they said earlier and show up with 200 or 300 people to go in there and say "we want \$500,000.00 added to the School Budget" for whatever, it's going to pass and it's the folks that need to get out there and he saw some members at some of the meetings and he applauds them for not standing up in a "hostile" environment trying to say something but this SB2 is just wild stuff because 100, 200 people can make the whole difference in this budget.

Doug Swett stated that maybe the people in charge of the Town had better face the fact that if the population ever did turn out, they're going to have to call the meeting off and put it some where else because they don't have seats enough. Karen Umberger stated she thought we should all be happy if that were to occur; let's not fight it and if there isn't enough room, move to the Gym because that has more seats.

Bob Drinkhall moved, seconded by Bill Masters, to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Iris A. Bowden, Recording Secretary