

**TOWN OF HOPKINTON**  
**Budget Committee Meeting**  
**Wednesday, January 16, 2019**  
**\*Approved\***

**BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Janet Krzyzaniak, Jim O'Brien, Ken Traum, Ginni Haines, Don Houston, Debbie Norris, Jonathan Cohen, Candace Youngman, Mark Zankel, and Rich Houston.

**PUBLIC PRESENT**

Steve Chamberlin, Superintendent of Schools; Michelle Clark, Business Administrator; Liz Durant, Mary Kusturin, Arnold Coda, Diane Lachance, Melissa Trafton, and Carolyn Koegler.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Janet Krzyzaniak called the Budget Committee Meeting to order at 5:30 pm, at the Hopkinton Town Hall. Jim O'Brien led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF JANUARY 9, 2019, DRAFT MINUTES**

Ken Traum motioned to approve the January 9, 2019, Meeting Minutes. Candace Youngman seconded the motion. Mrs. Krzyzaniak asked for any errors or corrections. Mrs. Youngman asked for clarification of the word "notional", on Page 9. *Mr. Chamberlin explained that "notional" means it is only accessed if there is a claim.* Mrs. Youngman asked if, on Page 11, the program codes were the same as function codes. *Mr. O'Brien replied that they referred to the same thing.* There being no changes, a vote was taken, all Committee members approved the January 9, 2019, minutes.

**CONTINUATION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY JIM O'BRIEN, SCHOOL BOARD REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE – copies of the presentation documents are available at the Town Hall, School District Office, and online at the School District website [www.hopkintonschools.org](http://www.hopkintonschools.org)**

Jim O'Brien explained that the School Board has a tentative HESS Contract agreement that will be presented at the School Board Meeting on Thursday, January 24, 2019. It will be ready to be presented to the Budget Committee on Wednesday, January 30, 2019.

Mr. O'Brien explained the scheduling of the bond process. At the School Board Meeting on January 10, 2019, the School Board decided to put forward two bond amounts for Public Hearing. The Bond Hearing will be on January 24, 2019, at 5:00 pm. The School Board will then vote whether to go forward with a bond amount. If the School Board decides to move forward, they would come back to the Budget Committee on January 30, 2019, for a presentation of the bond amount. The Budget Committee would vote on whether or not they would support the bond proposal put forward by the School Board. He explained that the Budget Committee can't change the amount being put forward, they can only agree or disagree. If the Budget Committee doesn't agree to the amount, the School Board will put forward for a bond amount, on February 7, 2019, after the Public Hearing, the School

## **PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY JIM O'BRIEN, continued**

Board would reconvene and discuss the Budget Committee's non-support. The statute does allow the School Board to proceed with the bond even without the Budget Committee's support. The article at the Town Meeting needs to state it is not supported by the Budget Committee. He explained that if the bond goes to the Town Meeting, the voters can amend the bond amount down, but they can only move it up by 10%.

- Mark Zankel asked if the Budget Committee would be asked to vote on two bond amounts?
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that the School Board warranted two amounts, but they can only move forward with a vote on an amount after it's been warranted, and a public hearing has been held. They will vote on January 24, 2019, on one amount.*
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that there could be a contingent warrant article, and because they have two warrant articles, they could move forward with two bond amounts.*
  
- Candace Youngman asked if the School Board would be trying to move forward with one bond amount, or have two amounts?
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained they have two options that they can move forward with. It would be up to the School Board to decide on January 24, 2019.*

Mr. O'Brien presented the two School Board bonding options – 1) dated January 10, 2019, Hopkinton School District Worksheet Phase I, for \$9,796,692, and 2) dated January 16, 2019, O'Brien Proposal, for \$7,796,692. He explained that they discussed at their meeting on January 10, 2019, and they are different by \$2M. He explained that these are the two total amounts that are warranted and will be discussed at the Public Hearing on January 24, 2019. He explained that both options include - at HMS, a four-classroom addition for a total of \$3,271,320, and an office expansion/renovation for a total of \$250,000; and at HMHS, science lab renovations for a total of \$1,958,400. He further explained that the \$2M difference in the proposals, is in the Deferred Maintenance and Basic Safety and Security lines. The O'Brien Proposal explains what is left in and what has been taken out, so the public has a clear indication of what totaled up the amounts.

