

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
BUDGET COMMITTEE - MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, November 12, 2015
APPROVED – November 16, 2015

9
10
11
12
13

CALL TO ORDER – at approximately 7:30pm

PRESENT: Mr. Daniel Guimond (arrived after the meeting commenced), Mr. David Cate, Ms. Daryle Hillsgrove, Mr. Bob Sherman, Mr. Michael Bilby, Mr. Leo Rush, Ms. Donna Dube, School Board Representative Megan Larson, Selectmen Representative Doug Viger

EXCUSED: Mr. David Cronin

9
10
11
12
13

Also present: School District Superintendent Amanda Lecaroz, School Business Administrator Deborah Mahoney, School Board Chair Brian Carton, School Board Member Deb Ryan

14
15

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

16
17

MEETING MINUTES

18

November 9, 2015

MOTION: (Dube/Hillsgrove) To approve the November 9, 2015 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-2) The motion carried. Mr. Sherman and Mr. Bilby abstained.

19
20
21

2016 SCHOOL BUDGET VOTE – (Representing the School’s 2017 Fiscal Year)

22
23
24

School District Superintendent Amanda Lecaroz and School Business Administrator Deborah Mahoney came forward for budget presentation/review.

25
26
27
28
29

Mr. Cate stated there were suggested reductions submitted by Board members. A majority were submitted by Mr. Guimond (who arrived after the meeting commenced). He said he would acknowledge the suggestions and ask the School to comment. After which the Board would determine how to proceed.

30
31

Elementary School – School Board recommended budget \$6,571,172

32
33
34

Page 7 – line 610 - Math Education – supplementary supplies – reduce \$3,590.
Mr. Sherman made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

35
36
37
38

Mr. Viger questioned on what basis the reduction was proposed. Mr. Cate replied a member submitted suggested reductions and felt the Board should give that member the courtesy of bringing it up.

39
40
41
42

Ms. Lecaroz explained that the supplementary supplies were manipulative supplies to instruct students in the younger grades. Ms. Larson pointed out that Ms. Lecaroz had already reduced the section.

MOTION: (Sherman/Rush) To reduce \$3,590 from Math Education – Supplies.

VOTE: (1-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Page 9 – line 610 – Enrichment Education – Supplies – reduce \$1,999.
Mr. Sherman made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

Ms. Lecaroz stated the line was for Little Bits Invention Kits to promote creativity, problem solving and critical thinking. She noted the cost was \$1,999; if that figure was cut it would eliminate all of the kits. Ms. Larson stated that the Enrichment program supported the STEAM activities, which had been promoted from the elementary school through the High School, where they have a STEAM pathway. She asked the Board to consider not reducing the line so the program could continue to be supported in the younger grades.

MOTION: (Sherman/Rush) To reduce \$1,999 from Enrichment Education – supplies.

VOTE: (1-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66

Page 17 – line 610 – Nurse Services – Supplies – reduce \$2,000.
Mr. Sherman made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

Ms. Lecaroz explained that the nursing supplies were dependent upon the students and their needs within each building. She noted that there was a CPR training piece included in the line that was not budgeted last year.

Mr. Rush felt the increase was steep based on what was spent during the last year. Ms. Lecaroz pointed out that the FY14 budget, which was close to the FY17 proposal and reiterated they failed to budget for CPR training in FY15. They put the line back in FY16 and kept it for FY17 because of known student needs

MOTION: (Sherman/Rush) To reduce \$2,000 from Nurse Services – Supplies.

VOTE: (1-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80

Page 19 – line 734 – Speech Services – Equipment Additional (2 iPads) – reduce \$1,197.
Mr. Sherman made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

Ms. Lecaroz explained that the iPads for speech services were used specifically to meet student Individual Educational Programs (‘IEP’) goals. A majority of iPads were currently in the elementary school. She said any iPads at the middle school and high school wouldn’t be shifted down because they were used for instructional purposes. She noted that some of the Chrome Books and laptops would be moved down.

Mr. Bilby asked how the school was previously handling the situation. Ms. Lecaroz said they had been using iPads from the current iPad cart. She noted that the line was in the Special Education function lines and wouldn’t be moved out from there if they didn’t use it.

MOTION: (Sherman/Bilby) To reduce \$1,197 from Speech Services – Equipment Additional.

