

Unapproved

**BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL OFFICES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
35 Main Street
Thursday, January 15, 2015**

CALL TO ORDER

M. Miville called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

ATTENDANCE

M. Miville, N. Haas, F. Bizzarro, C. Morneau, J. Pieroni, T. Jennings, P. Gosselin, K. VanHorn, D. Winterton (Council Rep) and A. Boilard (School Rep)

Excused: S. Peterson

Absent: Hooksett Village Water Precinct and Central Water Precinct

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 8, 2015

J. Pieroni motioned to approve. Seconded by D. Winterton

Vote unanimously in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

Review School Budget

2% cost of living plus a catch up raise for 15 people including Principals, Assistant Principals, Directors, HS Special Education Coordinators. This will help individuals catch up to the benchmark salaries.

There is one Assistant Principal at Cawley that this would pertain to.

J. Pieroni: What does the percentage come to? It is more than 2%.

P. Gosselin: How would the 2% compare for those 15 people to the teacher's 1% plus step. Do we have a good understanding that the step plus their 1% make it comparable?

A. Boilard: You can't make that comparison because all teachers are at a different step.

D. Winterton: What is the average step increase?

P. Gosselin: The sheet that J. Pieroni distributed is accurate. There are 14 steps; are they incrementally the same? At the last meeting I wasn't interested in making the cut, but now with the information provided, I want to make sure that the teachers' increases are equitable so I can make a final judgment on the wage pool.

T. Jennings: I calculated wage plus benefits for the Principals and Assistance Principals to determine the range of the cost of the people in that tier. Take the salary of the Principal and Assistant Principal and add that to the benefits and take into consideration the other benefits (workshops, grad classes, professional books and dues) and I didn't consider the wage pool percentage or mileage reimbursement. I was surprised by the amount. The range for Assistant Principals is \$95,000 to \$98,000 per person; Principals are at \$139,000 to \$143,000. When I compare that to what the teachers make... is a wage pool district wide something they should be provided, I think we should revisit.

J. Pieroni asked to allow the Superintendent to speak to the differences between Administration and teachers. One example is the Principals have a year round salary. We also are trying to attract qualified people so we need to compare their salary to other districts. There are also some individuals that may only be getting this increase.

T. Jennings motioned to reconsider the budget to continue discussion. Seconded by P. Gosselin.

Vote 3:7 motion failed.

J. Pieroni asked the Superintendent to explain the wage pool and the Principal's contract.

Dr. Littlefield: Amy Boilard has accurately described what she was asked. I have one administrator on steps. When I hired him and he was recommended for the position, he was a teacher. He was at Masters Step 5, making about \$42,000. He took Matt Benson's place. I don't think I'm going to give an employee a \$35,000 increase so I said I will start you at an increase over your teaching salary because you work a longer day but I will make you take 5 years to reach the full salary. He is the only one in that position, everyone else gets 2%. I don't like to conjecture, I like hard facts. The wage increase for the teachers was more than 2%. I'm not sure that I compare the teachers to the custodians to the Administrators. It is what is fair for that group. There was a 1% increase to the salary schedule, steps, and the majority gets a step increase which is much greater than 1%. When we voted on the contract, we disclosed the total value of that package. They range about 4 – 4.5%.

P. Gosselin: In my interpretation, there is very much equity.

Default Budget
Warrant Articles

PUBLIC HEARING opened by Chair Miville at 7:00 pm.

M. Miville read the warrant articles in to the record:

2. Shall the Hooksett School District 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 purposes set forth therein, totaling \$30,607,507? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$30,757,659, 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. (Recommended by the School Board 6 in favor, 0 against)

M. Miville: Tax rate is 13.38 which is an increase of .48 over this year's tax rate.

J. Pieroni: We reduced \$70,000 from transportation and \$2000 reduction in shipping.

M. Miville: I received an email from a citizen that could not make it tonight and asked that I read that email.

In an email from David Pearl: I am unable to attend the public hearing on the Hooksett School Board budget. I asked the Budget Committee to add \$60,000 for the school suspensions program which was removed by the School Board.

N. Haas: I received phone calls regarding this. This program allows the designee to call the parents and have that child brought to the town office. The School Board did not have all the data when they made the decision to cut. I would like to learn more about this program. I think we need to keep track of the students that are not in school.

T. Jennings: I've spoken with members of the PTA as well as teachers and they have grants where the teachers can apply through the PTA for supplies. I served on that subcommittee, and when I got numerous grants they were items already in the budget. Where is the disconnect between the teachers and the Principals? Why is PTA paying for items that are in the budget? When we go looking for explanation, teachers say they were told that it wasn't funded. As a PTA member, when I vote to write a check for teachers for items in the budget, it is double dip. There is apparently no communication between the teachers and the Administrators.

J. Pieroni: This budget will not go into effect until next year. This budget was put together months ago and they didn't know they were going to get funding from the PTA. This is an estimate. If they get it great, don't ask for it a second time but it isn't wrong to have it in the budget.

Dr. Littlefield: That assumes that there is a giant conspiracy and that the Business Administrators and Principals are all involved. Here is what was appropriated and here is what was spent. Field trips are level funded so if people want to do more next year than this year, they may be looking for additional field trips and seeking that. We don't take money from field trips; we don't take money from kids and use it for other purposes.

Show me where the Tiger Program is in the budget. It has historically been funded by the PTA. The E-Sweep is part of the Imagine –It Program. When adopted, we got the E-Sweep for free. It was not used at the Underhill School and was not funded. It is funded at Memorial and is used at Memorial. I am a person that deals with facts. Some pretty heavy accusations of administrative incompetence were stated. I want to know who, and what was requested. The PTA should not have to provide what the taxpayers should provide. There are times that a music teacher may ask for 24 Ukuleles and I may say we are level funding the, and she may say we can only buy 11 Ukuleles. But she may then go to the PTA and get 13 more. We didn't take the money for the Ukuleles and pay legal bills. Tiger is not in the budget. E-sweep is at Memorial and not at Underhill and was not utilized at Underhill. Ukuleles, we will level fund them. Almost 100%, I level funded discretionary items. If we are purchasing 26 million composition books, it's because that is what the classroom request. There is no disconnect.

3. Shall The Hooksett School District vote to approve a tuition agreement with Pinkerton Academy for the education of some of Hooksett's high school students, which provides for a 10-year term beginning on July 1, 2016 that will automatically be extended for an additional five years every five years unless notice of an intent not to extend the agreement is provided by one of the parties, and further calls for Hooksett to agree that beginning in the 4th year of the agreement (that is, during the school year 2019-2020), the District will commit to a minimum financial enrollment set as the average percentage of its 8th grade students who enroll as 9th graders in the Academy in the years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019; such minimum financial enrollment percentage will thereafter remain fixed for the duration of the Agreement, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to a change, and for Hooksett to pay tuition based on Pinkerton's operating costs per high school student in an amount equal to tuition charged to other Pinkerton sending districts, and for a Hooksett resident to be appointed as a member of Pinkerton Academy's Board of Trustees; and further to authorize the School Board to take such other and further actions as are necessary to carry the tuition agreement into effect, including the adoption of minor amendments to the agreement from time to time during its term, without further action by the School District meeting? (Not recommended by the School Board 2 in favor, 3 against, 1 abstention)

4. Shall the Hooksett School District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$65,000 for the purpose of replacing the upper parking lot at the David R. Cawley Middle School. (Recommended by the School Board 5 in favor, 1 against)

A. Boilard: The parking lot is the upper back parking lot and is 10 years old. It doesn't get a huge amount of use and there is a drainage issue. There are divots and places the hot top is crumbling.

5. Shall the Hooksett School District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$95,500 to be added to the Construction and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established in March of 1990 as the first payment of a four year plan for the purpose of replacing the roof on the Fred C. Underhill School. (Recommended by the School Board 5 in favor, 1 against)

A. Boilard: This is to put money aside to fund a roof at the Underhill School in the future. This is the first money requested to be put in the fund. It is a four year funding for a total of 384,200.

Dr. Littlefield: The four years takes over the life expectancy of 20 years.

6. Shall the Hooksett School District vote to authorize the School Board to convey part of the land on which the Hooksett Memorial School is situated, consisting of approximately 7 acres, on the far westerly side of the parcel, to the Town of Hooksett, on such terms and conditions as the School Board shall determine are in the best interest of the District. (This land will be used by the Hooksett Wastewater Department for the further expansion of the wastewater treatment facility). (Recommended by the School Board 4 in favor, 2 against)

7. Are you in favor of changing the terms of the School District Clerk, Moderator and Treasurer from one year to two years, beginning with the terms of the School District Clerk, Moderator and Treasurer to be elected at next year's regular School District Meeting? (Recommended by the School Board 6 in favor, 0 against)

M. Miville closed the Public Hearing at 7:28 pm.

Review and Recommendations of School Budget and Warrant Articles

T. Jennings: I do believe there is disconnect between the levels. This budget does not say Tiger Program but under Other Professional Services there is an appropriation of \$2445 and I go to the budget book it states "Amoskeag Fishway, Author visits, and Tiger Program". I'm not making up random things. I am also not a liar. We are cutting a check as the PTA for Tiger Program, and it is here in the budget.

M. Miville motioned that the School Board representative get together with Mrs. Jennings and retrieve that list from the PTA and match it up with the Budget requests and reconcile that mis-match. Seconded by Chris Morneau.

J. Pieroni: I think that is beyond the Budget Committee's role.

M. Miville: If we are cutting duplicate checks, we should know that.

D. Winterton: I don't think this is in our purview. I don't think we are cutting two checks. If the PTA has an issue with who they are giving their checks to, they should take care of it themselves.

M. Miville: In reconsideration, I agree that the PTA should put themselves on the agenda and speak to the School Board.

M. Miville withdrew motion

J. Pieroni motioned to Approve and Recommend Article 2 as written. Seconded by P. Gosselin.

Roll Call Vote

A. Boilard Yes

c. Morneau Yes

K. VanHorn Yes

D. Winterton Yes

N. Haas Yes

F. Bizzarro Yes

J. Pieroni Yes

T. Jennings No

P. Gosselin Yes

M. Miville Yes

Vote 9:1 motion carried. Article 2 Recommended.

C. Morneau motioned to approve and recommend Article 3 as written. Seconded by K. VanHorn.

Roll Call Vote

M. Miville: I did look at the parking lot before there was any snow and it looked fine to me. There is no documentation, no data, no photos and no bids; therefore I will not support it.

C. Morneau: You don't see the issues in the fall. In the spring, the water is extensive and the paving shifts and cracks significantly.

T. Jennings: I have no idea what the parking lot looks like but I have an issue with the fact that there is no plan, I don't know if there are bids or quotes and how that \$65,000 will be used. If I could see the issues and given the information of what is wrong and the plan on how to pay for it and how long it will last and when will it be done; I may approve it.

D. Winterton: This item will go out to bid when it is approved. This is an estimate.

Roll Call Vote

P. Gosselin Yes

T. Jennings No

J. Pieroni Yes

F. Bizzarro Yes

N. Haas Yes

D. Winterton Yes

K. VanHorn Yes

C. Morneau Yes

A. Boilard Yes

M. Miville No

Vote 8:2 Motion carried. Article 3 Recommended

*F. Bizzarro motioned to recommend Article 4 as written. Seconded by K. VanHorn.
Roll Call Vote*

*J. Pieroni Yes
F. Bizzarro Yes
N. Haas Yes
D. Winterton Yes
K. VanHorn Yes
C. Morneau Yes
A. Boilard Yes
P. Gosselin Yes
T. Jennings Yes
M. Miville No*

Vote 9:1 Motion carried. Article 4 Recommended

OTHER BUSINESS

PUBLIC INPUT

ADJOURNMENT

*T. Jennings motioned to adjourn. Seconded by J. Pieroni.
Vote unanimously in favor*

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan