

Timberlane Regional School Board
Atkinson, Danville, Plaistow and Sandown
New Hampshire

Minutes of the Deliberative Session
February 05, 2015

At the Timberlane Regional High School, Moderator Steven Ranlett called the February 05, 2015 Deliberative Session to order at 7:00 PM. The High School Select Ensemble sang the National Anthem, following which Superintendent Earl Metzler led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Ranlett introduced himself as the Moderator, and Norman Major and Robert Harb as Assistant Moderators.

Members of the Budget Committee in attendance: Tony Cantone, Thomas Geary, Arthur Green, Jason Grosky (chair), Dennis Heffernan (vice chair), Joshua Horns, Michelle O'Neil, Gregory Spero. Absent: Cathleen Gorman

Members of the School Board in attendance: Peter Bealo, Richard Blair, Robert Collins (arrived 8:10pm), Kate Delfino (vice chair), Donna Green, Jack Sapia, Susan Sherman, Nancy Steenson (chair), Kelly Ward

Dr. Metzler welcomed the voters to the Deliberative Session and gave a presentation, speaking on the efforts of achieving balance between politics vs pedagogy, and economic liberalism vs fiscal conservatism. He also spoke on the importance of maintaining cooperation between the four towns of the Timberlane Regional School District, and pointed to the attendance at the Deliberative Session as an example of local control.

Mrs. Steenson gave a presentation on the District's achievements and the increasing success rate of students since Dr. Metzler was hired as the Superintendent of Schools, as measured by SAT scores, AP test scores and college acceptance rates. In addition to academic success, she noted the achievements of Timberlane's music and athletic programs. She spoke on the past history on the increases in the budget, as well as enrollment and staffing levels.

Rick Blair spoke on the importance of providing the best education affordable for the students who are the future of America. He presented an explanation of budget surplus and its impact on tax rates.

Mr. Ranlett read the following list of non-voters that may speak or present information at the Deliberative Session:

Dr. Earl Metzler	Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Roxanne Wilson	Assistant Superintendent
George Stokinger	Business Administrator
Atty. Gordon Graham	District Legal Counsel
Deb Armfield	Executive Dir. of Curriculum, Assessment and Prof. Learning
Beth Rincon	Director of Special Education
Susan Rasicot	Director of Student Services
Nancy Danahy	Director of Human Resources
Michelle Auger	Principal - Pollard
Douglas Rolph	Principal - Sandown Central
Michael Hogan	Principal - Timberlane Regional Middle School
John Holland	Director of Technology
Angelo Fantasia	Director of Athletics
Tony DiBartolomeo	Director of Music
Jim Hughes	Director of Facilities
Lou Broad	TTA – Teachers' Union President
Lorraine Mascioli	TTA – Teachers' Union Vice President

On a motion by Robert Harb, seconded by Dennis Heffernan

- **Voted:** To accept the non-resident list as stated above.
- **Having no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Ranlett outlined the rules of the session, stating that Roberts Rules of Order would be the guide he would be following for the Deliberative Session and that at any time those rules could be altered by a majority vote.

A motion by Beth Blomquist of Atkinson, seconded by Jack Sapia, to limit all presentations to three minutes.

Leon Artus of Atkinson spoke to remind the people in attendance that this was the one time when they could have a voice and that anyone who wanted to make a presentation should have as much time as they liked.

Peter Bealo stated that in other meetings he has attended there has been a time limit of three minutes.

Donna Green stated that the reason most people were in attendance was because there is a challenge to the budget, and that it is unfair to deny presenters an opportunity to explain why they are challenging the budget.

Jack Sapia stated that he is in favor of the motion.

Shawn O'Neil of Danville stated that everyone should have the right to make a presentation longer than three minutes.

Kimberly Farrah of Danville stated that she thinks it is unfair that people who have citizen's petitions on the warrant should not have the opportunity to state their reasons for the petition.

Brian Stack of Plaistow stated that he has a petition warrant article, and that he is fine with having three minutes to make his case.

Rick Blair of Plaistow asked what differentiates a presentation from someone speaking.

