

TOWN OF DEERFIELD, NH  
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE  
George B. White Building  
8 Raymond Road, Deerfield, NH 03037  
6:30pm Tuesday January 3, 2017  
MINUTES

Call to Order 6:30pm

1. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

2. Moment of Silence/Prayer

3. Roll Call

Present: James Spillane, Chairman; Bill von Hassel, Vice Chairman; Ian Scott, Kevin Verville, Karen Cote, David Carbone, Steve Giovinelli, Carol Levesque, Members; Zach Langlois, School Board Rep Member; Andrew Robertson, Select Board Rep Member

Excused Absence: Troi Hopkins Member

Also Present: Patty Sherman, SAU 53 Co-Superintendent; Paul Yergeau, DCS Principal; Amber Wheeler, SAU 53 Business Administrator

4. Citizen's Comments

None seen

5. Approval of Outstanding Minutes

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to approve the meeting minutes from Tuesday November 22, 2016 as written.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to approve the meeting minutes from Tuesday November 22, 2016. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to approve the meeting minutes from Saturday, December 3, 2016 as written.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to approve the meeting minutes from Saturday December 3, 2016. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to approve the meeting minutes from Thursday, December 8, 2016 as written.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to approve the meeting minutes from Thursday December 8, 2016. Yay: 9, Nay: 0, Abstained: 1 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to approve the meeting minutes from Tuesday, December 13, 2016 as written.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to approve the meeting minutes from Tuesday December 13, 2016. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

## **6. Old Business**

Chairman Spillane states that he saw in the School Board meeting minutes that there was an inappropriate action on the part of the School Board. The School Board attempted to put money back in to a line once the budget had been turned over to the MBC. He reminds the School Board that once the budget is turned over to the MBC, it belongs to the Budget Committee and money cannot be added to a line unless it is done through the MBC. Adding money to a line simply adds it to the proposed budget and which is not the one that the MBC is currently working on. If the School Budget were to be set up the same way as the Town Budget with multiple lines and the Proposed School Budget was in one column and the MBC Budget in another column, what would be adjusted would be the column with the Proposed School Budget.

Z. Langlois asks that the Chair recognize Ms. Amber Wheeler, SAU 53 Business Administrator.

Ms. Wheeler states that the budget before the Committee is set up in the manner described by Chairman Spillane.

Chairman Spillane states that the School Board Representative can make a motion to the MBC to add to a line in the budget otherwise it cannot be added in to the budget that the MBC is working with.

Chairman Spillane states that there was a question posed by the MBC asking if a reduction can be taken from the bottom line since it is a bottom line budget. He consulted legal about this question and they responded that cuts can be made from the bottom line. The court case that backs up this is Brentwood School vs. Brentwood Budget Committee in 2015 in Superior Court.

Z. Langlois states that question posed earlier about the surplus from the 16/17 budget is not available since the school year is only six months.

Chairman Spillane clarifies that the question wasn't asking about 16/17 but rather the surplus from 15/16.

Ms. Wheeler states that within the budget there is a column for 15/16 actual. Comparing the budget for 15/16 and the actual for 15/16 will show where the surplus is.

K. Verville asks for the differentials to be provided for the Saturday meeting.

Ms. Wheeler replies that she will provide that information on a separate sheet.

Z. Langlois states that for PACE coverage 14 individuals required 4.5 substitutes at \$65 each per day for a total of \$292.50 for four days total \$1170 which was for training 56 staff members and a cost of \$20.89 per day.

Line 001.1100.731.108.000 budgeted for \$7400 broken down is \$1400 for xylophone, replacement keyboard for the Music Department \$3500, 2 necessary pieces of equipment for \$1100 each and \$300 for unanticipated expenses.

Math line 001.1100.610.108.023 \$16,283 (\*\*inaudible\*\*)

K. Verville asks for an anticipated 17/18 spend for PACE.

Z. Langlois states that there are three days planned for 17/18 at the \$292.50 per day cost.

A. Robertson states that Mark Young, Road Agent, was not able to be present at this meeting.

A. Robertson states that the Select Board has not and does not plan to have any warrant articles pertaining to road repair/maintenance for a specific road. It was discussed at the last Select Board meeting. There was discussion about revitalizing the Highway Commission for the purpose of planning future road reconstruction including select board member, MBC member, citizen or two for 5-10 year planning.

A. Robertson states that the town has incombered \$41,000, handout includes the break-down. Currently shows surplus of \$28,316. Surplus is likely to be \$225,000-230,000 after final accounting. Anticipated revenues were handed out. New budget and new default budget have been passed out. Wage adjustments have been included. FICA and benefits are not accurate yet for the Town Administrator so there will be another adjustment.

K. Verville asks when the final lists of warrant articles will be provided.

A. Robertson states that the warrant articles will be made available on Saturday.

## 7. New Business

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reconsider the Highway budget.

**Second:** A. Robertson

Chairman Spillane asks how can an amount be considered to add to the line if the Highway agent is not here to ask how much is costs per linear foot.

**Point of Order-** K. Verville asks it is necessary to vote on the motion to reconsider.

Chairman Spillane states that it is.

A. Robertson states that the Select Board makes suggestions to the Highway Agent about the roads but ultimately it is his decision about which roads are reconstructed/worked on.

**Vote to reconsider the Highway budget. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to increase the Road Reconstruction and Grinding line by \$243,000 to \$500,000.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

K. Verville states that he had asked to have the Highway Agent present tonight so that some of the questions mentioned by Chairman Spillane could be addressed. He feels that if roads are reconstructed at twice the mileage than was done this year, it town will be better for it. Asphalt and fuel prices are low so it is a good time to get work done for less expense. He appreciates that this motion may be a “budget buster” but he feels that this expenditure should be a top priority.

A. Robertson states that he may not personally disagree with Mr. Verville, however in speaking with the Highway Agent, he was clear that he does not want more money for road reconstruction this budget cycle.

S. Giovinelli states that Deerfield is an agricultural town and should not be expected to have great roads. If the Highway Agent believes the roads are fine, then they are good enough.

K. Verville states that last year Mr. Giovinelli had the opposite argument last year.

I. Scott appreciates the idea of having better roads but the government has no place in the road making business. For better roads, the roads should be privatized and have a for-profit company manage the roads for the town.

Z. Langlois moves the question.

**Vote to move the question. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Question is moved.**

**Vote to increase the Road Reconstruction and Grinding line by \$243,000 for a total of \$500,000.**

**Yay: 2, Nay: 8, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails.**

A. Robertson provides copies of the warrant articles to the members of the committee. He notes that the warrant articles have not changed with the exception of the first article which has the MBC's recommended budget and the Default Budget.

Article #1- Operating Budget as recommended by MBC and Default Budget.

Article #2- Water cistern to be located in the center of town. This warrant article was presented by the Fire Chief.

Article #3- \$50,000 for Fire Apparatus and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund from taxation.

Article #4- \$26,600 for replacement of Town Hall roof from taxation.

Article #5- \$25,000 Winter Road Expendable Trust with a cap of \$100,000 not from taxation.

Article #6- \$25,000 for previously established Municipal Government Buildings Infrastructure Expendable Trust Fund. For expenses, such as septic fail or roof leak. There is not a cap on this fund.

Article #7- \$10,000 for previously established Fire Department Vehicles and Equipment Expendable Trust Fund not from taxation.

Article #8- \$10,000 previously established Rescue Vehicles and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund from taxation.

Article #9- Milfoil Prevention efforts on Northwood Lake. The back side of the lake and one small front portion of the lake are in Deerfield.

Article #10- \$5,661 for LED lights and paddle fans in the upstairs of the GBW. This will reduce costs in the long run.

Article #11- \$2,500 for the Pleasant Lake Preservation Association's efforts to increase inspection of boats going into Pleasant Lake to prevent milfoil and other invaives.

A. Robertson notes that both of the lake related articles are related to maintaining property values.

S. Giovinelli asks how many residences are on Northwood Lake in Deerfield.

A. Robertson replies that there are 40-50. The total assessment for properties in Deerfield on Northwood Lake is \$16,363,339.

S. Giovinelli states that the total assessment is irrelevant. The number of residences is important because they are the only ones who have access to this lake.

Article #12- Provisions of the All Veterans' Tax Credit. Right now, depending on the terms of service, one may not qualify for the tax credit.

Chairman Spillane states that the change was made at the State House but the RSA is worded such that a town has to adopt this change.

I. Scott asks if there is an estimate of what the impact of this would be.

A. Robertson states that there is not an estimate of the impact.

Article #13- Allow the town to dispose of property acquired by tax deed. Several years ago the authority to dispose of these properties was taken away from the Select Board. There are currently a fair number of properties that need to be acted upon. The only way to do so now is to bring those properties on to the ballot to be vote on each year.

Chairman Spillane states that the MBC will not weigh-in on Articles #13, 14, or 15.

D. Carbone asks Mr. Robertson if there is an estimate of what the profits of the properties that the town is looking to sell.

A. Robertson states that he does not have this information but he can get it for Saturday.

Chairman Spillane states that this does not adjust the current tax rate or the budget being discussed.

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #1 as written.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

I. Scott asks if after this vote is the budget set in stone.

Chairman Spillane states that unless it was reopened under reconsideration, it would be final. If this happened and a change was made to the budget, there would be a revote on the warrant article.

K. Verville states that historically the Public Hearing is held and then at the net meeting each line in the budget to the bottom line is reviewed along with the warrant articles and then vote to recommend or not.

Chairman Spillane states that Tuesday, February 7<sup>th</sup> is when the next MBC meeting after the Public Hearing will be held.

**Vote to recommend Article #1 as written. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0.—Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #2 in the amount of \$67,540 for a 30,000 gallon water cistern in the vicinity of Town Hall.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

S. Giovinelli asks about a deep hole near the Fairgrounds and asks if this is duplicative.

A. Robertson replies that the water supply at the Fairgrounds remedies a concern at the Fairgrounds. This water cistern was planned independent of the water hole at the Fairgrounds.

S. Giovinelli asks how 30,000 gallons compares to other water cisterns in town.

A. Robertson states that most water cisterns that have been 8,000-12,000 gallons including one by the senior housing behind the church.

Vice Chairman von Hassel states that he is against this water cistern because there is a water cistern at the senior housing and it was used during the recent Church Street fire. His understanding for why it was not used was because the Fire Chief didn't want to fill it back up. He also states that he does not support the water cistern because of the lack of man power. There are 3-4 people during the day and 7-12 people at night and regardless of how much water is available, there would be enough man power.

A. Robertson states that he does not agree with the accuracy of Mr. von Hassel's statement. The Church Street fire had over 90,000 gallons of water used on it. The decision was made to leave the water in the cistern by the senior housing in case the fire moved. There were a number of departments and equipment here for that fire and they were able to get the water that they needed. He states that a cistern where one doesn't need to break through ice or use temporary draining devices is an advantage.

Z. Langlois states that 30,000 is the equivalent to a reasonably sized back yard pool. When there is a fire there is support from other towns and having as much water accessible to any fire department is crucial in fighting a fire.

I. Scott states that he is in favor of government fighting fires and he is in favor of this cistern, Chairman Spillane asks how much of this is due to the historic Town Hall.

A. Robertson states that this is purposed with an eye to the Town Hall, library, and churches.

**Vote to recommend Article #2 in the amount of \$67,540 go a 30,000 gallon water cistern in the vicinity of Town Hall. Yay: 8, Nay: 1, Abstained: 1 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #3 to raise and appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to be placed in the previously established Fire Apparatus and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.

**Second:** K. Verville

S. Giovinelli asks what the balance is currently in this fund.

A. Robertson states that he does not have that information but that he will have it for Saturday along with the current balance for any other previously established funds.

K. Verville states that the Trustees of the Trust funds have provided a recent update of the funds available. This can be viewed in previous meeting's paperwork,

Vice Chairman von Hassel offers to bring fund balances from the Trustees of the Trust funds.

Chairman Spillane states that whomever is in the best position to provide the information about the funds, should bring it on Saturday. He points out that Article #3 is raised from taxation not from a fund balance.

**Vote to recommend Article #3. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #4 to see if the town will raise and appropriate \$26,600 for the Town Hall roof.

**Second:** K. Verville

A. Robertson states that Mr. Tibbetts, the Building Manager, received estimate and recommendations. He states that the roof will be in keeping with the historical nature of the Town Hall.

Chairman Spillane asks if a 100 year, metal roof had been looked into.

A. Robertson replies that these numbers were based on asphalt.

Chairman Spillane suggests that a metal roof be looked into.

S. Giovinelli asks where \$26,600 fell in the received estimates.

A. Robertson states that he does not have that answer.

**Vote to recommend Article #4 to see if the town will raise and appropriate \$26,600 for the Town Hall roof. Yay: 9, Nay: 1, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #5 to see if the town will put \$25,000 in the previously established Winter Road Maintenance Expendable Trust. This fund will have a cap of \$100,000 and no amount will come from taxation.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

A. Robertson states that this fund is used to cover winter road maintenance costs rather than needing to take money from other lines in the event of unexpected weather. It was established a couple of years ago

K. Verville states that to the best of his knowledge this fund was established last year with \$75,000 and no money has been spent from this fund. He will not support this article.

**Vote to recommend Article #5 to see if the town will put \$25,000 in the previously established Winter Road Maintenance Expendable Trust. Yay: 4, Nay: 6, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails.**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #6 in the amount of \$25,000 to continue funding of the Municipal Buildings Expendable Trust Fund with funds not to come from taxation.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

Vice Chairman von Hassel asks what the difference is between Article #4 and #5.

A. Robertson states that Article #4 is a foreseen cost that is on a maintenance schedule. Whereas, Article #5 is for unforeseen circumstances such as heat or plumbing failing.

Chairman Spillane asks if Article #4 passes, is the town limited to \$26,600 or could the difference be found elsewhere to cover the costs of a metal roof.

A. Robertson replies that his understanding is that there would be a limit of \$26,600.

Chairman Spillane asks that the article be reworded so that there is a minimum amount.

A. Robertson states that this would typically be written as “up to...” an amount. He replies that they will

work to get an estimate on metal roofing rather than asphalt shingle.

**Vote to recommend Article #6 in the amount of \$25,000 to continue funding of the Municipal Buildings Expendable Trust. Yay: 9, Nay: 1, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #7 in the amount of \$10,000 the Fire Department Vehicles and Equipment Expendable Trust Fund, not from taxation.

**Second:** K. Verville

A. Robertson states that this fund is to get a jump on expensive replacements.

I. Scott asks what this fund will be used for specifically.

A. Robertson replies that it is not for any one specific expense at this time. There is a capital purchase plan for the Fire Department. This fund is used for replacing vehicles, breathing apparatus, turn-out gear, etc.

I. Scott asks Article #3 and #7 are essentially the same thing except that one is from taxation and one is not.

A. Robertson replies that is correct.

**Vote to recommend Article #7 in the amount of \$10,000 for the Fire Department Vehicles and Equipment Expendable Trust Fund, not from taxation. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #8 in the amount of \$10,000 for the Rescue Department.

**Second:** K. Verville

**Vote to recommend Article #8 in the amount of \$10,000 for the Rescue Department. YAY: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #9 for the requested contribution from Deerfield by the Northwood Lake Association for the purpose of fighting milfoil in Northwood Lake.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

S. Giovinelli states that as discussed before there are approximately 50 Deerfield houses that sit on this lake. There are 1672 households in Deerfield. This means that 8% of the households in Deerfield are affected by this. This is not Veasey where everyone in Deerfield has access, boat launch, and beach. This is \$8,000 for some people to keep their houses nicer. He does not support this article.

K. Verville states that there is a public boat launch on both Northwood Lake and Pleasant Lake accessible to anyone and that it doesn't take much to hiring milfoil from one lake to another. He is neither in favor of this article nor against it. He appreciates the need to control milfoil in public waters.

Z. Langlois states that it people frequently visit one lake and then the other. It is important to protect Pleasant Lake any way possible. With the \$16,300,000 valuation at a \$20 per thousand tax rate is \$320,000.

S. Giovinelli states that there has been, is and will continue to be milfoil in Northwood Lake. The property values are not going to go to \$0.

Z. Langlois states that the values will not go to \$0 but that those residents are contributing significantly to the tax base.

S. Giovinelli states that the same principal would apply if \$8,000 of landscaping was done on his road.

C. Levesque states that she lives on the lake and many of the boats come from Northwood Lake and go to Pleasant Lake. It doesn't take much to spread milfoil and other invasive species. She points out that the tax impact is \$.01 per thousand. She points out that it is a very small amount of money per tax bill to cover this concern.

S. Giovinelli states that he doesn't think that the people living on Northwood Lake are hurting to the point of needing of his tax money to help. He reiterates that the milfoil is there and cannot be removed.

C. Levesque states that there are new techniques being used at other lakes where milfoil is being removed.

I. Scott states that control of milfoil in a lake is not the government's job. If people who live on this lake want to keep their property values, they need to hire people to clean up the milfoil themselves.

C. Levesque states that if milfoil becomes a real problem then the tax value is lowered and then there is less money in the tax rolls.

I. Scott states that less money in the tax rolls wouldn't be a bad thing. There needs to be less money spent anyway.

Chairman Spillane asks if there is anyone who would like to move the question.

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves the question.

**Second:** S. Giovinelli

**Vote to move the question: Yay: 8, Nay: 1, Abstained: 1 – Question is moved**

**Vote to recommend Article #9 for the requested contribution from Deerfield by the Northwood Lake Association for the purpose of fighting milfoil in Northwood Lake. Yay: 4, Nay: 5, Abstained: 1 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves to recommend Article #10 in the amount of \$5,661 for LED lights and paddle fans in the upstairs of the GBW.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

A. Robertson states that he is moving this article for the reasons previously stated.

**Vote to recommend Article #10 in the amount of \$5,661 for LED lights and paddle fans in the upstairs of the GBW. Yay: 9, Nay: 1, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves to recommend Article #11 to raise and appropriate \$2,500 for the purpose of having trained attendants at the public boat launch on Gulf Road.

