

**LITCHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT
DELIBERATIVE SESSION
February 8, 2020
The State of New Hampshire**

Time, Place: The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. in the Campbell High School Auditorium.

Present: Moderator, Mr. Frank Byron, presiding.
School Board members: Mr. Brian Bourque, Chair; Mrs. Christine Harrison, Vice Chair; Mrs. Elizabeth MacDonald, Mr. Robert G. Meyers, Mrs. Tara Hershberger.

Dr. Michael Jette, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Cory Izbicki, Business Administrator; Mrs. Michele Flynn, Administrative Assistant; Diane Gorrow, Attorney for the District.

Budget Committee members: Mrs. Keri Douglas, Chair; Mr. Andrew Cutter, Vice Chair; Mrs. Jessica Martin, Mr. William Hayes; Mr. Robert Leary, Select Board Representative; Mr. Robert Meyers, School Board Representative.

Ballot clerks: Mrs. Trisha Byron

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

Mr. Byron introduced Mr. Brian Bourque, School Board Chair. Mr. Bourque introduced School Board members, SAU staff, and attorney.

Mr. Byron introduced Mrs. Keri Douglas, Chairperson of the Budget Committee. Mrs. Douglas introduced Budget Committee members.

Mr. Byron read the Moderator's rules and announced that elections will be held on March 10, 2020 from 7:00 am – 7:00 pm at CHS.

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.

As is customary, Mr. Byron asked voters if they were in favor of allowing non-voters and employees of the school district who were in attendance to comment during the meeting.

The majority was in favor of allowing non-voters and/or employees of the district to comment during deliberative session by voice vote.

Mr. Byron read Article A.

ARTICLE A.

To elect by ballot the following School District Officers:

School Board Member	3-Year Term
School District Clerk	3-Year Term
School District Moderator	3-Year Term
School District Treasurer	3-Year Term

The Moderator opened discussion of Article A.

Hearing no discussion, the Moderator indicated **Article A stands as written.**

Mr. Byron read Article 1 and indicated that Mrs. Douglas 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 **\$23,514,330**? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$23,660,450, 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.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.26 (Operating Budget) ***Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.44 (Default Budget)***

*Not Recommended by the School Board
Vote 0-5-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 7-2-0*

Mrs. Douglas made the following statements:

The School District Budget was received in November. The Superintendent and Business Administrator presented school priorities, enrollment projections and projected revenues. Budget Committee members reviewed line by line over three meetings in November and December. The budget information was presented by the School Board representative, Superintendent, Business Administrator and department heads as needed before voting. Final votes on budgets and Warrant Articles occurred in January 2020.

Decision Criteria

Mrs. Douglas explained the Budget Committee made their recommendations based on the following criteria:

- Consider history of actual spending of previous years using 3 year averages
- Consider School District Priorities as presented by educational professionals

- Consider year to date actual spending of current budget
- Consider the rationale for why dollars are being requested by the school district and educational professionals as well as any data presented
- Consider what was a reasonable budget to present to the voters given fixed cost increases and revenue projections.

Mrs. Douglas presented the school district budget review:

- The approved School District operating budget for the current year is \$22,041,958
- The initial School District Budget request for FY 2021 was \$23,033,262 – representing an increase of almost \$1M.
- Approving the budget as presented would have resulted in an estimated tax increase of \$1.07.
- After presenting their initial proposal to the Budget Committee, further School Board action resulted in additional savings.
- Based on feedback from their health insurance provider, the School Board was able to level fund health insurance, providing a savings of \$216,525.
- Other insurance related adjustments brought their reductions to \$263,659.
- As a result of these savings, the updated School Board budget request was \$22,769,603.
- This updated proposal reflected an increase of \$727,645 – or \$0.79 on the tax rate.
- During the initial review of the proposal, the Budget Committee reviewed the budget on a line by line basis.
- Budget Committee adjustments were considered on an account by account basis, which allowed the Committee to review the budget proposal with the big picture in mind.
- After a review of each account was completed, the Budget Committee recommended an additional \$445,362 in reductions.
- The combined School Board and Budget Committee reductions totaled \$709,021.
- The Budget Committee’s recommended operating budget for next year is \$22,324,241.
- This budget is \$282,283 more than last year’s approved budget, representing an increase of 1.28%.
- The estimated tax impact of this increase is \$0.26.

