

**TOWN OF DEERFIELD
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE
January 10, 2012
MINUTES**

Call to Order:

9:00 am Chairman Don Daley called the meeting to order.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag:

Chairman Daley asked all to rise and pledge allegiance to the flag

Roll Call:

Present:

Don Daley, Chairman; H. Cady, Kevin Chalbeck, T. Dillon, F. McGarry, D. Pitman and K. Verville Committee Members; Maryann Clark, School Board Representative

Excused: James Spillane, Vice Chair and Liz Murphy Committee Member

Absent: Steve Barry, Selectman;

Also Present: School Board Representatives & Deerfield Community School/SAU Staff: Peter Aubrey, Kevin Barry, Deb Boisvert, Peter Menard, Patty Sherman, Gregg Williams and Paul Yergeau

Approval of Minutes: January 3, 2011

Motion: M. Clark moved to approve the minutes as written

Second: D. Pitman

Discussion: H. Cady asked that it be noted that at the time of the January 3rd meeting Committee Member F. McGarry was absent and not excused. Though the absence was excused at a later time, the minutes should reflect how it was originally stated.

Vote to approve the minutes of January 3, 2012 as corrected: Yea: 7, Nay: 0, Abstained: 1 – Motion Carries

Old Business: None

2012-2013 School Budget and Warrant Articles:

P. Yergeau noted that the School Board had voted to move the Salary increases out of the 2900 line and into the appropriate areas within the budget. This does not impact the bottom line.

WARRANT ARTICLE 2 – Deerfield Education Association Salaries: M. Clark informed the MBC that there had been some language changes to the contracts. Specifically sick leave now includes the care of parents. There is an additional Reduction in Force (RIF) that was added, and there was a formula defined for the sick leave bank, allowing a maximum of 120 hours in the bank, and language specific to the 2011/2012 school year was removed. There was also language added regarding personnel file maintenance to be done at the SAU. The increase in funds required reflects a one step increase for each Teacher on the scale and a 1.5% salary increase for those at the top of the scale in year one of the contract, and the same for year two. M. Clark said that it is important to note that the current year's contract some teachers are earning less than in the 2010/2011 school year as retirement contributions have gone up. The State's average teacher salary is \$52,706 and Deerfield's is \$49,456. FICA, Life and Disability Insurance and Retirement costs are all included in Warrant Articles proposed figure.

Motion: M. Clark made a motion to recommend Warrant Article 2 as written

Second: F. McGarry

Discussion: Chairman Daley noted that the MBC will discuss and vote on whether to recommend or not recommend before Wednesday's Public Deliberative Session. K. Verville asked what for a definition of RIF. P. Sherman answered that a new State law states that a RIF cannot be based only on salary and must no include a number of parameters, for example years

of teaching, years of teaching in a subject, etc. T. Dillon asked if it was more or less restrictive. P. Sherman answered that it didn't change the standards it just made it so that you cannot cut from the bottom of the salary scale to the top.

H. Cady noted that industry average is for 80 hours of sick leave and she feels that 120 are excessive. She understands that teachers can donate to a bank, so potentially the School could be paying for more than 120 hours for a teacher in one year. P. Sherman responded that the 120 is for the bank only, the hours given per teacher are 115. H. Cady asked if a teacher gives notice of retirement, and receives the \$3,000 separation benefit does he/she also receive the 115 hours. P. Sherman answered no. H. Cady noted that it would be useful to see the number of teachers included in the 1100 lines of the budget. She asked if the contract negotiations caused the teachers to pay a greater amount of their retirement, or if that was the result of a new State law. M. Clark responded that it was a new State law, though she cannot discuss anything specific to the negotiations. H. Cady feels that the MBC should get a copy of the contract. M. Clark confirmed she will provide before the next meeting.

T. Dillon asked if the salary averages provided were a straight formula, or if it took into account a teacher's experience? If it did not take into account education/experience he feels the number could be deceiving. For example if the teachers in Deerfield are less experienced than the State average than it would make sense that the salary average was lower. M. Clark said that the averages did not take into consideration the step levels that she is aware of. K. Verville agreed that one would need to consider both variables. M. Clark informed the MBC that there are 57.1 members of the Collective Bargaining Unit and 21.4 are on the step scale, leaving 35.7, or 62.5%, that are at the top of the scale. F. McGarry commented regarding the level of education for our teachers, if we had a higher percentage of teachers with a Masters degree that would indicate that our salary levels are even further below State averages. Chairman Daley asked what, if the contract passes, will be the Deerfield average salary after two years. M. Clark did not have that number available. K. Chalbeck feels there is a lack of wording in the Warrant Article and would like to see the percent raise between steps as information provided to the voter. Chairman Daley asked if the School Board could make a handout available at the Deliberative Session. M. Clark confirmed that they will.

T. Dillon noted that the Committee has seen the changes to the contract that benefit the teachers, what were the changes made that are of benefit to the School Board? M. Clark responded that there are items, but that it is difficult to identify. Providing that information would require her to say where each party started the negotiation and she cannot legally do that.

H. Cady asked if the teachers are sharing an increased amount of their insurance costs in the contract. G. Williams answered that as far as a dollar amount no, but with regards to potential turnover and DCS teachers seeking employment in other parts of the State yes. At the close of negotiations the teachers now feel like they are being heard. M. Clark noted that last year's contract had included an additional thirty minutes of school day and that the pay had not increased to reflect, this contract addresses that. H. Cady asked if the School Board can provide staff turnover figures for the last five years. M. Clark confirmed that they can and indicated that they did have teachers who left last year to positions that paid significantly more. P. Yergeau said that in recent years turnover has been spread between senior and junior level teachers. K. Verville noted that the Committee should be careful in identifying turnover for money as there are some individuals who are motivated solely by money and others who take into account factors like the community and quality of life. He asked if Deerfield has a bubble of senior teachers nearing retirement, if so what that timeframe is. P. Yergeau said that yes, they do have a number of senior teachers and they try to gauge that potential for turnover on an ongoing basis. Chairman Daley asked if exit interviews were conducted. P. Yergeau answered sometimes, but not always. H. Cady referenced the Teacher roster and noted that 37 of the 63 individuals are earning more than \$50,000/year. She encouraged the MBC members to review. T. Dillon commented regarding the lengthening of the school year and the pay to coincide with that – he recalled that it had been discussed years prior and that in last year's contract a raise was included to compensate for that time. M. Clark agreed, though she said the raise did not fully reflect the extra 30 min/day.

Motion: M. Clark made a motion to table discussion until the MBC has seen the contracts

Second: K. Verville

Vote: Yea: 2, Nay: 6, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails

Vote as to the Recommendation of Warrant Article 2: Yea: 2, Nay: 6, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails

H. Cady asked that it be noted she feels at a disservice, she cannot recommend the Warrant without the full information. Chairman Daley noted that the calling for a vote is in an attempt to keep things moving and to get an idea of where the MBC stands in preparation for the Public Meeting. H. Cady feels that receiving the information next week will not allow enough time to formulate a decision. Chairman Daley noted that the MBC had requested the Contracts be furnished as early as possible and he feels today's vote is the result of getting the contracts completed so late without time to review. M. Clark informed the MBC that the contracts had been voted on by the School Board the previous Wednesday and Chairman Daley confirmed that they will be emailed to the MBC no later the Monday, January 9th.

WARRANT ARTICLE 3 – Para-Educators Association Salaries:

Motion: M. Clark made a motion to approve Warrant Article 3 as written

Second: D. Pitman

Discussion: M. Clark informed the MBC that the contract calls for a 1 step increase for those on the Para-Educators scale and a 1% increase for those off the scale in both years one and two. P. Sherman noted that the School Board voted to include the amount of the Insurance Buy Out in the Warrant Article, but that legal counsel had advised the amount should not be included as the actual numbers are not a known cost. M. Clark noted that the language surrounding the Insurance Buy Out option had also been changed, in past years it was restrictive based on pre-existing waiver of insurance, now the buyout is offered to everyone. If every member without insurance accepted the buy out the potential cost is \$10,500; that information will be included in the voter's guide as a potential cost along with the assumptions made to arrive at that number. The buyout amounts are \$250 in year one, \$500 in year two and \$700 in years three and after.

In addition to the salary step increases and the Health Insurance the contract included a change in salary schedules. Previously there had been two separate salary schedules, 1100 and 1200, this caused for some confusion as employees shifted between schedules from year to year. The language has been updated to one salary schedule, which is that of the Special Ed Paras and the change is reflected in the amounts requested on the Warrant Article.

T. Dillon noted that he feels the recommendation from the attorney is inappropriate as all costs in the budget are estimations. M. Clark noted that she agrees and that the School Board had expected the buyout figure to be in the Warrant as well. T. Dillon noted that should the Warrant fail there would be the potential to have to come up with \$10,500 out of somewhere else in the budget. P. Aubrey agreed, but restated that it is not a known cost and that they cannot go against legal opinion that to include the insurance buyout maximum impact would be overstating the budget. T. Dillon continued that the salary is also not a known cost, if you carry the legal counsel's logic forward, what if three top level teachers were to leave; the salary number is also an estimation. K. Verville agreed, but noted that in that example the budget would actually decrease. P. Aubrey reiterated that the School Board needs to adhere to the legal opinion received. M. Clark mentioned that the voter's guide will show this information. K. Verville noted that the School Board is assuming everyone will read the voter's guide while many don't. Regarding finding the funds in the budget, H. Cady noted that the \$10,500 figure is based on 10 of the 30 Paras taking the buyout. If just one additional Para-educator were to drop the insurance and take the buyout the funds would be made available. M. Clark confirmed yes, that the \$10,500 is based on the 10 Para-Educators who are currently not taking insurance, assuming that they would continue to do so and would receive a buyout. T. Dillon noted there is experience to look at. He said the language is the same as was included in the teacher's contract last year. How many teachers dropped their insurance following the buyout option? P. Aubrey answered 1 teacher and 1 aide, so the net change to the bottom line was zero.

Vote as to the Recommendation of Warrant Article 3: Yea: 2, Nay: 6, Abstained: 0 – Motion Fails

WARRANT ARTICLE 4 – Facilities Repair and Improvement Expendable Trust Fund:

Motion: M. Clark made a motion to recommend Warrant Article 4 as written

Second:

Discussion: M. Clark informed the MBC that following the septic failure last year, funds were taken from the Repair Trust Fund and the School Board would like to move \$25,000 from a potential surplus back to re-establish the Trust Fund Level. Chairman Daley asked what the current fund balance was. P. Aubrey answered \$100,632, not including the interest earned in 2011. Chairman Daley asked what the goal amount was. H. Cady stated the maximum was likely set by language in the original Warrant Article. P. Aubrey said that no, he believes the maximum amounts are set year by year with each subsequent Warrant, but does not believe there is a cap on the amount that can be placed in the reserve, but he will look into it. \$84,379 was spent out of the funds last year. The original intent of the funds was for repair of the roof, but it has not become a general repairs fund as they School has lost its heating and septic systems in recent years. T. Dillon asked if there were any anticipated projects. M. Clark responded yes, that the roof will need to be replaced at some point. At its last meeting the School Board formed a committee to look forward and identify specific items for attention (i.e. Building, Curriculum, Technology, and the mobile units).

Vote as to the Recommendation of Warrant Article 4: Yea: 8, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries

WARRANT ARTICLE 1 – 2012/2012 School Budget:

Motion: M. Clark made a motion to recommend Warrant Article 1 as written.

Second: D. Pitman

Discussion: M. Clark opened discussion by pointing out that the bottom line represents a decrease of \$104,969 year over year before appropriations from Warrant Articles. She feels the School Board and School Administration have made a concerted effort over the last years to present a tight budget. They are listening to and working with the recommendations provided by the MBC at both the School and SAU Level. She pointed out that the Concord tuition line is up 1.2%, but noted that figure could be significantly higher were it not for the contract DCS had negotiated with Concord. That amount is a positive reflection of the relationship DCS has with Concord High School. Additionally the electric line is down as DCS has joined a Co-Op, and resources have been combined within the SAU school districts to secure better bussing contract pricing. Finally, Special Education costs have been reduced significantly with a reduction in the number of Para-Educators employed. Chairman Daley thanked the School Board on behalf of the MBC and noted that he appreciates the work that has been done. It was noted again that the proposed Salary increases from the 2900 lines had been moved to their respective areas within the budget. H. Cady referenced the Equalized Valuation for 2010 and it notes that each \$462,000 spent results in a \$1 tax increase, yet she heard from the Town that each \$540,000 spent equals \$1 additional to the tax rate, which is correct? P. Aubrey said that the \$462,000/\$1 figure comes from the DRA and is a different number than is used on the tax rate as the DRA figures are from 2010.

As a result of questions raised at the January 3, 2012 meeting – M. Clark presented additional information on the following areas:

Technology: It had been asked at the last meeting if the DCS had looked at outsourcing the duties of its Network Technician as the town of Northwood does. A call was made to Computer Micro Services and they estimated that a contract for a school the size of Deerfield would be \$50,000/year, plus \$95/hour for any onsite maintenance and \$50/hour for off-site repair. Based on that estimate, outsourcing would cost significantly more than the salary of the current Network Technician, and it is felt that the Network Technician does a lot more, and has higher qualifications than the individuals who would be provided by an outside firm like Computer Micro Services. H. Cady is of the opinion that a real investigation would be to ask for FIPs. M. Clark confirmed that they can do that, but with the time available, this is the information they were able to get. Additionally, she checked with Northwood and it is worth noting that they have a smaller number of machines and are on a different replacement cycle than Deerfield. As a result, they allocate their money differently. Their replacement budget is \$47,000 while Deerfield's is \$20,000. Northwood replaces 20% of their machines annually (a 5 year rolling schedule) while Deerfield has identified essential machines (56% of the total number of computers) and only that top tier are on a 20% replacement (5 year rolling) cycle. T. Dillon asked if the \$47,000 full reflects the total cost of that position. M. Clark answered no, that the FICA, Medi, etc. is added to that elsewhere in the budget. P. Aubrey said that they

can break out to give a better estimate. M. Clark added that the Network Technician also handles things like the phone system, the clocks, the point of sale system in the cafeteria, the locks, etc.

K. Verville asked how the 5 year replacement policy was worded, if a machine is perfectly good at the end of its cycle is it thrown out? M. Clark indicated that it would be replaced only if it is an essential machine and asked Deb Boisvert of the school to expand. D. Boisvert indicated that they are concerned with maximizing those funds. They have identified 56% of the machines at the school as essential. If a machine is still in good working order at the end of its cycle it is moved down the road, to a non-essential function. She noted that the line for repair/replacement has remained \$20,000 since 2004, the cost has been kept level as costs of machines has gone down, and as they have been aggressive in upgrading older machines.

10:40 am – D. Pitman was excused

D. Boisvert informed the MBC that they employ the use of Thin Clients and Pod Systems where one more “hefty” and more expensive machine allows four to six students to log in at once. This is an example where having in-house skills saves money on testing and programming. Next year they are looking to replace the computer lab and will be pursuing a server option where one machine can run twenty to thirty stations. She noted that representatives from Salem and several other school districts have actually come to Deerfield to look at how we are doing what we do in being so cost effective. T. Dillon asked if the configurations mentioned save in software license expenses or only hardware. D. Boisvert answered that it depends how the software license is written. She added that they have been very aggressive in securing donations of software and hardware. In one instance a member of the community employed by Microsoft secured \$5 in software licenses for each \$1 donated. They have begun to run Open Office as well. K. Verville asked if the School had coordinated with the library so that software used carries over. D. Boisvert indicated that they do not, but certain can. She commented that they have seen the use of tablets growing exponentially and she is thinking about including an Ap review in the next Newsletter.

Regarding the SAU initiative, line 2400, for Outside Tech support, K. Verville felt that the description of the benefits provided didn’t provide a very good justification for the expenditure and asked if D. Boisvert had an opinion on the proposal. D. Boisvert addressed the concerns with reliability of connectivity by stating that they are already connected with the SAU remotely. Student records are housed in Pembroke and the Course Management system is hosted by an outside vendor in Manchester. Technology is already operating in the “cloud” world and while there are problems with connectivity, for example Metrocast going down the Thursday before Christmas, those challenges already exist and would not be unique to the SAU proposal. She feels the SAU is underfunded in terms with keeping up with the needs of the individual schools there is not enough staffing to keep up with the demands of the Districts. There is a need for more personnel to keep up with the efforts already underway. T. Dillon clarified that this is not to add to technology in terms of software or hardware, but to add a staff member. He asked how many are currently employed at the SAU. P. Sherman answered there is 1 Technology Employee at the SAU. There were challenges in wording of this proposal, but the intent of the contract would be to add one additional person to the staff. That individual would work on lower level projects at Pembroke in an effort to free up the higher level employees already employed by Pembroke to assist the SAU. T. Dillon asked who would sign the paycheck and will there be rules in place addressing expenditure of time. P. Sherman answered that Pembroke would continue to pay the two higher level individuals and the Deerfield monies would hire a new person to fill in the gap. There would be a contract with 0.4 FTE being shared by the districts outside of Pembroke. F. McGarry asked if there would be time sheets specific to each function. P. Sherman confirmed yes.

Class Size: Chairman Daley noted that the MBC was interested at the last meeting in looking at reducing the number of classroom teachers by 1 and that there might be several options in how to accomplish that. M. Clark indicated that she had brought the concerns of the MBC before the School Board and at that meeting the Administration spoke to the needs of some of the small classes, specifically the 2nd grade class. The School Board did discuss and they feel the staffing is appropriate as proposed. H. Cady said she feels the class size information should be included in a Newsletter, the community should see it. M. Cady responded that she could include the data, but without explanation and the context of discussion she feels that it is a tricky piece of information to throw out. H. Cady feels it should be distributed and the

School Board should consider making an informational session available for those who would like to discuss it. Chairman Daley suggested the piece only include the projected class size data as that might make it easier to digest. M. Clark confirmed she can include some version of the piece for the Deliberative Session. K. Verville commented that voters want to know what the class sizes recommend by the School Board is and what is in deviation from those numbers. G. Williams pointed out that deviation from the recommendation is entirely dependent on the dynamics within the class, there could be 26 students with no issues or there could be 12 students in chaos. K. Verville commented that he full appreciates that and understands it will be a challenge to both quantify and qualify the information for the voters, but he does feel more needs to be done to communicate justifications for the head count. P. Yergeau commented that the School struggles with how to reach the general population and noted he feels a piece of that is through the support of the MBC *following* these discussions. Class size is not based on numbers but on who the students are. K. Chalbeck agreed that publishing the numbers will increase awareness and hopefully generate questions, starting the conversation.

Guidance Staff: M. Clark addressed the State Standards that H. Cady had mentioned at the January 3rd MBC meeting. The numbers provided are *minimum* standards. The 1:500 Guidance Counselor to student ratio relates to Elementary Schools and there is a 1:300 minimum suggested ratio for Middle/High School level students. While DCS is technically an Elementary School they have a large percentage of students that are in the Middle School. If all students were in grade levels K-4, then yes, she feels one Guidance Counselor would probably be sufficient, but the Middle School students have a greater Guidance need. She provided information on the Guidance staffs of other schools in the districts noting that Northwood employs 2 full time Guidance Counselors and 2 full time Psychologists; Barnstead employs 2 full time Guidance Counselors and 1 full time Psychologist, etc. K. Verville asked if M. Clark stated that the guidance needs for Middle School students are greater. M. Clark confirmed yes, according to the State Minimum Standards. H. Cady would like to know the hours of the part time and half time positions and the size of the student bodies in the schools given as examples. Chairman Daley pointed out that the student body size and Guidance staffing specifics are also in the Comparative Cost report. K. Verville asked if it was the position of the School Board and School Administration that one Guidance person would place the School below the State recommended standards. M. Clark said that because technically DCS is an Elementary School, 1 Guidance Counselor would meet the legal State minimums.

K. Verville noted that the MBC had been told the two Guidance Counselors currently employed were straight out and asked for an expansion of the description that their time is spent “helping kids and getting them ready for High School”, is there a better description? M. Clark read a list of Guidance activities that includes, but is not limited to, group sessions, working with students that are autistic, cutting, suicidal, dealing with neglect and abuse, crisis counseling, group and individual counseling sessions, sessions that are based on IEPs and students under 504, behavior management services provided to students, parents and staff, professional development, serving on various School and Community committees, new student liaisons, parent/teacher meetings. They also do work with the New England Schools and Colleges Accreditation process. G. Williams expanded that in his opinion the School has changed in the twenty-eight years he has worked. Much like the Para Professionals employed, the Guidance staff is an expense, but without them the expenses would be much greater. There are students who without the support of guidance would not be able to be in school. He noted that Deerfield is dealing with big city issues, 20% of women have been abused, 20% of the population has a drug or alcohol addiction; there are murders and suicides, without Guidance support these students would end up in outside placement, including incarceration. He also noted that the Guidance Staff are mandated reporters to the State. K. Verville thanked the School for the justification. He asked how the Staff’s time was split. Does one handle K-4 and the other 5-8? P. Yergeau answered that they have opted to split the students alphabetically, there are some instances that do not follow that rule for example if the needs require a female or male specific Counselor or if staff is dealing with siblings with a different last name, or a certain area where one has expertise.

Contracted Services: T. Dillon asked if M. Clark had gotten the Contracted Services detail requested as far as what was an increase in current expenses and what were new expenses. M. Clark informed the committee that the increases that were

not a rise in existing contracts was funds built in for unexpected emergency costs. In the 2010-2011 School Year the School incurred several emergency costs including air sample testing (\$625), snow removal on the roof (\$7,000+), an emergency call on the heating unit (\$2,113), a new sewage pump (\$4,877), etc. They have forecasted \$2,152 for unexpected services in the current proposed budget. H. Cady asked what the \$86,000 expenditure was in 2012/2011. P. Aubrey was not sure, but will get that information.

Vote: Yea: 6, Nay: 0, Abstained: 0 – Motion Carries

Chairman Daley thanked the School Board and M. Clark for their openness in these discussions and noted that the MBC does not have a negative opinion of the areas addressed or of individuals in those departments and what they do. The MBC is simply looking for justification of proposed expenditures.

2012 Town Budget:

Chairman Daley noted the current proposed Town Budget bottom line of \$3,432,213 and asked the Committee Members if there were outstanding items for attention. K. Verville would like to revisit the purchase of a Police Cruiser within the Police Department's budget. He would prefer to see it as a Warrant Article as are the purchase of other Town Vehicles, i.e. Fire Trucks. H. Cady agreed that she would prefer to see it as a Warrant Article and noted that it bothers her to see four or five vehicles sitting in the parking lot daily at the Police Department. Are they all necessary? K. Chalbeck would like to revisit the Highway Department's budget, specifically the Brown Road paving. H. Cady agreed noting Vice Chairman Spillane's comments that residents of that Road should be able to bring their children to meet the bus at the Transfer Station as other residents are required to do.

Motion: K. Chalbeck moved that the Highway Department Budget be reduced by \$36,000 on line 14312-03735, eliminating the Brown Road hot topping project and resulting in a new line total of \$264,000.

Second: K. Verville

Discussion: K. Chalbeck feels this is a project that can be postponed. A lot of work has been done to Brown Road thus far and he feels with the total budget up almost 3%, the elimination of this expense will help to bring it closer to the default budget. T. Dillon asked if the Committee had considered the cost of maintaining a tar versus a dirt road. K. Chalbeck agreed that the winter maintenance is difficult, but noted that as a dead end road Brown Rd likely won't get the same volume of traffic as other dirt roads in town, for example Middle Road. K. Verville noted that he had recently read a study that it costs less to maintain dirt roads and that many communities are reverting to dirt for that and other environmental reasons. F. McGarry informed fellow committee members that he would feel it necessary to vote against this motion as Selectman Barry and the Highway Agent were not present to address. Chairman Daley noted that he had spoken with the Highway Agent and he was unable to attend this afternoon.

Motion Withdrawn – K. Chalbeck

New Business:

M. Clark asked which group, the Town or the School, would be addressed first at Wednesday's Public Hearing. Chairman Daley responded that typically they swap, the Town is currently first on the agenda, but M. Clark can discuss with Selectman Barry and however they agree is fine with the Committee.

H. Cady made the Committee aware that she is circulating two petition Warrant Articles. The first currently has 30 to 35 signatures and is to allow the MBC to be able to look at and have the ability to change the default budgets. The second is to have the Board of Assessors an elected Board. Chairman Daley noted that those petitions may need a 60% or two thirds vote to pass, as opposed to a simple majority.

K. Verville commented that the change in formatting of the minutes is appreciated; the page numbers make it much easier to read. Chairman Daley thanked Recording Secretary K. Libby for the timely manner in which the January 3rd minutes were pulled together.

Citizens' Comments: None

Adjournment

12:15 pm

Motion: M. McGarry

Second: M. Clark

All in favor – Motion Carries

The Minutes were Recorded, Transcribed and Respectfully Submitted by Katie Libby.
Pending Approval by the Municipal Budget Committee