

## Unofficial

**BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Hooksett Town Hall - Council Chambers**  
**35 Main Street**  
**Thursday, January 12, 2012**  
**Minutes**

### CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miville called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

### ATTENDANCE

M. Miville, Chair, T. Keach, Vice Chair, K. Hughes, Secretary, D. Pearl, JR Ouellette, N. Haas, F. Bizzarro, G. Smith, T. Lizotte, Council Rep, and C. Akstin, School Rep.

Absent: Central Water Precinct, Village Water Precinct

SAU Staff: M. Polak, Assistant Superintendent and K. Lessard, Business Administrator

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 10, 2011

***T. Lizotte motioned to approve the minutes of December 10, 2012 as amended. Seconded by JR Ouellette.***

***Vote unanimously in favor***

### OLD BUSINESS

M. Miville:

Default budget presented - \$27,636,986

Budget Committee 2012-2013 - \$25,808,908.31

School Board proposed budget 2012-2013 - \$26,808,851.31

School Board budget 2011-2012 - \$25,806,977

Actual 2010-2011 - \$24681457.81

D. Pearl questioned the default budget.

T. Lizotte stated, "Looking at the economic forecast and the potential for revaluation next year and the number of liens on properties this year with a spike in 2010 and also the ability for us to collect taxes is of concern, I want to be on the record that I believe we cannot expand with regard to personnel."

***D. Pearl: It is the opinion of the Budget Committee that the School Board not hire a Language Arts Coordinator this year. Seconded by T. Lizotte.***

D. Pearl: At the School Board meeting this week, it was evident that it will happen and the Chair of the School Board stated it is an existing position. Because it was funded by a grant, it is being placed as an existing position.

N. Haas: I agree with Mr. Pearl and add when a position is funded by grant money, it is just down shifting that burden on the taxpayers and I don't think we should do that at this time.

T. Lizotte: The presentation at the Saturday Workshop was compelling but it wasn't conveyed that it was a Curriculum Director position and those years were part time. I requested more info on how that was funded. When it was laid out the year prior by Dr. Littlefield, it was going to be a grant and then presented. It was actually done years early and split between Auburn and Hooksett. Then when I looked at that data, it wasn't a full time position. Was the piece we were

seeing because of the Imagine It program or direction? It was floated as contingent on federal money and not a full time position.

M. Miville: I feel that any new position would be incorporated into the budget and now we must include this position in any future budgets and raises. I am in principal opposed to it at this time.

T. Lizotte: That position is an Administrative position and not a teaching position as presented last year.

**Vote: 8:2 motion carries**

JR Ouellette: Can we get a breakdown of the default budget? When this was created, there must be a detail that shows how this was developed.

D. Pearl: It is my understanding that the default is developed under regulations dictated by the State. You just want to see how those numbers were determined?

K. Lessard and M. Polak arrived at the meeting at 6:55 pm.

K. Lessard stated that the default budget is reflective of the current year's budget plus any contractual obligations, minus any one time expenditures from the current year's budget. There were changes and reduction in the proposed 2013 budget. These adjustments are not reflected in the default budget.

JR. Ouellette: Should for funds for the plowing be removed from the default budget.

K. Lessard: That should have been removed and I will make that adjustment.

K. Lessard will review the detail and get back.

K. Lessard: The MS includes Federal and Food Service funds.

T. Keach: According to the LGC Handbook, the Language Arts Coordinator was funded with federal money and half with Auburn?

K. Lessard: Last year she was 60% Hooksett and 40% Auburn. That position is not in the default.

Chairman Miville opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 pm.

M. Miville read the proposed 2012-2013 Budget Committee budget into the record. This is a cut of \$999943.16 from the proposed School Board budget

**Warrant Article 2 Teacher Contract**

*Shall the District vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Hooksett School Board and the Hooksett Education Association, which calls for the following increase in salaries and benefits at the current staffing levels:*

*Year 2012 – 2013*

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Estimated Salary Increases</i>               | <i>\$201,906</i> |
| <i>Estimated FICA &amp; Retirement Increase</i> | <i>\$ 38,261</i> |

*and further to raise and appropriate the sum of two hundred forty thousand, one hundred sixty-seven dollars (\$240,167) for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, 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 in the prior fiscal year? (Recommended by the School Board)*

Read into the record  
No Public Input

Warrant Article 3 Support Staff Contract

*Shall the District vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Hooksett School Board and the Hooksett Educational Support Professionals, which calls for the following increase in salaries and benefits at the current staffing levels:*

Year 2012 – 2013

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <i>Estimated Salary Increases</i>               | <i>\$50,429</i> |
| <i>Estimated FICA &amp; Retirement Increase</i> | <i>\$ 8,296</i> |

*and further to raise and appropriate the sum of fifty-eight thousand, seven hundred twenty-five dollars (\$58,725) for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, 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 in the prior fiscal year? (Recommended by the School Board)*

Read into the record  
No Public Input

Warrant Article 4 Operating Budget number plus Federal and Food Service

*Shall the 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 vote of the first session, for the purpose set forth therein, totaling twenty-six million, eight hundred ninety-eight thousand, five hundred forty-nine dollars (\$26,898,549). Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be twenty-seven million, six hundred thirty-six thousand, nine hundred eighty-six dollars (\$27,636,986), which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Hooksett School District, or by law; or the governing body 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. (This article does not include appropriations in any other warrant articles).*

Read into the record  
No Public Input

Warrant Article 5 – Underhill paving

*Shall the District vote to raise and appropriate up to the sum of sixty-two thousand, three hundred dollars (\$62,300) to replace the parking lot at the Fred C. Underhill School? This sum to be funded from the June 30, 2012 undesignated fund balance. (Recommended by the School Board)*

Read into the record  
No Public input

Warrant Article 6 – Technology fund

*Shall the District vote to raise and appropriate up to the sum of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000) to be placed in the Technology Expendable Trust Fund established in March 2008 for the purpose of upgrading the technology at the Hooksett Schools? This sum to be funded from the June 30, 2012 undesignated fund balance. (Recommended by the School Board)*

Read into the record  
No Public input

Warrant Article 7 – Strategic Planning

*Shall the District vote to create an expendable trust fund under the provision of RSA 198:20-c to be known as the Hooksett School District Strategic Planning Fund for the purpose of engaging consultants and related services to develop a strategic plan for the School District to include, but not be limited to; facilities, measurable learning goals, and a long term plan for educating our High School students. Furthermore, to raise and appropriate up to the sum of fifty-thousand dollars (\$50,000) toward this purpose, with such sum to be funded from the June 30, 2012 undesignated fund balance (surplus) and to name the School Board as agents to expend from this fund. (Recommended by the School Board)*

Read into the record  
No Public input

Warrant Article 8– School Building Construction  
Read into the record

*Shall the District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000) to be placed in the School Building Construction/Reconstruction Capital Reserve Fund established in March 1960 for the purpose of construction/reconstruction, replacement or acquisition of capital improvements for school purposes? (Recommended by the School Board)*

T. Lizotte: Has this fund been used?

K. .Lessard: I think this was used to redo the Underhill kitchen.

#### **Default Budget**

The Default Budget presented is \$27,636,986.

Chairman Miville closed the Public Hearing at 7:27 pm

#### **#2 Teacher Contract**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 2 – Teacher’s contract. Seconded by N. Haas.***

**Vote: 10:0 to recommend Article 2**

#### **#3 Support Staff Contract**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 3 – Support Staff contract. Seconded by N. Haas.***

**Vote: 8:0:2 abstained to recommend Article 3**

#### **#4**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 4 – Operating Budget. Seconded by N. Haas.***

M. Miville: The Operating Budget is \$738,000 below the default budget.

D. Pearl: It is good that the voters get a choice between the default and the Budget Committee’s budget. The budget will be the will of the town.

F. Bizzarro: I echo what everyone said. However I differ with the committee with the evaluation of the tuition. I’m concerned we have underfunded tuition and there is evidence of flux but it is estimation. We have not dealt with the bubble class that will need additional funds and we owe it to those parents with students to fund that tuition.