**Second:** Z. Langlois

A. Robertson notes that the Pleasant Lake Association came to the Select Board and asked for assistance with this. They do a lot funding themselves. Their primary concern is that the monitoring is really only in place on the weekends looking for invasive and exotics.

Chairman Spillane points out that there is essentially no tax impact from this article.

K. Verville asks what the hourly rate is for the attendant.

A. Robertson replies that he is unaware of the hourly rate. He will bring that information for Saturday.

Z. Langlois states that articles #8, 9, 10, 11 have approximately \$30 impact on a home with a \$500,000 valuation.

K. Verville comments that his point is not based on the impact. He would like to know what the rate of pay is so that he can decide if it is money well spent or not.

Chairman Spillane points out that the final votes to recommend or not will be taken at the next MBC meeting on February 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Vote to recommend Article #11 to raise and appropriate \$2,500 for the purpose of having trained attendants at the public boat launch on Gulf Road. Yay: 6, Nay: 4, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves Article #12 noting that there is no direct impact on taxes but that if it passes it could have an impact on tax revenue.

**Second:** K. Verville

**Vote to recommend Article #12: Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries.**

Chairman Spillane asks if anyone would like to comment on his opinion that the committee does not need to weigh-in on articles #13, 14, or 15.

I. Scott states that he believes that these articles effect the overall budget. Even if they don't affect the budget this year, it effects the overall revenue. He sees especial impact with Article #13. Currently the town can vote to sell the properties and put them back in the tax rolls whereas if this article passes, there is no timeline for the Select Board to sell and there or they may never sell the properties and get the m back on the tax rolls.

Chairman Spillane disagrees especially when talking about Article #13.

K. Verville makes a point of order and asks if it would be appropriate to find the will of the committee pertaining to weighing-in on these articles.

Chairman Spillane states that he believes that there could be an argument made that would show a connection between Articles #14 and 15 to the budget. However, the transfer of power in Articles #13 does not indicate that there will be any sales or not that could impact the tax rolls.

K. Verville states that the Board could chose to dispose of properties to a tax-exempt organization.

Chairman Spillane states that there is not a direct value associated with the transfer of power.

K. Verville suggests consulting the Municipal Association about the MBC voting to recommend or not these articles.

**Vote to take a vote on Articles #13, 14, and 15. Yay: 1, Nay: 9, Abataiend: 0- Motion Carries**

Chairman Spillane states that he will consult the MIonicpal Association about the MBC voting to recommend or not these articles.

K. Verville states that the School Budget has atypical increase. Anything that can be done to avoid the Default budget is good.

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce (001.1100.650.108.55) Software Regular Ed Programs Line 51 by \$4100 to bring it in line with historical spend.

**Second:** I. Scott

Z. Langlois states that this line is for renewals for various subscriptions for services that the school uses. The increases are to cover renewals that are up. The School Board does not support this change.

K. Verville states that he does not see the spend for renewals in the historic spending.

**Vote to reduce (001.1100.650.108.55) Software Regular Ed Programs Line 51 by \$4100.**

**Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0--- Motion Carries**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 98 Co-Curricular Officials by \$1000 to bring it in line with historical spend.

**Second:** I. Scott

K. Verville states that the line is consistently underspent and this reduction is to bring it to where it is typically spent.

**Vote to reduce Line 98 Co-Curricular Officials by \$1000. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** I. Scott moves to reduce the bottom line of the School Budget from \$893,392.20 to \$12,054,397.80 (the actual bottom line spend for 2015/2016).

**Motion Fails (no second)**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 126 Curriculum Stipend by \$4,000 to bring it in line ot where the line has been historically.

**Second:** I. Scott

Mr. Paul Yergeau, DCS Principal, states that the increase this year is due to a community vote to add a stipend for three people.

K. Verville states that the line is shown as reduced year on year by 7.7%.

Z. Langlois states that this line is used for staff who do additional work on curriculum.

K. Verville comments that he has the minutes from the School Board meetings from the last year and states that the minutes can be reviewed to see how many times the Curriculum Review Board reported throughout the course of the year. He states that the majority of the reports are “no report”, “did not meet”, “met, no action taken”.

Mr. Yergeau states that the reason for this is because the School Board has chosen to leave the Curriculum Review Board on the agenda for each meeting although the Review Board only meetings three or four times a year. Curriculum Committees meet on a regular basis twelve months out of the year.

**Vote to reduce Line 126 Curriculum Stipend by \$4,000. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 129 In-Service Training by \$1400 to bring it in line with historical spend.

**Second:** I. Scott

**Vote to reduce Line 129 In-Service Training by \$1400. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 121 Assembly in the amount of \$3499 leaving \$1. This line has never been funded and never been spent.

**Second:** I. Scott

Mr. Yergeau states that the money has been in and out of the budget. Many assemblies at school have been funded by grants, fundraising, PTO efforts because the amount of money that has been in there never seemed enough to be able to hold an assembly. This year the Wellness Committee has looked into having an assembly for students. The money was put into the budget with the hope of being able to hold the assembly without having to look to outside funding.

K. Verville states that the money would be better spent on sanitary wipes, pens, pencils, and paper. There is a large year on year increase in the budget.

**Vote to reduce Line 121 Assembly in the amount of \$3499 leaving \$1. Yay: 7, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries.**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 34 Electronic and Software Licensing by \$3000 based on historical spend and recent unsustainable growth in the line.

**Second:** K. Cote

Z. Langlois states that electronics have taken on a greater role in the school. There is a 1:1 device initiative in the upper grades. Electronics and software are a very important part of instruction now and he strongly discourages reducing this line.

K. Verville states that the research that he has seen is that this country is spending billions of dollars in K-8 schools and there is little to no evidence of any benefit to the children. He states that if anyone can produce articles that show that having device in a K-8 school as a benefit, he would consider withdrawing his motion.

I. Scott states that he disagrees with Mr. Verville. He is in favor of funding this line. He is in favor of more technology in the classroom and less teachers.

**Vote to reduce Line 34 Electronic and Software Licensing by \$3,000. Yay: 5, Nay: 5, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails**

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce Line 188 Summer Tech by \$4,000.

**Second:** K. Cote

K. Verville states that this line has a 50% year on year increase. The increase in technology is creating an increase of cost in a large budget.

I. Scott states that this line was already discussed and explained as being used to pay for reimaging of computers over the summer that is done over the summer months. People were already doing this and not being paid. Reimaging is standard and saves money in the long run.

K. Verville states that there was testimony to the committee that this is work that never fails to get done. If it takes a little extra time and it isn't all done when school starts, perhaps the routine can be changed and some can be done during the school year.

Z. Langlois states that this money is designed to compensate the people doing the extra work in the summer so that it is done timely and in time for school to start.

**Vote to reduce Line 188 Summer Tech by \$4,000. Yay: 2, Nay: 8, Abstained: 0—Motion Fails**

The budget as it stands now is a 3% increase year on year and tracking the last seven years of voting results, there is little chance that this budget will pass.

I. Scott asks if there is a new bottom line number available.

Ms. Amber Wheeler, SAU 53 Business Administrator, states that the new bottom line is \$12,933,791.

Z. Langlois asks about Line 177 the District's share of the SAU Management Share reduced by approximately \$27,860 at the last MBC meeting. This is a contracted service that was voted on by the SAU Board. It was recommended that the committee find the savings elsewhere.

**Motion:** K. Verville moves to reduce the bottom line by \$27,860.

**Second:** K. Cote

I. Scott asks for clarification about the intended use for the amount reduced from the SAU Management Share.

K. Verville states that the SAU 53 Board chose to hire a position Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Coordinator. This line has increased year after year at an unsustainable rate. Our district send to Concord. This Coordinator will undoubtedly spend the majority of their time aligning with PA where the rest of SAU 53 send its students. People spoke against this position at Deerfield School Board meetings. People tried to speak against it at the SAU 53 Board meeting and all members present from the Deerfield School Board voted against allowing public question and comments.

S. Giovinelli states that it would be better to leave the reduction in the line that it was intended.

Ms. Wheeler states that because it is a contract, money will need to be managed back into the line either by the MBC putting it back in or by the School Board managing the bottom line. The way it is now is in violation.

K. Verville states that he will leave it up to the Committee how they would like to proceed.

Chairman Spillane states that he would rather not be in violation.

**Motion:** S. Giovinelli moves the question

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to move the question: Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Vote to reduce the bottom line by \$27,860. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to add \$27,860 back in to Line 77 the District's share of the SAU Management.

**Second:** A. Robertson

**Motion:** S. Giovinelli moves the question

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

**Vote to move the question: Yay: 9, Nay: 1, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Vote to add \$27,860 back in to Line 177 the District's share of the SAU Management. Yay: 9, Nay: 1, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** I. Scott moves to reduce the bottom line of the School Budget by \$879,393.20 to \$12,054,397.80 which was the actual for fiscal year 15/16.

