

**LITCHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT
DELIBERATIVE SESSION
January 31, 2009
The State of New Hampshire**

Time, Place: The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Campbell High School Auditorium.

Present: Moderator, Mr. John G. Regan, presiding.

School Board members: Mr. Dennis Miller, Chair (School Board Representative to the Budget Committee); Mrs. Cynthia Couture, Vice Chair; Mrs. Dot Beauregard; Mr. Ralph Boehm; and Mrs. Pat Jewett (Board Member and Selectwoman).

Dr. Elaine Cutler, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Stephen Martin, Business Administrator; Dr. Ronda Gregg, Director of Special Services; Amanda Lecaroz, Director of Curriculum & Instruction; Deb Mahoney, Director of Human Resources; Bruce Ballou, Director of Technology; Michele E. Flynn, School Board Secretary; Ms. Lynn Baddeley, School District Clerk; Gordon Graham and Maureen Pomeroy, Attorneys for the District.

Mr. Robert Manseau, Campbell High School Principal; Mr. Tom Lecklider Litchfield Middle School Principal; Mr. Martin ("Bo") Schlichter, Griffin Memorial School Principal.

Budget Committee members: Mr. Brent Lemire, Chairman; Mr. John Harte, Vice Chair; Mr. Paul Parker; Mr. Mike Falzone, Mr. Brian McCue; Mr. Ray Peeples, Mr. George Lambert, (Selectmen's Representative).

Ballot clerks: Ms. Bertha Miecowski, Mrs. Trisha Regan.

Mr. Regan invited members to join him in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Regan introduced Mr. Phil Reed, Vice Moderator, and reviewed the Moderator's rules and protocol for the Deliberative Session according to state law.

Mr. Regan introduced Mr. Dennis Miller, School Board Chair. Mr. Miller introduced School Board members, SAU staff, and attorneys.

Mr. Regan introduced Mr. Brent Lemire, Chairman of the Budget Committee. Mr. Lemire introduced Budget Committee members.

Note: The order of business of the Deliberative Session is sometimes conducted out of the warrant articles' numeric sequence. Recording activity in chronological order would make the minutes difficult to follow; therefore, the articles will be listed, with action taken thereon, in the order in which they were listed on the warrant.

Mr. Regan read Article 1 and indicated that Mr. Miller would speak to the article.

ARTICLE 1

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by the vote at the first session of the annual school district meeting, for the purposes set forth herein, totaling Twenty Million, Seven Hundred Twenty-Seven Thousand, Six Hundred Thirty-Six dollars (\$20,727,636)? Should the article be defeated, the default budget shall be Twenty Million, Eight Hundred Forty-Nine Thousand, Six Hundred Seventy-Eight dollars (\$20,849,678), which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Litchfield School District or by law; or the School Board may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13 X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.

Mr. Miller gave an overview of the budget process. The Administrative Team makes initial recommended reductions with prioritization. The SAU then prioritizes their requests and makes second level adjustments to the budget. The School Board made final adjustments and approved the proposed budget for Budget Committee consideration. The Budget Committee is responsible for recommending the budget amount to be placed on the warrant. Mr. Miller indicated that many people worked to bring this budget forward. He also explained that the Default Budget is created for the School Board and approved by the Board. The Budget Committee is not involved in the Default process.

Mr. Miller deferred to Mr. Martin to speak to the budget. Mr. Martin explained that Dr. Cutler instructed administrators to submit a level-funded budget. Article 1 represents the total District operating budget for the 2009-2010 fiscal year and that it includes general fund, food service, and grant fund budgets.

Mr. Martin explained that he would present a budget summary, the School Board proposed operating budget with major factors impacting district needs, the Budget Committee's recommended budget, the Budget Committee's reductions, estimated revenues and appropriations, and tax rate impact. He added that all presentations and budget handout are available on the District website at www.litchfieldsd.org.

The School Board's proposed total operating budget of \$20,802,147 reflected an increase of \$797,416, or 4.2% over last year. The Budget Committee recommended a total budget of \$20,727,636 reflecting a \$74,511 difference, an increase of 3.8% over last year's total operating budget. The total proposed FY10 budget, \$21,228,990, **which is a total of the operating budget and warrant articles**, reflects an increase of \$1,259,069, or 6.3%, over the FY09 total budget. The proposed FY10 Default budget, \$20,849,678, is 4.41% over 2009. Mr. Martin pointed out that the cost of Article 2 is actually less than what was posted on the warrant and that the School Board would be amending Article 2.

Mr. Martin highlighted the major factors impacting the FY10 operating budget. The major factors are the state mandated kindergarten expenses of \$321,725, of which \$303,330 will be offset by additional state revenues; NH Retirement System mandated contribution rate increases, \$109,841; and mandated repairs and improvement to GMS, \$95,650. If these items are excluded, the operating budget increase would only be 1.04%.

Mr. Martin pointed out that the School Board's recommended general fund operating budget is \$797,416 less than 2009. He reviewed the major increases impacting the budget as follows:

- Kindergarten has been mandated by the state and the expenses, \$321,725, account for 40.35% of the increase to the operating budget. The cost will be offset by \$303,330 in additional state funding.
- Existing non-LEA Staff Salary & Benefits increase of \$136,330, account for 17.10% of the increase to the operating budget.
- NH Retirement contributions increase of \$109,841, account for 13.77% of the increase to the budget, due to mandated contribution rate increases.
- Utilities increase of \$75,539, account for 9.47% of the increase to the operating budget.
- Paraprofessionals Salaries increase of \$50,060, account for 6.28% of the increase to the operating budget (\$30,000 reduced in 2009 budget).
- Mandated safety repairs at GMS required by the Litchfield Fire Department and Building Inspector, \$48,000, account for 6.02% of the increase to the operating budget.
- GMS Repairs required by the NH DOE & the Litchfield Health Inspector for School Approval, \$47,650, account for 5.98% of the increase to the operating budget.
- Expanded Days for the Director of Curriculum, \$45,609, account for 5.72% of the increase to the operating budget.
- Health & Dental Insurance increase of \$42,129, account for 5.28% of the increase to the operating budget.
- Transportation Contract increase of \$38,422, account for the 4.82% of the increase to the operating budget.
- Data Communications increase of \$32,436, account for 4.07% of the increase to the operating budget. Mr. Martin pointed out that half of this increase is due to an error in setting the 2009 budget. The other half is due to two additional T1 lines supporting GMS and LMS.
- LEA Grade Change Salary & Benefit increases of \$21,393, account for 2.68% of the increase to the operating budget, are covered under the operating budget and are not part of the costs of the new Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Current GMS Portable lease of \$21,299, accounts for 2.67% of the increase to the operating budget (the portable was leased last year due to the closure of the 1930's building).
- Workers' Compensation Insurance increase of \$21,222, accounts for 2.66% of the increase to the operating budget. The major share of this increase was to gross appropriate the costs prior to the refund.
- Teacher 6th Period Classes increase of \$18,745, accounts for 2.35% of the increase to the operating budget, which is attributed to teachers at the middle and high school levels who teach an additional course period.
- Daily Substitute Salaries increase of \$16,142, account for 2.02% of the increase to the operating budget, which is driven by a need to increase the daily rate.
- LMS School Year Receptionist salary of \$15,523, which is a new position, accounts for 1.95% of the increase to the operating budget.
- All other accounts have been reduced \$264,649 or 33.19%.

Mr. Martin explained that object accounts are used to describe the services or commodities obtained as a result of the specific expenditure. He briefly reviewed object accounts highlighting a 40% increase in the Property Services account, which is due to required repairs, updates, and improvements (GMS mandated repairs and upgrades). He indicated that the site work and septic set up for the GMS portables for kindergarten will be funded 100% by the State of New Hampshire. Other property service account increases include transportation, out-of-district tuition for at-risk students in compliance with the new state attendance age law, and property and liability insurance. Salaries & Benefits account for 72% of the operating budget. If the Teachers' contract is approved by voters, salaries and benefits will account for 74% of the budget.

Mr. Martin explained that function accounts are used to describe the activity for which a service or expense is used. He reviewed increases and decreases to the function accounts. Regular Programs increased 1.4%; Special Programs 3.5%; Student Support Services 7.4%, part of which includes a transfer position (teacher) from LMS to CHS for an at-risk counselor; Instructional Staff Services 7.1%, due to an increase in days (salary) for the Director of Curriculum; Operation & Maintenance of Plant 10.4% due to the required GMS repairs and upgrades.

Mr. Martin reviewed the Budget Committee's reductions to the School Board budget. These reductions included: Athletic salaries \$5700; Dental Insurance \$8000; Social Security \$23,811; Workers Compensation Insurance \$10,000; Game Officials \$2,000; Electricity \$13,000; Fuel \$10,000; and Ground Equipment Replacement \$2000; for a total of \$74,511. Mr. Martin pointed out that the reduction in the Workers Compensation Insurance will not allow the District to gross appropriate this account.

Mr. Martin reviewed estimated revenue, which includes the revenue from state sources for kindergarten; an increase in the adequate education grant offset by a reduction in the state education taxes, which will reduce the state property tax rates by seven cents. Revenue from state sources will increase 3.8%. Mr. Martin also reviewed revenue from federal sources, such as Food Service revenue and revenue from grants, which will not impact the tax rate.

Mr. Martin indicated that the 2007-2008 year concluded with a fund balance of \$467,000. He is budgeting a fund balance of \$200,000 for this year, which is subject to change.

Mr. Martin indicated that the total 2009-2010 budget to be raised by taxes would equate to \$10.81 per thousand, a \$.49 increase from last year, which has been adjusted by the .07 reduction in state property tax. If the Teachers' contract and the Special Education Capital Reserve articles are approved by the voters, the tax rate increase will be \$1.00 (adjusted by the seven cent reduction to the state property taxes).

The Moderator invited the community to comment on Article 1.

Mrs. Laurie Ortolano, 16 Martin Lane, made a motion to reduce the 2009-2010 Operating Budget to \$20,405,911. The motion was seconded.

Mrs. Ortolano indicated that the amount of the reduction was \$321,925, which was budgeted for kindergarten.

The Moderator invited discussion of Article 1.

Mr. Miller commented that the State of New Hampshire has mandated the implementation of kindergarten. The District is required by law to have kindergarten. Reducing the cost of kindergarten in the budget would not mean that kindergarten would not be implemented. The District would have to find the money to fund kindergarten. A kindergarten program is essential and would mean more efficiency for first graders.

John Latsha, 10 McElwain Drive, commented that the problem is not with kindergarten, but the process in which the cost was included in the budget without being placed on a warrant article for the taxpayers to decide. He commented further although kindergarten would be funded by the state for three years, residents would have to fund it after that period. He felt that the people should have the right to vote on it. Mr. Latsha indicated that the mandate from the state was unfunded and quoted a School Board member who commented [at a previous Board meeting] that kindergarten is an unfunded mandate and is unconstitutional. He continued quoting that the Board member referred to the Hudson litigation. Mr. Latsha commented that the kindergarten issue should be decided by the people on a warrant article. He also referred to past warrant articles that failed (e.g. CHS track resurfacing, fencing), stating that these issues were not approved by the voters, but were included in the following year's budget.

Mr. Miller commented that he understood Mr. Latsha's viewpoint, however, Hudson is not challenging the funding of kindergarten. Hudson is challenging the mandate. Mr. Miller indicated that the explanation from Hudson's attorney is that they are not challenging the funding. If Hudson wins the lawsuit, it will not overturn the funding. Mr. Miller pointed out that even if kindergarten was on the warrant in Litchfield and it fails, the town must still implement kindergarten according to the law.

Michael Couture, 41 Stark Lane, commented on the budgetary breakdown for kindergarten, noting that some costs are occur only once and some are recurring. He queried about the annual operating cost of kindergarten.

Mr. Martin indicated that the total salaries and benefits to staff kindergarten would be recurring costs and total \$108,107, but would be offset by \$1,200 per pupil from the state for the first three years. Non-salary items, which include the portable classroom leases, would be funded by the state for the first three years as well. Approximately \$84,000 of this expense would be recurring beyond year three. The site work and set up for the portables is a one-time expense that is funded by the state. After three years, the state expects the town to provide a permanent space solution for kindergarten and would fund construction at 75% state building aid.

John Latsha, 10 McElwain Drive, commented that Hudson is, in fact, concerned about the financial aspect of implementing kindergarten.

Mr. Miller responded that Hudson is not challenging the funding of kindergarten, only the mandate.

Bill Spencer, 9 Cranberry Lane, clarified that Hudson is challenging the legal aspect of kindergarten. Hudson did not put kindergarten in their budget and he queried how they were allowed to do so.

Mr. Miller responded that it was Hudson's decision not to include kindergarten in their budget. However, kindergarten has been mandated and we do not know what the ramification from the state will be.

Mr. Spencer commented that they challenged the mandate and chose not to include the money in their budget, but will let the voters decide. He indicated that is the same issue with kindergarten in Litchfield and the voters should make the decision.

Mr. Latsha commented that the only penalty for Hudson if kindergarten is not implemented is to file for an exemption for one year.

Attorney Gordon Graham clarified that Hudson's issue with kindergarten is that it is mandated by the state, but only funded for the first three years. Hudson wants it fully funded. Hudson's lawsuit does not invalidate the law. Hudson is challenging that the districts that do not have kindergarten are being compelled to implement and fund it. Litchfield is different because of the complexity of the law. The "no means no" law [RSA 32:10, I (e)] states that the purpose or article shall be deemed one for which no appropriation is funded in that budget year. The Town of Litchfield approved kindergarten three years ago. The legislature passed the portion of the bill for kindergarten construction that was exempted from the no means no law to preempt kindergarten failing on a warrant. They never exempted the operational budget from the no means no law. School districts are now in a bad position. It was his advice that it was necessary for districts [for legal issues] to include kindergarten in the operating and default budgets. An unfunded mandate in Litchfield is contingent on voters never approving a program. The Litchfield community did vote in favor of kindergarten.

Peter Moore, 31 Deerwood Drive, commented that placing kindergarten on a separate warrant article placed the Board in an unfair position. They have been criticized several times for including items that failed in previous warrant articles in the operating budget. This reduction is a specific amount for kindergarten. If residents think the budget is too big, find specific areas to reduce. He added that it is disturbing that Litchfield is one of the few towns in the nation that does not have kindergarten. We have to support education for our children. He stated that he is not supporting the amendment to Article 1.

Bill Spencer, 9 Cranberry Lane, commented that when the original vote for kindergarten was taken the former Superintendent was asked if kindergarten was being forced on the people and she said no. She made a commitment to bring kindergarten to the voters.

Mr. Miller responded that the different conditions exist now than did previously. The law has changed and put us in a difficult position.

Mr. Phil Reed, 7 Forest Lane, stated that he was opposed to the amendment. He commented that the issue is either pay now or pay later, and pay later always costs more. We need to move forward. He urged residents to defeat the amendment.

Mr. George Lambert, 3 Lydston Lane, commented that he was not in favor of the amendment. Kindergarten will cost us more later and cost us adequate education for our children. Penny Shupe, 8 McQuestin Circle, commented that she has been a resident of Litchfield for 26 years and spent 20 years as an educator. She stated that this community has continued to invest in our students and that is what we need to do.

Mr. Ralph Boehm, School Board member, commented that we are in a quandary. If we support the amendment we will have to find the funding for kindergarten in the budget and pay legal fees. Our hands are tied. Mr. Boehm stated that if we remove kindergarten by amendment, we would place parents in a difficult position. They would have lost the opportunity to register their child at a private kindergarten of their choice. He urged residents not to support the amendment.

Mr. Bill Spencer, 9 Cranberry Lane, made a motion to call the question. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

A secret ballot was requested in writing by William Spencer, Patricia Spencer, Patricia Byron, Laurie Ortolano, Robert Martineau, for the vote on the motion on the floor to reduce the operating budget to \$20,405,911. The Moderator instructed voters to use ballot number 13 on the blue ballot sheet.

While the secret ballots were being counted, Board members requested a short break. Mr. Miller announced that Mrs. Dot Beauregard would not be seeking reelection to the School Board. He gave a brief background of Mrs. Beauregard's service and contribution to the community. He congratulated her on serving five years on the School Board and presented her with an award.

The Moderator indicated that the secret ballot had been collected and counted by the Supervisors of the Checklist.

The secret ballot count for the proposed amendment was: Yes, 26; No, 44. **The amendment was defeated.**

The Moderator asked if there was further discussion of Article 1.

Al Raccio, 16 Bear Run Drive, queried about the transportation costs for kindergarten.

Mr. Miller responded that there would be no increase in transportation costs as kindergarten students will be transported in conjunction with the elementary students. There will also be no midday transportation for kindergarten.

There were no further amendments or discussion, **Article 1 stands as written.**

Mr. Regan read Article 2.

ARTICLE 2

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Litchfield School District and the Litchfield Education Association which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Estimated Increase</i>
<i>2009-2010</i>	<i>\$ 457,623.00</i>
<i>2010-2011</i>	<i>\$ 374,373.00</i>
<i>2011-2012</i>	<i>\$ 379,805.00</i>

and further to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Hundred Fifty-Seven Thousand, Six Hundred Twenty-Three dollars (\$457,623.00) for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those of the appropriation at current staffing levels paid in the prior fiscal year?

Pursuant to RSA 273-A:12, VII, this collective bargaining agreement, including the pay plan but excluding cost of living increases, will continue until a new agreement is executed.

Recommended by the School Board

Recommended by the Budget Committee

Mr. Dennis Miller made a motion to reduce the first year cost amount of the Teachers' Contract in Article 2 to \$451,354. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Miller explained that the amendment was being made due to an accounting misallocation in the athletics and co-curricular accounts. The purpose is to adjust the figure to implement the negotiated agreement and correct a mistake in the original calculation of the cost items needed to implement the cost items in the agreement.

The Moderator asked if there was any discussion on the amendment. Hearing none, the Moderator asked for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

Mr. Miller spoke to the article explaining that the contract is the result of a four month long negotiation process during which he and Mr. Boehm served on a negotiation committee. He noted that the Board's desire was to minimize the cost to the taxpayers, reduce health insurance costs to the District, and maintain competitive salaries. Several options were discussed. The end result was that salary schedules would be adjusted 2.5% each year for three years, plus step increases that range from 2.76% to 4.48%; there is a 0% step increase for teachers at the top step, and no increase in longevity adjustments for those that qualify. 37% of the District's teachers are at the top step of the salary schedule.

Mr. Miller further stated that there will be no increase in co-curricular and athletic stipends over the three years. Board members and the LEA will study the allocation of the stipends. Also agreed upon is a new perfect attendance stipend to help reduce the cost of substitute teachers. The lower cost health plan reflects increased co-pays for office visits and emergency room visits. There is no increase in the per LEA member professional development dollars over the three years.

1
2 Mr. Miller indicated the cost of the agreement is \$451,354 for year one, \$374,373 for year two,
3 and \$379,805 for year three. The impact is \$.46 on the tax rate for year one and \$.39 on the tax
4 rate for years two and three.
5
6 The Moderator opened the floor to discussion of the article.
7
8 Rich Carter, 74 Talent Road, queried if the perfect attendance cost was included in the budget.
9
10 Mr. Miller responded that the perfect attendance cost is not reflected in the budget.
11
12 Mr. Carter was concerned about where the money would come from.
13
14 Mrs. Couture noted that the cost would be offset by the need for fewer substitutes.
15
16 Anja Duprat, 5 Ronisa Avenue, queried if the health costs are locked over the three years of the
17 contract and who would pay any difference if there were an increase in cost.
18
19 Mr. Miller responded that the costs differ from year to year, and the District pays 85% of the cost
20 from year to year.
21
22 SueAnn Johnson, 35 Locke Mill Drive, queried if the COLA and longevity are paid annually.
23
24 Mr. Miller responded that the 2.5% is an annual adjustment. The longevity stipend will be added
25 to the salaries of the teachers who have reached top step and qualify for longevity.
26
27 Ms. Johnson was concerned with a three year contract in light of the economy. She commented
28 that many people's salaries are being reduced and many are facing layoffs. She stated that
29 although she wants the District to have quality in teaching, the attendance bonus is not necessary.
30 She felt that the Board should have been more conservative in negotiations.
31
32 Mr. Miller commented that Litchfield has a high quality staff and they considered a shorter term
33 contract. They felt that the economic climate warranted the three year contract as futures are
34 uncertain. The teachers, School Board, and Budget Committee felt this was a fair contract. It
35 will be up to the voters in March.
36
37 Peter Moore, 34 Deerwood Drive, queried why the first year was higher than the other two years.
38
39 Mr. Martin explained that in the cost is higher in the first year because of the allocation of
40 teachers on the schedule. Each year additional staff reach the top step, which reduces the annual
41 cost increase. It can be very complicated because of the combination of steps and total
42 experience.
43
44 Bill Spencer, 9 Cranberry Lane, commented that part of the reason for the question is because the
45 contract is based on the existing pool and over three years the cost is affected by new hires.
46

1 Al Raccio, 16 Bear Run Drive, commented that the longevity doesn't seem to track the rest of
2 the numbers.

3
4 Mr. Martin responded that it is based on the allocation of current staff. When a teacher reaches
5 15 years with 5 years in the district, or 20 years with 5 years in the district the teacher is eligible
6 for longevity. The longevity cost was calculated for each existing staff member.

7
8 Mr. Raccio commented that would assume the history shows a very low attrition.

9
10 Mr. Martin indicated that there are a number of staff at the top of the longevity step. They could
11 teach another 10 or 15 years and you will see no change in that line. It is an actual expected cost
12 based on current staff.

13
14 There were no further amendments or discussion, **Article 2 stands as amended.**

15
16 *Mr. Dennis Miller, 37 Wren Street, made a motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 1. The*
17 *motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.*

18
19 *Mr. Dennis Miller, 37 Wren Street, made a motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 2. The*
20 *motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.*

21
22 Mr. Regan read Article 3.

23
24 **ARTICLE 3**

25
26 *Shall the Litchfield School District authorize the Treasurer, with the approval of the School*
27 *Board, to appoint a Deputy Treasurer for a 1-Year Term under the provisions of RSA*
28 *197:24(a) to serve only in the absence or unavailability of the Treasurer? This is an unpaid*
29 *position.*

30
31 Mr. Boehm spoke to the article. He explained that Litchfield has no deputy treasurer. This is a
32 one year term and the deputy treasurer would only serve in the absence or unavailability of the
33 treasurer. The position is necessary to operate the District within the law and is required by the
34 District's outside auditing firm. This is an unpaid and necessary position.

35
36 John Latsha, 10 McElwain Drive, queried if the position is voluntary.

37
38 Mr. Boehm indicated in the affirmative and that the position is unpaid.

39
40 The Moderator clarified that the deputy treasurer is appointed by the treasurer and approved by
41 the School Board.

42
43 There were no further amendments or discussion, **Article 3 stands as written.**

44
45 Mr. Regan read Article 4.

46
47

1 **ARTICLE 4**

2
3 *Shall the Litchfield School District raise and appropriate up to Fifty Thousand dollars*
4 *(\$50,000.00) to the Capital Reserve Fund for educating educationally disabled children*
5 *established in 2004 and authorize the use of that amount from the June 30 unreserved fund*
6 *balance (surplus) available for transfer on July 1 of this year?*

7
8 *Recommended by the School Board*

Recommended by the Budget Committee

9
10 Mr. Miller spoke to the article. He indicated that the Board is not requesting an increase to next
11 year's budget. We are requesting approval to add up to \$50,000 from any funds not spent by
12 June 30, 2009 to the existing special education capital reserve fund. These funds may be used to
13 cover any unanticipated educational costs for a special education student that is not included in
14 the approved budget. Out-of-district placements can cost in excess of \$100,000.

15
16 John Latsha, 10 McElwain Drive, commented that his research of special education capital
17 reserve funds in other districts indicated that the average is \$10,000 to \$25,000 and that \$50,000
18 is excessive.

19
20 Mr. Miller responded that actual out-of-district placements of special education students can
21 exceed \$100,000. This is not a slush fund and would require a vote of the Board to expend the
22 money.

23
24 There were no further amendments or discussion, **Article 4 stands as written.**

25
26 Mr. Regan read Article 5.

27
28 **ARTICLE 5**

29
30 *Shall the School District vote to require that all votes by the Budget Committee and the School*
31 *Board relative to budget items and warrant articles, shall be recorded votes and that a numeric*
32 *tally of the votes be printed in the School District warrant next to the affected warrant article*
33 *in accordance with RSA 32:5, V-a?*

34
35 Mrs. Couture spoke to the article. She explained that the article would require the District to
36 record the recommendation and vote tally of both the Board and Budget Committee on the
37 warrant. This practice was approved at a previous District meeting. The new law restricts the
38 printing of the vote tallies on the ballot. A new vote is needed to reinstate the ability to print the
39 vote tallies on the ballot and warrant. The Board believes it is beneficial for voters to see the
40 recommendations and tallies and is recommending this article.

41
42 There were no discussion or amendments, **Article 5 stands as written.**

43
44 The Moderator thanked all who attended and accepted a motion to adjourn at 3:50 p.m. The
45 motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Prepared by:
Michele E. Flynn
Secretary to the Litchfield School Board

A true record of the
Litchfield School District Deliberative Session

Attest:

Lynn Baddeley
School District Clerk

Submitted: February 4, 2009