

BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT
ANNUAL MEETING
FIRST SESSION (DELIBERATIVE)
FEBRUARY 7, 2024
MEETING MINUTES

The First Session (Deliberative) of the Annual Meeting of the Brookline School District was conducted on Wednesday, February 7, 2024, at 6:32 p.m. at the Captain Samuel Douglass Academy.

Moderator Peter Webb presided.

Members of the School Board Present: Colleen Micavich, Vice Chairperson
Tracy Perry, Secretary
Alyson Manion
Kelly Zakar (arrived at 7:11 p.m.)

Members of the School Board Absent: Kenneth Haag, Chairperson

Also in Attendance: Andrew Corey, Superintendent
Gina Bergskaug, Superintendent-Elect
Lauren DiGennaro, Director of Student Services
Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator
Donna Smith, Assistant Business Administrator
Daniel Molinari, Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School
Patricia Bouley, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy
Jonathan Verity, Assistant Principal
Meg Peterson, Curriculum Administrator
Christine Johnston, Esq., School District Attorney
Cindy LaCroix, Chair, Brookline Finance Committee
Daniel Koenig, Brookline Finance Committee

Moderator Webb led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members of the School Board and Administration were introduced. Members of the Administration are not members of the Town, and, therefore, technically not permitted to participate. However, given what they could add to the discussion, the Moderator requested anyone objecting to allowing them to speak make that objection known. No objections were stated.

Moderator Webb introduced members of the Finance Committee; Cindy LaCroix and Daniel Koenig.

Moderator Webb noted this to be an SB2 meeting under RSA 40:13 also known as the Official Ballot Referendum System. The School Board has created a Warrant having 10 Articles. Under SB2, the Warrant is effectively the Ballot. Before the voters was the opportunity to discuss each of the Warrant Articles and to consider any amendments. Although the Ballot could be changed, it could not be approved until before the voters on Tuesday, March 12, 2024.

Moderator Webb noted that, under the Statute, the legislative body (taxpayers) cannot eliminate the subject matter of an article; it can be supplemented, but not eliminated.

A presentation was made providing detailed information on each of the articles presented (can be viewed [here](#)).

Throughout the Deliberative Session members of the Legislative Body were very engaged in the process of making and seconding motions on the various articles. A great deal of participation and effort was put forth to forward to the ballot articles that clearly delineate the action that would result by supporting/opposing each article.

Although the Moderator identified when motions were made and seconded, the makers of the motions were not always clearly identified or within the view of the camera. A review of the video will identify that parliamentary procedure was adhered to.

Article 1 – Election of Officers

To elect all necessary School District officers for the ensuing terms by official ballot vote on March 12, 2024, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy, 7:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.:

- To choose a Moderator for the ensuing year.
- To choose a Clerk for the ensuing year.
- To choose a Treasurer for the ensuing year.
- To choose one (1) member of the School Board for the ensuing three (3) years.

Article 1 will be placed on the official ballot as written.

Article 2 – Brookline Education Support Staff

To see if the Brookline School District will vote to approve the cost of items included in year three of a four-year collective bargaining agreement reached between the Brookline School Board and the Brookline Education Support Staff Association for the 2022-2023, 2023-2024, 2024-2025, and 2025- 2026 school years, which calls for the following increase in support staff salaries and benefits at the already approved 2024-2025 staffing levels:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Estimated Additional Increase</u>
2024-2025	\$93,370
2025-2026	\$7,100

Total Additional Increase: **\$100,470**

and further to raise and appropriate an additional sum of **\$93,370** for the third fiscal year (2024-2025 school year), such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in support staff salaries and benefits required by the new agreement over those that would be paid at the already approved 2024-2025 staffing levels. Majority vote required. **The School Board recommends this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee does not recommend this article 3-0-0.**

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.08/\$1,000

MOTION MADE BY MELANIE LEVESQUE TO MOVE ARTICLE 2 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED BY BETH GILDEA

ON THE QUESTION

Colleen Micavich, Vice Chair, Hollis School Board, explained although unusual to re-open a support staff contract, it was done for both ethical and financial reasons. The district is obligated to provide certain services for students on IEPs. As a result of not having the required paraeducators in-house, the district had to contract out for those services. A typical paraeducator earns approximately \$18,000/year. The district was paying 7 different contracted positions between \$60,000 and \$63,000 for those same services.

Had we not re-opened this contract, we would be hiring additional contracted individuals. The district renegotiated with the support staff and reached an agreement that brings them closer to wages earned at the Hollis and COOP school districts.

A chart was displayed comparing FY24 starting wages for the positions of paraeducators and food service workers in each of the three school districts within SAU 41 as well as FY25 starting wages once the Brookline school district increase is applied.

Financial Details of the third and fourth years of the contract are as follows: wages-step increase +4% for a cost of \$37,141 in year 3 and \$46,043 in year 4 and the \$1,475 year 3 cost associated with one additional paraeducator day prior to student first day. Original totals for years 3 and 4 were \$38,616 and \$46,043, respectively. The warrant article proposes FY25 and FY26 additional increases of \$93,370 and \$7,100. The result is a total increased cost of \$131,986 for year 3 and \$53,143 for year 4.

No further discussion was offered on Article 2.

Article 2 will be placed on the official ballot as written.

Article 3 – Operating Budget

To see if the Brookline School District will vote to 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 **\$11,970,361**. Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be **\$11,771,665**, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the 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. Majority vote required to pass. **The School Board recommends this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee recommends this article 3-0-0.**

Estimated Tax Impact: \$6.99/\$1,000

MOTION MADE BY COLLEEN MICAVICH TO MOVE ARTICLE 3 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED BY ALYSON MANION

ON THE QUESTION

Andrew Corey, Superintendent, SAU41, stated the proposed FY25 operating budget of \$11,970,361 represents an increase of \$445,574 or 3.9% over the FY24 approved operating budget of \$11,524,787. Key changes include an increase of \$44,190 in the area of academics, \$122,492 for regular education personnel, \$136,086 for special education personnel, \$42,390 for computer equipment replacement \$5,000 for shared services/software, and \$28,000 for facilities/safety.

Highlighted were major changes, which include reductions, based on program needs, in the areas of special education contracted services (\$135,112), special education out-of-district tuition (\$113,843), and special education out-of-district services (\$41,122). Increases, based on program needs, are in the areas of special education new positions \$136,086, special education transportation \$69,876, and special education teachers/paras \$37,780 as well as increases, per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), in the areas of classroom teachers (salary increases as well as 1 new teacher) \$246,191 and teacher retirement of \$39,552. In addition, an increase of \$38,019 is based on the Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) of increase (18.6%) for health insurance costs.

The default budget is the FY24 adopted operating budget of \$11,524,787 plus \$271,004, which represents the required by law or contracted increases, less one-time FY24 expenses in the amount of \$24,126 for a total FY25 default budget of \$11,771,665.

The required by law or contracted increases were identified as \$219,886 for wages/benefits (already approved), \$77,318 for health/dental/FICA/NHRS, \$8,400 for regular education transportation and \$1,828 for regular education contracted services. Decreases were identified as \$36,428 for special education services/transportation.

The difference between the proposed and default operating budgets is \$198,696. Were the default budget to come into play, potential cuts include teaching positions (1.5 FTE), which would result in increased class sizes (\$135,788), Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum (\$15,000), MTSS Social Worker/Behavior Specialist (\$14,992), and playground safety upgrades (\$25,000).

Noted was that the PTO donated \$50,000 towards the playground at the Captain Samuel Douglass Academy (CSDA). The \$25,000 proposed allocation would be added to the donation. That total amount would outfit the new playground.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Had posed a question to the Administration concerning the default budget and how the raises for the principals are not under contract but were included in the default budget. He asked if a response was available.

Superintendent Corey responded that an email was sent noting the \$7,916 was deducted from the default budget amount, which is why the amount stated differs from that identified in the presentation material. Although the administrators have contracts next year, their raises have not been approved. Under the requirements for a default budget, those amounts do not qualify to be included.

MOTION MADE BY ERIC PAUER TO AMEND THE PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET TO A TOTAL OF ELEVEN MILLION SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED SIXTY-SEVEN DOLLARS (\$11,062,367)
MOTION SECONDED BY JACQUELINE WACHOWSKI

ON THE QUESTION

Mr. Pauer spoke of being familiar with how schools operate. He and a small group of citizens scrutinized the budget to determine where cuts could be made. The tax rate has increased. The school district represents about 38% of the tax bill.