- Mark Zankel asked for the rational of voting in more deferred maintenance into the bond.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained there are needs at the schools around maintenance issues and safety and security, and one way to get more of that done now and early is through the bond. With the bond, you can alleviate a lot of the items. He explained that these are facilities and so by bonding it out, you are spreading out the cost to future taxpayers, who are using those facilities. He explained that his rational for reducing that line is because he questioned some of the smaller items and whether they should be bonded out, or whether they should be included in the Maintenance Trust over time and make priority decisions on our Maintenance Trust accounts moving forward to try and make up some of those costs. He explained that he was also looking at budget flexibility – he is concerned that the District has a lot of facility needs, overcrowding issues, where our enrollment is going, and he was looking to lower the amount of debt we would be taking on with this bond. He explained, it's not like our challenges as a District are going to be lessened; he'd rather incur debt on larger, needed, capital items.*
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that this is one way to catch up with the facilities and still maintain most of the programs. He explained that by working together with the*

## PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY JIM O'BRIEN, continued

*Harriman Report, himself, Michelle Clark, and the Facility Director; they got a \$29M project down to \$9.8M, and Jim O'Brien got it down to \$7.8M. He said there are still items in the \$7.8M they are hoping to do.*

- Debbie Norris asked for an explanation of why the 5% contingency was in one plan and not in the other.
  - *Steve Chamberlin explained that a buffer was needed, in the School District Worksheet, for flexibility, because of the changing facility prices in the deferred maintenance and basic safety and security. He explained that there is already a large contingency, included by the engineers, for the renovations, because of the fluctuating construction prices.*
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that he didn't include the 5% in his proposal, because he wanted to get as much value out of the \$2M that he could, to get more project work done. His proposal doesn't include the additional 5% contingency on Deferred Maintenance and Basic Safety and Security items that are on the School District Worksheet.*
  
- Candace Youngman asked for an explanation on how the bond process works, and if State approval was needed.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that they have bond counsel; they'd be borrowing money, they'd have choices of municipal bonding or private lenders, looking for the right interest rate and the right length of time. The State looks at the language that is used on the warrant.*
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that there is no State oversight, it's all at local control.*
  
- Mrs. Youngman asked if bonding for maintenance is allowable?
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that it is, the life of the asset must be less than the term of that component of the project, and this is all worked out with bond counsel and the vendors – explaining that there is a worksheet that is produced for all the work that will be done under the bond.*
  
- Jonathan Cohen asked what the effect on the tax rate would be for the \$9.8M?
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained he would have an estimated tax impact next week for the bond hearing, but that he believed it would be about \$1.00/\$1,000.*
  
- Mr. Zankel asked for clarification – 1) With less borrowing there is less bond payments, which gives more budget flexibility, the difference is only \$0.20/\$1,000. 2) There are certain elements of the Deferred Maintenance on the O'Brien Proposal that lends themselves less well to bonding? What are the criteria used to come to these items?
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that he began with wanting to take \$2M off as a starting point, then there were things he felt weren't as much of a priority in terms of getting it done today and bonding it out. He explained he was not trying to pass value judgements on the items, the intent was to decide if the items were of immediate need or if we should incur years of debt on. Are there other ways for these projects to be done, like in a CIP? Mr. O'Brien explained that the public can have discussions at the Public Hearing as to how they feel about these items.*

## **PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY JIM O'BRIEN, continued**

- Debbie Norris thanked Mr. O'Brien for his proposal, explaining it opens options for how we go about the work, explaining that community members had asked about local contractors doing the work.
- Don Houston asked what the principal payment, the interest payment, and the total interest amount paid for the 20-year, \$10M bond, would be? He explained that if you borrow some now to do some of the projects and then you put in another \$100,000-\$250,000 every year, into a building fund, that you take out of every year, it comes out to the same end cost, you just wouldn't have to pay the interest.
  - *Mr. Chamberlain said he would have that information at the bond hearing.*
- Debbie Norris asked for an explanation of why "Phase I" was in the title of the District Worksheet.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that the proposal that came forward last year was for \$30M, and there is a lot of identifiable need, and this "Phase I" trims it back to a more manageable amount for either proposal that has been presented. He explained that, as we move forward, the school buildings will still need work to be done (sprinkler system at HM, accessibility at HMHS, etc.). He explained that "Phase I" addresses the proposal of the work that needs to be done this year.*
- Mr. Traum asked for clarification on the 5% contingency. He asked Mr. O'Brien, if in his proposal, was he only removing the contingency related to the items he was removing.
  - *Mr. O'Brien, said no, the way the contingency was produced on the School District spreadsheet was it took the totals of all the items and then added 5% on top of that. He explained that he took all the numbers within that 5%.*
- Mr. Traum asked if the total in the gray box, on the O'Brien Proposal, \$1,889,685, with 5% added to that would make it roughly \$2M. He explained that, to him, that meant Mr. O'Brien was removing 5% related to those items.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that he'd share the spreadsheet and would go over the numbers, to make sure what he is presenting is accurate.*
- Don Houston asked Mr. Chamberlin, if the bond rate is different, does that change the factor being used - if we borrow \$1M, it costs us \$66,00 a year?
  - *Mr. Chamberlin said he'd check with the bond bank and have them run the numbers at the recent sale rate. He explained that he had done \$3M at 3% and that came to \$1.00 for 5 years. He explained that the Board wanted to have even, stable payments to keep the tax rate stable.*

Mr. O'Brien explained that he wanted to provide the Budget Committee with the information that the School Board discussed at their meeting, so that the Budget Committee would understand the context of the proposals prior to the Public Hearing.

## **CONTINUED PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY STEVE CHAMBERLIN**

Mr. Chamberlin presented an updated budget bulletin, an updated Programmatic Budget, department and course information, and other information for further explanation.

## **PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY STEVE CHAMBERLIN, continued**

Michelle Clark was asked to present the changes that were made since the packet dated January 3, 2019. She explained that the packet had that date on it because that was when the School Board last approved it. She further explained that there were two other items that were approved since January 9, 2019, Budget Committee meeting. She explained, referring to the 2019-2020 Proposed Budget Summary:

- ❖ Page 2 - changed because the Board did recommend adding \$145,562 in the Repair and Maintenance Trust Fund. She explained that at the last presentation \$15,000 was there for the Vehicle Trust.
- Mr. Cohen asked if \$145,462 was going into the Maintenance Trust Fund as opposed to the \$100,000 that was discussed at the last Board Meeting?
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that the School Board voted to pull \$145,562 and then about \$40,000 is coming out of Surplus and \$100,000 is General Operating Budget, to be raised by taxation.*
  - *Ms. Clark explained that these figures would be more visible when the Warrant Articles are explained, later in her presentation.*
- ❖ Pages 3 and 5 - percentage changes have been added to the Revenue Sheet and the Operational Budget.
- ❖ Page 4 – On the Bond line, there is no amount listed. Transfer from Expendable/Maintenance Trust was included before. Less Transfer to Expendable Trust Funds used to be \$15,000, for the Vehicle Trust, now it adds in the \$40,562. The Total Revenues changed. The Total Appropriations changed because they had to add in \$140,562, for the Repair and Maintenance Trust Fund addition. This increases the Appropriations minus Revenues-estimate to be raised locally - to \$100,000 more to be raised through taxation. This increased the tax rate by \$0.16, to a total of \$1.56.
- ❖ Page 11 – Summary by Location – Mr. Chamberlin presented Change in FTE by location detail, unpacked, that was requested by the Budget Committee. Ms. Clark explained that, in unpacking the details, she had forgotten about some psychology that was district wide last year as an FTE, that is now in a specific school, due to the student need; explaining that FTE's in total did not change, they just changed locations. She explained that the empty line in the HMHS section, with the 0.18 change, is for a psychology position. She explained that student need changes, students move into town, and the percentages may change, because this budget is for 18 months from now.
- Mr. Cohen asked why there was a 5.5% increase in Change to Instructional Supports at HMHS.
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades, there are several students that require one-on-one, paraprofessional support.*
- Don Houston asked what the 195.46 on the Summary by Location included.
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that it includes teacher, aids, everything. Ms. Clark explained that the breakdown for teachers only would be later in the presentation.*

## PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY STEVE CHAMBERLIN, continued

- ❖ Page 14 – breaks down the HEA (teachers), HESS (paraprofessionals), and nonunion (permanent substitute that is not covered by any of the union contracts) FTE's. Ms. Clark explained that the HESS area went up because the kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade regular IA's before were all budgeted in the 1200 section, but they do help regular education children as well, so in the 2019-2010 Budget, they split that number in half – meaning half are charged to regular education and half are charged to special education.
  
- ❖ Page 15 – last week's report had 173 students enrolled in special education programs, as of October 1, 2018. As of January 9, 2019, that number has increased to 187.
  
- Mr. Traum asked if there would be a corresponding increase in State Aid because of that, and if proposed Revenues should be adjusted because of that additional aid.
  - *Ms. Clark explained that every identified student does get a little bit of adequacy aid, it depends on other components that could be IEP driven. Ms. Clark explained that Revenues wouldn't be adjusted, because they use 100% of what the State says they will be getting for adequacy. The State gives them the number and they work their budget with that number.*
  
- ❖ Page 16 – breaks down the HEA and HESS FTE's.
  
- ❖ Page 37 – Article X – now has an amount based on the School Board's recommendation. It explains the balance and the tax impact based on the \$100,000.
  
- Mr. Cohen asked if the \$140,562 amount is going into the Maintenance Trust, regardless of the bond.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that there is always an opportunity to amend the warrant on the floor at Town Meeting. This amount is what the School Board moved forward with, which could be reconsidered before they finalize the article depending on what happens with the bond vote. If no bond went forward, he believes the School Board might want to increase this amount; there would be a discussion on February 7, 2019, on what they would want to do with Maintenance. They would have until February 7, 2019, to finalize the warrant.*
  - *Ms. Clark explained that the Public Hearing is on February 6, 2019, after that the Budget Committee makes their final recommendations.*
  
- Don Houston asked what would happen if there was no bonding approved, we need \$1M just to do the roofs. What would be the fallback for doing that?
  - Mr. O'Brien explained that if the town didn't want the \$9.8M or \$7.8M bond, on the floor, at Town Meeting, the bond amount can be amended down, through discussion, and then the town can vote to amend that number; but it can only go up by no more than 10%.
  
- Mark Zankel asked, with the Maintenance Trust Fund, if the School Board moves forward with the \$7M proposal, some of the work might not get done; but would be paid for through annual warrants.

## PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY STEVE CHAMBERLIN, continued

- *Mr. O'Brien explained that the Trust Fund has been renamed to School Building Repair and Maintenance Trust, and that would be where capital projects are planned for and the expenditures would come out of. That is where \$140,000, or more, would be added yearly to meet the needs of the facilities.*
  
- Don Houston explained that this would take a lot of work. He asked Mr. Chamberlin, is the CIP subset relative to what is going to be bonded? Are you doing a scenario for each of those situations so that we can all see what would be in a CIP and how it would be staggered out on these various scenarios?
  - *Mr. Chamberlin explained that they put in the Capital Improvement Plan, to have some things in a bond, some things in the Maintenance Trust, and some over the next 10 years. He doesn't know how much funding they are eventually going to get. They have looked at projecting if the bond doesn't happen – they know what they are going to do if the bond happens.*
  
- Mr. Houston asked if this information will be presentable, before Town Meeting? There is concern that there hasn't been a CIP that would solve the problem if we don't have it by bonding.
  - *Mr. Chamberlin believes they have a good CIP program, it's the funding. Explaining that right now there is \$100,000 more put in funding to take care of the projects but, it's only at 10% of what is needed.*
  
- Mr. Houston is concerned that we are so far behind that curve in the CIP, the funding for a CIP is just in and out in the same year; and that we need a very substantial amount just to get caught up and we aren't going to do that for 10 or so years.
  - *Mr. O'Brien explained that we're moving in the right direction, we've identified what needs to be funded; this board and future boards will need to work with Steve and Michelle to fine tune it. There needs to be consistent funding coming into that account, at a higher level than where we are at today, with a real solid plan, so we will know in the next 10 years, what appropriations should be coming in, in order to get projects done over time.*

Mr. Zankel asked with the \$2M difference between the two bond proposals, is it financially better off for the town to pay that 3%-4% interest rate now, compared to spreading it over time? The \$2M more that has been identified as deferred maintenance, that needs to get done, and will be added to the CIP.

Don Houston said that if we go with the full bond, there is going to be no appetite now to add more money to the bottom line of what we must pay for taxes, for creating another fund for future maintenance. We'll have the issue each year especially if more deferred maintenance builds up in the future.

## **PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET BY STEVE CHAMBERLIN, continued**

Rich Houston expressed, that's why we are here today, because there is a pile up of deferred maintenance. If we take out a giant loan to pay for what needs to be done, and then a new CIP comes along, more funding will be needed.

Mr. Cohen explained that we already know that the sprinkler system and the entrance are not in this proposal. They are needs that have been discussed that are in another phase.

- Candace Youngman asked if the warrant articles are worded as they are going to be worded in the actual annual report?
  - Ms. Clark explained that the warrant articles go to legal counsel as well as in the DRA web portal, for review. She explained that the structure of the articles is the same as last year, and the proposed forms presented are drafts.
- Mrs. Youngman asked if the vote count on the Warrant Articles could be added to the article for public view.
  - Ms. Clark said they don't normally put vote counts in their Articles, it's up to the School Board.
- ❖ Page 37 – Article XI – the School Board approved to put on the Warrant, to make sure the SAU was captured, because the way it's currently written, they could never withdraw any money out of the Repair and Maintenance Trust Fund for the SAU office.
- ❖ Page 42 – Performance Contract repayment schedule – the wording has been changed to be transparent as to what happens with the funds to pay for this project, and to capture more of the information to make it helpful.
- ❖ Page 46 – HSD 5-year CIP Proposal – in the last presentation, there was no value in the FY20 as a contribution. The \$140,562 has been added, and some of the FY19 items have been moved over to FY20 (George Park). Mr. Chamberlin explained that this is the Maintenance Trust component of the CIP, it talks about past projects, and projected projects. This is where the funding would come from.

Steve Chamberlin explained the Yellow Tab section, dated January 16, 2019, provided to the Budget Committee for their binder. He explained that it includes:

- A breakdown of the number of students, in grades 6-12, in each department.
- A breakdown of the number of students, in grades 6-12, participating in each course; the highlight indicates the end of a department/beginning of a new department.
- The Programmatic Budget – He explained that Michelle worked with the vendor, and the line items are "all in" including salaries, benefits, and new equipment.
- The program/function codes are broken down.
- Graduation requirements are listed.

Mr. Chamberlin explained that these numbers are for the first semester. It will be presented to the Budget Committee twice a year, after drop/add. The cost to prepare this report is about \$9,000.

Jim O'Brien again requested for any questions for the School Board, from the Budget Committee should come through him first.



## **BUDGET COMMITTEE QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD**

- Ginni Haines asked if the increase in the Health Costs include both the educational staff and the support staff?

## **BUDGET COMMITTEE QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD, continued**

- *Michelle Clark explained that the cost includes non-union, educational, custodians, and support staff.*
- Candace Youngman asked if in the Other Expenses on the Programmatic Budget, where will the Maintenance line be?
  - *Ms. Clark explained that Facilities has always been in its own category, the maintenance is in the same function, it's a different department; it has the same function code. She explained that within the Budget Packet, the Property Services is bolded on page 30, and that is where either the maintenance agreements or repair and maintenance are.*

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Diane Lachance asked for clarification on Line 5200 Transfer to Trust Funds, on the Proposed Budget Summary, amount of \$155,562.

- Michelle Clark explained the first number of \$155,562, that's the Repair and Maintenance contribution as well as the Vehicles, the \$10,000 is what was in last year's budget. The following column is the difference between the two, \$145,562.

Ms. Lachance asked, when you do a project and you have the money budgeted in the bond, will that cover all the expenses of the project? Will there be additional costs that need to be raised to finish a project?

- Ms. Clark explained that there may be some additional overhead costs, that would be in the following year's budget.

Arnold Coda had several questions/comments, including:

- Where do things stand on the development of the Programmatic Budget?
  - Mr. Coda was given a copy of the Programmatic Budget, and Mr. O'Brien explained that collaboration has taken place between the School Board and the Budget Committee, over the course of several months, developing this format. Mr. O'Brien explained that this information will be presented to the Budget Committee and be made available for the community to see how the budget breaks out in a different way.

Mr. Coda expressed that a programmatic budget is a very valuable tool, it can/should show you all the elements, and enable you to ask questions that might not be answered. He explained that the dollar amount of the budget might remain the same, but at least then you can prove why you have and how you have come up with that figure.

- He asked, as of tonight, the way things stand with both the Operating Budget and the Proposed Facility Project, the potential tax increase value would be \$2.56/\$1,000, based on the higher bond amount?

## **PUBLIC COMMENT, continued**

He is concerned because a lot of people he's talked with are concerned about yet another increase in their taxes. He explained, he and his wife have been in the process of deciding what they need to do next, to down-size their home. About 2 years ago they invited two real estate agents to give them a market analysis. He explained they both came within the same range for the price of the house. Recently, they asked them to come back and update their figures, they both came back \$20,000 less.

He asked them why, they said there were two reasons - the real estate market in Hopkinton has slowed substantially, and they attributed that to the taxes.

- On the Facility Project – What he is concerned about is that we are continuing to pour money into old buildings, that ought not even be in use. We have put millions of dollars into all our buildings. What concerns him is that it appears not to be any foresight in thinking on the part of the School Board and the Administration on doing more than just coming up with facility programs that cost money, that we put into antiquated buildings.
- Whether or not this bond issue passes, he hopes that there will be some long-range thinking about what we want to do with our schools. Can we consolidate them? Can we build a campus? Is it a thought worth looking into? He encourages everybody to think about that. We should be looking at how do we bring our schools into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Mary Kusturin asked, should one of these bonds go through, would it be a hard and fast maximum amount, or would it be another amount if the rates were better?

- *Mr. O'Brien explained that the bond would be for the amount the voters have given the District authority to borrow. He explained, especially with the larger projects, there is some contingency built in to allow for flexibility in choosing the best options.*

*Ms. Kusturin asked if it would be clear with what's going to be paid for by the security grant and what's going to be paid for with the bond.*

- *Mr. O'Brien explained that the work with the security grant has already been done and none of the figures are included in the bond; there are items that deal with safety and security, but they are disconnected from the security grant received from the State; and he explained, the \$9.8M grant items are included in the supporting documents included on the web site for the School Board's January 10, 2019, meeting.*

Carolyn Koegler-Miller asked how important is it to have some bond pass, in terms of standings with NEASC? Would it make any difference if it's the \$7.8M or the \$9.8M?

- Mr. Chamberlin explained that some of the issues were specifically addressed in the \$9.8M project, specifically the science labs. He explained that on April 1, 2019, they have a special report due to NEASC, with the results of the March meeting. He explained that the NEASC letter used the language "grave concern", but it would be tough to say if they would move us from warning to probation. NEASC has been kept informed of the \$2.4M work that has been done already.
- Mr. O'Brien explained that the School Board is committed to move forward with the bond to address a lot of these issues. There are some areas that are not addressed i.e. the locker room is not included in this year's bond. Mr. O'Brien explained, both proposed bonds would move us in the right direction.

## **BOARD REQUEST**

Janet Krzyzaniak asked Michelle Clark if it would be possible to put grid marks on the Programmatic Budget? Also, could there be a blank column so the number of students can be added, from the other report?

- Ms. Clark and Mr. Chamberlin responded, this should be able to be done.
- 

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD**

Mr. O'Brien shared that streaming will be available for the February 6, 2019, Public Hearing, to be held in the High School auditorium.

Mrs. Krzyzaniak asked if there should be a Meeting on January 30, 2019, followed by discussion. A vote was taken to approve holding a Budget Committee Meeting on January 30, 2019, and all Board Members approved.

Candace Youngman asked Mr. O'Brien if the HESS Contract would be a "done deal" when it is received by the Budget Committee.

- Mr. O'Brien explained that when the Budget Committee is presented with the Hess Contract, HESS and the School Board will have already signed off on it.

Don Houston asked if the Budget Committee should prepare a one-page Summary Sheet, including the various increases on the tax rate, for both the School District Meeting and the Town Meeting? Would that be appropriate to do this year? Is this something we should do for the voters in Town?

- Discussion took place about how important this information would be for the voters to see what the different tax impacts would be across all the budgets being presented. Mr. Houston offered to put a conceptual copy together for the next meeting.

## **UPCOMING BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

January 23, 2019 – Follow up discussion to the budget presentations. Review of all budgets.

January 30, 2019 – Budget Committee Deliberations.

February 6, 2019 – Public Hearing on all Budgets in the High School Auditorium, 6:30 pm.

February 13, 2019 – Final Budget Committee Deliberations, if needed.

Public Hearing on the School Petition Warrant Articles, if needed.

## **MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Don Houston motioned to adjourn at 7:45 pm. Ken Traum seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. A vote was taken, and all Board Members approved.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tammy Clay