Article 1 reflects all areas of spending, including programs that are self-funded.

General Fund	\$22,324,241
Food Service	\$ 615,089
Grant Funds	\$ 575,000
Total Requested Appropriation	\$23,514,330

The Default Budget is \$23,660,450, which is \$146,120 more than the Budget Committee’s proposed budget.

Mrs. Douglas reviewed all department budget totals in the FY21 budget.

Budget Committee Action

- Reduced Supplies \$10,056
- Reduced Items associated with Additional K Class \$103,000
- Reduced Salaries/Benefits \$259,000
- Reduced Conferences and Travel \$15,826
- Reduced Transportation \$20,776
- Reduced Printing/Binding \$200
- Reduced Extended Year Program \$200
- Reduced SnowPlowing \$2,002
- Reduced Legal \$3,000
- Reduced Game Officials \$5,000

Potential Tax Impact

\$0.26 potential tax impact resulting in a \$91 increase on a house valued at \$350,000.

\$0.44 default tax impact resulting in a \$154 increase on a house valued at \$350,000.

School Board Budget Process

Mr. Bourque indicated the budget process begins over the summer months and continues through September. The requested budget is presented to the School Board and is then sent to the Superintendent, who meets individually with administrators to review their budget and make adjustments. The recommended budget is sent back to the School Board who reviews the budget in an all day work session in October, which includes presentations from all administrators and department heads.

Mr. Bourque indicated the School Board feels the reductions to the FY21 Operating budget by the Budget Committee were too deep. He explained they use a three year average, but it sometimes does not work in the thought process.

Mr. Bourque explained the FY21 Default budget is higher than the operating budget because it includes all contractual items. He pointed out the recommended operating budget has been cut so deep that it resulted in the default budget being higher.

Mr. Bourque commented that the School Board could not recommend the FY21 Recommended budget for the reasons stated.

Ralph Boehm 6 Gibson Drive, who is also a State Representative, commented that the House Education Committee worked on fixing the state revenue for schools and increased the revenue in Litchfield by \$650,000. He asked why there is still a large increase in the budget when the revenue has increased.

Mrs. Douglas commented one of the items of revenue has to do with Special Education and the Budget Committee reduced that budget in anticipation of that revenue.

Dr. Jette clarified that the special revenue that is coming to Litchfield School District is one time revenue and the NH DOE has recommended that it is used for infrastructure and not to offset taxes as it is not adequacy aid. He explained if those funds are used to offset the taxes then there will be a spike in the tax rate in the following year. He indicated the district is considering projects recommended by the Capital Planning Committee that need to be addressed at no cost to the taxpayers and will most likely recommend the use of the one time infrastructure funds for that purpose.

Mr. Boehm commented that these funds are additional revenue the district will be receiving.

Mrs. Douglas commented that there is additional adequacy aid coming to Litchfield and has been offset by the anticipation of reimbursement of special education needs.

Greg Richardson, 14 Mike Lane, referred to the slide that referenced individual account increases. He asked why CHS, the newest building, is showing a \$17,000 increase when the other two schools are showing less.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that it is programmatic and does not include facilities. She noted the investments in CHS would be under the Facilities account. She explained CHS saw a large increase in athletics transportation and other programs.

Tim Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, asked for the total of the approved budget last year.

Mrs. Douglas indicated the approved operating budget was \$22,041,958.