Twenty nine line items were identified for reductions ranging from \$132,000 down to \$149.00. None of the proposed reductions are within special education services as it is understood those services are required by law.

If comparing this to three years prior, the total proposed spending for FY25 will represent an increase of 22.4%. Enrollment has been down for two years. The New England School Development Council (NESDEC) projects enrollment will increase slightly next year (1.7%). The proposed reduction of \$907,994 represents a modest 4% decrease from the proposed budget.

With this amendment, total spending is still up 13.7% over the past three years. Most taxpayers experienced a 14% or more property tax increase this past year. We simply don't have the unlimited ability to pay. We must separate wants from needs. Schools make up most of the spending and the Brookline School District is 38% with the COOP being 41%. A modest reduction in spending is needed to keep property taxes on a more sustainable path.

Robert Rushton, 19 Flint Meadow Drive

One of the things not stated in the presentation was that for the tax money we expend we receive services. Those services, to the credit of our school district, are generally provided on a fairly cost-effective basis. When you talk about reducing the budget to below the levels recommended by both the School Board and Finance Committee, you are looking correspondingly at a reduction in services. In that case, where are your services going to be reduced? What is that going to do to the quality of education that we see in our schools? Before we vote for this amendment that is worthy of great consideration.

Melanie Levesque, 2 McDaniels Drive

Is opposed to the amendment. Believes the School Board to be very conservative with their budgets. Sees a larger problem as the education savings accounts that take money away from all our citizens to pay for private and home schools. They are taking money away from us and now we are taking money away from our students.

Ed Perry, 4 Muscatanipus Road

Is opposed to the proposed amendment. When talking about a 4% reduction in the budget you come into an unrealistic situation. If you look at it as a business, you think about the necessities you need to run your business. If suddenly you were to reduce your budget by 4% it would mean losing staff, cutting back on

programs and it would lead to losses in your overall finances. You couldn't even run your business flat because with inflation you would be running with 2023 money trying to pay 2024 bills.

He agrees with the previous speaker that we have a very conservative school board. He is a little disappointed to see that it is only about a \$200,000 increase when you take out the items that are state mandated. We live in a town where every so often he wonders if he is still in a first world country because we hear people arguing on these budget cuts and it comes down to whether we keep a math program or put a fire panel in that the fire chief has recommended. When we look at our town makeup, 1/3 of our town is under the age of 18. Two thirds of this town is connected to the schools.

The taxes you pay are connected to the service you came here for. As those things start to be reduced year after year with flat or declining budgets you will see people stop wanting to move here. He is uncertain what else you would sell Brookline on. There are trees and trails everywhere in the state. Our unique advantage is our education system. This is the backbone of our town and our chief selling point to grow and sustain this town for everyone.

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

One of the issues stated was that the budget has increased some 20-30% over the past several years. He asked what impact inflation has had on the general cost, which cannot be avoided. The cost of goods and services has increased 30-40%. If the school district budget is not increasing by that amount, we are spending less than the impact of inflation.

He has commented on support staff wages in the past, questioning whether we are competitive with Dunkin Donuts. The answer was no. We ended up costing ourselves money because we were short-sighted on wages for support staff. That is what gets cut when we decide to knock \$900,000 out of the budget just because.

Katherine Elkins, 95 Mason Road

Requested the ability to read something on behalf of a taxpayer who was unable to be in attendance.

Moderator Webb questioned the will of the Legislative Body.

There being no objection, the following was read into the record:

"Carol Schreck, 292 Route 13

When addressing school budgets, we each must ask what are we asking of our schools and are we willing or not to give them the resources they need to do so. In addition to teaching, our schools, teachers, and administrators have been called upon to fix and attend to more and more of our town's social and economic problems; mental health, addiction, homelessness, abuse, bullying, hunger. We continue to ask administrators and teachers to accomplish more than we as a community have sometimes been unable or unwilling to address.

A strong public education system is essential to the town's individual and collective wellbeing. It develops good citizens, and as we know is a foundation of our local economy. High performing schools directly support higher property values. The math is there.

So why aren't we giving the schools the resources they need to continue to be high performers? I am not a parent, and yet I fully support the proposed budget."

Speaking on her own behalf, Ms. Elkins stated she would oppose the amendment completely. She trusts the school board and finance committee and would like to see the proposed budget move forward at the full amount.