**Second:** Vice Chairman von Hassel

I. Scott states the town is not going to approve an approximately budget with a 3.6% increase. If the school was able to operate without any major incidents at this amount in 15/16 then they should be able to do so next year with the same amount of money.

S. Giovinelli states that a major factor this is labor including benefits. He states that he agrees with being frugal but that this size of a cut may be too much.

Vice Chairman von Hassel states that the school has been able to consistently returned on average \$305,000 each year since 2009. He sees this increase and doesn't feel he has seen the demonstration for this increase. He finds it interesting that administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, non-para professionals have all received a raise but that the school board could not find the money to fund the initial supplies for students at the start of the year and it was left up to the teachers or parents to fund those.

K. Verville points out that pay raises were also voted in at the SAU level as well. He states that he will not support this cut.

Mr. Yergeau points out in reference to the cuts proposed by Mr. Verville to return lines to historic spending, last year the budget was frozen almost the entire year. With regard to the amount of money returned, for example High School tuition was 15/16 budgeted at \$2,330,000 and only spent \$2,174,000. The excess is returned to the town. With regard to the supply line, at one time everything was fully funded. The school heard from public that they wanted parents to provide initial supplies. The change was made for parents to provide these initial items but no student is ever without a pencil if they need one. Some parents enjoy back to school shopping with their children. Students want to be able to choose their own folders, pencils, etc. which is why the lists exist.

K. Verville states that he often attends School Board meetings and he does not recall discussion about the budget being frozen. He also does not recall it being in the minutes that the budget was frozen. He has asked in the past and been told that budgets are not frozen. This is why the MBC asks questions. If budgets are frozen from day 1 of school and it isn't being discussed at the School Board, that is a problem. Parents asking what they can supply is not what these letters indicate. No one has said that the school providing the supplies keeps a student from bringing in their own folder. He does not support this motion.

I. Scott states that taking this money from the bottom line gives the voters a true choice. If they don't want to have these cuts, then they will vote for the default budget.

Z. Langlois states that this cut is based on two fiscal years passed and will have drastic consequences.

I. Scott states that this decrease is 6.7% which is not drastic.

**Vote to reduce the bottom line of the School Budget by \$879,393.20 to \$12,054,397.80 which was the**

**actual for fiscal year 15/16. Yay: 1, Nay: 9, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails**

**Motion:** Vice Chairman von Hassel moves to reduce the bottom line by \$395,365 to \$12,638,426.

**Second:** I. Scott

Vice Chairman von Hassel states that looking at the handout from tonight he sees a trend each year since 2009 with an average return of \$305,000. In 2015 \$335,000 returned, 2016 \$378,000 returned, 2011 \$438,000, 2010 \$557,000 returned.

K. Verville states that this proposed bottom line is a .8% year on year increase.

Z. Langlois cautions against removing large amounts from the bottom line. Contractual obligations can come up and very quickly the surplus is used up.

Vice Chairman von Hassel states that \$30,000-40,000 surplus returned would be a reasonable amount.

Anything higher than that is poor planning.

Z. Langlois points out that \$30,000-40,000 is three to four high school students.

Vice Chairman von Hassel revises his statement and states the \$75,000-100,000 would be a reasonable surplus returned.

Z. Langlois states that even that amount of money can be used up very quickly.

K. Verville asks how much money is in the Retention Fund.

Ms. Wheeler replies that there is \$190,000 currently in the Retention Fund which can only be used if there was deficit.

K. Verville asks how many years has this fund been funded at \$190,000.

Ms. Wheeler replies that it has been two years.

K. Verville asks how the School Board arrived at \$190,000.

Z. Langlois replies that he looked at the allowed amount which is 2.5% of valuation and he reviewed the surplus amounts.

K. Verville states that he what he understands that the School Board is managing to a surplus. He asks what the maximum retention would have been for this year.

Z. Langlois states that he believes it is \$250,000.

K. Verville states that he believes there are more emergency trust funds available to the school.

Chairman Spillane states that a continued surplus of \$305,000 is an interest free loan by every tax payer in loan. The breakdown would be the equivalent of a half a tank of oil for each tax payer.

K. Verville believes that there are 15-20% of the DCS students who are on free and reduced lunch. Those are the townspeople that this reduction of surplus is for.

Vice Chairman von Hassel states that this surplus breaks down to a \$247 overcharge for each single-family home in Deerfield.

**Vote to reduce the bottom line by \$395,365 to \$12,638,426. Yay: 7, Nay: 3, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

Ms. Wheeler states that the new bottom line is now \$12,538,426.

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to recommend Article #1 the School Budget in the amount of \$12,538,426.

**Second:** A. Robertson

**Vote to recommend Article #1 the School Budget in the amount of \$12,538,426. Yay: 8, Nay: 2, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to recommend Article #2 the cost items in agreement with the

paraprofessionals association for 17/18 at \$31,540, 18/19 \$32,773, 19/20 \$36,650 as well as \$31,340

**Second:** A. Robertson

K. Verville states that if you vote yes, you are recommending this three-year contract with the paras and if you vote no, you are not recommending this contract with the paras.

**Vote to recommend Article #2 and the costs associated with the agreement. Yay: 8, Nay: 2, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to recommend Article #4 up to \$30,000 to the previously established Facilities Repair and Expendable Trust Fund from the 2017/2018 surplus not from taxation.

**Second:** K. Verville

I. Scott asks how much is already in this fund.

Ms. Wheeler replies that there is currently \$183,066.09 in this fund.

K. Verville asks if there is any cap on this fund.

Ms. Wheeler states that she is not aware of a cap.

S. Giovinelli asks why the fund needs an additional \$30,000.

Z. Langlois replies that the fund is for emergency repairs. He states that they are preparing for the roof to fail which will cost \$160,000.

Chairman Spillane asks why the Board would choose to wait until the roof fails to make repairs and use emergency funds rather than make repairs now.

Z. Langlois states that he does not have a response to that question.

Ms. Patty Sherman, SAU#53 Co-Superintendent, states that it is her understanding that this fund was not set-up as an emergency fund.

Z. Langlois regrets the misunderstanding.

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves the question.

**Second:** I. Scott

**Vote to move the question. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Vote to recommend Article #4 up to \$30,000 to the previously established Facilities Repair and Expendable Trust Fund from the 2017/2018 surplus not from taxation. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries**

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to recommend Article #5 in the amount of up to \$102,000 for the purpose of replacing the gym floor.

**Second:** A. Robertson

Z. Langlois states that this is the only gym in Deerfield and it is worn out

I. Scott asks if there is a tax impact.

Ms. Sherman states that if you look at the \$30,000 warrant article that has a \$.06 impact and then multiply by three.

Chairman Spillane asks why the Facilities Repair Expendable Trust Fund isn't being used.

Z. Langlois replies that it may be used shortly to replace the roof.

Vice Chairman von Hassel asks if the \$102,000 is the high or the low estimate.

Z. Langlois replies that it is the budgetary number that was provided by a gym flooring company. The project would still go out to bid.

**Vote to recommend Article #5 in the amount of up to \$102,000 for the purpose of replacing the gym floor. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0—Motion Carries**

**Motion:** Z. Langlois moves to recommend Article #6 in the amount of up to \$35,000 to be added

to the Facility Paving Plan Expendable Trust Fund to come from 2017/2018 surplus.

**Second:** K. Verville

Z. Langlois states that this is for paving on the top part of the parking lot.

Ms. Wheeler states that this is the third phase of the paving project. There is currently \$48 in the Fund. \$35,000 will be put in the end of the 2017.

**Vote to recommend Article #6 in the amount of up to \$35,000 to be added to the Facility Paving Plan Expendable Trust Fund to come from 2017/2018 surplus. Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0—  
Motion Carries**

#### 8. Citizen's Comments

Ms. Harriet Cady states that she is against money being put in to trust funds. The money is from people who have moved away or died rather than from the people who move in. It is not fair to take this money instead of from taxes. Deerfield is one of few towns that do not have any bonds. Epping has a bond of \$5,000,000 to cover road repair and it is a fairer way to do so.

She asks about the town's Government Expendable money. Last year it was \$78,000 to make improvements to the George B. White Building. She states that she has not seen that there is a Capital Improvement Plan that shows how the money will be spent.

She expects that the selling of tax properties will be unexpected revenue and will come back to reduce taxes. She asks if the Conservation Commission asked that Deerfield hand over the to them, would that be a vote of the people or would the Select Board have the choice to do that.

She states that the \$190,000 in the was voted by the legislature for it to be used in emergency situation. In looking at the law about paying for what is voted for the SAU budget. It does not agree with what was said by DRA. The law states that any new positions at the SAU must be approved by the School District. She wants to know what the legislatures intent of the law was when it was discussed and voted on. She wonders if DRA has been misinterpreting this law. She asks that legislative services be asked.

A. Robertson states the Select Board would not hand property over to the Conservation Committee. It may require a vote on the part of the town.

#### 9. Adjournment

**Motion:** A. Robertson moves to adjourn

**Second:** K. Verville

**Vote to adjourn: Yay: 10, Nay: 0, Abstained 0 - Motion Carries**

*Next Meeting: Tuesday January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017 at 6:30pm*