



Budget Committee  
Public Hearing 2020/2021 School Warrants  
Milton Town Hall, Selectmen's Chambers  
Saturday, January 18, 2020

Call to Order: The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM

Roll Call of Seating Members: Chairman Tom McDougall, Humphrey Williams, Dennis Woods, Tammy Smith, Peg Hurd, a Quorum was present

This is the public hearing for the school warrants. No motions or votes are taken by the budget committee on any of the articles. This is the public's first opportunity to ask questions about the warrants.

Article 1, No discussion of any consequence was had

Article 2, No discussion of any consequence was had.

Article 3, Mr. Williams requested a reason for the difference in what was first presented to the committee as a \$120,000 DECREASE and then appeared as a \$170,000 increase in the teacher contract.

The reason put forth was the original starting point for the CBA was the default budget and, according to the lawyer it should have been based on the requested operating budget. It was suggested that the school be prepared to talk about this at the deliberative session.

Article 4, no discussion of any consequence was had

Article 5, Clarification was given that while material purchased with these monies may be geared towards a younger audience, anyone can check out these materials.

Article 6, No discussion of any consequence was had

Article 7, It was suggested that the grammar be checked.

Article 8, A used truck can be purchased with this money and any unused funds would be returned. The school thanks the town for the use of the old town truck. Suggest a note be added indicating that unused monies would be returned.

Article 9, No discussion of any consequence was had.

Article 10, No discussion of any consequence.

Article 11, No discussion of any consequence

Article 12, No discussion of any consequence

Article 13, Question number and cost to send special educational students out of district. For \$84,757 elementary, \$182720 Middle, \$162399 High, as of date the book was printed. Question about cap of students? A school may set a cap of the number of students the accept from out of district but a school is not allowed to cap the number or students that need special ed.

The Public hearing was adjourned at 2:05, motioned by Mr. Williams and seconded by Ms. Hurd, vote was 5-0 to adjourn.

Next budget meeting 1/28 at 6pm at town hall.

Chairman requested that the committee settle on a school budget at this meeting.

He also requested that when we are done we have a budget that we can defend and stand behind as being a reasonable/prudent budget for the town and school.

The consensus of the board was to review by function using the spreadsheet put together by Mr. Williams. The review would concentrate on the bottom line of each major function.

The first function was Guidance 2120. There were initial reductions identified of \$12,487.90. As these were explored it was found that what appeared to be salary increases were actually having a higher paid teacher move into a guidance slot. The final reduction was \$4550.00

The next function was the office of the Principal 2410. There were initial reductions identified of \$35,877.45. As these were explored it was found that what appeared to be salary increases were again changes to hours of work. The final reduction was \$5921.50

The next function was operation and maintenance 2610. There were initial reductions identified of \$44190.17. As these were explored additional funds were found that could be further reduced. The final reduction was \$55536.13.

The next function was other instruction programs 1400. There were initial reductions identified of \$27190.00. As these were explored additional funds were found that could be further reduced. The final reduction was 29,820.00.

The next function was regular education 1100. There were initial reductions identified of \$18,465i.79. As these were explored there were some items that were deemed important enough to keep at the requested funding levels. The final reduction was \$11,851.01.

The next function was SAU expense 2320. There were initial reductions identified of \$6,280. As these were explored it was determined that part of the increase was due to the increase in hours support staff were working. The final reduction was \$4743.00

The next function was school board 2310. There were initial reductions identified of \$415.46. As these were explored it was determined that part of the increase was due to an increase in the number of hours the secretary was working. The final reduction was \$111.46.

The next function was special education 1200. There were initial reductions identified of \$94355.73. As these were explored it was determined that the bulk of what appeared to be salary increases was actually staff changes due to the requirements of IEPs. The final reduction was \$1000.00.

The next function was technology services 2820. There were initial reductions identified of \$5241.20. As these were explored there were no changes identified either higher or lower. The final reduction was \$5241.20

The next function was transportation 2710. There were initial reductions identified of \$44,472.96. As these were explored additional funds were found that could be reduced further. Mr. Shute mentioned that the school board did look into leasing the van but they are not permitted to engage in a lease for a van. He did not have an explanation as to why they can lease a 52-passenger bus but not a 7-passenger van. The final reduction was \$44,641.48.

The next function was vocational education 1300. There were initial reductions identified of \$11,511.50. As these were explored it was determined that some of the lines that were initially thought to be over budgeted were actually in line with the path the school is trying to take in assisting students with vocational education. The final reduction was \$271.27.

Some of the reductions resulted in a change to the amount required to be held back for FICA. This additional reduction is \$13,489.04.

Functions not mentioned above were not adjusted.

The chair repeated his request that the members ensure the budget they vote for be one that they can stand behind and support as required.

A motion was made by Mr. Brown to propose \$10,665,719.59 as the budget for the Milton School District. Mr. Williams seconded. A roll call vote was made with the vote as follows:

Mr. Brown Aye, Mrs. Hurd Aye, Mr. Woods Nay, Mr. Williams Aye, Ms. Smith Aye, Mr. Rawson Aye, Mr. McDougall Aye. Motion carries 6-1.

Mr. Shute requested that the roll call vote be taken again. The results stood unchanged.

The Chair asked Mr. Shute if the school warrant articles would be available by the 14<sup>th</sup>. He indicated that they would be ready.

The next meeting will be the 14<sup>th</sup> of January at 6pm with the location dependent on what rooms are available. This meeting will be to vote to approve/not approve the warrant articles.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Brown, Seconded by Ms. Hurd. Motion carried U/N. Meeting adjourned at 9:52.

Submitted by Thomas McDougall, Chair