Jesse Bassett, 8 Rock Ramond Road

In the difference between the requested and default budget of about \$200,000, there was the loss of 1.5 full time educators. With an additional loss of \$500,000, what would the impacts be? He understands what would be cut is a decision of the school board but was hoping to have an idea of the potential cuts.

Superintendent Corey responded at that magnitude of a cut of \$900,000, we would have to go into personnel. That would impact class sizes, and in some ways impact regular education students more than special education students as costs associated with special education are guaranteed under the law. He would have to look at classroom teachers and those types of services, which would probably elevate the student teacher ratio in each of the classrooms. We would try to avoid those cuts because class size matters, but at the same time, with that dollar amount there would be no way to avoid it.

Diana Korczynski, 5 Wallace Brook Road

Supports the budget as proposed by the school board. She spoke of the identification of the position of MTSS social worker/behavioral specialist as a potential cut should the default budget come into play and asked that the benefits gained by that position be discussed.

Superintendent Corey stated the Brookline School District does not presently have that position. The COOP School District does. In their second year there, they have seen the position assist families greatly as they go through crisis; dealing with students or families that are in crisis. They have a skillset in terms of counseling background and professional training that really allows them to deliver more of what he would call wrap-around services and work with other agencies in the communities that can assist folks that are truly struggling.

What is included in the proposed budget is about 400 hours as a pilot to see how that impacts on our elementary schools. The issue will be revisited with the school board to see if we look at adding that position in the future.

Ms. Korczynski asked for confirmation that the reason we think that is needed is based on current reality, e.g., have seen cases where we feel that to be beneficial. Superintendent Corey responded that coming out of COVID has been very difficult for a number of our families and a number of our students. We are seeing children, younger than he can recall in his 40 years of doing this, talking about suicide and harming themselves. That is not a topic, as a parent, that we are often prepared for. This person provides a level of expertise to assist our families as they deal with those issues. We have also seen increases in unkind behavior, e.g., the words we use, the things we say. That is really impacting our students because they hear the word but developmentally they don't know what the word means. As a result, we are dealing with more and more of those types of issues.

Lynn Powers, 2 Parker Road

Is opposed to the proposed amendment. As a real estate agent in town and a parent with 2 children in the school system, she has a unique perspective. Her initial reaction is yes taxes are increasing. From her day-to-day experiences of moving people to town, she can state that 95% of the time they are moving here because of our school system. A decrease in the school budget would hurt that standing. As a parent, she knows there are already some areas where things are lacking in the schools. Principal Molinari has stood in as a substitute when needed when he should be doing things at a much higher level. In addition to students that need special education, we need programs in place for those students needing accelerated math and/or reading programs. Cutting the budget further will remove services for those students who could benefit from additional help as well.

Johanna Shriver-Halligan, 17 Birch Hill Road

Is opposed to the proposed amendment. This is a very conservative budget. In furtherance of what the Superintendent has stated around social workers in schools, she can provide the perfect example; her family is about to face a traumatic death and her daughter is preverbal (4 years old) and is having a very hard time processing that. As a therapist, she can help her at home, but she cannot be with her at school and her teachers have other students they need to help as well. She believes it to be an excellent idea to have a social worker in that school who can really help the students who are struggling to understand really big things like death and grief.

As the Superintendent stated regarding cutting of personnel, last year in the preschool there were 13 students with 1 teacher. You could not have paid her enough to be the teacher of that classroom. They did an amazing job managing that class, but that is a lot of kids with a lot of needs. Without the staff and paras they had she does not know it would have been such a successful year. She wished for taxpayers to think about it from that approach; our kids are the ones going through the system.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Wished to make the point that the amendment would change the proposed budget. The number he provided would be the proposed budget and the voters would decide whether they want the proposed budget from this Deliberative Session or the default budget. The default budget is still a 2.2% increase. Let the voters decide on election day to have a real choice between a 2.2% increase and a modest 4% decrease. He stated a secret ballot had been requested.

Moderator Webb noted if five (5) voters, who are present, ask for a secret ballot we are obligated to do so.

He requested those who requested a secret ballot stand to be counted. Six (6) individuals stood to be recognized.

Steve Saccoccio, 57 Laurelcrest Drive

Having heard comments about the conservative nature of the school board, he wished to learn of some of the things that were excluded from the proposed budget.