Mr. Finnegan commented that it seems every year we get a choice on the ballot and the default budget always seems to be higher. He indicated the proposed budget is higher each year because the School Board comes with a big request that gets cut back by the Budget Committee, but is always greater than the previous year. Mr. Finnegan commented that when speaking of the process, the School Board can spend all of the money for anything they want. He stated those accounts are set up for them and not for the warrant article.

Mr. Byron clarified we are here to discuss the numbers. He noted the process is another topic.

Mrs. Douglas commented that anyone that wants to change the process needs to suggest it. She indicated we have a method to arrive at that final number.

Mr. Finnegan commented that community members can only discuss numbers and not the process, but the Budget Committee can discuss the process.

Mr. Byron indicated we need to stick to the article.

Marsha Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, commented that the district is receiving almost \$700,000 in additional revenue. She asked how taxpayers vote on the budget when we are losing \$750,000 and it may not be accurate.

Dr. Jette clarified the additional revenue in adequacy aid is \$450,000. He indicated that the district is receiving \$660,000 as one-time infrastructure revenue and this money will be used for capital improvements.

Mrs. Finnegan asked if the extra money is going to be used to fund the football club.

Mrs. Douglas explained the one time funds will be used for projects addressed by the Capital Planning Committee, who are working on the Capital Plan currently.

Mrs. Finnegan commented that it is a bottom line budget and the School Board can spend it anywhere.

Mr. Bourque commented if you look at the increase from last year (\$282,283) it covers the second year of the teachers' contract.

Robert Meyers, 13 Nesenkeag Drive, commented that the high school is approaching 20 years and there are issues that have to be addressed.

Tim Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, made a motion to amend Article 1 to reflect an Operating Budget total of \$22,045,000 for FY21. Marsha Finnegan seconded.

Mr. Byron indicated that there is a motion to amend Article 1 to read:

*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 **\$22,045,000**? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$23,660,450, 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. Finnegan indicated the estimated tax impact will be zero. He commented there are unexpended funds from last year, which means the budget was more than enough to operate the district for the whole year and there will be more than \$650,000 coming to the district. He felt we should keep our taxes the way they are now.

Mr. Bourque asked how Mr. Finnegan arrived at the proposed number.

Mr. Finnegan indicated that it is the same amount of the budget from last year.

Mr. Bourque pointed out that is the General Fund budget only.

Mrs. Douglas commented the increase over last year's budget is \$282,283.

Mr. Finnegan commented that you are saying that the proposed budget of \$23,514,330 encompasses everything the district needs and the budget from last year was \$22,041,958.

Mrs. Douglas clarified the number approved last year is the General Fund number and does not encompass everything.

Attorney Diane Gorrow commented there is some confusion created by the Budget Committee presentation of the budget. She explained under the law the district has to gross appropriate and last year's warrant article (FY20) includes the gross appropriation. She indicated the district has to spend money on food service and special education, which is offset by revenues. She concluded separating it out by general fund is misleading to the public.

Mr. Izbicki, Business Administrator, explained the FY20 approved budget was \$22,865,429 and any warrant articles that are approved on the ballot are included in the budget, which includes the new LEA contract approved in October. He indicated the total FY20 approved budget is \$23,134,716. He noted the number presented by the Budget Committee was the general fund budget only.

Mr. Finnegan commented, so the number that was presented is not the correct number.

Mrs. Douglas explained the intent of the slide in the presentation is what is considered and reviewed by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Finnegan asked what the Budget Committee approved this year.

Mrs. Douglas indicated the Budget Committee approved a budget for FY21 of \$23,514,330, which includes a general fund budget of \$22,324,241; a food services budget of \$615,089; and a special revenue budget of \$575,000. She commented when the Budget Committee reviews the budget we focus primarily on the general fund. She apologized for not using the correct verbiage and will take all comments into consideration for next year's presentation.

Mr. Finnegan began to motion a new amendment.

Mr. Byron advised that if the voter wishes to submit a new amendment, the original amendment on the floor must be withdrawn.

Mr. Finnegan withdrew his motion. Mrs. Finnegan withdrew her second.

Ralph Boehm, 6 Gibson Drive, clarified there is a one time only amount that is not in this year's budget and there is additional adequacy aid. He noted the use of the one time funding has not been decided by the School Board.

Mrs. Finnegan asked if the money the state is giving Litchfield will be there when the budget comes up next year.

Mr. Byron indicated money has not been received and will have to be appropriated.

William Barrett, 53 Pilgrim Drive, asked if article explanations will appear on the ballot.

Mr. Byron commented the only verbiage on the ballot is the articles with no explanations.

Mr. Barrett indicated that the school district article explanations handed out at this meeting provided great information and would be helpful to all residents.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that information will be available in a voter guide.

Greg Richardson, 14 Mike Lane, commented that he has heard a lot of numbers. He asked if voters can have an option to level fund what was approved last year as opposed to this proposed operating budget.

Mr. Byron indicated under state law the only number that can be changed is the operating budget number.

Tim Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, made a motion to amend Article 1 to reflect an operating budget of \$23,134,716 for FY21. Marsha Finnegan seconded.

Mr. Byron indicated that there is a motion to amend Article 1 to read:

*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 **\$23,134,716**? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$23,660,450, 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. Finnegan commented this is the option that will level fund the budget to the current budget. He indicated there are funds left over from last year and there is more than needed. He felt the budget should remain flat.

Mrs. Harrison commented with regard to the unexpended funds of approximately \$496,000, it is recommended by the auditors to maintain a 2% balance to remain solvent and fiscally responsible. She noted the Town has a fund balance as well. She indicated there are unforeseen circumstances that can occur and the district returns all remaining funds to the taxpayers each year. Mrs. Harrison commented that the purpose of maintaining a healthy fund balance is so the School Board does not have to go to the voters for a supplemental tax bill. She indicated this type of reduction puts the district at legal risk of fulfilling our contracted services and will

require us to lay off teachers. She noted the voters approved the teachers' contract. Mrs. Harrison indicated this type of reduction will affect programming and students. Mr. Finnegan asked if Mrs. Harrison was speaking as a School Board member or citizen.

Mrs. Harrison indicated she is speaking as a citizen who is knowledgeable about budgets.

Mr. Finnegan commented she tells us the district needs those unexpected funds to keep a balance and then states the district cannot keep those funds. He asked which statement is true.

Mrs. Harrison indicated both are true. She explained the district maintains a 2% fund balance during the school year and returns all funds not encumbered by June 30.

Mr. Finnegan commented that budgeting should always begin with \$0; anything else is fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. Izbicki clarified that the School Board has authority to encumber funds by June 30 for projects for the following year. He indicated the remaining unassigned fund balance is returned to the taxpayers.

Mrs. Douglas made a motion to call the question. William Barrett seconded.

Mr. Byron explained we are voting on the motion to end debate only.

The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Byron indicated voters may now vote on the amended article (Article 1).

The voice vote was inconclusive and the Moderator asked for a standing vote.

The motion to amend Article 1 failed by standing vote: Yes 10; No 32.

Dan Guerrette, 40 Talent Road, asked why there is such a difference in the estimated tax impact of \$0.26 on the operating budget and \$0.46 on the default budget.

Mrs. Douglas explained it is based on the increase over the operating budget and the assessed valuation calculation.

Tim Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, asked why two Budget Committee members voted against Article 1.

Mr. Meyers, School Board Representative to the Budget Committee commented that the reductions were to the budget were too deep.

Mr. Leary, Select Board Representative to the Budget Committee commented he feels that there are two new positions in the budget that should be on the warrant.

Mr. Bourque, School Board Chair, commented the positions in the budget are not new positions, but reinstated positions and placed back due to necessity.

Mr. Leary commented that you can call it what you want, but when it is not in last year's budget it is new.

Mrs. Douglas commented this is an ongoing debate and we can agree to disagree on this issue.

Janine Anctil, 43 Tanager Way, commented the Budget Committee proposed a salary/benefits reduction due to attrition. She asked if that means the Budget Committee recommends the School Board only consider hiring new teachers right out of college.

Mrs. Douglas commented that older teachers retire and newly hired teachers are typically hired on a lower step than those that leave, which contributes to attrition. She noted historically it is teachers that have been in the district for several years that retire.

Mrs. Anctil commented that the Budget Committee proposed a reduction to transportation. She indicated the district has already signed a contract for transportation that includes increases each year. She noted the Budget Committee believes there could be savings in combining routes and planning more efficiently, but in Special Education routes are already combined as needs dictate. She asked if the Budget Committee consulted the Director of Special Education about combining routes.

Mrs. Douglas indicated Mrs. Bandurski was at the Budget Committee meetings. She explained the Budget Committee reviews the budget on an account by account basis. She noted ultimately it is a bottom line budget and the School Board can move money from other areas where there is money into this account.

Devin Bandurski, Director of Special Education, commented when budgeting for transportation for students with special needs, we budget for each student's needs, which cannot be accurately determined until we get into that year.

Mrs. Douglas commented that the district budget is presented in one perspective and the Budget Committee looks at it from another perspective.

Tim Finnegan, 147 Talent Road, commented that the School Board representative said he did not think it was a good budget. He asked if the representative is allowed to vote against school board recommendations.

Mr. Meyers indicated that, through training with the State, School Board representatives to the Budget Committee are ethically expected to vote with the majority of the School Board. He noted that this is not the School Board recommended budget that is being presented today.

Mr. Finnegan commented that Mr. Meyers is an unelected member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Meyers indicated that he is a representative of the School Board and a voting member of the Budget Committee, and in his opinion this was not a good budget.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Byron indicated that Article 1 will appear as written on the ballot.

Mr. Byron read Article 2 and indicated Mrs. Harrison will speak to the article.

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 Support Staff Association, which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing level:

Year	Estimated Increase
2020-2021	\$67,521
2021-2022	\$44,377

and further to raise and appropriate the sum of **\$67,521** for fiscal year **2021**, such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits required by the new agreement over those that would be paid at current staffing levels.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.08

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 8-0-1*

Mrs. Harrison spoke to the article. She presented the following information:

Contract Overview

This article represents 11 administrative assistants and receptionists, 14 facilities crew, 61 paraprofessionals, 13 food service staff and 9 monitors, with high turnover. The unit is made up of mostly residents of Litchfield.

Goals:

- 1) attract, retain and grow excellent support staff by maintaining a competitive salary scale
 - Year 1: Salary step equal to a 3% increase
 - Year 2: Salary step equal to a 3% increase
 - Increase of 7 hours of Professional Development
 - Increase in course reimbursement for all members to \$300/employee
 - Added option of pre-payment for 50% tuition.

- 2) shift to consumer driven health plan
 - Year 1 maintain Green Plan with \$0 deductible and \$20 copay
 - district pays 80% for individual plan
 - Year 2 switch to Yellow Plan with \$2,000 deductible for individuals and \$4,000 for family plan
 - district will pay 88% for individual plan

The switch to the consumer driven health plan will give employees better control over healthcare dollars and decrease costs for employees and the employer.

Cost Savings: Year 1 will result in \$1,440 savings; Year 2 will result in \$27,190 savings

Mr. Byron opened discussion of Article 2.

Hearing no discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 2 will appear on the ballot as written.**

Mr. Byron read Article 3 and indicated Mrs. Hershberger would speak to the article.

ARTICLE 3

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to establish a Class Size Reduction Expendable Trust Fund under the provisions of RSA 198:20-c, V for the purpose of funding staffing due to unexpected increases in enrollment and to raise and appropriate and place into the fund **\$99,000**, which has been appropriated in the FY20 Operating Budget, but has not been expended? This sum to come from the June 30 unassigned fund balance available for transfer on July 1 with no amount to be raised from taxation. Further, to name the School Board as agents to expend from the fund.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 9-0-0*

Mrs. Hershberger made following statements:

This article is requesting to fund an expendable trust fund to add a class in a grade level that exceeds the class size policy guidelines. With regard to Kindergarten, the enrollment for the last two years triggered an additional class, which should have been added (4 classes to 5 classes). An additional Grade 1 class was added in August 2018 as registrations spiked in late August. It is difficult to predict enrollment even with projections as there are many unknowns. This fund is not just for the Kindergarten grade level, but for any grade level that triggers an additional class.

The School Board monitors registrations and deliberates each summer on enrollment and numbers in the schools. Considerations when adding a class include:

- current enrollment
- projections and past history
- class size policy
- available space and timing
- greatest need.

In the past two years, Kindergarten and Grade 1 have grown significantly. Enrollment projections are much more variable at lower grades.

Data for GMS class sizes in 2019 and 2020 reflect grade levels that exceed the class size policy guidelines (kindergarten, grade 3 and grade 4). Growth data for grades K-4 reflects an average growth of 6.6% per class at GMS. Data also shows that Litchfield is aligned with all school districts (K-4) in the peer cohort for class sizes, which are above the State average (exceptions: Sunapee, Moultonborough).

Mr. Byron opened discussion of Article 2.

Greg Richardson, 14 Mike Lane, asked what happens to the trust funds the following year. He wanted to know if they become part of the budget or if it will become a growing fund.

Mr. Byron explained the money stays in the fund until it is used or appropriated and the School Board has the authority to expend the funds. He indicated that in order to add to the fund, the School Board would have to bring a warrant article to the voters.

Hearing no amendments or further discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 3 will appear on the ballot as written.**

Mr. Byron read Article 4 and indicated Mr. Bourque would speak to the article.

ARTICLE 4

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to raise and appropriate up to **\$50,000** to be added to the Special Education Capital Reserve Fund established in 2004 and authorize the use of that amount from the June 30 unassigned fund balance available for transfer on July 1 of this year, with no amount to be raised from taxation?

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 9-0-0*

Mr. Bourque made the following statements.

Two unanticipated out of district placements came into the district this year. This resulted in a current negative balance in special services transportation (-23,476); a negative balance in handicapped tuition (-\$30,750); and a current unencumbered balance in special services of \$35,591. It is anticipated that the School Board may have to withdraw funds from the Special Education Capital Reserve Fund prior to the end of this school year. When budgeting it is unknown who will be moving into the town and what their children's needs will be.

This article is requesting to add up to \$50,000 to the Special Education Capital Reserve Fund to replenish funds that are anticipated to be withdrawn.

Mr. Byron opened discussion of Article 4.

Hearing no amendments or discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 4 will appear on the ballot as written.**

Mr. Byron recessed the meeting for five minutes.

Richard Lascelles, Charles Bancroft Highway, commented that Pat Jewett has had a significant impact on Litchfield. He announced Pat Jewett is recuperating at a nursing home. He asked attendees to reflect wishes of wellness for her in a moment of silence.

Mrs. Douglas announced Jessica Martin will not be seeking re-election to the Budget Committee and recognized her service to the Town.

Mr. Byron reconvened the meeting.

Mr. Byron read Article 5 and indicated Mr. Bourque would speak to the article.

ARTICLE 5

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to establish a Capital Improvement Expendable Trust Fund under the provisions of RSA 198:20-c,V for the purpose of funding the study, planning and cost of new construction or renovation of existing facilities in the Litchfield School District as recommended by the Capital Planning Committee, and to raise and appropriate the sum of **\$70,000** to be placed into the fund? This sum to come from the June 30 unassigned fund balance available for transfer on July 1 with no amount to be raised from taxation. Further, to name the School Board as agents to expend from the fund.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 9-0-0*

Mr. Bourque made the following statements.

The Capital Planning Committee was established six months ago and has been working off of the HL Turner Building Assessment report from 2016, which identified all systems and components in our buildings. The Committee is trying to decide how to best address the needs of the district facilities and capital assets. The Committee is considering a study to determine the feasibility of new construction or renovation of GMS, getting the students out of the portables at LMS, addressing the HVAC and energy performance of all school buildings.

Greg Richardson, 14 Mike Lane, asked if there is \$70,000 left over at the end of the year and the district has money coming from the State for one time items, is this needed now or should it go toward expenditures in upcoming articles with a tax impact?

Mr. Bourque indicated it is needed now. He noted the articles with tax impact are critically needed.

Mr. Byron clarified what is being done is that \$70,000 will be placed in a fund to be able to use as planning today in order to spend the infrastructure revenue next year.

Hearing no amendments or further discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 5 will appear on the ballot as written.**

Mr. Byron read Article 6 and indicated Mrs. Hershberger would speak to the article.

ARTICLE 6

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of **\$35,000** to purchase and install door barricade security devices for all hallway classroom/office doors at Griffin Memorial School, Litchfield Middle School and Campbell High School? These door security devices are necessary to prevent an intruder from gaining access to the doorknob, lever or lock on classroom and office doors in the school buildings.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.04

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 9-0-0*

Mrs. Hershberger made the following statements.

The devices requested are temporary barricade devices that are recommended by the NH Department of Homeland Security audit and endorsed by the Litchfield Fire Department. The devices will be installed on all interior doors to hallways or common areas. The devices are easy to use and portable. Emergency responders can unlock the devices. Currently, the barricade method that is used by staff and students is more cumbersome, using desks, chairs, furniture, etc. to barricade the classroom doors.

Mr. Byron opened the discussion of Article 6.

Hearing no amendments or discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 6 will appear on the ballot as written.**

Mr. Byron read Article 7 and indicated Mr. Bourque would speak to article

ARTICLE 7

Shall the Litchfield School District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of **\$25,000** to re-core (cylinders and keys) all door locks at Litchfield Middle School? This is based on security and safety recommendations from the building security assessment performed by the New Hampshire Department of Homeland Security.

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.03

*Recommended by the School Board
Vote 5-0-0*

*Recommended by the Budget Committee
Vote 8-1-0*

Mr. Bourque made the following statements.

Recently, the District Emergency Management Team walked through LMS to identify concerns regarding inconsistencies with keys in the building and concerns from the Fire Department regarding access while responding to an emergency. It was discovered that over the years there have been several changes to door locks, which has resulted in a keyring filled with keys. Some doors do not have keys and the locks are outdated.

This article is requesting funds to change the cylinders in all door locks at LMS and to replace with a grandmaster system, which will make it easier not only for staff, but for emergency responders as well. A grandmaster system will provide more control, consistency and security.

Mr. Byron opened the discussion of Article 7.

Hearing no amendments or discussion, Mr. Byron indicated that **Article 7 will appear as written on the ballot.**

Total Potential Tax Impact

If all articles are approved by the voters, it will result in a tax impact of \$0.41. The potential tax impact to a home valued at \$350,000 will be \$143.50 per year.

If the default budget is adopted and all other articles are approved, the potential tax impact to a home valued at \$350,000 will be \$206.50 per year.

Hearing no further discussion or business, the Moderator thanked all who attended and accepted a motion to adjourn at 12:20 p.m. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

A true record of the Litchfield School District Deliberative Session,
Prepared by:

Michele E. Flynn
Administrative Assistant to the Litchfield School Board

A true record of the
Litchfield School District Deliberative Session

Attest:

Lynn Baddeley
School District Clerk

Submitted: February 14, 2020