

**HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL DISTRICT
BUDGET COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 27, 2022
MEETING MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School District (COOP) Budget Committee was conducted on Thursday, October 27, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at the Hollis Brookline Middle School Library.

Chairman, Darlene Mann, presided:

Members of the Budget Cmte. Present: Raul Blanche, Vice Chairman
 Matthew Maguire
 Brian Rater
 Anthony Stanizzi
 Tom Whalen

Members of the Budget Cmte. Absent: David Blinn
 Cindy VanCoughnett, School Bd. Rep.

Also in Attendance: Holly Deurloo Babcock, Chairman, COOP School Board
 Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Mann lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS - None

APPOINTMENT OF MEETING OBSERVER

Brian Rater was appointed to serve as Meeting Observer.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

COOP Budget Committee [September 29, 2022](#)

The following amendments were offered:

- Page 2, Lines 9 and 10; correct punctuation
- Page 2, Line 22; replace “as a result of” with “because of”
- Page 2, Line 25; insert “lower cost” following “driver”
- Page 2, Line 29; correct spacing for “needs in”
- Page 2, Line 48; correct spelling of “been”
- Page 2, Line 49 and Page 3, Line 24; replace “flushed” with “fleshed”
- Page 2, Line 50; insert “create an” before “application”
- Page 3, Line 23; remove the additional “involved”
- Page 3, Line 35; insert “There” before “will”
- Page 4, Line 31; insert “it” before “is”
- Page 5, Line 7; insert “; including” following “timeframe”
- Page 5, Line 8; insert “and” before “enrollment”
- Page 5, Line 49; correct the spelling of “summaries”
- Page 7, Line 43; replace “number” with “increase”

MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER BLANCHE
MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0

PUBLIC INPUT - None

GENERAL BUSINESS

- Monthly Results

Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator, commented on this being early in the fiscal year. She believes there will be somewhat of a surplus in the area of special education due to student changes, although not as dramatic as it has been in the past few years. As of October 12, 2022, out of the \$27,598,743 approved budget, expended to date is \$6,320,778 and encumbered \$20,790,744 resulting in a current surplus of \$487,221. Given we are in the first quarter of the fiscal year, much can change.

Chairman Mann remarked, as a result of legislation, the district and towns may have received an NHRS reimbursement. She questioned and was told those funds (\$81,000) will be included in this year's tax rate setting.

- FY24 Budget Overview

The budget file includes preliminary guidance, guidance multiplier spreadsheets, a budget trend spreadsheet, which has historical budgets to actuals and includes up to Round 2 of the draft FY24 budget, Superintendent's view, and new items sheet. A Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) will eventually be included.

Chairman Mann spoke of two sheets (highlighted in yellow) at the beginning of the spreadsheet; one is the guidance multiplier calculation, which includes a bit more detail that is then carried forward to the preliminary FY23 guidance sheet. She added a second column titled November guidance. Should the Committee consider other changes when coming back together in November, which is where the final guidance would be identified?

The way the Committee typically discusses, reviews, and builds a guidance point for the budget is to start with the approved FY23 budget and remove items that are not impacted by factors such as inflation. Those items include transfers for food service and special revenue, contingency and trust funds, debt service (outlined by amortization schedules), special education (reviewed separately and based on the student population we anticipate servicing), SAU budget allocation (reviewed by a different sub-committee and brought forward by the Governing Board), and the New Hampshire Retirement System (NHRS) (driven by annual rate setting by the NHRS; set in two-year increments). When recalculated, the NHRS number is put back in after the calculation.

The result of those removals takes the approved FY23 budget of \$26.9 million to a starting point of \$16.5 million.

There are then adjustments and considerations for what part of that amount is then related to salaries; most of those salaries are driven by either contractual arrangements (Administration) or Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) (professional and support staff) and should not be affected by an inflation factor.

That brings the total amount of the \$26.9 million budget that we are considering to apply a multiplying factor to down to \$8.3.

The Committee will look to come to agreement on the guidance that will be provided to the School District for an anticipated increase to the items that make up that portion of the budget moving into FY24.

The Committee could say a straight 4% and apply that to the \$8.3 million or could look at the percentage that salaries are of the remaining \$16.5 million and say that is about 50% so take 50% of whatever factor is being used and apply the net of those two things to the guidance base. It could either apply a full factor to \$8.3 million or in this case half of a factor to \$16.5 million. It is just a way to acknowledge collectively bargained or contracted salaries as a percent of the base.

Once the multiplier or inflation factor is identified and the amount calculated, added back is what is anticipated for FY24 in terms of food service transfers, debt service, special education, NHRS, FY24 contract costs, etc., to arrive at a new guidance warrant article operating budget.

There are additional warrant articles the Committee addresses at the Annual Meeting that currently include the 3rd year of the support staff contract, maintenance trust, special education trust, contingency (listed), and the SAU budget assessment.

Inflation numbers from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics were noted; 4% last year and 8.1% for September. Chairman Mann remarked the question becomes how the Committee would have inflation impact the guidance view that will be put forward. There is a lot of conjecture on whether the Committee believes inflation should affect the remaining amounts, being a year in advance of when the budget will be implemented, do we think inflation will be at the same level, etc. Those are discussions to be had by the Committee to decide where the starting point/factor should be that is applied to the guidance base.

A column was added to the spreadsheet following discussion of putting together guidance from a different vantagepoint (identified as Calculated FY24 on the spreadsheet). Rather than starting with the FY23 approved budget, the FY22 actuals would be the baseline. If starting from the FY22 actuals, you need to consider what was voted in for FY23, e.g., new lease agreement, year 2 of the professional and support staff agreements, maintenance proposal, etc. Those items are added into the FY22 actual figure.

A staff adjustment is listed (previously referred to as COVID adjustment). The district is not staffed where needed as we begin this year. Where there was an underrun in FY22 there would now be more salaries and related benefits. This implies we do not start at FY22 where we underran our budget significantly because of special education and staff underruns. The figure on the spreadsheet anticipates those positions being filled moving forward. Then it goes through the same process discussed with the other viewpoint, e.g., take out transfers, contingencies, debts, to get to another guidance base, applying a factor, etc. We get to roughly the same place of a factor that gets applied to a multiplier, an anticipated increase is added in, everything gets added back, and we end up with a budget view that is about a million dollars different from the first view.

When this process was undertaken last year, the difference was less than \$100,000. When the guidance calculation was done (first pass), it came in higher than the initial budget view from the Administration, which had never happened before. The Administration continued to adjust and exceeded what was anticipated for guidance.

Currently, the two views represent a million dollar differential. The conversation becomes, is either view preferred? Is there something other than the actuals versus budget view to be considered?

Member Rater questioned the bottom of the spreadsheet where there are three rows that appear to have the same text repeated. Chairman Mann responded it is not the same. Once the Committee looks at these views, it often likes to compare (for the operating budget) the increase from the operating budget of the prior year. The operating budget is less than the total budget, which includes all warrant articles. If looking at the operating budget, which is the budget the Budget Committee owns and the article it puts forward on the Warrant, you

cannot make a direct correlation between the prior year's operating budget, which is what the last set of numbers is, because once that operating budget and the full warrant is passed, the additional articles become part of the operating budget. To compare what you think is apples to apples when comparing the FY24 operating budget to the FY23 warrant article operating budget, it really is not the same thing any longer.

In this case, outlined and bolded (lines 62-64), which include CBAs (HESSA contract from last year) and the debt service that was passed in different articles, would really become the apples to apples comparison from an operating budget perspective. The other one included the CIP or the maintenance trust fund as an additional overlay. Experience says the comparison point to the CBAs and in this case debt service (not always there as an additional item) is the comparison point. They are points to look at percentages that would be used when looking at specific articles versus the percentage looked at if viewing the total warrant; once taking the operating budget that is calculated from whatever factor is decided upon, adding in the potential warrants, you come up with \$28,372,000, which is a 5.5% increase from the fully loaded budget we have now. The Superintendent's view fully loaded is at \$28.6 million or 6.5% above a total view. They are different points of comparison to review and consider.

Chairman Mann remarked were the Committee to move forward today, the operating budget she would use as backup information to discuss the operating budget would be what is in the highlighted box.

- Preliminary Guidance Discussion

Chairman Mann questioned the will of the Committee regarding the starting point, e.g. inflation factor, if it is believed something in the 5-6% range is something that would not necessarily be appropriate, if there is the desire to hear some of the things included in the new items list that are driving some of the costs, etc.

There are always ways that items can be addressed outside of guidance (relief items). It may be that the Administration makes such a request for an item that is important to how education is delivered in the school, capital expenditures, etc. In the past, when having a really high Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) for an insurance increase, the Committee has considered benefits to be outside of guidance.

Holly Deurloo Babcock, Chairman COOP School Board, spoke of how staff adjustments are included in the Calculated FY24 column, and asked if anything was put back in for special education given that was one of the biggest reasons there was an underrun. Chairman Mann stated the amount put back in is the estimated amount that is included in the FY24 budget view (Round 2). While we underran this year, the current budget assumes a student population and a budget that we are working with. Based on this population, we are then moving forward. School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock reiterated the number used is more the real number based on what the Administration expects special education to be this year based on what is known given the student population currently in the district. Chairman Mann noted that involves the entire district as she anticipates the Administration is looking at 6th graders in Hollis and Brookline and that population to see what affect that has and also considering the impact of legislation, which includes providing student services until an individual reaches the age of 22.

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock questioned if there is any funding included in the budget to anticipate say 1 additional special education student and was told there is not. Ms. Seeley stated the budget is based on current population. Needs could change. Chairman Mann commented on uncertainty of the number of students who cross into Massachusetts noting significant rate increases that are anticipated for services. One of the reasons the direction was that of a special education trust fund is because we do not anticipate, within the budget, the possibility of additional placement(s) and understanding the large cost that can be associated.

Asked to provide an overview of the key changes from Round 1 to Round 2 of the Superintendent's budget, Ms. Seeley noted, under the heading of Academics, Round 1 started with roughly \$116,000 and was reduced to \$103,000 in Round 2.1. The changes are minor, e.g., Social Studies Department requested 2 sets of maps and it

was believed 1 set could be ordered this year and the other next year. Under the heading of Personnel, Round 1 was at \$98,000 and was reduced to \$61,000. The most significant changes are the shared positions that are not being put forward as it is known Brookline cannot do those positions (removed for all 3 districts). Chairman Mann spoke of the position of directed classroom substitute and asked if there is already one in place. Ms. Seeley stated there is 1 in place to cover all 3 districts. There has been difficulty finding an individual to fill that position.

Under the heading of Special Education Personnel and Training, the total began at \$105,000 and was reduced to \$52,000. The difference is the 504 Paraprofessional. It is believed the same work can be done through the use of stipends and other resources.

No new computer equipment is proposed.

The category for Replacement Computers started out at \$172,000 and remains there. It is believed all of the requested items are necessary. They pushed academics forward, e.g., interactive flat panels are a fabulous addition (17 at the high school and 9 at the middle school). The audio systems are another game changer. The desire is for them to eventually be in every classroom.

Shared services remain the same in both rounds.

In the area of Athletics, the budget started out at \$14,600, and covered the cost of basketball backboards in the middle school and turf field sound system at the high school. The hope is that the Booster Club might be interested in funding the turf field sound system. It is felt the basketball backboards can wait another year.

Chairman Mann reminded the Committee and viewing audience, in the past, the district had an athletics expendable trust, which has changed over to a revolving account. While there are lines in the budget for various pieces of the athletic budget, there are intended uses for the funds that are collected through participation fees as well. She suggested an overview could be provided of the funds coming out of the athletic expendable trust (future meeting).

Under the heading of Safety/Compliance, taken out was the sidewalk from the wrestling entrance all the way around to the left side of the building so that students can get to carpool vehicles. As there is the possibility of renovations in that area, the desire is to wait for the appropriate time.

Under facilities/Maintenance, the budget started with \$1.3 million and is down to \$164,000. Items highlighted in blue have been moved to the Maintenance Trust. The section of roof at the middle school to be upgraded has been postponed. The hope is to get through the high school roofing before moving on to the middle school. That may not work out as hoped. The tennis court did not make it to Round 2. There are renovations that will be postponed; school counseling renovation; that has already been done may be sufficient.

The Maintenance Trust includes the student dirt lot; gravel was put in this summer, which will sit as a prep to paving (hoped to occur next summer). Phase VIII of the roofing project will be done along with Phase VII, which was not done this summer because of all of the HVAC work that was done. Also identified is the flooring in the middle school, additional HVAC upgrades in the middle school, and elevator retrofit for the high school.

Vice Chairman Blanche questioned how close the draft budget is to being finalized and was told rounds 3 and 4 are still to come. Ms. Seeley commented she has a good deal of work remaining.

Vice Chairman Blanche stated he has always found it easier to comprehend and understand the methodology when you start from the point of actuals. Chairman Mann stated her greatest concern with utilizing actuals to be when it is compounded by another year that we have to get through before we get to the implementation, it adds

to the list of unknowns. The Committee has been using this guidance process for several years, it is consistent with how the Hollis Budget Committee applies its guidance calculations, and she feels comfortable that it is a methodology that has been used consistently and has left us on a good track. She suggested the Committee could move ahead and then do another comparison to where we end FY23. One of the things Column E does not address is the anticipation that several hundred thousand dollars would be returned to the tax base. She would be very concerned that the view put forward in Column E really does not allow for much to be returned to the tax base.

Member Rater commented both factors require a lot of manipulation of the numbers to get down to something that we have control over. Noting the approx. \$1.1 million difference between the two views, he questioned what the large drivers are. Chairman Mann stated her belief the biggest driver is the starting point having had a year where we really underran the budget. The Hollis Budget Committee used a multiplier of zero after having the inflation conversation. Changing that factor and adjusting the multiplier down to zero would put it at a \$600,000 difference from the current Superintendent's view to where our budget guidance would be. It is really hard to say where inflation will be. She questioned what has been put in the budget for increases anticipated in the areas of utilities, etc. Ms. Seeley stated what is being experienced is higher than the current budget and what is anticipated, based on that, is probably in the area of the inflation factor being discussed. In some cases, it will be far off.

Noted were the changes that occur each year in regard to retirements, new hires, lane changes, etc. Vice Chairman Blanche stated he would be comfortable starting with a zero multiplier and having the Business Administrator come back with the best budget. If that is say 3% higher, the Committee can adjust the multiplying factor to 3% to match.

Member Whalen commented on the Committee having budgeted at 4% last year based on an assumption that 4% was going to be the inflation rate when actual came in at 8%. We were saved only because of COVID and our reduced operating rates, special education costs, teacher costs, reduced bus service, etc. Everything that was reduced because of COVID brought us down to that 4% number. We ate it last year, it just does not show in the numbers. If we are starting a budget this year at +4% that is actually zero. What is good about this methodology is if the factors are reasonably close or explainable, then it really does not matter which one you use. What is really important is what the Business Administrator does with each line item. He feels very comfortable that we are analyzing each line item one at a time.

Vice Chairman Blanche commented in the line-by-line evaluations there is a built-in estimation of cost increases. The actual number reflects that inflation already. Member Whalen clarified he was simply stating it does not matter where you start. The reality is it was 8%. Had the situation that occurred last year not happened he doubts we would be looking at giving monies back to the tax base. We would likely be looking for additional funding. Ms. Seeley responded had the district not had the windfall with special education and unfilled positions, we could be having a very different discussion.

Member Stanizzi questioned, when looking at item by item in terms of inflation, is a particular percentage used or is each category considered individually, e.g., heating oil is up by 30%, etc. Ms. Seeley stated a specific percentage is not applied to every category because there may be something that the teachers are buying that is less expensive than in the past, utilities will be evaluated in a different way, etc. The GMR is at 4% for the second year where the State average is at approx. 8.4% and other districts are at 18-20% range. Also considered when looking at potential increases in insurance costs is the type of plans likely to be chosen by the current staff.

Member Rater commented in the budget calculation the last step before applying the multiplier is to take out the salaries. He questioned if that includes benefits. He was looking to identify if the amount the budget multiplier is applied to includes benefits and was told the multiplier is applied to benefits. Member Whalen noted that is then reviewed and the number changed based on GMR.

Member Rater commented there is a \$26 million budget that is narrowed down to the \$8 million that the target factor is applied to, which includes benefits, maintenance, utilities, etc. Vice Chairman Blanche reiterated his desire to see the Administration's view of the budget before making an adjustment to try to come up with a compromise because they are one step ahead already calculating some level of increases in all of the key items.

Member Rater noted past practice has been to provide preliminary guidance after which the Administration will present a draft budget that may or may not meet that guidance. From there adjustments are made.

Chairman Mann reiterated other articles to be considered include the 3rd year of the HESSA CBA and the potential there may be a sidebar agreement associated with that. Ms. Seeley stated a tentative agreement has been reached. There is the need for the School Board and union to ratify it. School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock stated it would be a warrant article as the HESSA contract is not sanbornized and therefore not built into the budget already.

Chairman Mann noted the \$125,000 for contingency is back stating her anticipation the level at \$125,000 is because they are not considering pursuing a change to the Retained Fund Balance. Ms. Seeley stated she put that dollar amount in there simply as a placeholder. The Board has not discussed that as of yet.

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock commented, ultimately, the School Board wants a budget that will fund what we need for our students. They trust the Business Administrator and the process of the Budget Committee to do that. She spoke of appreciation for the work that is done. Chairman Mann remarked the Superintendent always has a consideration of the elementary districts in mind too because he has that overarching view of every project and everything that is being put forward in both towns, and always has the impact to the communities in mind when considering recommendations and changes to what is being requested. She questioned if there is the potential for a bond or larger scale project. Ms. Seeley stated that will be the decision of the School Board. The Administration is discussing that internally and will very likely be putting something forth to the School Board.

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock spoke of the Administration having applied for Building Aid from the State. If successful, the district will be looking to move forward with project(s).

Asked, Chairman Mann stated she would be of the opinion to move forward keeping inflation at the 4% range, which nets to a multiplier of 2%. That puts us at a difference of just under \$270,000 between the view we have today and the view that the district has proposed.

Member Whalen asked if the Committee is intended to give feedback to the district concerning what is going on in the economy, what we anticipate is happening, what is actually happening or supposed to be looking at the dots on the impressionist painting and saying we need more yellow dots and fewer blue ones to make that green. Chairman Mann replied without doing the work the Business Administrator does, there is no way for the Committee to put a stake in the ground on all of the aspects of the budget and what percentage we think they are going to move. The Bureau of Labor and Statistics summary has inflation factors for all kinds of things. We could go in and pick utilities and apply 12% here and 6% there.

Member Whalen remarked if looking at this from real world numbers a 4% adjustment for this cycle is essentially zero from last year's cycle based on inflation numbers. We often hear concerns around individuals on fixed incomes not being able to keep up with inflation. Social Security is increasing 8.1%. That argument is probably less efficient than it has been in past years. He suggested if starting at 4% we are not offering any increase. No one can anticipate that inflation will double, but we do not expect inflation to be negative next year. If we anticipate any inflation at all next year, we should probably add that number to the 4% as our baseline.

Member Stanizzi remarked the Business Administrator has indicated that her numbers represent some inflation factor. What you are saying is 4% over her inflation. Member Whalen commented that was the purpose of his

earlier question of whether the Committee is to give financial guidance based on what we know about the economy or if supposed to give guidance based upon what we know about what is happening at the finite level in the school district.

Chairman Mann stated it is a starting point, but it could be both. Member Rater remarked there are two different budgets here; there is the budget that the Business Administrator has been working on and that results in the Superintendent 's current total. Our budget is last year's approved budget that we are going to take the \$8 million out of, apply an adjustment to it, and then take the other big items and add them in. That is kind of the target for the Administration to reach. Those are two different things.

Member Whalen commented that 8% on \$8 million out of the \$26 million makes it less than a 2% increase on the entire budget.

Member Rater reiterated the Committee is only talking about \$8 million out of the budget because the remainder is taken into consideration in other ways/factors. Member Whalen added it will offset some of those other increases that we cannot control, the non-inflation adjusted increases like the contract increases that are not part of that \$8 million. Chairman Mann stated if putting in the 8%, the preliminary guidance view would be greater than the view that we have right now. Member Whalen spoke of the number of items removed from the initial proposal that he believes to be necessary, e.g., roofs, paving. Member Rater noted those items were moved to the Maintenance Trust as a funding source. There is a separate warrant article for funding to go into the Maintenance Trust to cover those things.

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock commented on there being people on the School Board who do not believe the Maintenance Trust should be used in that way, that it was established to be a savings account for an item in maintenance that is unanticipated. That conversation is brought forward every year by a long-standing member who was on the Board when the Maintenance Trust was established and discussed as a mechanism for unanticipated expenses. There are now 2 or 3 members who are starting to feel the same way, that the maintenance costs should be included in the budget as taxpayers need to understand that maintenance is part of having these facilities. When the draft budget is discussed, it will be noted that roughly \$600,000 worth of regular maintenance items are identified for the Maintenance Trust.

Chairman Mann noted the budget itself does include other capital maintenance items as well. Ms. Seeley remarked the Administration has patterned how that is addressed based on how the Hollis School District does it, which has been very successful for them. School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock stated she is fine with the way it is handled, she simply wished to express the opinion of other members of the Board, and that there are two different ways of looking at that.

Member Rater remarked there is an advantage to doing it the way we do, which is that it takes off a slice of significant maintenance work and puts it as a separate vote to the voters, which results in instant feedback on how the voters are feeling about projects.

MOTION BY MEMBER BLANCHE TO SET PRELIMINARY GUIDANCE ON THE OPERATING BUDGET AT TWENTY SIX MILLION SIX HUNDRED NINETY FOUR THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED EIGHTY EIGHT DOLLARS (\$26,694,888)
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MAGUIRE

ON THE QUESTION

That is based on applying a 4% inflation factor to arrive at the adjusted multiplier.

Member Rater remarked comparing that figure to where the Administration is at this point in the process, there is a difference of \$270,000. He spoke of the new items list noting there is not a lot there that he would want to

cut back on. Particularly given an 8% inflation rate, he would be more comfortable with a 6% factor, which would result in an operating budget of \$26,864,904. That is about \$100,000 below where the Administration is at this time.

Ms. Seeley noted the Administration is near completion of discussions/amendments to the new items list, but there remains work to be done to complete the review/adjustments to the individual line items within the budget.

**AMENDED MOTION BY MEMBER RATER TO SET PRELIMINARY GUIDANCE ON THE OPERATING BUDGET AT TWENTY SIX MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED FOUR DOLLARS (\$26,864,904)
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER STANIZZI**

ON THE QUESTION

Member Whalen remarked were an 8% factor utilized, the guidance number would be \$71,000 above the figure the Administration is currently at.

MOTION CARRIED

4-2-0

Members Maguire and Blanche voted in opposition

A draft calendar of the SAU 41 annual meeting dates and deadlines was included with the materials provided the Committee. Listed is a date of February 2, 2023 for the Public Hearing (snow date 2-3-23) and a district meeting date of March 8th with a snow date of the 9th.

Voting day is March 14, 2023. Ms. Seeley spoke of an arrangement with the Brookline Selectmen whereby the district and town alternate on which voting session is conducted first.

- SAU Budget

The draft budget proposal for the SAU 41 Governing Board included an adjustment to the budget that was used to do the comparison points. This view reflects the FY23 adopted budget, additional expenses that were voted in by the Governing Board and provides a comparison to FY24. The initial version used a 5% GMR, which will be adjusted to 4% (will result in an approx. \$2,000 decrease). The proposed budget currently sits at a 7.6% increase over the FY23 budget.

- School Board Update

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock noted the State has reinstated building aid. She spoke of presentations provided by the Administration concerning applications for building aid and projects that would impact the middle and high schools (likely phased approach). Efforts are underway to prioritize the work. The Board has not decided whether to move forward but did vote to support making application. Asked if the projects would be bonded, she stated that would be the case.

Details on the tentative agreement reached with the support staff, will be made public after the Board and Union ratify it. That will change the warrant that was anticipated. She spoke of the difficulties faced in filling positions across the district providing the example of food service workers and custodians.

Tom Enright was appointed as a member of the School Board to fill the position vacated by Elizabeth Brown until the time of the next election.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

At upcoming meetings information will be available for tax rate setting, enrollment, Adequacy Aid, Legislative Service Requests (LSRs), and a non-public session conducted to review items regarding student services.

School Board Chair Deurloo Babcock commented on the amount of special education programming that happens within the district, which is believed to be in the best interest of the students and results in cost avoidance of sending students out of district to receive services. That has had an impact on space, which is one of the reasons why folks do not really understand that the high school is fully utilized. Even if overall enrollment does not appear to be increasing dramatically, the available space is utilized more by keeping our special education students in-house.

AGENDA BUILDING

The November meeting will be rescheduled for Monday, November 21, 2022.

PROCESS OBSERVER READOUT

Member Rater stated the meeting ran as expected and stayed on task.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MEMBER RATER TO ADJOURN
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER STANIZZI
MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0**

The October 27, 2022, meeting of the COOP Budget Committee was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Date: _____

Signed: _____