School Board Vice Chair Micavich noted the items that were discussed and excluded are documented in the minutes of the past meetings. She did not have them in front of her but could speak to the growing preschool. There was a request by the administration to add administrative staff to deal with that. The decision was made not to, understanding that taxpayers are struggling financially. Unfortunately for the Director of Student Services, she will continue in that role in addition to the responsibilities of her position.

She spoke of the multiple rounds of discussion on the budget and how with each round, items were removed. There are things that would benefit students and it is difficult to make such cuts. The budget discussions begin in August and are part of each meeting.

Mr. Saccoccio questioned what the initial figure (dream number) was if \$11,970,000 is the hard fought conservative number. Vice Chair Micavich stated there never was a dream number presented because the administration doesn't ever present a dream number. They present the first number.

Mr. Saccoccio asked what the first number was. Superintendent Corey stated the first number associated with new item requests totaled \$852,027. That came down over the four rounds of discussion to \$378,158. Reduced were academic items (although efforts are made to avoid that as much as possible), maintenance items, and a number of personnel areas that were either reduced or eliminated. There were requests to move the librarian to full time, which we did not do. There were requests to move a secretary to full time, which was not done. The MTSS social worker was reduced by about \$10,000 from where we started. We had a maintenance position that was shared across the SAU that was removed from the budget. We delayed the purchase of iPads for the kindergarten, etc.

Kelly Zakar, School Board Member, noted the agenda for the December 20, 2024 Joint Meeting with the Finance Committee includes identification of items removed from the new item requests. One of the items removed in the first round related to the renovations of the bathrooms in this building. There are gaps in the doorframes that allow one to see through the stalls. Those bathrooms are used by students and adults. Replacing classroom floors was removed, etc.

She spoke of the discussions that have occurred over the past several months and of members of the school board having felt strapped by the tax cap. It does limit the ability to have accelerated services or enrichment services for students who may need a bit more than the general education being provided, foreign languages, etc.

Mr. Saccoccio spoke of those items being wants not needs.

School Board Member Zakar commented that the board truly tried to present the taxpayers with a minimal increase. A review of the materials provided with agendas and the minutes from the past few months will highlight the administrators never ask for pie in the sky items. It is not like they pad the first round so that we can cut it down.

Mr. Saccoccio commented that everything is padded at some point. That is just reality. Coming up on his 20th year as a public employee he is aware of what he refers to as doing more with less. That has been his experience for the entirety of his career. He spoke of the input provided around situations such as Principal Molinari having to fill in as a substitute. He believes Principal Molinari to be a fantastic gentleman and is very happy with Principal Molinari and the preschool, but he understands that as a top level administrator you are

called upon to not only be an expert on all the positions that report to you but be able to fill in when necessary. That is what government work is; you are always going to be asked to do more with less.

A school is a government building. The bathrooms are not going to be granite and polished, etc. The bathroom does not make the education of the school better. He is glad to see items like that removed from the budget. Do kindergarten students need iPads?

Stefanie Gray, 24 West Hill Road

Is opposed to the proposed amendment. The default budget is the absolute bare minimum. We are scraping by with what we are required to do. She would hate to think of Brookline as a bare minimum type of town. She does not want her child in a bare minimum education system. She understands taxes have increased and it doesn't feel good to anybody. This town is going to need those kids to be educated, involved engaged, and they are going to want them to be a part of this community. When you give the bare minimum that is what you get in return. If our schools are not serving our children, our children will not serve our community.

Home values and everything else are completely tied to this type of behavior. If we don't support them at this stage we will lose it all.

As a parent whose child is coming to this school next year, she wished to say she is 100% certain everyone deserves 100% privacy in that bathroom. That is not really a want.

MOTION MADE BY JOSEPH HARTMAN TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED
MOTION CARRIED

Moderator Webb stated discussion would be closed following input provided by those already standing to be recognized.

Kacie Petrin-Ellis, 7 Smith Road

Is opposed to the amendment. She questioned if the original \$24,000 for the MTSS position itself was a conservative estimate based on the needs.

Superintendent Corey responded he does believe that to have been a conservative estimate. The original number was based on an hourly rate to get the position into the building. Although he believes proof of concept is already there, from a tax point of view, the desire was to integrate the position to see how it fits into the structure. The data gained from the position within the COOP indicates it has served us very well. The individual has positively impacted more students than he would have identified.

Ms. Petrin-Ellis asked if this is typically a position found in other school districts in the state. Superintendent Corey responded it depends on the district, but it is becoming more and more common.

Ms. Petrin-Ellis commented that her child has experienced some issues. There was mention of COVID having impacted some social emotional needs and she does think there is a need for an MTSS specialist that is beyond 400 hours. She believes there to be likely many other parents who would echo her sentiments. As a

government employee she knows every year our budgets are getting cut, we are operating under continuing resolutions, told to do more with less, but these are children. We can't cut when it comes to our children.

Talking about the math specialist, a lot of children fall off around 4th grade and beyond. We need strong math skills in our elementary schools. She personally thinks we have a need for a full-time MTSS and would be interested in the Board considering that in the future.

John Liska, 197 Route 13

Is a businessman. Right now, our economy is in the bottom. There are a lot of things he would like to buy but cannot. We cut back. We just cannot keep spending. He sees businesses going under. All he hears is the need for more. You can't take something from nothing. Let's start trying to bring it down.

The amendment calls for a modest 2% increase over the prior budget. There are ways we can cut to keep things afloat rather than hurting people and causing them to lose their homes.

Moderator Webb noted the discussion to be ended and that those present would now vote on the amendment by paper ballot.

Moderator Webb noted those present and wishing to have the opportunity to cast their votes have been afforded that opportunity.

Moderator Webb questioned the will of the legislative body regarding moving forward with Article 4 while the ballots are counted.

The majority of the Legislative Body indicated a desire to move forward.

Article 4 – SAU Budget

Shall the voters of the Brookline School District adopt a school administrative unit budget of \$2,377,762 for the forthcoming fiscal year in which **\$473,655** is assigned to the school budget of this school district? This year's adjusted budget of \$2,356,823 with \$469,484 assigned to the school budget of this school district will be adopted if the article does not receive a majority vote of all the school district voters voting in this school administrative unit. **The School Board recommends this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee recommends this article 1-2-0.**

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.41/\$1,000

**MOTION MADE BY COLLEEN MICAVICH TO MOVE ARTICLE 4 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED BY ALYSON MANION**

ON THE QUESTION

School Board Vice Chair Micavich stated the proposed FY25 budget (\$2,434,995) represents an increase of \$166,621 or 7.4% over the FY24 approved budget (\$2,268,374).

The FY25 adjusted budget, should that come into play would be \$2,386,056.

Major budget drivers include salaries (increase over FY24 of \$81,980) and benefits (increase of \$70,839). The details for the increase in salaries identified \$37,962 for Board approved salary adjustments for FY24, \$20,033 merit bonus pool increase based on historical trend, and 3% salary increases. The details of the increase in benefits were identified as the GMR for health (18.7%) and dental (4.7%). The Brookline School District is responsible for 20% of the SAU budget.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Spoke of the SAU budget process noting that during the month of December, the Governing Board, which is made up of the members of the three school districts, approves a budget. Taxpayers are provided with the options of the proposed and adjusted budget. This SAU has really been spending a lot of money. This year the proposed increase is 7.4%. In the past 3 years it has increased 21.5% while enrollment, K-12, has increased by 1%. It is clearly not based on enrollment.

Our Superintendent is the 2nd highest paid in the state. The highest paid Superintendent in Oyster River is going to be retiring. Our Superintendent will likely then be the highest paid in the state; out of 133 Superintendents. That includes large cities such as Manchester, Nashua, and Concord. At \$196,174, if this budget passes.

For every student in the SAU this is a lot of overhead. We have a warrant article coming up to look at what it would take to get out of the SAU for this district. In the meantime, he wants people to realize part of the reason the tax rates are increasing is this budget.

For Brookline residents we are paying for the Brookline district but also the COOP district which is apportioned to both communities.

He agrees with the Finance Committee and would vote no on the article so that the adjusted budget is what is passed.

Tom Solon, 2 Shady Rock Road

Is a member of the COOP School Board and Chairperson of the SAU 41 Governing Board. He wished to clarify that the SAU budget represents about 4% of the entirety of the SAU 41 budget (3 districts and SAU). It is probably one of the most cost-effective elements of our entire operation. Because we have the SAU we can consolidate activities and share them among the three different school districts.