The Moderator stated that in the rules there are ten minutes allowed for presentations, and three minutes allowed for general comments.

Arthur Green of Sandown stated that everyone knows that he is presenting a challenge to the budget. He stated that he had been allowed fifteen minutes for his presentation, and was notified the day before the Deliberative Session that his presentation allowance would be shortened to ten minutes. He stated that he has prepared a ten minute presentation.

Dennis Heffernan made a motion to move the question. Seconded by Jason Grosky.

The Moderator indicated that he had received a petition for a secret ballot.

Donna Green stated that she had requested a secret ballot. She stated that she was prepared to withdraw her request for a secret ballot if the petitioner was willing to withdraw her motion.

The petitioner declined to withdraw her motion and the motion was moved to secret ballot.

Jason Grosky asked if the names on the petition for the secret ballot could be read.

The Moderator read the names: Len Mullen of Danville, Peter Torosian of Atkinson, Marcia Devine of Sandown, Katherine Piemonte from Sandown and Anthony Piemonte from Sandown.

The Moderator explained how the secret ballot would be conducted.

Paula Bonin of Sandown stated her displeasure with the conduct of the adults as an example to the children.

The Moderator restated that the motion was to limit presentations to three minutes, and the vote was conducted.

YES = 498

NO = 134

The motion passed.

With no other discussion on the Moderator's rules, they were adopted as amended for the meeting.

The Moderator then presented the 2015 Timberlane Regional School District Warrant:

To the inhabitants of the School District of the Towns of Atkinson, Danville, Plaistow, and Sandown, New Hampshire, qualified to vote in District affairs:

First Session of Annual Meeting (Deliberative)

You are hereby notified to meet at the Timberlane High School, 36 Greenough Road, Plaistow, New Hampshire, on Thursday, the 5th day of February 2015, at 7:00 p.m. This session shall consist of explanation, discussion, and debate of warrant articles number 2 through number 12. Warrant articles may be amended subject to the following limitations: (a) warrant articles whose wording is prescribed by law shall not be amended, (b) warrant articles that are amended shall be placed on the official ballot for a final vote on the main motion, as amended, and (c) no warrant article shall be amended to eliminate the subject matter of the article.

Second Session of Annual Meeting (Voting)

Voting on warrant articles number 1 through number 12 will be conducted by official ballot to be held in conjunction with town meeting voting to be held on Tuesday, the 10th day of March, 2015, at the Town election polls in Atkinson, Danville, Plaistow, and Sandown, New Hampshire.

Atkinson	Voting will be conducted at the Atkinson Community Center from 7am-8pm
Danville	Voting will be conducted at the Danville Community Center from 8am-7pm
Plaistow	Voting will be conducted at Pollard School from 7am-8pm
Sandown	Voting will be conducted at the Sandown Town Hall from 8am-8pm

Article 1 - Election of Officers

To choose the following school district officers:

Atkinson Voters	School Board Member	2-year Term
Atkinson Voters	School Board Member	3-Year Term
Plaistow Voters	School Board Member	3-year Term
Sandown Voters	School Board Member	3-Year Term

Atkinson Voters	Budget Committee Member	3-Year Term
Danville Voters	Budget Committee Member	2-Year Term
Plaistow Voters	Budget Committee Member	2-Year Term
Plaistow Voters	Budget Committee Member	3-Year Term

Article 2 – Operating Budget

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional 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 \$67,723,927? Should this article be defeated, the operating budget shall be \$68,160,616 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Timberlane Regional 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. Note: Warrant Article 2 (the operating budget) does not include appropriations proposed under any other warrant articles. (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 7-0-1

Recommended by the Budget Committee 8-0-2

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Jason Grosky, to place Article Two on the floor for discussion.

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Jack Sapia, to amend Article Two to increase the budget by \$250,000. The amended Article would read:

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional 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 \$67,973,927? Should this article be defeated, the operating budget shall be \$68,160,616 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Timberlane Regional 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. Note: Warrant Article 2 (the operating budget) does not include appropriations proposed under any other warrant articles. (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Mr. Bealo stated that the purpose of the addition is to install a fire sprinkler system in Danville Elementary School.

Chris Wahlen of Plaistow asked why a motion to increase the budget was being made now instead of during the budgeting process.

There being no further discussion the motion was moved to the vote.

A voice vote was unclear, a show of cards was unclear, and a count of the voter cards was conducted.

YES = 352

NO = 289

The motion passed.

The amended budget amount will be **\$67,973,927**. The moderator re-stated Article Two as amended.

A motion by Arthur Green, seconded by Leon Artus, to amend Article Two by decreasing the budget to \$64,940,900.

Mr. Green gave a presentation on his motion.

Cookie Ellis of Sandown asked if she could make a motion to increase the budget. The Moderator explained that there was an amendment currently on the floor and another motion could not be made until after the current amendment had been voted upon.

Lucas Appleton, the student representative to the School Board, asked of Mr. Green whether he considered the students of Timberlane an expense or an investment.

Mr. Green responded that his mission was to provide the District with the resources to deliver a quality education at a reasonable cost to taxpayers.

William Gannon of Sandown asked if he could waive his three minutes to someone else.

The Moderator responded that he could not.

Donna Green of Sandown stated she was not here to tell the assembly that Timberlane was bad, but to give an honest assessment. She gave some examples of what she considered wasteful and irresponsible practices.

Leon Artus of Atkinson stated that at the end of this school year the expenses will come in at around \$64,000,000 and there is no reason that the District cannot operate on a lesser budget.

David Gearns of Plaistow stated his opposition to the amendment because it was passed without objection from either Budget Committee or School Board. He said that they brought in a budget that was slightly above level funding. He stated that he was in favor of a budget that would not harm the students.

Robert Zukas of Plaistow stated his frustration with being constantly told that the budget needs to be cut. He said that Timberlane's dropout rate is very low compared to other schools and has a very high college enrollment rate, and listed some of the accomplishments that have been achieved by the District.

Mark Ward of Plaistow stated his opposition to the amendment. He said that Timberlane's teachers are the reason that the students are doing so well. He said it's not about money, it is about dedication. He stated his belief that if the budget is reduced, teachers will have to be cut.

Dennis Heffernan of Plaistow stated the process in which the Budget Committee developed the budget, and asked the voters to support it.

Chris Wahlen of Plaistow asked if there was anyone who could give an explanation of the cost per student.

Dr. Metzler responded that there would be a presentation by the Chair of the Budget Committee, Jason Grosky, following the vote on the amendment.

Peter Bealo stated that the comparisons that have been made to other school districts do not take into account their graduation requirements or their dropout rate. He also stated that the comparisons of the cost per pupil have not been calculated equally.

Leon Artus of Atkinson said that if the total budget is divided by the number of students, the cost per student is over \$18,000. If the budget goes through with the currently amended amount, the cost per student would be over \$20,000.

Susan Burrell of Danville stated her opposition to the amendment. She said that they are not just supporting students academically, they are also supporting them emotionally, physically, and in every other development area as they go through school.

Brian Lonergan of Atkinson (student) asked Mr. and Mrs. Green why they wanted to change a Blue Ribbon school?

Erica Stack stated her strong opposition to the amendment, as a former student, former teacher and present parent of Timberlane students. She stated that she thinks the teaching staff is grossly underpaid for what they do.

The Moderator allowed Mr. Green to respond to Mr. Lonergan.

Mr. Green responded that he disputes Mr. Bealo's cost per pupil figures. He also stated that the Blue Ribbon award did not have any academic achievement elements in its rubric.

Mr. Lonergan stated that academics are not all that makes a great school.

The Moderator restated the amendment on the floor. He said that he had received a request for a secret ballot. He read the names of the voters who had signed the petition: Christopher True of Sandown, Arthur Green of Sandown, Donna Green of Sandown, Rosemarie Bruno of Sandown, F.L. Riley of Sandown.

The Moderator stated that a Yes vote on the amendment would cut the budget by \$3,000,000 to \$64,940,900. A No vote would keep the budget as previously amended.

Voting was held by secret ballot. The results were:

Yes = 100

No = 517

Blank = 1

The motion failed.

With no further discussion, Article Two was placed on the ballot as amended, to read:

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional 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 \$67,973,927? Should this article be defeated, the operating budget shall be \$68,160,616 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Timberlane Regional 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. Note: Warrant Article 2 (the operating budget) does not include appropriations proposed under any other warrant articles. (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

A motion by Michelle O'Neil, seconded by Jack Sapia, to restrict reconsideration of Article Two. The motion passed by voice vote.

The Moderator noted that the presentation for Article Two will be posted on the District's website.

Article 3 – Capital Reserve Fund

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$250,000 to be placed in the School Building Construction, Reconstruction, Capital Improvement and Land Purchase Capital Reserve Fund established in 1996, with such amount to be transferred from the June 30, 2015 unassigned fund balance (surplus) available for transfer on July 1 of this year? This sum to come from fund balance (2014-15 budget surplus) and no amount to be raised by taxation. (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 7-1

Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-1

A motion by Sue Sherman, seconded by Nancy Steenson, to place Article Three on the floor for discussion.

Nancy Steenson spoke on the intent of Article Three.

Ann Gears of Plaistow asked what the purpose is of the money in the Capital Reserve Fund.

Robert Collins responded, explaining that the money is put away each year into a fund and it cannot be touched until a warrant article is put forward to the voters to expend it for a specific purpose. Past examples of uses of the Capital Reserve Fund were to use the funds to renovate school kitchens.

Kim Farrah of Danville asked for clarification on the statement that there is no tax impact to this warrant article.

Nancy Steenson responded to the question.

Rick Blair stated that the article says up to \$250,000 from surplus and does not automatically move that amount into the Capital Reserve Fund, and that the School Board has discretion over how much goes into it up to the amount of the warrant article.

Attorney Graham clarified that if the District does not have \$250,000 in surplus, that any amount up to that amount can be moved into the Capital Reserve Fund. If the District does have more than \$250,000 in surplus, than \$250,000 will have to be moved into the Fund if the warrant article passes and it will not be at the discretion of the School Board.

Melissa Coombs of Sandown asked if money for the sprinkler system at Sandown could be taken out of surplus.

Donna Green stated that there was going to be discussion at a future School Board meeting regarding using surplus to fund a sprinkler system at Sandown North.

Mrs. Green also stated that appropriating money for the Capital Reserve Fund will have no tax impact in the current year but it will impact the tax rate in the next tax year.

Tony Cantone asked for clarification on which tax year the money would be taken from.

Attorney Graham responded with an explanation of what creates a surplus. He said that the language in the warrant article is the language recommended by the Department of Revenue Administration.

Phil Sherwood of Atkinson spoke in support of the article, and said that it was a fiscally responsible thing to do.

Sue Sherman of Plaistow spoke on the purpose of a Capital Reserve Fund.

There being no further discussion, Article Three will be placed on the ballot as read.

A motion by Michelle O'Neil, seconded by Dennis Heffernan, to restrict reconsideration of Article Three. The motion passed by voice vote.

Article 4 – Sandown Central Elementary School Kitchen Renovation and Operational Costs

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$1,160,544, with \$744,299 to be used for the operational costs of Sandown Central Elementary School and \$416,245 to renovate the kitchen at Sandown Central Elementary School and to further authorize the District to withdraw the said \$416,245 from the existing School Building Construction, Reconstruction, Capital Improvements and Land Purchase Capital Reserve Fund? (Only \$744,299 shall be raised by taxation.) (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Not recommended by the School Board 6-2

Not recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

A motion by Arthur Green, seconded by Nancy Steenson, to place Article Four on the floor for discussion.

Nancy Steenson spoke on the intent of Article Four.

Arthur Green made a motion, seconded by Donna Green, to amend Article Four as follows:

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$1,000, with \$1,000 to be used for the operational costs of Sandown Central Elementary School and \$0 to renovate the kitchen at Sandown Central Elementary School and to further authorize the District to withdraw the said \$0 from the existing School Building Construction, Reconstruction, Capital Improvements and Land Purchase Capital Reserve Fund? (Only \$744,299 shall be raised by taxation.) (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Mr. Green explained his purpose in proposing the amendment.

Peter Bealo asked the attorney if zeroing the amount changes the intent of the warrant article so that it is no longer legal.

Attorney Graham responded that it did not.

Louise Pajak of Sandown asked if Mr. Green's intent was also to defund Article Eleven.

Mr. Green stated that it was not his intent.

Mrs. Pajak asked if Warrant Article Eleven passes and Warrant Article Four is amended as proposed, is the District hurting itself on the Sandown Central kitchen repair.

Sue Sherman responded in the affirmative.

Leon Artus of Atkinson spoke in favor of the amendment.

Jon Goldman of Sandown stated that the amendment will defund the school.

Mary Ann Springer of Danville noted that the original amendment was stated incorrectly in the final amount to be raised by taxation.

Mr. Green withdrew his motion, Mrs. Green withdrew her second of the motion.

Mr. Green re-submitted his motion, seconded by Mrs. Green as

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$1,000, with \$1,000 to be used for the operational costs of Sandown Central Elementary School and \$0 to renovate the kitchen at Sandown Central Elementary School and to further authorize the District to withdraw the said \$0 from the existing School Building Construction, Reconstruction, Capital Improvements and Land Purchase Capital Reserve Fund? (Only \$1,000 shall be raised by taxation.) (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Jack Sapia said that even though Mr. Green had stated that he had no intention of proposing an amendment to Article Eleven that did not mean that someone else would not make a motion.

Jon Goldman of Sandown stated his opposition to the amendment.

Sue Sherman stated that she was opposed to the amendment.

Donna Green stated that she is in favor of keeping Sandown Central open for at least one year so that further study can be done. She stated that projections show that enrollment in Sandown will be going up in nine years.

Robert Zukas of Plaistow questioned Mrs. Green's enrollment projections. He asked if enrollment is projected to go up or down.

The Moderator moved the amendment.

On a voice vote, the amendment failed.

There being no further discussion, Article Four will be placed on the ballot as written.

On a motion by David Gearns of Plaistow, seconded by Lee Dube of Sandown, the order of the Warrant Articles to be changed so that Articles Ten and Eleven will be read next.

On a card vote, the motion passed.

Article 10 – Amend Articles of Agreement on Warrant Petition by Shawn O’Neil et al

To see if the Timberlane Regional School District shall replace Article #5 and Article #6 from the April 30, 1964 agreement to read:

5. The operating and capital expenses of the Timberlane Regional School District payable in each fiscal year shall be apportioned at a rate so each pre-existing district pays the same local school rate of taxation based upon the equalized valuation as most currently available as determined by the State Tax Commission. All forms of aid and local school impact fees from each pre-existing district will be applied to reduce the operating and capital expense before apportionment.

6. Repealed

(2/3 MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Not recommended by the School Board 8-0

Not recommended by the Budget Committee 7-0-3

A motion by Shawn O'Neil, seconded by Kim Farrah, to place Article Ten on the floor for discussion.

Shawn O'Neil gave a presentation on Article Ten.

Leon Artus of Atkinson stated that the changes proposed would cause Atkinson and Plaistow taxes to go up, and Sandown and Danville taxes to go down.

Jack Sapia spoke against the Article.

David Gearns of Plaistow spoke against the Article.

Peter Bealo spoke against the Article and said that the Plaistow has had a plan in place for growth for many years and has managed that growth which helps Plaistow's tax rate. He stated that the disparity in tax impact is also due to a flaw in state funding of education.

Jason Grosky spoke against the Article, while stating that the four towns of the Timberlane District need to come together and look at this issue collectively.

Kim Farrah of Danville stated that similar amendments to the Articles of Agreement had been brought forth at least twice historically. She said that this Article is intended to help the District as a whole.

Shawn O'Neil pointed out that the businesses in Plaistow are patronized by residents of the other District towns, and would not exist without them.

Dennis Heffernan said that the residents of Plaistow have to pay for the increased police and fire protection for the businesses.

Leon Artus encouraged all voters to come out in March to vote.

Jack Sapia said that he does not make a distinction between students of Atkinson and students of other towns. He also agreed with Mr. Bealo that the State bears some responsibility.

Arthur Green stated that he does not support this Article, as he is opposed to the redistribution of tax burden.

There being no further discussion, Article Ten will be placed on the ballot as read.

*Article 11 – Continue Operation of Sandown Central on Warrant
Petition by Shawn Freligh et al*

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$602,528 for the continuing operation of Sandown Elementary School as an elementary school? This warrant will be void if warrant article "Sandown Central Elementary School Operational Costs and Kitchen Renovation" passes. (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Not recommended by the School Board 7-1

Not recommended by the Budget Committee 5-0-5

A motion by Donna Green, seconded by Peter Bealo, to place Article Ten on the floor for discussion.

Shawn Freligh of Sandown explained that the intent of Article Eleven is to give the voters a choice in whether or not to keep Sandown Central open. He would like to see further review and deliberation before a decision to close the school is made.

Leon Artus stated his opposition to the Article.

Paul Rogers of Sandown stated that he thinks that Sandown Central will be needed in nine years when demographics show an increase in enrollment.

Chris True of Sandown said that he has read that if the voters vote to keep Sandown Central open, the administration would not necessarily have to abide by the will of the voters. He asked if that was accurate.

Jack Sapia stated that he would personally never go against the will of the voters.

Nancy Steenson stated that the law does not require the School Board to keep the school open if this Article passed. She said that after the election there will be a new board and could not speak to what a new board would approve.

Mr. True asked if there was a School Board Policy that a thorough evaluation must be conducted before closing a school, and if so where was that review.

Dr. Metzler responded that there is a School Board Policy and that a report had been shared with the School Board and it met all the criteria that the policy required regarding the retiring of a facility.

William Gannon of Sandown stated that the schools in Sandown are among the best in the state and the District should pull up the schools in the other towns instead of closing one of Sandown's.

Tony Cantone stated that Dr. Metzler gave a very good presentation to the Budget Committee on why closing Sandown Central was strategically the right initiative. He said that Dr. Metzler had assured the budget committee that closing the school was not because of the downward pressure on the budget, but because the Sandown Central expenses were redundant and closing the school would give the District the opportunity to fund other school initiatives. He said that he understands that the School Board would like to put the decision on whether or not to close the school in the hands of the voters. He suggested that information garnered from the studies be shared with the voters so they could make an informed decision.

Donna Green stated that she disputes Dr. Metzler's claim that the report given to the School Board was in compliance with the School Board Policy. She also stated that projections show that while the District enrollment shows a decline, Sandown's elementary population shows an increase in eight years.

Dr. Metzler responded with a point of clarification that the retirement of a facility is the potential closing of a facility completely. It does not mean that the District will not have an additional use for that facility and that is a School Board decision. He said that the School Board has all the information they need to decide if they can move two grades, or 137 students. He said that if those students were moved to Sandown North, that school would be at about 90% capacity. He said it was not ideal, but it can be done. He said that the School Board would decide if the Sandown Central facility would be repurposed for District use.

Melissa Coombs of Sandown stated that 25% of Timberlane is coming from Sandown and they are bringing that excellence with them. She asked why they were not looking at reducing class sizes in other schools and making those schools better.

Joshua Horns asked if Article Eleven and Article Four are both defeated, can Sandown Central remain open.

Attorney Graham responded that by law it could not.

Ms. Coombs stated that people were not necessarily opposed to closing the school, but they wanted to take the time to do it the right way.

There being no further discussion, Article Eleven will be placed on the ballot as read.

Article 5 – Sandown North Elementary School Playground

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$90,000 for the expansion and upgrade to the Sandown North Elementary School playground? (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 7-0-1

Not recommended by the Budget Committee 8-1-1

A motion by Jack Sapia, seconded by Gregory Spero, to place Article Five on the floor for discussion.

Nancy Steenson spoke to the intent of the Article.

Donna Green made a motion, seconded by Arthur Green, to amend Article Five as follows:

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District raise and appropriate up to \$63,000 for the expansion and upgrade to the Sandown North Elementary School playground?

Donna Green stated that the actual estimate given to the School Board was \$63,000.

Peter Bealo stated that the number Mrs. Green was quoting was an informal estimate from one vendor.

Erich Beyrent of Sandown stated his concern that the quote for the new playground will not provide adequate playground equipment for older students if the schools are consolidated and that the quoted amount will not be enough to bring in fill to create field space.

Dennis Heffernan asked if there is any formal plan for what the playground would look like.

Dr. Metzler responded that there is a presentation prepared if anyone wanted to view it. It is also included in the Deliberative Session packet.

Robert Zukas of Plaistow asked if the PTA has already raised funds to improve the playground. The response was that funds had not been raised.

Jason Grosky asked that Mr. Hughes be allowed to give his presentation.

Mr. Zukas also asked if the playground equipment at Sandown Central could be used at Sandown North.

Dr. Metzler responded that once playground equipment is installed it cannot be touched again for safety and liability reasons.

The Moderator asked if Mr. Hughes would like to give his presentation. There was no response.

There being no further discussion, the motion was moved to vote.

By a voice vote, the motion failed.

Jennifer Silva of Atkinson made a motion to amend the amount of Article Five to \$75,000, and that the amount would come from the Capital Reserve Fund.

Attorney Graham stated that in his opinion the Department of Revenue Administration would not allow a change in the Warrant Article from appropriation to Capital Reserve and that if the Article passed, the DRA would disallow it.

The motion was withdrawn.

With no further discussion, Article Five will be placed on the ballot as read.

A motion by Debra Brown of Sandown, seconded by Erich Beyrent of Sandown, to restrict reconsideration of Article Five. The motion passed by voice vote.

A motion by Debra Brown of Sandown, seconded by John McArdle of Plaistow, to restrict reconsideration of Article Four. The motion passed by voice vote.

Article 6 – Two Year Collective Bargaining Agreement (Timberlane Support Staff Union)

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Timberlane Support Staff Union and the Timberlane Regional School Board, which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing levels over the amount paid in the prior fiscal year:

<i>Cost Distribution</i>	<i>2015-16</i>	<i>2016-17</i>
<i>Salaries</i>	<i>\$82,518</i>	<i>\$83,212</i>
<i>FICA</i>	<i>6,313</i>	<i>6,366</i>
<i>New Hampshire State Retirement</i>	<i>8,952</i>	<i>9,095</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$97,783</i>	<i>\$98,673</i>

and further to raise and appropriate the sum of \$97,783 for the 2015-16 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 the current staffing levels? (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 8-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Nancy Steenson, to place Article Six on the floor for discussion.

Nancy Steenson spoke to the intent of the Article.

There being no discussion, Article Six will be placed on the ballot as read.

Article 7 - Authorization for Special Meeting on Cost Items

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District, if Article 6 is defeated, authorize the Timberlane Regional School Board to call one special meeting, at its option, to address Article 6 cost items only? (Without this Article the District would have to petition Superior Court for a Special School District Meeting. This saves the District the expense of attorney fees and court costs). (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 8-0
Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Rick Blair, to place Article Seven on the floor for discussion.

There being no discussion, Article Seven will be placed on the ballot as read.

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Jeff Padellaro of Plaistow, to restrict reconsideration of Article Six. The motion passed by voice vote.

A motion by Peter Bealo, seconded by Jeff Padellaro of Plaistow, to restrict reconsideration of Article Seven. The motion passed by voice vote.

Article 8 – General Acceptance of Reports

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District accept reports of agents, auditors, and committees as written in the 2014 Annual Report? (MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Recommended by the School Board 8-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 7-0-3

A motion by John McArdle of Plaistow, seconded by Robert Harb, to place Article Eight on the floor for discussion.

There being no discussion, Article Eight will be placed on the ballot as read.

Article 9 – Expand Kindergarten to Non-Tuition, Full Day Program on Warrant Petition by Brian Stack et al

Shall the Timberlane Regional School District expand the current kindergarten program to a non-tuition, full day kindergarten program in each elementary school with the increase in necessary funding coming from the operating budget? (ADVISORY ONLY)(MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Not recommended by the School Board 8-0

Not recommended by the Budget Committee 7-0-3

A motion by Brian Stack, seconded by Kathy Goodman of Plaistow, to place Article Nine on the floor for discussion.

Amy Gentile-Cantone and Brian Stack spoke in support of the Warrant Article.

There being no further discussion, Article Nine will be placed on the ballot as read.

Article 12 – Conduct Impact and Consolidation Plan on Warrant Petition by Shawn Freligh et al

Shall the voters of the Timberlane Regional School District require that before any District school is closed or consolidated the District School Board must conduct a complete impact and consolidation plan to determine feasibility of closing a school? The details of the study and consolidation plan will be presented to District voters at a public hearing a minimum of two-months before voting. The decision to close any district school must be placed in the school district ballot for voting. In the event the District School Board votes to close any District school for the 2015/2016 school year, that vote will be reversed and authority revoked by the voters of the District per passage of this Warrant. (ADVISORY ONLY)(MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED)

Not recommended by the School Board 7-1
Not recommended by the Budget Committee 5-1-4

A motion by Donna Green, seconded by Paul Rogers of Sandown, to place Article Twelve on the floor for discussion.

Donna Green asked the Attorney what makes this Article advisory only.

Attorney Graham responded that the decision and the policy is within the realm of the School Board to determine how it wishes to enact policy concerning the maintenance and operation of the schools.

Mrs. Green noted that the numerals following the recommendations were in inverse order, and asked if they could be changed so that the positive votes could be noted first.

Attorney Graham stated that unless there have amendments to the Article, the recommendations could not be changed.

Robert Collins stated that it would be confusing if the recommendation order were changed to read "recommended by the school board 1-7" instead of the way it is written. It is how they have always done it.

Mrs. Green stated that the vote taken was to recommend, and the vote came out negative.

Attorney Graham said that the recommendations are part of the Warrant that has been approved by the School Board. He said if an error has been made the Board has the ability to correct it before it goes on the Warrant but that is not a subject for the Deliberative Session.

Mrs. Green asked if it is possible to reorder the Articles as they appear on the ballot.

Jason Grosky made a point of order that Article Twelve is on the floor for discussion.

The Moderator asked the Attorney if it was possible to re-order the Warrant Articles.

Attorney Graham stated that the voters could do that.

There being no further discussion, Article Twelve will be place on the ballot as read.

There was a motion made to adjourn, it was denied by the Moderator because there was indication from the audience that there were some who were willing to entertain Mrs. Green who was in the process of forming a motion to re-order the order of the Warrant Articles.

Dennis Heffernan recognized Gregory Spero who has served four years on the Budget Committee and will be moving on.

A motion by Donna Green, seconded by Arthur Green, to re-order Warrant Articles Four, Eleven, and Twelve to Four, Five, and Six.

The Moderator stated that the intent of the motion is to place Warrant Articles dealing with similar issues together on the ballot for clarity.

Sue Sherman asked if School Board Warrant Articles and Citizen Petition Articles could be mingled on the ballot.

Attorney Graham stated that they could, but noted that some Articles name other Articles in them. He cautioned the body to be very careful in how the Articles are re-ordered.

Nancy Steenson stated that the Warrant Articles have been posted and presented in the current order, and it could be misleading to the public if the order is changed.

Erich Beyrent of Sandown stated that people have been discussing these Articles by number for several weeks, and it would not be fair to re-order them.

By a voice vote, the motion failed.

The Articles will appear on the ballot as written.

A motion by Jason Grosky, seconded by Peter Bealo, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

Moderator Ranlett adjourned the Deliberative Session at 12:05am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lorna Walker
School District Clerk