VOTE: (1-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

81

82 Page 23 – line 110 – School Administration – Salaries – reduce \$5,306.

83 Mr. Sherman made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded. The proposal reduced salaries
84 to a 1.5% increase, similar to Town employees.

85

86 Ms. Lecaroz stated the budget line reflected the current salaries for the six employees listed. She
87 explained proposed raises were contained in the salary adjustment line (page 24) of the District
88 Wide budget, Superintendent Service - Salaries (line 110). She believed the Board member's
89 proposed salary reductions for each school was in the District budget, they weren't allocated in
90 the individual school lines.

91

MOTION: (Sherman/Rush) To reduce \$5,306 from School Administration – Salaries.

VOTE: (1-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

92

93 Mr. Cate spoke of the proposed reduction of \$4,225 from page 26, line 412 - Building Services –
94 Utilities Septic because it was believed to be done every other year. Ms. Mahoney told the Board
95 they pumped the septic every year to avoid issues due to the items flushed at the elementary
96 school. There was no motion offered.

97

98 Page 27 – line 624 – Building Services – Utilities – Heating Oil – reduce \$24,225.

99 This reduction was offered by the School after reviewing the budget figure against the
100 recommended range provided by the Energy Consulting Group.

101

102 Mr. Viger made a motion to accept the School Board's recommended figure of \$6,571,172 as an
103 operating budget for the Elementary School. Mr. Sherman seconded.

104

105 The only reduction approved was \$24,225. The Budget Committee's recommended budget is
106 \$6,546,947.

107

MOTION: (Viger/Sherman) To approve \$6,546,947 as the recommended Elementary School budget.

VOTE: (7-1-0) The motion carried. The majority of the Board voted in the affirmative. Mr. Rush voted in opposition.

108

109 **Memorial School – School Board recommended budget \$4,515,237.**

110

111 Mr. Cate indicated there was a list of reductions offered (in writing) by members and by Mr.
112 Guimond, who had not yet arrived. There were no motions offered.

113

114 Mr. Viger made a motion to accept the School Board's recommended figure of \$4,515,237 as an
115 operating budget for Memorial School. Ms. Larson seconded.

116

117 Page 21 – line 624 – Building Services – Utilities – Heating Oil – reduce \$23,362.

118 This reduction was offered by the School after reviewing the budget figure against the
119 recommended range provided by the Energy Consulting Group.

120
121
122
123
124
125
126

Friendly amendment offered by Mr. Rush to reduce \$23,362 from the proposed budget with regard to heating oil. Mr. Viger and Ms. Larson accepted the reduction amendment.

The only reduction approved was \$23,362. The Budget Committee's recommended budget is \$4,491,875.

MOTION: (Viger/Larson) To approve \$4,491,875 as the recommended Memorial School budget.

ROLL CALL VOTE: (6-2-0) The motion carried. The majority of the Board voted in the affirmative. Mr. Rush and Mr. Bilby voted in opposition.

127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136

Pelham High School – School Board Recommended budget \$7,234,061

Page 3 – line 610 – Regular Education – Supplies – reduction of \$891
Mr. Bilby made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded. In looking at past years, Mr. Bilby saw they didn't come close to what they had budgeted in the past and felt the line could be reduced to actual expenditure. Ms. Larson replied they estimated the figure based on a slightly larger enrollment (approximately 50 students) in the next year. The budget line covered supplies for the entire building.

MOTION: (Bilby/Rush) To reduce \$891 from Regular Education – Supplies (page 3 – line 610)

ROLL CALL VOTE: (5-3-0) The motion carried. Mr. Bilby, Mr. Rush, Mr. Cate, Ms. Dube and Ms. Hillsgrove voted in the affirmative. Mr. Viger, Ms. Larson and Mr. Sherman voted in opposition.

137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146

Page 4 – line 610– Art Education – Supplies (consumable) – reduction of \$2,000
Mr. Rush made a motion for discussion. No second.

Mr. Cate reviewed items contained on the list submitted by Mr. Guimond; there were no motions offered.

Page 4 – line 734 – Business Education – Equipment Additional – reduce \$9,000.
Mr. Rush made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

147
148
149
150
151
152

Ms. Lecaroz explained the line was included as part of the on-line digital curriculum so students could work on a split screen computer. This item was not included in the high school project, it was part of the future ready program. Ms. Larson explained by reducing textbooks it was difficult for students to work without split screens when learning with a digital curriculum.

Mr. Guimond arrived.

153
154
155
156
157
158
159

Mr. Guimond spoke to his proposed reduction. He believed this line was included in the high school project. Ms. Lecaroz replied the equipment was not part of the project, it was a result in moving to the one-to-one Chrome Books. She said students would access curriculum content on one screen and work on the other screen. She noted it was strictly for the business labs. Since most business environments use split screen, they were trying to simulate that experience for students.

160

MOTION: (Rush/Bilby) To reduce \$9,000 from Business Education – Equipment Additional.

VOTE: (2-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush and Mr. Guimond voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

161

162 Page 6 – line 610 – Music Education – Supplies (consumable) – reduce \$500.

163 Mr. Bilby made a motion for discussion. Ms. Hillsgrove seconded.

164

165 Ms. Lecaroz explained that the music program, band specifically, had increased. All sheet music
166 is purchased out of the supply line. Mr. Bilby wanted to know the current enrollment. Ms.
167 Lecaroz didn't know the current enrollment, but knew there would be approximately 36
168 additional students next year. She noted that music had been underfunded and spent what they
169 were given each year. Mr. Bilby asked if the reduction would create significant issues. Ms.
170 Lecaroz felt they would manage, but commented that the department listed what they needed. By
171 reducing the line, they would end up not doing something. Ms. Hillsgrove added that the band
172 received assistance from the boosters, and sought alternate resources. She didn't feel the budget
173 request was a lot to request.

174

MOTION: (Bilby/Hillsgrove) To reduce \$500 from Music Education – Supplies.

VOTE: (3-6-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush, Mr. Guimond and Mr. Bilby voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

175

176 Page 6 – line 737 – Tech Education – Furniture Replacement (workbenches)– reduce \$2,500.

177 Mr. Cate offered a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

178

179 Mr. Guimond suggested the adjustment because he felt any equipment at the high school should
180 have been included in the project, given it was a 'turn-key' operation. Ms. Lecaroz explained
181 when they redesigned the down stairs, they were able to put a 'maker' space and define the area.
182 Mr. Guimond asked if the high school project was on time and on budget. He wanted to know if
183 they were missing any of the items that were supposed to go into the high school. Ms. Lecaroz
184 replied the project was on time and on budget. Last year they made some design adjustments, but
185 remained consistent with the proposal. Mr. Guimond asked if most of the equipment contained in
186 the proposal would be purchased. Ms. Lecaroz answered yes. She said they used a majority of
187 the furniture that was in the existing building.

188

189 Mr. Guimond asked that his proposed adjustment be withdrawn. Mr. Cate and Mr. Rush
190 withdrew the motion.

191

192 Page 7 – line 734 – Science Education – Equipment Additional (STEM 3)– reduce \$2,000.

193 Mr. Viger made a motion for discussion. Mr. Cate seconded.

194

195 Mr. Guimond felt since it was a new course, it could be delayed. Ms. Lecaroz replied they were
196 already teaching the classes (Green Energies, Robotics, Bio Technology). They needed new
197 equipment to support what they want to do in the classes.

198

MOTION: (Bilby/Hillsgrove) To reduce \$2,000 – Science Education – Equipment Additional.

VOTE: (2-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush and Mr. Guimond voted in the affirmative, the remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

199

200 Page 20 – line 610 – OT Services – Supplied – reduction of \$5,000.

201 Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

202

203 Mr. Guimond stated he suggested the reduction based on the average of what was spend in the
204 last few years. Ms. Lecaroz replied they had a new occupational therapist and there were a
205 number of students requiring OT Services at the high school. The budget request was designed to
206 bring the program up to where it needed to be. She believed there were currently seven students.

207

208 Mr. Sherman pointed out there was a cost savings if the proposed services were provided, versus
209 sending the students out of district. Ms. Lecaroz noted if the budget line was in special
210 education; if it wasn't spent it would not be transfer elsewhere.

211

212 Mr. Guimond asked that his proposed adjustment be withdrawn. Mr. Cate and Mr. Rush
213 withdrew the motion.

214

215 Page 24 – line 534 – School Administration – Postage/General Expenses – reduce \$3,341.

216 Mr. Bilby made a motion for discussion. Mr. Cate seconded.

217

218 Mr. Bilby suggested the adjustment based on past averages. Mr. Viger understood there was a
219 postage increase due to come in the next year. Mr. Guimond was going to offer a further
220 reduction, but based on possible postage increase, he agreed with Mr. Bilby's motion. Mr. Cate
221 also agreed.

222

MOTION: (Bilby/Cate) To reduce \$3,341 from School Administration – Postage/General
Expenses (page 24-line 534)

ROLL CALL VOTE: (4-5-0) The motion failed. Mr. Bilby, Mr. Cate, Mr. Rush and Mr. Guimond
voted in the affirmative. The remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

223

224 Page 27 – line 624 – Building Services – Utilities – Heating Oil – reduce \$30,864.

225 This reduction was offered by the School after reviewing the budget figure against the
226 recommended range provided by the Energy Consulting Group.

227

MOTION: (Cate/Bilby) To reduce \$30,864 from Building Services – Utilities – Heating Oil
(page 27 – line 624)

VOTE: (9-0-0) The motion carried.

228

229 The Board then took action regarding the recommended high school budget.

230

MOTION: (Cate/Sherman) To approve \$7,202,306 as the recommended High School
budget.

ROLL CALL VOTE: (8-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Rush voted in opposition.

VOTE:

231

232

233 **District Wide – School Board Recommended Budget - \$10,599,458**

234

235 Page 2 – line 446 – Regular Education – Rental/Lease Software (Discovery Education) – reduce
236 \$8,326.

237 Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

238

239 Mr. Guimond said he was trying to take a conservative view of the budget and remove new items.

240 Ms. Lecaroz replied it was not a new item, just new to the budget line. She said in the past it had

241 been budgeted in the individual schools; it was the primary resource for science in the middle

242 school and covered supplemental resources in both the middle and high schools. It provided up-

243 to-date/real-time science information rather than waiting for book replacement.

244

MOTION: (Cate/Rush) To reduce \$8,326 from Regular Education – Rental/Lease Software
(page 2-line 446).

VOTE: (2-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Guimond and Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative.
The remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

245

246 Mr. Guimond withdrew proposed reductions for those Administrator’s included in the

247 Superintendent Service – Salaries – Salary Adjustments line (page 24 – line 110).

248

249 Page 16/17 – line 110 – OT Services – Salaries – reduction of \$11,996.

250 Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

251

252 Mr. Guimond understood the personnel budget already contained adjustments. He questioned

253 why there was an adjustment. Ms. Lecaroz called attention to the two part-time OTR positions.

254 The School is proposing the two be combined into one full-time position to help with the

255 continuum of services for students and the collaboration between teachers. To have the full-time

256 position will add the proposed \$11,996 in benefits. Mr. Guimond believed any additional

257 personnel should be in a warrant article, since that position would now receive benefits.

258

259 Mr. Sherman asked if the current employees were receiving prorated benefits. Ms. Mahoney

260 noted in comparing the salaries of the two part-time positions, with the salary of one full-time

261 person, it represented a reduction in the salary line. She said when looking at the benefits, they

262 had to budget on an estimate of a two-person plan. As a result of such, there could be an

263 increase. She said rather than having a minus in salary and a plus in all the benefit areas, they

264 combined the estimated figure to show the possible impact. Mr. Guimond wasn’t aware that part-

265 time employees received benefits. Ms. Mahoney replied certain employees listed in the collective

266 bargaining agreement received benefits.

267

268 Mr. Bilby questioned if the proposal constituted a new position. Mr. Guimond replied that was

269 his assumption. Mr. Sherman said it was an interesting situation since there were two part-time

270 people being combined into one position for a possible cost savings. Mr. Bilby recalled there was

271 a similar situation at the Senior Center that was allowed.

272

273 Ms. Larson spoke about the importance for having consistency of services and provided better

274 support for parents. Ms. Mahoney noted Occupational Therapy was part of the Special Education

275 budget.

276

MOTION: (Cate/Rush) To reduce \$11,996 from OT Services – Salaries (page 16/17 – line
110).

VOTE: (2-7-0) The motion failed. Mr. Guimond and Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative.

The remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284

Page 18 – 550 – Improvement Instruction – Printing (student reports) – reduce \$500.
Ms. Hillsgrove made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

Ms. Lecaroz provided the Board with the current printing cost. She was amenable to the line being reduced to \$900-\$1,000. Ms. Hillsgrove’s recommendation was for a reduction of \$500, the remaining line would contain \$1,000.

MOTION: (Hillsgrove/Bilby) To reduce \$500 from Improvement Instruction – Printing (page 18 – line 550).

VOTE: (8-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Viger voted no.

285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292

Page 22 – line 110 – School Board Services – Salaries – reduce \$3,000.
Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

Mr. Guimond proposed the reduction to match the Selectmen’s stipend. Ms. Larson believed the \$3,000 line was for the recording secretary; the stipend total was in line with what the Selectmen received. Mr. Viger agreed.

Mr. Guimond withdrew his proposed reduction. Mr. Cate and Mr. Bilby withdrew the motion.

293
294
295
296
297

Page 24 – line 110 – Superintendent Service – Salaries – reduce \$12,200.89
Mr. Bilby made a motion for discussion. Mr. Cate seconded.

Mr. Bilby’s suggested reduction would allow for the ability to increase each of the administrator salary lines by 3%, rather than the submitted proposal of a three-phase increase model. Ms. Hillsgrove agreed with Mr. Bilby because she felt the voters may have some difficulty with the higher increases. She appreciated the research/comparison, but felt the proposed figure may be too much for voters to accept at one time. Mr. Guimond said he wouldn’t support a 3% raise because the Town employees received 1.5% and the current PESPA contract also stayed at 1.5%. He didn’t feel that other people in the community should receive more than what everyone else was receiving. Ms. Larson didn’t know where the 1.5% figure came from. Mr. Guimond said he reviewed some of the Town numbers and they typically came out to 1.5%. Mr. Viger said he couldn’t speak specifically to the 1.5%. He knew that some of the individual contracts were greater than that. Overall, for the 2-3 non-union positions they averaged approximately 1.5%; however, some may get more and some may get less. Ms. Larson stated not everyone would receive a 3% raise; increases were merit based on performance. She noted they were currently negotiating the teacher’s contract, so any increase figure was currently unknown. Mr. Bilby felt his suggested 3% would provide the school with the ability to work with the numbers.

313

MOTION: (Bilby/Cate) To reduce \$12,200.89 from Superintendent Services – Salaries (salary adjustment 11 administrators)(page 24 – line 110)

ROLL CALL (6-3-0) The motion carried. The majority of the Board voted in the affirmative.

VOTE: Mr. Viger, Ms. Larson and Mr. Guimond voted in opposition.

314
315
316
317

Page 27 – line 275 – Special Services Administration – Workshops Non-Union – reduce \$3,000
Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

318 Mr. Guimond said with the proposed budget amount he felt they should review every potential
319 areas they could cut. He felt it was appropriate to level fund the budget line. Ms. Lecaroz
320 explained that included in the line was the Special Education Liaison and Director plus the
321 School Psychologist and Behavior Specialist, which were not budgeted in that line in the past.
322

MOTION: (Cate/Bilby) To reduce \$3,000 from Special Services Administration –
Workshops Non-Union (page 27 – line 275)

ROLL CALL (5-4-0) The motion carried. Mr. Bilby, Mr. Cate, Mr. Rush, Ms. Dube and Mr.
VOTE: Guimond voted in the affirmative. Mr. Viger, Ms. Larson, Ms. Hillsgrove and
Mr. Sherman voted in opposition.

323

324 Page 35 – Line 2630 – Ground Services – reduce \$5,000.

325 Mr. Bilby made a motion for discussion. Mr. Cate seconded.

326

327 Mr. Bilby saw that in recent years the amount in the budget line had not been reached. He
328 understood there was an increase due to the new ball field in place of the tennis courts and
329 questioned what the annual cost for maintenance would be for it. Ms. Lecaroz didn't have an
330 exact number. Mr. Sherman noted once the portables were moved over that area would need to
331 be restored. Ms. Lecaroz said moving the portables and restoring the area was part of the high
332 school project.