D. Pearl: Dr. Littlefield explained that he went over the last 5 years and came up with an average of 92% and if applied it is \$472,000 available in that line. He wasn’t endorsing this cut but he was stating that if that holds this year, they will only be \$100,000 short on that cut. I picked the tuition line because it is a bottom line budget. It was not my intention to target that and I picked it because it had more than \$572,000 in that line.

M. Miville: This committee chose a line knowing it was a bottom line budget. We were not cutting \$572,000 out of the tuition specifically.

D. Pearl: At that meeting, it was very evident that some members of the School Board were looking to fund the Curriculum Coordinator with that money. That points out that it is a bottom line budget.

C. Akstin: With the high school tuition, it is a risk going to 92% considering the bubble class.

JR Ouellette: The expenditure for 2011 and look at the lines that were overspent like supplies, not including wages, I'm looking at spending what was appropriated, if you add that up in addition to what went back to the General Fund there was \$1,400,000 and a million increase is almost a 2.5 million increase. If you take out the teachers, paving, coordinator and plowing, you are only talking half a million dollars. If they don't fund what we cut there will still be close to a million dollars in this budget.

D. Pearl: When you listen to D. Argo and the Superintendent say they plan to have an extra million dollars and if there were a restriction of fund balance spending, there would be no problem. That is also calculated in the default budget. Twice I asked the School Board representative to talk to the School Board regarding restriction of fund balance spending and I asked the School Board directly to restrict spending and I received no reply. I would have had a different opinion on the budget if they had accepted my proposal.

***Vote 9:1 to recommend Article 4***

**#5**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 5 – Underhill paving. Seconded by N. Haas.***

D. Pearl: At a School Board meeting, they called this an emergency item; legal counsel suggested they put it back in the budget because if voted down as a warrant article, no means no, and they won't be able to do it.

***Vote: 8:2 to recommend Article 5***

**#6 – Technology fund**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 6 – Technology fund. Seconded by N. Haas.***

***Current fund balance is \$300,017.***

T. Lizotte: I brought up to Mr. Dumont that in the past the School Board has put warrants forward to move fund balance to a fund. That seems to work in the past.

N. Haas: This involves the public more in the decision.

D. Pearl: I don't support this because we are buying equipment without planning. The Technology Director stated they follow trends. I don't agree and feel we should have a plan and have competitive spending. I don't support this article.

M. Miville: I see this as a conflict with the BYOD program.

***Vote: 6:4 to recommend Article 6***

**#7- Strategic Planning**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 7 – Strategic Planning. Seconded by N. Haas.***

T. Lizotte: I know on the CIP this was pushed out 4 or more years. The kindergarten was pushed out 6 years. This was limited to the strategic planning for that piece and now adding in measurable learning goals, I'm concerned this will be re-tasked. I'm leery this isn't limited to a plan; long term plan for education high school. I'm not sure what that means.

JR Ouellette: I want to see this go forward that way the public gets a say.

D. Pearl: I believe all the warrants should go forward and I agree with Todd. The measurable learning goals are vague. I don't know what this can be spent for under that qualification.

C. Akstin: I think the intention for the "measurable learning" was to see where we will go for a high school, including what it will cost to educate them. They also wanted it broad enough to address any school needs not just high school.

T. Lizotte: I searched minutes on Council on exploratory exercise spending and I feel that the School hasn't put anything forward that says we will put forward a high school. There is no dollar amount. I would hate this to go through with people thinking they are getting a high school. I would like to see more discussion on it. Some of this can be done internally.

***Vote: 5:5 to recommend Article 7. Motion Failed***

#### **#8 – Construction Fund**

***T. Lizotte motioned to recommend Warrant Article 8 – Construction fund. Seconded by N. Haas.***

***Current fund balance is \$52,366***

T. Lizotte: I have been able to interact with the maintenance people and there are things that need to be fixed and the staff keeps the school immaculate and compared to other schools in other districts, it is exemplary. I support this.

***Vote: 10:0 to recommend Article 8***

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

***T. Lizotte motioned to adjourn. Seconded by D. Argo.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan