

**MINUTES OF MEETING
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE
February 11, 2016**

A meeting of the Municipal Budget Committee was called to order at 6:30 PM in the Professional Development Room at Kennett Middle School with the following members present: Chairman Joe Mosca, Vice Chair Danielle Santuccio, Doug Swett, Pat Swett, Peter Donohoe, Mark Hounsell, Jim LeFebvre, John Colbath, Terry McCarthy, Dick Klement, John Edgerton, Pat Kittle (arriving at 6:35 PM), Bill Marvel and Christopher DeVries. Excused: Frank McCarthy and Bill Masters. Also present: Lilli Gilligan, Town Finance Director; Iris Bowden, Recording Secretary; and Damon Steer of The Daily Sun.

John Edgerton led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

TOWN VOTE

Chairman Mosca stated that on the previous night the Committee members voted on the Precinct Budgets and the members challenged one of the Precincts which was something that has never happened before. The Precinct went to the DRA and the DRA came back and said that everything that we've been doing since before he was on the Board is wrong with the Precinct Budgets. We have to vote on the Operating Budget and then vote on any Capital Reserve Funds or any Special Warrant Articles separately. We've been voting everything as a total, that's wrong and because we know about it, we have to go back and redo them all.

PRECINCTS

REDSTONE FIRE DISTRICT

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by John Edgerton, to approve the Operating Budget for \$45,500.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to approve the Capital Reserve Fund for \$10,000.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

EAST CONWAY FIRE DISTRICT

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to approve the Operating Budget for \$46,650.00. In favor 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

John Colbath moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to approve the Capital Reserve Fund for buildings for \$3,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Dick Klement moved, seconded by John Colbath, to approve the Capital Reserve Fund for equipment for \$8,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

CENTER CONWAY FIRE PRECINCT

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to approve the Operating Budget for \$161,050.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Dick Klement stated he thought that was reduced last night. Chairman Mosca stated we did not; we reduced the whole thing because we were including the Warrant Articles in that total. There is the Operating Budget of \$161,050.00, a Warrant Article for \$30,000.00 for Capital Reserve for equipment, and a Warrant Article for \$48,000.00 for a new Fire Chief. Those are separate Articles and we are right now just voting on the Operating Budget.

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to approve the Capital Reserve Fund for equipment for \$30,000.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Joe Mosca; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated he wanted to make note that right now he believes there is \$55,000.00 in reserves and he didn't know if the \$30,000.00 was something that was needed/required or not. He was just throwing that out there. Chief Leavitt did mention last night that they had about \$55,000.00 in reserves. This is just so everybody knows.

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by John Edgerton, to approve the Warrant Article for a new Fire Chief for one-half of the year for \$48,000.00. In favor: 0; Opposed: 11; Abstain: 3 - Pat Kittle, Christopher DeVries and John Edgerton.

Chairman Mosca stated this is for half a year and will go up to \$96,000.00.

Pat Swett stated she thought the members needed to remember that this is for only 6 months; it will double next year. Chairman Mosca agreed.

John Edgerton stated he was the representative from the Center Conway Fire Precinct. It was an addition this year of \$48,000.00 which would have been covered with surplus and there would not be a tax increase this year; however, the \$188,000.00 is the regular Budget and \$80,000.00 to \$82,000.00 increase next year. For him that's \$300.00 a year increase in his taxes. He can go along with what went on last night, but he will have to abstain from the vote, but as long as you understand that this year there would be no tax increase. Next year there will be a substantial increase and we will vote on it this year to put it together. There's no way of getting out next year.

John Edgerton stated he had talked with Chief Leavitt who had talked with the Board and they know what this Committee will probably approve again to be turned down. They are planning on going to raise it 10%, \$18,000.00, at the Annual Meeting on March 24, 2016. For those people that said there were no notices, the notices go out for the Annual Meeting on the 24th and there will be three, one week apart, of each so that the notices will be there as to what the meeting will be. With that \$18,000.00 increase, their

proposal is they will go for a Fire Inspector on a per diem basis which is really what they wanted the Chief for.

Chairman Mosca asked if they get the Fire Inspector, will they still want the Chief. John Edgerton stated all they said was they will increase it 10% over the Budget and use that money to pay a Fire Inspector on a per diem basis. That's it. Chairman stated he wished they had said that prior to the vote on the Budget last night.

Mark Hounsell stated in all his years of doing this, he couldn't recall when the Budget Committee stood in a position of obstructing any requests that the Precincts make through us. He was hesitant to not recommend, but as a cautionary vote, he thought it was necessary for him to express that caution and he was not sure how he was going to vote and hope that there would be more discussion. At this point, he thought the strongest vote that we can give as a Board is to join John (Edgerton) in abstaining. If he was to say to any of these Precincts when they have such an increase as this, it would be a cautionary thing. It wouldn't be "I don't approve it" or "it's too much", it's going to really hit you down the years. He was thinking he might abstain as a cautionary measure and perhaps the voters of the Precinct when they come up with it they will understand the abstentions from the Budget Committee is really a cautionary expression.

Dick Klement stated really what we are doing is saying if we vote "no" that we don't support this. It still goes to the voters and they can say "okay Budget Committee we heard you, we listened to you and we don't want to do what you want to do". It's not taking it off the ballot, it's just saying what our position is.

Peter Donohoe stated to John Edgerton, just for clarification, they are proposing to increase the Operating Budget by 10% to fund the Fire Inspector. John stated that's the conversation to do that; they haven't done that. The conversation is they know they can raise it 10%. What they really need is an Inspector right now. Ray (Leavitt) is overloaded and he's the only Inspector they have. John, himself, doesn't recommend and thought one has to be very careful about some of the increases that could happen because of this. Their biggest complaint when they came to us and spoke to us was the lack of the extra jobs that Ray can't do. He runs a farm, he runs a bakery, he gets between 5 and 6 hours of sleep a night. We are not going to get somebody that does that for nothing. His truck is at the Fire Station every single day and he doesn't get paid for that. They need something. What do they need? They're asking for a Chief.

Chairman Mosca stated his position is should Center Conway end up with a full-time Fire Chief, what happens when Redstone comes to us and what happens when East Conway comes to us. At that point of time, there will be a total of 5 paid Fire Chiefs in the Town of Conway totaling over \$500,000.00 in salary and benefits. If people don't think that's insane, then he doesn't know.

TOWN WARRANT

Chairman Mosca stated his proposal is that we do everything but the Operating Budget and that we come back and do the Budget last because he thought that was going to take the most amount of time. He thought we could get through everything else fairly quickly.

Chairman Mosca began with **Article 11 - Collective Bargaining Agreement for the Calendar Years 2016-2017 Between the Town of Conway and Conway Police Department** in amount \$21,774.00 for 2016 and \$72,378.00 for 2017.

John Colbath moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe to recommend Article 11 - Collective Bargaining Agreement for the Calendar Years 2016-2017 Between the Town of Conway and Conway Police Department in amount \$21,774.00 for 2016 and \$72,378.00 for 2017. In favor: 8; Opposed: 6 - Pat Swett, Dick Klement, Christopher DeVries, Bill Marvel, Doug Swett and Jim LeFebvre; Abstain: 0.

Bill Marvel stated the only objection he had was the multi-year nature of it. People are tending toward two and three year Contracts now and it just strikes him that a single year is enough to wait to resolve differences and the economic situations change quickly. He guessed he was more concerned about that in the School than here, but for the sake of consistency he is mentioning it here.

Chairman Mosca stated to your (Bill Marvel) point, the last Police Contract was three years and he thought they heard this Committee say that we didn't want 3-year Contracts and thought that was why they came to us with a 2-year Contract this time. The last Contract was a 3-year Contract. Bill asked if that was true and the Chairman stated it was. Bill stated well then that makes a difference.

Doug Swett stated he agrees with Bill (Marvel) 100%. With the economic situation in this country and \$19 Trillion owed, some where here something is going to break and we're all going to regret it.

Dick Klement stated once again he will vote against this because the taxpayers, a vast majority, are getting no pay raise. How can the people who are not getting any pay raises, pay for pay raises for public employees.

Mark Hounsell stated he thought it was not accurate to say that people in this town are not getting pay raises. He understands that there was no cost of living adjustments made for Social Security recipients, and he knows several of them that rely on that, but most people have other incomes, either through pensions or investments. He thought it was not quite a solid argument to suggest that seniors are going to be strapped by this. These people who we are talking about, we're talking about a 3% pay raise and he didn't think that was out of line for the performance. It his feeling that they earn it, they work hard and they earn it. Yes, it's a lot of money but they earn it. Three percent is not out of line and he thought because COLA uses a really strange way, Social Security, to achieve their adjustments, he thought it wasn't really reflective of a

true adjustments that people who are retired get in their overall income. He would encourage all of the members to support this because they've earned the money and it's not an excessive amount.

Chairman Mosca stated to Mark Hounsell that he mentioned investments. He would show Mark his investment portfolio for the last year and a half and Mark can tell the Chairman how well he is doing.

Dick Klement stated he wasn't speaking solely about seniors. He believes that a significant amount of people in the Valley who are not seniors but are working at jobs supplied in the retail industry, at the ski lifts or whatever, they're not getting pay raises. Nobody's getting pay raises except the public employees. That's his feeling.

Mark Hounsell stated he thought it was inaccurate to say that people aren't getting pay raises. He just talked with a young man the other day who, through his education and achievement, did get a pay raise. He worked himself to a point where he was worth more. He didn't think it was accurate to say that nobody got a pay raise.

Chairman Mosca stated he didn't disagree with Mark (Hounsell) but thought to Dick's (Klement) point, a majority of the people who work in the service industry in this town don't get pay raises every year.

Mark Hounsell stated he thought that was unfortunate, but that's a different issue between their plight and these people's plight. These people are Town employees, they've earned the money, they've done their part and are moving things in accordance with programs and services provided. He thought they were entitled to what he considers a reasonable request at 3%.

Chairman Mosca stated he didn't disagree with Mark (Hounsell) at all, but he was just saying that the people that have to pay for the pay raises aren't getting raises themselves.

Mark Hounsell stated he was just reminded that most people get excited about the possibility of expenditures, but no one gets excited about taxes.

Peter Donohoe stated he would just like to point out that 3% per year or per Contract cycle, with the effective compounding, that is if every Contract cycle is 3% a year, he believes that the Police are doing a good job and are due an increase, but he does believe that the public sector is starting to out pace the private sector with respect to raises every year.

Mark Hounsell stated just to reiterate, we hire people to do a job. When they do a good job as determined through what he thought was a very reasonable evaluation process, they've earned it. We're talking about people's careers, regardless of whether they are private or public. We have no say about what happens in the private sector. We have to recognize that when we're talking about public sector activity, we should not be prejudiced about what people do for their work; we should be prejudiced about how they perform their work. This Contract allows that consideration

to be the forefront and not the plight of people who aren't being paid right by the service industry as Dick (Klement) alluded to.

Chairman Mosca stated to Peter's (Donohoe) point, historically public service figures have received less per pay raise than private sector. Right now it's completely turned around so that the public sector is getting more than the private sector. He thought that was Peter's point.

Mark Hounsell stated and to that point if that was Peter's (Donohoe) point, is we have to understand that our role here is to feel that this is a reasonable request. It has to balance against a lot of things and that's why we have a discussion such as this. Everything that he's heard so far fails to address the point that these negotiations which are done according to law include provisions to make sure that evaluations are done in a manner that before someone gets a pay raise, they've actually earned it. There is that process in place. We're stewards over a lot and if people think a career decision to go public or private in their decision, there shouldn't be a segregation of their effort. That's how he feels about it and guessed he was done.

Jim LeFebvre stated during a conversation that he had with Chief Wagner, he asked the Chief how many of his total staff did not get to the 82% rate which would enable them to get up to a 3% pay raise. Out of his entire staff, two persons he indicated to Jim. Now in the HR world that he comes from, that gentlemen is a skewed bell curve. He totally supports the fact that the Police Department is doing a good job, however they need to tighten up on how they evaluate their personnel to bring it back to a more equitable level for everyone.

Mark Hounsell stated he wanted to say he didn't disagree with Jim (LeFebvre) about the evaluation process. It always, continuously, in all departments needs to be looked at by the Police Commissioners, the Selectmen and the School.

Jim LeFebvre stated to a larger point if he may, the other thing we need to take a look at as we look at this is that the taxpayers, and we are representing all of the taxpayers, to include the Police Department and the taxpayers who come from the private sector, and in the public sector, we were talking earlier about the fact that they used to have lower salaries for other benefits. Those other benefits include the fact that it is much harder to discharge a public sector employee because they have legal protections that do not exist in the private sector and that gives them a degree of job security that he, working for a defense contractor right now, do not have plus his wife who used to work for the Federal Government. That is a general rule across public/private sector involvement from the Federal Government all the way down. That's all he wanted to say. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Mosca stated last comment, until there is something on the Ballot to change the Town's system of pay raises and hiring, it's going to stay the same. It's a system that was adopted years ago, the 20 or 30 Town Survey, and that's where the starting pay is from and that's how they look at how everybody gets their pay raises. Until we, as a community, want to

change it change it, then we live with what we have. He didn't think 3% was that dramatic to be truthful and that was his last two cents.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 12 - if Article #11 is defeated, authorize the governing body to call one special meeting at its option, to address article cost items only.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to recommend Article 12 - if Article #11 is defeated, authorize the governing body to call one special meeting at its option, to address article cost items only. In favor: 0; Opposed: 13; Abstain: 1 - John Colbath.

Chairman Mosca stated that last year this Committee had a similar Article and we voted it down unanimously.

Peter Donohoe stated he was always against any attempt to get a second bite of the apple.

Mark Hounsell stated he agreed with Peter (Donohoe); he would never vote for this Article.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 13 - Capital Reserve Fund for Infrastructure Reconstruction in amount \$750,000.00.**

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Bill Marvel, to recommend Article 13 - Capital Reserve Fund for Infrastructure Reconstruction in amount \$750,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Peter Donohoe stated he thought Paul (DegliAngeli) presented this well and that this is something that we really have to do.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 14 - Capital Reserve Fund for Highway Equipment in amount \$300,000.00.**

Bill Marvel moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to recommend Article 14 - Capital Reserve Fund for Highway Equipment in amount \$300,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 15 - Capital Reserve Fund for Solid Waste Equipment in amount \$110,000.00.**

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Terry McCarthy, to recommend Article 15 - Capital Reserve Fund for Solid Waste Equipment in amount \$110,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 16 - Capital Reserve Fund for Landfill Expansion in amount \$110,000.00.**

John Colbath moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to recommend Article 16 - Capital Reserve Fund for Landfill Expansion in amount \$110,000.00. In favor: 11; Opposed: 3 - Peter Donohoe, Jim LeFebvre and Joe Mosca; Abstain: 0.

Peter Donohoe stated this was one Article that he was not going to support this year because he thought it was money that we could afford to skip putting in the bank for future expansion. Given the life cycle of the previous expansions, and he understands Paul's (DegliAngeli) argument, again well placed, about the timing of this. He thought this was one Article we could afford to skip this year.

Dick Klement asked how much was in that fund right now because he thought the Town had skipped a couple of years already. Lilli Gilligan stated on page 37, the Capital Reserve balance is \$112,901.00 and yes years were skipped. She believed that two years ago it was removed.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 17 - Capital Reserve Fund for Maintenance of Town Buildings and Facilities in amount \$218,000.00.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Terry McCarthy, to recommend Article 17 - Capital Reserve Fund for Maintenance of Town Buildings and Facilities in amount \$218,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 18 - Capital Reserve Fund for Parks Department Vehicles and Equipment in amount \$25,000.00.**

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Doug Swett, to recommend Article 18 - Capital Reserve Fund for Parks Department Vehicles and Equipment in amount \$25,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 19 - Capital Reserve Fund for Police Vehicles in amount \$65,000.00.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by John Edgerton, to recommend Article 19 - Capital Reserve Fund for Police Vehicles in amount \$65,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 20 - Public Educational/Government Cable Television (PEG) Trust Fund in amount \$110,000.00.**

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Terry McCarthy, to recommend Article 20 - Public Educational/Government Cable Television (PEG) Trust Fund in amount \$110,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 21 - Eastern Slopes Regional Airport in amount \$10,000.00.**

John Colbath moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 21 - Eastern Slopes Regional Airport in amount \$10,000.00. In favor: 7; Opposed: 7 - Dick Klement, Christopher DeVries, Peter Donohoe, Bill Marvel, Jim LeFebvre, Danielle Santuccio and Joe Mosca; Abstain: 0.

Bill Marvel stated he was opposed to this as he was to almost any venture that takes public funds and puts them into private enterprise even though it may be considered part of our Transportation Infrastructure, he didn't see us throwing money into real travel and what little money we've been

contributing to the bus service seems to be wasted basically. He certainly didn't want this going into the Selectmen's Budget to expand at leisure.

John Edgerton stated no way does this say private venture. This is strictly a transportation venture of government interest within the Valley for the Valley.

Chairman Mosca stated to Bill's (Marvel) point, he was voting against it because he didn't want to see it going into the Operating Budget where it can get changed for any amount and that's the only reason he's voting against it. He thought it was a good use of money, but he didn't want to see it being something that can be abused in the future. That's why he will vote against this.

Mark Hounsell stated the Selectmen have kept their word that they will keep this on the Warrant for three consecutive years and if the voters approve it. He saw nothing that's really changed the argument that would sway him to think that this isn't still a good use of resources. He is going to vote for this and hopefully next year it will be in the Operating Budget. Even if it is there, we will be able to look at it and comment on it, but as far as this one, this is part of the arrangement that was agreed upon of the Selectmen putting it out there for the voters for three years and this is the third year. Nothing's changed.

John Edgerton stated he would like to not see it in the Budget either, but he will vote for it. You have to understand that this operation runs on 90% Federal funds, so it's really a Federal operation and it must have local funds in order for the Federal Government to pump in the other 90%. He's in favor of it, but he doesn't like seeing it in the Selectmen's Budget.

John Colbath stated to Chairman Mosca that once it goes into the Budget line, then the voters have a chance to change that at the Deliberative. There is a legislative process for it. It's not just going to be totally at the discretion of any one group of people to dictate that.

Bill Marvel stated just a rebuttal really. What John (Colbath) commented on is true of anything in the Budget, but the process that we have under SB2 makes it much easier for the public at large to have a direct say in the management of these sorts of funds. He guessed that he would add also that the Airport probably gets local funds from Fryeburg as well since it's in another state and that should probably qualify it for Federal funds. On top of all of that, the Airport operated successfully for a long time without getting these funds. The funds were denied on many previous years and he thought this was just another instance of the Town being a grab bag and probably with the hope that at some point it will become a substantial source of revenue.

John Edgerton stated the Airport for many, many years had no expansion whatsoever. It needs expansion to get the extreme high value clients into this Valley. It needs a 500 foot extension on the runway and with that they can bring in all of the executive jets in here and bring in the big bucks.

Bill Marvel stated John (Edgerton) just gave me one more reason to vote against it.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 22 - Vehicle for Town Hall Employees in amount \$20,000.00.**

John Colbath moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 22 - Vehicle for Town Hall Employees in amount \$20,000.00. In favor 13; Opposed: 1 - Peter Donohoe; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 23 - Crime Scene Mapping System for the Police Department in amount \$27,200.00; half will be paid by taxes and half will be paid by a Grant or \$13,600.00 to be raised by taxes.**

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to recommend Article 23 - Crime Scene Mapping System for the Police Department in amount \$27,200.00; half will be paid by taxes and half will be paid by a Grant or \$13,600.00 to be raised by taxes. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Christopher DeVries; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 24 - Town Hall Facility Needs and Site Alternatives Analysis in amount \$40,000.00.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Terry McCarthy, to recommend Article 24 - Town Hall Facility Needs and Site Alternatives Analysis in amount \$40,000.00. In favor: 3 - John Colbath, Bill Marvel and Joe Mosca; Opposed: 10; Abstain: 1 - Doug Swett.

Dick Klement stated he didn't understand why we have a Code Enforcement Officer who is supposed to know what's safe, what's not safe and how things are supposed to be put together in a building. Why can't that person do much of this to determine what they need. He didn't understand the \$40,000.00 to do something that we can do internally.

Peter Donohoe stated it was his opinion that this is chasing good money after bad. He understands that an outside Report may be needed to validate whatever future needs may be, but he is at a loss to understand the expenditure of \$40,000.00. He thought there could be some smaller steps taken at a much smaller cost and, as Dick (Klement) mentioned, perhaps even internally and \$40,000.00 is a big price tag for something he thought that is not worthwhile.

Mark Hounsell stated that it's been his observation of late that a lot of these studies just become fuel for an argument from one side or the other or both sides at the same time. He is familiar with the building and Peter's (Donohoe) is being kind saying good money after bad. He would put it a little bit different; he would say it's pouring money down a rat hole.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 25 - Place the Conway Public Library Building and Park on the National Register of Historic Places in amount \$10,800.00.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 26 - Place the Conway Public Library Building and Park on the National Register of Historic Places in amount \$10,800.00. In favor: 11; Opposed: 3 - Pat Swett, Jim LeFebvre and Joe Mosca; Abstain: 0.

Pat Swett stated she knows last night they said that they could do anything to the building and it wouldn't change the status of the historical. She knows at their Church when they put it on the National Historic Places, they said they couldn't do anything without getting their permission. That's just something to think about and maybe somebody else can clarify differently. She didn't know.

John Colbath stated two points: the way this is worded remember that it is only a \$8,640.00 Grant, so it's only an expenditure of \$2,160.00 and when they looked into this research, the Library Trustees, the Director said to the contrary that it would not affect what is done to the building. It's really for historical purposes to maintain the historical structure in a historical district. It may be important for future Grants and funding for the Library to have that.

Dick Klement stated he guessed his question is if there were, and God forbid it happen, a fire that damaged the building severely and we, the Town, feel that it is more expedient to tear the building down rather than fix it, are you allowed to do that. There are different rules and without knowing what the rules are, we may be putting ourselves in a corner.

Bill Marvel stated he couldn't speak with absolute authority, but he knows a number of buildings and caretakers of buildings that are on the National Historic Register and it is his understanding that it's completely an honorary system. The problems you would have with tearing down a building of a certain age in this town for instance would have more to do with zoning with Town regulations than with the National Register. The value he saw in this and, as he has said before, he would have seen much greater value in it back around 1994 when he was fighting the addition to that building in that particular place because it compromised the historical/architectural integrity. It wouldn't stop the owner of the building, the owner being the Town basically, from doing whatever they wanted.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 26 - Repair the Roof on the Conway Public Library in amount \$200,000.00.**

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 26 - Repair the Roof on the Conway Public Library in amount \$200,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 27 - Assume the Operational Responsibility for Sidewalks Located Within the Conway Village Fire District in amount \$67,214.00.**

Jim LeFebvre moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to recommend Article 27 - Assume the Operational Responsibility for Sidewalks Located Within the

Conway Village Fire District in amount \$67,214.00. In favor: 1 - John Colbath; Opposed: 13; Abstain: 0.

Peter Donohoe stated he would be brief. He thought the Achilles heal with this Article is the wording and just the whole way that this thing has been presented. That's what he will say about that.

Mark Hounsell stated he has two ways he can argue against this and he was going to pick the gentler way because that's the way he wants to live from now on, he's going to try to be gentle. Mark apologized to Dick (Klement) about his outburst.

Mark Hounsell stated he was going to be gentle and say that the Selectmen just don't understand the situation and he can explain that on a number of different points, but he can also tell the members that he doesn't know of a sole in the Conway Village District, including the Commissioners, that agreed to this in negotiations. The fact is that they agreed to something different and then this was changed by the Selectmen which is of course their right. The thing is that the numbers don't add up especially with the Pollard Street Sidewalk; he believes that was put in there in a way that, not purposely because he wouldn't accuse anyone of purposely doing it, but the affect of it is that it kills it, it muddies it up, it's a different issue. If there was ever an Article that needed to be divided it would be whether the Town takes over the responsibility of the sidewalks and, oh here's the other part of it, do you want to build a sidewalk on Pollard Street.

Mark Hounsell further stated Pollard Street is not an exceptional street. If you were to go by Pollard Street right now, you would see it covered with snow. If you were to go by it in the summer time, you would see cars parked on it. People don't walk on those sidewalks because they are not fit to walk on. There's no compelling reason why Pollard Street should have a sidewalk any more than Lake Street or River Street or Swett Street or Oak Street or Jack Frost Lane or Hobbs Street or Kennett Street. It just doesn't make sense and he objects to this Article for that reason and also because the second paragraph is not what was agreed on and negotiated with in good faith between the Commissioners and the Selectmen. He hopes we do not give it a single vote of support.

John Colbath stated first, personally, it is a very muddy issue and he totally agrees. The Selectmen had Public Hearings on both Pollard Street and on the sidewalks. The Selectmen were asked to take this into consideration because the Precinct of Conway wanted to no longer be in the sidewalk business. If the people of the Town take it over, it has to come before the legislative public referendum to do it. There are sidewalk funds there within the Precinct so those funds were part of the negotiation as to how they would be used.

John Colbath further stated Pollard Street happened in the Town Projects going to be reconstructed totally this summer. It now has two sub-standard sidewalks on both sides, so those will be removed and one sidewalk will be on the, if you enter from the East Main Street it would be the south side of the road, it would be on the right hand side that a sidewalk will be

put in. When they had the Public Hearing, everybody who lived in the Pollard Street area who was there came in and were in favor of the sidewalk. When you think in terms of liability issues, it only takes one accident with someone severely injured or killed for it to become a big insurance liability issue because the street was reconstructed without sidewalks that were there before. Again, it's a very muddy issue.

John Colbath further stated the other thing is this proposal the way it is has to be accepted by the Conway Village Precinct which will be having their meeting the night before the Deliberative Session. This may not even be an Article that comes up for consideration because if the Precinct does not agree with the Article the way it is for participation, then the whole thing goes away.

Mark Hounsell stated his honorable colleague allows him to stay on the gentle side, but he needs to point out that those are not sub-standard sidewalks, they're non-existent sidewalks. There's some pavement that's thrown on the side of the road that rolls up and down. They are not used. Anyone with any brains will walk in the road because those sidewalks are already unsafe. He believes it's necessary for us to recognize that not ever street that wants a sidewalk gets to have one. Pollard Street or some of them are asking for a sidewalk. What are we going to do when someone from one of the other streets comes in asking for a sidewalk. We're not replacing anything. What we're recognizing, he believes, especially if you drive by them tonight, there are no sidewalks there. If the Selectmen really wanted to adhere to the law, they would look at the Texas case that says, or the Precinct would, that these sidewalks have to be maintained. They don't have to be maintained because they're really not sidewalks.

Mark Hounsell further stated the other part and he would just kind of put it out there, that isn't the issue of taking over the sidewalks or whether we construct more of them. That should be a separate Article. It should be asked separate from the main question that the Village people asked for was to have the Town consider taking over the sidewalks in the same manner that they have taken over the North Conway sidewalks and how they maintain the Center Conway sidewalks and every other sidewalk in the Town except the ones in the Village.

Mark Hounsell further stated an event that happened the other day, the Selectmen without any notice and with a different approach decided to put additional money in to take over the Kearsarge Lighting District. That's not a Warrant Article, that's a request that was made. You know you've got to deal with all of the Villages the same, just like you deal with your children the same. You can't favor one over the other. Conway Village is in the need of help and they are reaching to the Selectmen and this is what we end up with. He's going to stop now because he can feel himself he's not going to be gentle.

John Colbath stated just for clarification it's the Intervale Lighting District which is going to dissolve and all they are in business for is lighting. They have something like 39 light posts of which 19 are in Conway and 20 in what have you, so the decision will be whether to take those over or not.

Mark Hounsell stated just to point out that Intervale Lighting District and whatever is part of the Town of Bartlett and he finds it interesting that it's okay to go ahead and accept lights from a different government entity, but by golly we're going to put it on the Warrant in such a confused manner to make sure that we're not going to accept sidewalks.

Bill Marvel stated he didn't want to get too far aside here, but he thought those lights that they are talking about are on wooden poles, so doesn't the Highway Department have a chain saw.

Pat Swett stated she doesn't too often agree with Mark (Hounsell) wholeheartedly, but she does agree that the Pollard Street sidewalk should have been a separate Article.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 28 - Terms of Compensation for the Elected Town Clerk/Tax Collector.**

John Colbath moved, seconded by Terry McCarthy, to recommend Article 28 - Terms of Compensation for the Elected Town Clerk/Tax Collector. In favor: 11; Opposed: Pat Kittle, Dick Klement and Jim LeFebvre; Abstain: 0.

John Edgerton stated he was the Treasurer a long, long time ago when he was a young kid. During that period of time the system changed; the Tax Collector and Town Clerk was totally paid by fees and the salary went up and down, ridiculously up and down, maybe as much as 40% per year. It was changed to a salary system on the basis it is now to stabilize the income of the Tax Collector and Town Clerk.

Dick Klement stated this guarantees that this individual is going to get at least a 3% raise every year based upon the 30-Town Survey. It's not that he or she would get less than 3%, but they could receive 10% depending on what it is. Having a 3% base when over the last 4 or 5 years the Cost of Living Index as computed has been less than 3% and now some banks are even having negative interest on their accounts. He takes exception to this.

Mark Hounsell stated just that the evaluation piece of this is called the voters and elections. This is an elected position.

BUDGET VOTE

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 10 - Operating Budget in amount \$10,500,845.00. AMENDED (see below)**

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to recommend the Operating Budget in amount \$10,500,845.00. AMENDED (see below)

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to recommend the Operating Budget in amount \$10,481,920.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Dick Klement; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated if any member was not at the Public Hearings last evening, the Town passed out a sheet where they have already reduced line items by \$113,259.00 and they've reduced Warrant Articles by \$137,000.00 for a total reduction of \$243,259.00 and that was all done prior to last night.

Dick Klement stated he ran some numbers which is why he was not ready to speak about this last night. The non-union labor increases are \$43,257.00 and he would recommend that we amend the motion by reducing it by \$43,257.00.

Dick Klement moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce the Operating Budget by \$43,257.00. In favor: 3 - Dick Klement, John Edgerton and Jim LeFebvre; Opposed: 11; Abstain: 0. MOTION FAILED.

Chairman Mosca asked Dick Klement where was it being taken out of. Dick stated it comes out any where they want it to come out of because it's basically salaries, FICA and that stuff. However, they can take it out of wherever they want to take it out of.

Bill Marvel asked Dick Klement how did Dick come to that figure. Dick stated it was the Budget Summary by Department with the 2016 labor increases on it and he did not use the labor increases for Solid Waste, Highway and Police and the Employee Benefits. He did use all of the other information and it came to \$43,257.00.

Mark Hounsell stated he appreciated Dick (Klement) taking the time to identify that number, but the thing that causes him not to support Dick's motion is his comment that the Selectmen can still do it, so he's not going to strap them in other Departments to do something that they are probably going to do any ways. He didn't think this was a wise vote, but did think it was an enlightenment of the amount.

Dick Klement stated as with any recommendation that we've ever made, we send back to them, be it the Town or the School, knowing full well we're recommending a dollar amount. He's giving rationale for the dollar amount reduction, but he's not saying that they have to do that because it's not his place to do that.

Chairman Mosca asked if there was any further discussion on the amended presented by Dick Klement in amount \$43,257.00.

Chairman Mosca asked if there were any other adjustments and asked if any member wanted to look at the Patriotic Purposes line item.

Bill Marvel stated he had an email discussion with Lilli (Gilligan) today about the amount here because the 2014 figure of \$12,000.00 that was spent on that was in addition to \$20,000.00 from a Warrant Article. Bill was wondering if that happened the previous year or not. If there was a Warrant Article in addition to the 2013 appropriation of \$11,000.00. So there were only 2 years of additional funding. In 2014 we threw a Warrant Article in for another \$20,000.00 and then it has been going up independently from that. He has to agree with the observation that the

increase and the expansion of the celebration has less to do with patriotism than profit and he would prefer to go back to the 2014 figure of \$12,000.00.

Bill Marvel moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce the Operating Budget by \$8,925.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - John Colbath; Abstain: 0.

Mark Hounsell stated that Bill (Marvel) was absolutely correct that this was not about patriotic expression, this is more about getting people to come up here and buy things. That's a marketing tool and that's not what we should be doing. The last time he went, and that was some years ago to the display and the place was packed with people and he thought he knew a lot of people in town, but he did not see a single sole, not even from staff, at that event. He is not willing to support that any longer.

Mark Hounsell stated that he had a parliamentary procedure question. We have an amendment to the main motion. Chairman Mosca stated we would be reducing the Operating Budget by \$8,925.00 which would bring the Budget down to \$10,491,920.00. Mark stated his question is should the members refrain from trying to calculate that number until all of the amendments are dealt with and then go back to the main motion knowing what that figure is. Chairman stated you can only do one amendment at a time. Mark stated he was talking about adjusting that bottom line every time. We can keep track of the reductions. Chairman stated he heard what Mark was saying.

Chairman Mosca stated after the vote on the first amendment that the Committee was now working on a Budget of \$10,491,920.00. Chairman asked if there was any other discussion on the Town Budget.

Peter Donohoe stated he had recommended last year and was ultimately accepted, although adjusted slightly downward last year, some of the calculations for the fuel expenditures still seem a little bloated for a couple of reasons. One: winter is not over, but it doesn't look like we are even going to come close to the fuel use on the Highway side of things. The calculation that's being used at, he believes, the PD at \$1.80 per gallon is still high in his opinion. In just doing some quick calculations, he would like to make a motion.

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce the Budget fuel line item in the Highway Department by \$6,000.00 and the Police Department by \$4,000.00, for a total of \$10,000.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - John Colbath; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated there was a request from Lilli Gilligan that we break it down by Police and Highway because the Police Department is controlled by Commissioners and not by the Town.

Dick Klement asked if Peter (Donohoe) was talking about roadway fuel for Police cars and for trucks, not heating fuel. Peter stated he thought the Selectmen and the Department Heads did a pretty good job on the fuel side of things. He wasn't able to extract any excesses out of that. Dick asked if Peter meant heating. Peter stated that was correct. Dick stated so the

fuel for the Highway Department is primarily diesel, isn't it. Peter agreed. Dick asked isn't diesel running more. Chairman Mosca stated no, they're running about the same right now.

Mark Hounsell stated he didn't disagree with what Peter's (Donohoe) motion addresses, but he thought what we have done in recent years is the Selectmen and the Town comes together in March when winter is over and adjusts it on the floor. It's easier to adjust down than to adjust up. He thought there was merit behind Peter's motion, but thought the timing is not right. He thought we need to plan that February can turn into the February's of old and we're not out of winter yet.

Chairman Mosca stated to Mark Hounsell that this was the venue that we did it last year. We reduced it all down, sent our recommendation to the Selectmen and between our vote and the Deliberative Session the Selectmen came up with a different number somewhere between the two numbers that the Budget Committee agreed to in principle before the Deliberative even started so when it took place we were all in agreement and after the meeting we voted to accept that number.

Chairman Mosca stated after the vote on the second amendment, the Committee was now working on a Budget of \$10,481,920.00. Chairman asked if there was any other discussion on the Town Budget.

Dick Klement stated if you read the remainder of **Article 10**, it also says along the same lines of what we defeated in **Article 12**, that if they want to have another election they can. Is our rationale for defeating **Article 12** applicable to **Article 10**. **Article 12** said if **Article 11** was defeated then they could have another election. In **Article 10** they said if the Budget doesn't pass, they could have another election or they could call one. This would also apply to the School as well. If we're making an argument on the Town for **Article 12**, does that apply to **Article 10** and the School. It's just a question.

John Colbath stated he wasn't an attorney, but it is an RSA and he thought it was allowed by law and that's why it is in there. Chairman Mosca stated it's allowed, but if the Article failed and the Default Budget is more, why would they want to go back. That just doesn't make sense. Danielle Santuccio asked if that has ever been in the Articles before because just because it's allowed, is it every year. John Colbath stated yes. Chairman stated he thought in the case where the Default Budget would be less, they may want to check.

Mark Hounsell stated he may have missed the change in the law, but he does recall at one time before you could get a Special Meeting, you had to get permission from a Superior Court Judge. He didn't know if that was still in place, but if it is still in place, that renders this whole sentence thing. He didn't know if by Article they could say if it fails or is defeated that they will have one. He thought that was up to a Superior Court Judge unless the law has changed and it may have. Danielle Santuccio stated no, that's still right.

Mark Hounsell further stated that his question is why would we assume an authority that the law does not provide to us. Danielle Santuccio stated she thought it was in that RSA.

Bill Marvel stated he wondered if it isn't meant to absolve the Board of Selectmen from calling a meeting requesting one from a Judge. A lot of people frown on that and he wondered if it wasn't more political than legal in its intent.

Chairman Mosca stated that Danielle Santuccio was going to look up the Statute. Chairman stated he thought the only reason they would call a Special Meeting or try to call a Special Meeting is if the Default Budget was less than the requested Operating Budget and it failed and they really felt they needed the money. In this case, he thought where the Default Budget is \$145,000.00 +/- more why would you want to go and have another meeting when you're getting more money.

Mark Hounsell stated he was going to go ahead and vote for this motion, but he hopes in future years the Selectmen will consider this because he does think that this provision as Dick (Klement) has pointed out and as Peter (Donohoe) said earlier is two bites of the apple.

DEFAULT BUDGET

Chairman Mosca stated we are now going to vote on a **Default Budget** of \$10,645,158.00.

John Colbath moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to recommend a Default Budget of \$10,645,158.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

REVENUES

Chairman Mosca stated Anticipated Revenues are \$3,915,702.00.

Peter Donohoe moved, seconded by John Colbath, to accept and recommend the Anticipated Revenues of \$3,915,702.00. In favor: 9; Opposed: 1 - Dick Klement; Abstain: 3 - Pat Kittle, Christopher DeVries and Jim LeFebvre. (Mark Hounsell was not present for the vote.)

Mark Hounsell stated he knew we started doing this last year under the counsel of Lilli Gilligan, but he just didn't quite understand why we vote on something that doesn't appear on the Warrant. We're voting for a Budget and the Budget is what's being spent. This may be fine that we are going to have these Revenues and they're probably fairly accurate, but to vote on this to him sounds like we will raise this money. He just hasn't completely understood the process of voting on the Revenues.

Lilli Gilligan stated that the Revenues aren't posted on the Warrant, but they are on the MS737 which is posted with the Warrant and the Revenues are listed by Department and type, just the way she presented them to the members here. There are four columns: Board of Selectmen Recommended, Board of Selectmen Not Recommended, Budget Committee Not Recommended, Budget Committee Recommended. It's posted with the Warrant.

Mark Hounsell stated so this has to do with DRA. Lilli Gilligan confirmed.

Dick Klement stated he had no clue how he could vote on something, not having any information other than the projection and he didn't know what value his vote is. Just because the government wants it, is that why we are doing this. Chairman Mosca stated yes.

Chairman Mosca stated and that concludes the Town Warrant. John Colbath stated he had one more comment because this is his first time going through this process and doing it, but he wanted to commend Lilli (Gilligan) on an excellent job and for coming to both the Selectmen's Meetings and to the Budget Committee meetings. She has been very accessible and has tried to answer any questions that we've had and he thought she has done a very good job.

Chairman Mosca thanked Lilli Gilligan (applause). Lilli stated thank you very much, she appreciates it.

SCHOOL VOTE

Chairman Mosca stated we are now going to discuss the School Department Warrant Articles. We are going to do the same thing and skip the Budget until last.

Chairman Mosca began with **Article 2 - John Fuller Elementary School Bond in amount \$1,700,000.00 plus the first year of interest for a total of \$1,731,387.00.**

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Peter Donohoe, to recommend Article 2 - John Fuller Elementary School Bond in amount \$1,700,000.00 plus the first year of interest for a total of \$1,731,387.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Dick Klement stated as he understands it, we can not vote to raise this to \$2 Million, is that correct. Can we urge the School Board to go back and recalculate this to get John Fuller School and the change that it needs to \$2 Million that they've already stated and finish one school. If we can't do it, we can ask them to do it and say please.

Mark Hounsell stated he didn't know if the time that they have remaining allows that. Superintendent Kevin Richard stated Jim Hill was getting the rates today. He didn't know if Jim completed that, but he was getting the rates for what it would be for \$2 Million. Mark asked if there was time for the School Board to do it now. Chairman Mosca stated no because the Public Hearing was last night. It would have to be done at the Deliberative.

Mark Hounsell asked Mr. Richard if he had a sheet that Mark was holding. Mr. Richard stated he did. Mark asked that the sheet be passed out so that he could talk to the members with the information in front of them.

John Colbath called Point of Order. We can't up it here, but the Deliberative Meeting can and it was asked last night if the administration would come prepared to discuss that at the Deliberative Meeting. Chairman Mosca stated that is correct, it was discussed at last night's meeting.

Mark Hounsell stated he agreed that the only place at this point that can change is at the Deliberative Meeting. He would hope that there are two things that could happen at this meeting of the Budget Committee and that is that we support the \$1.7 Million and then, as we have done in the past, we send a message officially by vote from the Budget Committee to the School Board saying something along the lines of "we think you should have asked for \$2 Million". He takes personal responsibility that they didn't ask for \$2 Million. He was afraid of not getting anything, so he went to the lowest number and he didn't hear the arguments that we should go to \$2 Million. At that point, he thought if they could get \$1.7 Million at least they were moving forward. In hindsight, he was wrong.

Mark Hounsell further stated when you look at the list that's in front of you and the things that he believes are essential to be done especially those areas that are listed in red. For example, the electric panel, labeling. Without that we run the risk of having someone, and he hoped that it would never happen if they do it or if they don't do it, to experience a severe electrocution situation if they're not prepared and notified of the dangers in front of them. He couldn't off the top of his head recall what the amount of that was, but regardless it's in that total thing. Those areas in red, he thought an argument could be made for every one of them as far as Code Compliance. He also believes that the Kitchen Hood is important for energy savings and efficiencies. He would ask that this Committee somehow send that message back by a vote to the School Board, but on the motion in front of us, we give it our full support.

Chairman Mosca stated he thought for those that were there last night even though there were only 4 or 5 people at the Public Hearing, he was led to believe that a motion will be made to up it to \$2 Million at the Deliberative and he thought that's why there was a request to get the numbers together to see what it's going to cost. There was a request last night to have the numbers available for the Deliberative to see what the total cost would be for the \$2 Million. His guess is that the individual who asked that will make a motion to increase it to \$2 Million to have everything done. He thought that message should be loud and clear.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 3 - Expendable Trust Fund (New Kennett High School Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$54,443.00.**

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 3 - Expendable Trust Fund (New Kennett High School Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$54,443.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 4 - Expendable Trust Fund (A. Crosby Kennett Middle School Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$17,086.00.**

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by John Edgerton, to recommend Article 4 - Expendable Trust Fund (A. Crosby Kennett Middle School Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$17,086.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with Article 5 - Expendable Trust Fund (Elementary Schools Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$9,900.00.

John Colbath moved, seconded by Mark Hounsell, to recommend Article 5 - Expendable Trust Fund (Elementary Schools Facilities Maintenance Fund) in amount \$9,900.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with Article 6 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the Conway School Board and the Conway Education Association in amount \$476,301.00.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by John Colbath, to recommend Article 6 - Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the Conway School Board and the Conway Education Association in amount \$476,301.00. In favor: 7; Opposed: 4 - Dick Klement, Jim LeFebvre, Terry McCarthy and Doug Swett; Abstain: 3 - Pat Kittle, Pat Swett and Christopher DeVries.

Dick Klement stated as with the Town, he went through the line items for non-union personnel and the total delta was an additional \$50,264.00 for non-union people and the raises those people would get, a merit raise based at 3%. He requested that be a reason to reject this.

Mark Hounsell stated it would be unfortunate to reject this because of a number of different things going on at once. If you recall, he thought it was May or June where this Budget Committee sent a strong message he believes to the School Board to address certain things: putting money towards starting salaries of the younger teachers as best as they could and also to deal with the longevity issue. As everyone here knows, when you negotiate there are two sides, you just don't go in and say this is what we're going to have and that's it. You have to negotiate. He knows that both sides negotiated in not just good faith, but excellent faith.

Mark Hounsell further stated the requests and the demands in the position of the CEA are not out of line. What's out of line he thought was this graph that tells a story of the plight that we're in as a School District. That is, we're so far behind in salaries, not just statewide, but just in our own neck of the woods. (document being passed out that Mark is talking about) He thought the graph tells the story pretty accurately. The surrounding communities that we identify as Berlin, Conway, Tamworth and Governor Wentworth, we can see that we're not just lagging behind, we're lagging far behind. What this means is that at some point the good teachers that we do have will have to make their determination of their future, not based on what they're getting in Conway, but what they could be getting if they simply took a job in a District like Tamworth where the move would be relatively easy and they'd end up with more pay.

Mark Hounsell further stated that causes them to have to fill positions and that opens the possibility of even losing additional teachers. They

have experienced the loss of good, trained teachers because of the paying schedule. We in Conway bring in teachers and they start them on their career. Once they are well upon their career and they are moving along, they move to other Districts in some instances. In many instances, we are a training field for teachers for other Districts and he didn't think that was the best use of our resources and he certainly didn't believe it was the best direction we should take when we are considering the education of our children.

Mark Hounsell further stated he didn't think a 3% increase, although it is a lot of money, he did not think when one considers how they are moving forward to make what he has always considered a weak Contract into a better one. He wasn't even sure if that was a complete sentence. He thought there were all kinds of reasons to support this and very, very few not to.

Bill Marvel asked if there was a defibrillator on site because he wanted to know before he stated he was actually in favor of the Contract. He did have somewhat of a mixed bag of comments to make. The reason he supports it is because it follows the two criteria he has been asking for: a small, a very small, reduction in staff and a one year Contract. We still have quite a few more teachers than what we did 8, 10 years ago when we had more students, but there have been 4 positions dropped this year and we don't have a multi-year Contract.

Bill Marvel further stated that on the other hand, in response to Mark's (Hounsell) comment about the graph which he saw last night and thought about. He was looking at the New Hampshire Department of Employment Security Community Profiles and under Conway he found that between 2004 and 2014 the public sector average pay only rose about 18%, the private sector public pay did rise about 35%, but the difference comes in the number of jobs being held and the number of private jobs being held actually is less in 2014 than what is was in 2004. The number of public sector jobs is up 30%, just a fraction of a percent under 30%, in Conway. Now those aren't all Conway municipal positions, School positions, they are people in State, Federal or Local Government jobs.

Bill Marvel further stated that's the problem he thought that this District has. Too many people and therefore the resources can't go as far. The other issue in regards to basically engaging in an auction with other towns and cities in the State for teachers, this community has always been a poor paying community for any job, be it private or public and people put up with it because they want to live here. If they don't, if the money is more important, he doesn't hold it against them to go somewhere else for a job.

Bill Marvel further stated he didn't understand really what Dick's (Klement) complaint is; he thought he did, but wasn't sure. Bill asked Dick is it that the non-union people are getting the same benefits as the union people are getting through the Contract or is it something else. He really didn't understand it under the Town issue either.

Dick Klement stated his comment is pretty simple across the board: virtually everyone is getting a 3% raise, be it the Town or the School. There are some exceptions, but basically along that line. He's just opposed to that. The people that are paying the salaries of the public employees in large don't get a raise, so how can you continue to ask people who aren't getting pay raises to increase the raises for the people that are public employees. That's his rationale behind it.

Bill Marvel stated he was confused; Dick (Klement) had said something about delta and he was thinking Dental Insurance. He concurs in Dick's feeling, but when they finally give him a Contract that has the two main things he wants, he is hard pressed to oppose it.

Dick Klement stated he looked at the 2015/16 Salary Schedule, he looked at the 2016/17 Salary Schedule and a new teacher coming in with a Bachelors Degree, Step One, brand new off the boat, gets an increase of \$1,400.00. That's the Step level so he assumes that's the hiring pay for a Bachelors coming in out of school. If he looks at a Masters +60, the raise in the Salary Schedule, the base level of the Salary Schedule, is up over \$2,000.00, it's about \$2,500.00. His comment was that he fully supports giving the starting teachers, the younger ones more money, he fully supports that, but the creep has gone all the way over to the fact where the senior teachers are getting significantly more money than the starting teachers. Both of them have lives to live. That's his problem with this whole thing.

Chairman Mosca stated unless he did something really wrong, he took the 2015/16 base and he took the differential for the 2016/17 Contract, the salary adjustment for the 2016/17 Contract and came up with a base salary for 2016/17. Now that doesn't include longevity and he calculated the percent increases and the average increase for 189 teachers is 5.07%; 108 out of 189 teachers are getting 5% or greater and he knows we gave direction that we would like to see the starting pay raised, but he didn't think it was all going to be done in one year. He still has no idea how he is going to vote on this when we vote, he really didn't. He liked the fact that everybody seemed to listen to what the Budget Committee had to say last year about raising the bottom salaries and trying to get people up and about looking at longevity pay and trying to deal with it. He likes all that and appreciates the fact that everyone listened, but like he said, he didn't think it was all going to come in one year and that's where his problem is.

Chairman Mosca further stated he was going to say this right now to everyone that's in this room, if he does support this, he won't support another one with these kind of raises. Just so that everyone is in the same boat with him, so they know where he is coming from because he still doesn't know what he is going to do. He thought a 5% average raise for 189 teachers is a really good raise and to Bill's (Marvel) point where we have less, on the 2015/16 chart we had 188 teachers and on the 2016/17 chart we have 189 teachers, so we are actually up one teacher. The information that he has that was handed out by Kevin (Richard) for the salaries of the 2015/16 teachers there were 188 names; on the proposed 2016/17 information

there are 189 teachers so there is one extra position that didn't go down, it went up one.

Bill Marvel stated the numbers that he remembers were something like 342 and 346. Those were staff altogether and those were full-time equivalents. He was wondering if the Chairman's 188 and 189 were full-time equivalents, they might be individuals and there may be a lot of part-timers, he didn't know.

Chairman Mosca stated for 2015/16 there were 188 full and part-time teachers; what we were given for potential salaries based on the bargaining agreement for 2016/17, there are 189 full and part-time teachers and he was just talking teachers, he was not talking the whole administration. They are actually up one teacher from last year to this year. Chairman asked Superintendent Kevin Richard if he was wrong or right. Mr. Richard stated he wasn't sure. Chairman stated he was just taking the information provided by Mr. Richard.

Mark Hounsell stated he talked with Kevin (Richard) about what Dick (Klement) was saying because he knew there was something that was missing from it and basically Dick is giving half of the story, but he can't remember even now all of the stuff that Kevin just told him. Mark asked if it would be all right if Kevin was allowed to clarify. Chairman Mosca stated he would let Mr. Richard speak.

Mr. Richard stated one of the points that the School Board in negotiations took place was front ending the money into the base salary. So Dick (Klement) is correct; this year's base salary is projected to increase \$1,400.00 for next year. That means if you were to hire me this year, I would make \$1,400.00 less than if you were to hire me next year. Also, if you were to keep me employed, I would also get a Step increase of \$750.00. So that's a little bit different; it's not a \$1,400.00 increase, it would be \$2,150.00 for a beginning teacher. They have 40% of the staff currently that have 5 years of experience within the District or less and they have about 61% of staff that have 10 years in the District or less. That was really where the focus was on the first 10 years, \$1,700.00 for anybody that was off Step, so \$1,700.00 if they made about \$50,000.00 this year would be about a 3.4% increase. It's higher for beginning teachers that are new to our District and those are some of the goals that negotiations took into place.

Mark Hounsell stated he had a question: when the Chairman Mosca gave the roll call total, what years were you using. Chairman stated 2015/16 which is current and the list that was given to us by Mr. Richard for 2016/17 and there was one more on the first list compared to the second list.

Mr. Richard stated that doesn't take into consideration any of the reductions in personnel, the secondary list, that should be the same number of people, but he thought it didn't take into consideration the reduction of a John Fuller School teacher and a reduction of a high school teacher. Those are in there. Chairman Mosca stated so those are all listed in there. Mr. Richard stated listed in both pieces.

Mark Hounsell stated he guessed what he would say to kind of draw this conclusion that he didn't like this Contract that the District has with the CEA. He thought it's flawed in the attempts to make it better, like putting Band-Aids on top of Band-Aids and he thought eventually we would find ourselves the way of a Contract that's a little cleaner and a little bit in line with what we want and what the teachers expect. Having said that, these, because negotiations are baby steps, we didn't get everything we wanted and they didn't get everything that they wanted, but the things that we did want are the very things that this Budget Committee asked the School Board to pursue and that is to reduce longevity and to put more money towards beginning the younger teachers, or he believes the term that may have been used was less experienced teachers. They've done that; they're using a 3% increase and they also know that there are things that are affected because of the Salary Schedule, but it has always been that thing at the bottom on longevity that's been the bug-a-boo. This Contract addresses this. Is it the one we want? No, but it's closer to the one we will want.

Chairman Mosca stated to Mark Hounsell that he keeps saying 3%, but it's much more than 3%. He can show Mark the spreadsheet that he showed Kevin (Richard). By the numbers that were supplied to us by the School Department, it's greater than 3%, it's an average of 5.07% increase.

Mark Hounsell stated he wasn't on that negotiating team. John Colbath asked if that included benefits. Chairman Mosca stated no, that's salaries and it doesn't include longevity pay. Mark asked if a School Board member, Randy Davison, who was on the negotiating team. Chairman stated one quick statement because the public comment was last night.

Randy Davison stated he guessed that the Budget Committee was looking for certain percentages at the beginning and so that's where a lot of it went. The people in the beginning are getting higher percentages overall, so when you are talking about the beginning teacher rates, that's where they concentrated a lot of their efforts, so you're going to see that they are getting an additional amount on the base in addition to how a Salary Schedule works with the teachers, they're going across and over so that they get an additional \$750.00, so it is more. That's where he thinks what you are asking for or what the Budget Committee was looking at. If you think about it, if you go on the State web site, and he did the research there, and in 2012 and 2013 Conway ranked 148th out of 158 Schools in this State. He thought when he looked at it Berlin, Pittsburg, way up north, they were paying their teachers around \$33,000.00 back then.

Mr. Davison further stated what Mark (Hounsell) said, and you guys are aware of it, they are losing staff at the beginning of the scales because they aren't staying. You know, you're out of school and paying a lot of money for the loans that you have. They are not staying; we need to retain them. Mr. Davison further stated that Bill (Marvel) stated that Conway was known for that and yes, his wife works for the District and when they first moved here 23 years ago, Conway was in the top 10 for the State of New Hampshire for pay, so they've really dropped down. The senior teachers, what you were looking at, they have to look for the benefit as a whole and not just for the people that have experience and he thought

that's what they did this time, they put a lot of money up front to retain teachers and he thought that's what they need to do in Conway in order to make educational movement for the kids that are resurfacing. He hoped this helped.

Chairman Mosca stated he was looking at the base salary for 2015/16, the adjustment not inclusive of longevity pay, and the potential base salary for 2016/17. He was going to give the bottom line: the bottom line for 2015/16 was \$7,727,161.00 and the base for 2016/17, if the Contract passes, will be \$8,119,071.00 and that equates to a 5.07% increase. These are the numbers that we were given by the School Department.

Chairman Mosca stated the Public Hearing was last night and he wasn't going to let anybody else from the public speak. The members are discussing it.

John Colbath stated with your doing those numbers, that only confuses him more because the members haven't been privy to that. Chairman Mosca stated this was the spreadsheet that he sent out to everybody last week. He sent it, he emailed it and everybody got it.

Mark Hounsell stated there's an easier way to figure out what the increase percentage is and that would be by taking the \$476,301.00 and dividing it by what was paid in salaries last year and he thought that comes out to 4.75%. If you are looking for an overall number, that represents a 4.75% increase over what was paid last year. So he stands corrected.

Bill Marvel stated two things; first, he looked at the spreadsheet that was sent out and he was mainly looking at the proportions of increases to see where they were falling and they seemed to be falling on the lower paid teachers, so that was satisfying. What he wanted to know was whether Chairman Mosca satisfied with the personnel figures. Fifty percent of his reason for supporting the Contract was the reduction of 4 staff members which would be just over a 1% reduction in staff. Is that accurate? He is seeing nods.

Chairman Mosca asked Bill Marvel if he was just talking teachers. Bill stated no, all staff. Chairman stated when you go through the Summary, there looks like there were a couple of positions that were added. He thought it was under Tab I. Bill stated he saw that there were several positions added, but there were also several dropped. Chairman stated there's at least two or three that were added that didn't exist in the prior Budgets and we can look at those. Bill stated those were new positions, not just new people.

Peter Donohoe stated that he would just like to make the observation that the starting salary from 2006 to 2015 between the four Districts, three that are being compared to Conway. While the curves clearly shows us well below those, he thought it's not the whole picture. That is to say what does Berlin have for expenditures other than salaries, that is in buildings and in things such as that. Similarly Tamworth and similarly Governor Wentworth. There's an awful lot of talk about salaries, an awful lot of talk about what is enough. He thought people do come to Conway

because they do want to be here. He thought salary had to be adequate and he, like Chairman Mosca, was not really sure where he was going to fall in terms of recommending this or not.

Peter Donohoe further stated he came here thinking tonight that he would recommend it, but he thought at the very least that a message has to be sent to the School Board that they did a great job doing a one year Contract instead of a multi-year Contract. It seems as though everybody jumped on board here and got more, even though they did pay attention to the recommendation for paying more to the entry level folks. Turn over is a problem. He has kids in the District who have been directly impacted by that, but he thought there was an awful lot of focus on money here. He thought it has to be enough, but he thought there were cultural issues that may impact that turn over too and that could be addressed. He guessed in his final comment all he would say is that if this does pass, it would be his expectation that we would see something a little more equitable come down the line for next year's negotiations. Thank you.

Mark Hounsell stated he agreed with what Peter (Donohoe) was just saying and he thought that fairness is made by these types of steps. This is a step in the right direction and he thought when we consider the whole picture of it, and he knows we vote on the recommendation as it pertains to this increase, but we need to be aware of the other conditions that are contained in the Contract that will, he believes, help us as we negotiate the next Contract. He is certain that the relationship that we have established with the School Board of communication is going to be one where they will hear. They listened to the Budget Committee this year and there's no reason why they won't listen in future years because you all make valid points.

Mark Hounsell further stated to the issue that we have in front of us, we have a need to make this first baby step or else we'll be sitting right back here next year saying we're not making any progress or making any headway. Again, this is a step in the right direction and we should be supporting it.

Pat Kittle stated he thought we have a real problem with low teacher pay, but at the same time he thought we had a real problem with over staffing as well. He would love it if we could get to the point where the Budget Committee could trust the School Board enough to, maybe there wouldn't be any increase in wages at all, but you could pay people more and have less people working. He did think that we do have small class sizes here which we, compared to class sizes across the country, they are very small. Our teacher to student ratio is very high and there are definitely some movements that we could make and at the same time pay the teachers that we do have here a whole lot more equitably than we are now. He has a spouse that works in the District, so he won't be voting on this Article, but it just felt like he wanted to put his two cents in of we're over staffed and under paid.

Doug Swett stated we're on TV here and when you mention \$33,000.00 or whatever for starting pay, the cost of the perks that go with that

\$33,000.00 should be mentioned because it's a total figure and every dollar is the same, you have to raise it by taxation. Thank you.

Chairman Mosca stated for a starting teacher that would come in at a base of \$34,050.00, the approximate statutory benefits which are FICA, Medicare, Retirement, Workers' Comp and Unemployment would add approximately \$8,148.00 so the total salary and benefit would be \$42,198.00. That's for a starting teacher; that does not include Health Insurance, that's just the statutory requirements. He took that percentage based on an average of all of the percentages for everybody for all of the other ones. That's how he came up with that figure.

Dick Klement stated we were talking about percentages and he thought what we have to realize is 10% of nothing is nothing. To give 5% to a starting teacher is a whole lot less than giving 3% to a teacher making twice the amount of pay. If you look at dollars, we're going from the current agreement of \$31,900.00 to \$33,300.00, a \$1,400.00 increase. When we get on the senior teacher side, the starting for a Masters +60 is \$1,700.00 more in addition to what it was last year. Percentage wise they may be in the same ball park, but dollar wise they are still concentrating on the older senior people, the experienced teachers rather than the new teachers. In addition, the discussion of eliminating longevity pay, most of us will be long gone before that actually goes away. It starts out with people that haven't been hired yet. If you have a 25 year career and you're hired now, you're going to get longevity pay until you retire.

Dick Klement further stated third and last, public employees get a State Retirement Pension. Most private corporations don't give pensions anymore because they can't afford to. You have to look at the total compensation package and he thought the total compensation package is skewed to the teacher who has been there the longest rather than what he wanted to do was to give more to the starting teacher. He is going to vote against this for that reason.

Chairman Mosca stated he didn't know how many positions aren't going to be refilled from people leaving, but under Tab I there's one Special Ed Teacher, there's 3 Aides and there's 1 Family Support Liaison that are brand new positions this year. You have to go through the 70+ pages to figure it all out, but they are all in there. The Special Ed Teacher we were told about that they were hiring so he knew that, but there are 3 Aides, that's what he gathers from the comments on the side, and then there's a Family Support Liaison. That's 5 new positions.

Bill Marvel stated the spreadsheet that he was looking at is not in this packet; he has it separately. As he says, it had 346 total full-time equivalent staff members which kind of shocked him because he didn't know there were that many in the District, but he has been referring to it as a small army. Now that number is down to 342 he thought. If we can keep whittling away at that and making the demand of a reduction every time there's an increase until there's a reasonable figure, then we'll be paying a reasonable salary to fewer people. Certainly that's his goal.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 7 - Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Conway School Board and the Conway Educational Support Personnel in amount \$58,581.00.**

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to recommend Article 7 - Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Conway School Board and the Conway Educational Support Personnel in amount \$58,581.00. In favor: 11; Opposed: Pat Swett, Doug Swett and Bill Marvel; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated it's a 3-year Contract; \$58,581.00 this year, \$64,631.00 next year and \$69,446.00 for the year 2018/19.

Dick Klement stated he was going to support this and the rationale behind his supporting this is that these people don't make a living wage and that's why he is going to support it.

Bill Marvel stated only that Dick (Klement) is right and he is more supportive of this Union than the previous one. It's a 3-year Contract and he doesn't like that.

Pat Swett stated the reason she would vote against this is because it is a 3-year Contract. She thought the Town voters voted years ago to not do multiple years.

Chairman Mosca stated he has heard that in the past, but as was stated last evening, the Police Contract that is expiring this year was a 3-year Contract. This current one is a 2-year Contract. Personally speaking from his experience having been in labor, he thought if you could lock people in longer term, you're better off than having a short term Contract. That's his personal opinion and he supports anything that's in a 2 or 3 year term Contract.

Mark Hounsell stated his experience is that's absolutely correct. You have more stability when you have a Contract that is well thought out, well negotiated and is extended. One of the things that we need to understand is that the School Board has taken the position to have Budgets in the future be represented one at a time, no further years where we're voting on multiple Union Contracts, we'll be focusing on one. He didn't know how those are going to end up, but this pattern, if they are all accepted, would mean that next year we're only negotiating with the teachers and the following year he didn't even want to go there because he was a hard time figuring what to do tomorrow. The thing is that it presents a cycle that gives more stability eventually with all of their Contracts. Joe (Mosca) is right, you get better solid progress if you have a good Contract that's extended over a period of time.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 8 - Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Conway School Board and the American Federal of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) in amount \$10,233.00.**

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to recommend Article 8 - Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Conway School Board and the American Federal of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) in

amount \$10,233.00. In favor: 11; Opposed: Pat Swett, Bill Marvel and Doug Swett; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated this is a 2-year Contract; the first year is \$10,233.00 and the second year is \$45,501.00.

Dick Klement stated again he will vote on this one in a positive way because these are the lowest paid people that we have in the School District.

Bill Marvel stated it's a typically reasonable request, but again a multi-year Contract.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 10 - Project SUCCEED** in amount **\$38,600.00**.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by John Colbath, to recommend Article 10 - Project Succeed in amount \$38,600.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Bill Marvel; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 11 - Purchase of a Full Size School Bus and a Handicapped School Bus** in amount **\$155,000.00**.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Doug Swett, to recommend Article 11 - Purchase of a Full Size School Bus and a Handicapped School Bus in amount \$155,000.00. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 12 - School Buildings Maintenance Fund** in amount **\$100,000.00**.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by John Colbath, to recommend Article 12 - School Buildings Maintenance Fund in amount \$100,000.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Peter Donohoe; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca proceeded with **Article 9 - Operating Budget** in amount **\$34,825,178.00**.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by John Colbath, to recommend the Operating Budget of \$34,825,178.00; if the Operating Budget fails, the Default Budget is \$34,899,850.00. The Operating Budget was AMENDED to \$34,763,581.00; if the Operating Budget fails, the Default Budget would be \$34,899,850.00. In favor: 13; Opposed: 1 - Pat Kittle; Abstain: 0.

Chairman Mosca stated if the Operating Budget fails, the Default Budget is \$34,899,850.00.

Pat Swett stated she sees that this has that same clause in it that would allow them to have one Special Meeting if this doesn't pass.

Mark Hounsell stated he thought it was not right for that to be part of the Warrant, but he didn't think it was going to matter at this time. He will engage the School Board about this type of language because he really doesn't like saying "if you say no, we're going to ask again". He was just

told that we have to have that language. Chairman Mosca stated it has to be in there by Statute.

Chairman Mosca stated he was looking under Tab D, the Function Summary. At 2210 - Improvement of Instruction is going up 21% and he can't figure out why. At 2220 - Educational Media Service is only going up 5%, but it's going up \$20,000.00+, again he's looking through the back up which is under Tab I, it just doesn't compute. Next is School Board Services - it's up 72% and most of that is in some insurance that if you look through all of the other line items, you don't see where anything is taken out; a lump sum is put in, but it doesn't show being taken out of any line items any where, so he can't figure that out. School Support Services/School Admin - \$2,400.00 - that's up and the other Support Services, that's the only one that he could actually figure out and most of that is Retiree Health Care he believes. He would entertain a motion to reduce some of these line items.

Chairman Mosca stepped down as Chair and had Danielle Santuccio become Chairman. Mark Hounsell asked if the motion on the table right now is for the proposal. Chairman Mosca agreed. Mark asked if there may be individual reductions made by amendment. Chairman stated yes. Mark asked if the Chairman have the members go through each, one at a time. Chairman stated he was probably just going to do one for all four of them. Mark stated so then it's an all or nothing in the reduction. Chairman stated no, we could do each one if you wanted to do each one separately.

Joe Mosca moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce line item 2210 - Improvement of Instruction by \$28,769.00 to an even \$200,000.00. In favor: 9; Opposed: 5 - Pat Kittle, Mark Hounsell, John Colbath, Christopher DeVries and John Edgerton; Abstain: 0.

Joe Mosca stated as he said, he went through all of the almost 90 pages under Tab I and he can't figure out why we need the additional money. He is sure that some of it is needed and that's why he didn't cut it all out. He just doesn't see it.

Bill Marvel asked if he was mistaken or was this essentially staff development and could it be possibly because there is a glut of beginning teachers needing improvement.

Mr. Richard stated there are a couple of different lines that the members will see. One is absolutely Mentors because of the number of new staff they had to increase the Mentoring line. Also, in new Curriculum there is an increase, more so than the Staff Development, but new Curriculum. They have the new next generation Science Standards coming in and they have new curriculum coming in, so that was a coordinated effort and he thought that was about \$15,000.00 just for curriculum and there was an increase there.

Bill Marvel stated the second half of that explanation is satisfactory. It's his understanding from living with a teacher who taught in Baltimore who did mentoring as part of her job with no compensation. If some of the money were cut, that would simply replicate that system in other Districts where mentoring is an expected part of the professional day.

Dick Klement stated in High School Co-Curricular, they're going from \$366,993.00 to \$399,828.00 for an increase of \$32,828.00, almost a 9% increase. Why can't they get by with what they had last year.

Chairman Santuccio asked Dick (Klement) if his question was rhetorical. Dick stated that he was making a motion. Chairman advised that there was already a motion on the floor. Dick stated he guessed he was out of order again. Heaven forbid.

Dick Klement moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce the High School Co-Curricular (Function 1400) by \$32,828.00, putting it back to what it was in the adopted Budget of 2015/16. In favor: 8; Opposed: 5 - Pat Kittle, Mark Hounsell, John Colbath, Christopher DeVries and John Edgerton; Abstain: 1 - Pat Swett.

Joe Mosca moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to reduce line item 2310 - School Board Services in amount \$98,180.00. MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Joe Mosca stated last year it was \$178,879.00 and this year it's \$293,959.00 and if you go into Tab I, page 73, it says it is insurance liability and property that was transferred from all of the Units, but if you go through all of the Units, there is no line items for insurance liability and property. He can't figure out where it came from and how it go where it is, so that's why he is making a motion to reduce that line item by \$98,180.00.

Mark Hounsell stated this is serious reduction and it really kind of makes him scratch his head when in previous meetings there were ample opportunities and actual requests if there were any questions about the Budget and this Budget Committee a couple of times never did. Now we're sitting here wondering a question that could have been answered, addressed and absorbed. If there has been a transfer or responsibility to a line item and we need to have that answer before we cut \$100,000.00 off the Budget. He would ask that maybe we could have Becky (Jefferson) tell us why this amount is in this line, if it is all right with the Chair. Chairman Santuccio stated that Mark could vote against it, but she would give Becky a couple of minutes, but we are not going to do this all night. You can vote against the motion if there is no explanation.

Becky Jefferson stated under Section A, members have a Summary Page that's showing everything that's up and down in your Budget. If the members go to the maintenance area, they will see -\$69,000.00 for insurance transferred to Unit 10 and if you flip the page over, members will see an additional \$7,400.00 for the buses and she thought there was some where a \$15,000.00 increase in that for that particular insurance. That's a new price. Joe Mosca asked why it doesn't show up any where. Becky stated it does; you're looking in Special Education. Joe stated he went through all of them and he couldn't find it. Becky asked if she could show Joe where it was and Joe stated absolutely because if he's blind, he would admit to it. Becky pointed out different line items to Joe concerning the School Board Services. Joe stated it makes it very difficult when things aren't titled the same.

Chairman Danielle Santuccio asked why was it called School Board Services. Becky Jefferson stated that's where you have your dues, School Board salaries, etc. are in there, advertising for all positions.

Joe Mosca stated under Salaries for Custodians, it's gone up from 2015/16 to 2016/17 by approximately \$6,000.00. Is that part of the existing Contract. Mr. Richard stated it was.

Joe Mosca moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to delete all of the line items with the Family Support Liaison (Function 2313) and to reduce the line item for Family Support Liaison by \$28,183.00. MOTION WITHDRAWN

Joe Mosca stated this is a brand new position and he was wondering why we all of a sudden need a Family Support Liaison. Chairman Santuccio stated we aren't asking questions tonight. Chairman Santuccio asked Joe where he was in the Budget book for this motion.

Joe Mosca stated he didn't know why all of a sudden after all these years we've had the schools that we now need a Family Support Liaison. If someone could explain it to him.

Dick Klement stated it appears to be an Aide position deleted and replaced with a Teacher position which is what is causing the increase. Basically they are upgrading the position.

Mark Hounsell stated he guessed what he would like to tell the members at this time is that the School Board has had quite a bit of discussion about the need to have Family Support Liaisons in each of our schools. We are in a situation now where our Principals are responding after hours to take care of things that could have been handled if there was a Family Liaison. Now a Family Liaison is an educator, not an Aide. They're focused on specific things, but it's all an intricate part of a child's success and we're aware, and he knows it more policy than Budget, of the need to make sure that the children that come into our schools have a support mechanism in place to deal with a whole myriad of issues. We need to have our children supported while they are in school, but also as they are getting ready for school and to succeed in such a way that they recognized that the child needs that help. They made the adjustments by reducing Aides and by taking a step to meet that need. These positions are important and they are so important that should we cut this, he will do everything he can to make sure that they still provide that because it is a bottom line figure. If we cut it, that doesn't mean, as far as he is concerned that there isn't a need for it.

Mark Hounsell further stated having said all of that, what the School Board has brought to you is a Budget that, apart from the unknown and continuing increase of Special Education costs, this Budget, bottom line, is flat. There not anything that's in here that's startling on the bottom line. It's under 1%. Thank you.

Chairman Danielle Santuccio asked if there were any further motions or amendments. There being none, Chairman Santuccio asked for a vote on the Budget as amended.

Mark Hounsell asked for a 30 second recess. Chairman Mosca recessed the meeting for 2 minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Mosca reminded the members that there would be a meeting on March 30th at 6:30 PM to basically approve all of the Minutes.

Mark Hounsell moved, seconded by Dick Klement, to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Iris A. Bowden, Recording Secretary