333

334 Mr. Cate said he also questioned the line and read aloud the response provided by Ms. Mahoney.
335 Boyden's contract is for grounds maintenance, including lawn mowing, field preparation for
336 game plan, lining and installation of nets, goals etc. as needed. The contracted base cost of this
337 maintenance is for \$91,800. Additional costs such as fertilization, repairs, irrigation are also
338 included in the contract at a unit price rate. The FY17 budgeted amount reflects an increase in
339 order to maintain the additional fields within the district.

340

MOTION: (Bilby/Cate) To reduce \$5,000 from Grounds Services (page 35 – line 2630)

ROLL CALL (5-4-0) The motion carried. Mr. Bilby, Mr. Cate, Mr. Rush, Ms. Dube and Mr.
VOTE: Guimond voted in the affirmative. Mr. Viger, Ms. Larson, Ms. Hillsgrove and
Mr. Sherman voted in opposition.

341

342 Page 36 – line 519 – Regular Transportation – Transportation (Additional 1 hour) – reduce
343 \$2,500.

344 Ms. Hillsgrove made a motion for discussion. Mr. Cate seconded.

345

346 Ms. Hillsgrove understood that the line had been increased to budget for one additional hour per
347 day potential billing adjustment; however, they had never been billed for it. Ms. Lecaroz agreed
348 they hadn't been charged, but wanted some money in the budget in the event they were.

349

MOTION: (Hillsgrove/Cate) To reduce \$2,500 from Regular Transportation – Transportation
(page 36 – line 519)

VOTE: (7-2-0) The motion carried. Mr. Viger and Ms. Larson voted no.

350

351 Page 36 – line 626 – Regular Transportation – Gasoline/Diesel – reduce \$15,000.

352 Mr. Rush made a motion for discussion. Mr. Bilby seconded.

353

354 Mr. Rush stated that fuel costs had reduced and felt if 1/3 was taken out of the budget they could
355 still cover fuel costs. Mr. Guimond pointed out that the total budget line had already been
356 reduced by \$36,411. Mr. Cate disagreed with the reduction given that the budget was for 1.5
357 years from now and the commodities market was unknown. He felt the School had done a good
358 job reducing the line already.

359
360 Mr. Sherman questioned how the bus contract read. Ms. Mahoney replied the bus company
361 negotiates the rate for the district. She has very little input with negotiations. She told the Board
362 the district was in the last year of their 5-year contract. At the time the budget was drafted, the
363 rate had not been set. Based on the information from the Energy Consultant, the budget figure
364 was determined. Mr. Guimond asked if the figure could be reduced. Ms. Mahoney didn't feel
365 the line could be reduced. Ms. Hillsgrove noted with a new contract, they had to consider the
366 possible impact of such, which at this point was unknown.

367
MOTION: (Rush/Bilby) To reduce \$15,000 from Regular Transportation – Transportation
(page 36 - line 626).

ROLL CALL (1-8-0) The motion failed. Mr. Rush voted in the affirmative, the remainder of
VOTE: the Board voted in opposition.

368
369 Page 41 – line 738 – Technology Services – Equipment Replacement – reduce \$75,000.
370 Mr. Cate made a motion for discussion. Mr. Rush seconded.

371
372 Mr. Guimond wanted to know the age of the server. Ms. Lecaroz replied in FY17 they would be
373 in year five since it was last refreshed. She said the server refresh (5-year cycle) was part of the
374 technology plan. If they didn't keep the refresh cycle the performance costs would increase.

375
376 Mr. Guimond withdrew his proposal for reduction. Mr. Cate and Mr. Rush withdrew their
377 motion.

378
379 The Board then took action regarding the recommended District Wide budget.

380
MOTION: (Bilby/Cate) To approve \$10,576,257 as the recommended District Wide budget.

VOTE: (8-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Rush voted in opposition.

381
382 **Food Service – School Board recommended budget \$1,090,935.**

383
384 **Grants – School Board recommended budget \$730,000.**

385
386 **The Final number is \$30,638,320.**

387
MOTION: (Cate/Sherman) To approve \$30,638,320 as the recommended Pelham District
budget.

VOTE: (7-2-0) The motion carried. Mr. Rush and Mr. Bilby voted in opposition.

388
389 **ADJOURNMENT**

390
MOTION: (Sherman/Bilby) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (9-0-0) The motion carried.

391

392 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15pm.

393

394

Respectfully submitted,

395

Charity A. Landry

396

Recording Secretary