Our Superintendent is well paid as far as a Superintendent in the state. He is also one of the people with the most seniority in the state. He is a leader not only at the state but regional level and is called upon to provide input on a national stage because of the leadership that he has provided for us and perhaps more importantly the quality of the staff that he has been able to assemble and build so that when he does retire in a little over a year from now he leaves a legacy that will be able to continue the excellence that we have been able to enjoy.

He wished to point out that a lot of the questions that come up when looking at the SAU budget pertain to issue such as the merit bonus. Many of those bonuses are used as a type of compensation to help people who have been backfilling for unfilled positions. One of the problems that we have in our SAU, like our district, is that the pay scale is relatively low compared to commercial pay scales. When looking for people with the type of

administrative and business backgrounds, we are competing with industry in the area. That is a lot of what has been driving our salaries; to remain competitive, attract and retain qualified people. Whether we like it or not, the school is a business.

Moderator Webb questioned the will of the Legislative Body regarding the announcement of the votes cast in the secret ballot.

Having expressed the desire for the outcome of the votes to be identified, Moderator Webb stated the results on the motion to amend to be 28 in the affirmative and 60 in the negative.

Moderator Webb questioned the will of the Legislative Body regarding continuing the discussion on Article 4. The vote being in the affirmative, the discussion on Article 4 continued.

Steve Saccoccio, 57 Laurelcrest Drive

One of the slides shown referred to the merit bonus increase based on historical trend. He takes issue with that as at this time we are dealing with costs increasing all around. Anything based on past historical trends of increases should be thrown out. We're living in new times with new financial hurdles. He encouraged others to strike down the proposed article and go with the adjusted budget.

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

**MOTION MADE BY JOSEPH HARTMAN TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY TRACY PERRY
MOTION CARRIED**

No further discussion was offered on Article 4.

Article 4 will be placed on the official ballot as written.

Returning to the discussion of Article 3, noted was the motion to amend the amount of the operating budget to \$11,062,367 failed.

**MOTION MADE BY ERIC PAUER TO AMEND THE PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET TO A
TOTAL OF ELEVEN MILLION FIVE HUNDRED FORTY-THREE THOUSAND FORTY-SEVEN
DOLLARS (\$11,543,047)
MOTION SECONDED BY TOM DURAND**

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

This would bring the proposed operating budget down by approximately \$427,000. It still represents an increase of 0.2% from this year's operating budget. Even with this amendment, total spending is still 18.3% over the past 3 years. It won't provide a property tax reduction, but it won't result in a property tax increase. It would keep property taxes level.

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

**MOTION MADE BY JOSEPH HARTMAN TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY KELLY ZAKAR
MOTION CARRIED**

Vote on the motion to amend
MOTION FAILED

**MOTION MADE BY JOSEPH HARTMAN TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY KELLY ZAKAR
MOTION CARRIED**

Vote on the motion to approve Article 3 (in the total amount of \$11,970,361).

MOTION CARRIED

Article 3 will be placed on the official ballot as stated.

Article 5 – School Facilities Maintenance Trust

To see if the school district will vote to raise and appropriate a sum of up to **\$156,000** to be added to the previously established School Facilities Maintenance Trust Fund from the June 30th unassigned fund balance (surplus). **The School Board recommends this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee recommends this article 3-0-0.**

Estimated Tax Impact: Foregoing a potential rate reduction: \$0.13/\$1,000

**MOTION BY COLLEEN MICAVICH TO MOVE ARTICLE 5 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED BY KELLY ZAKAR**

ON THE QUESTION

Superintendent Corey stated the School Facilities Maintenance Trust Fund to be the format used to maintain the buildings. Presently the FY24 balance is \$30,657. The proposed FY25 allocation is \$156,000 and proposed FY25 expenditures \$106,000, which would result in an FY25 ending balance of \$80,657.

The proposed uses for FY25 and their estimated costs were identified. The intercom/bells/phone system at RMMS has reached the end of useful life (EOL). The \$45,000 expenditure would address year 1 of a two-year project. Phase 3 of door frame replacements at CSDA has an estimated cost of \$10,000. The RMMS kitchen area roof replacement (EOL) is estimated at \$25,000. The panic/burglar alarm replacement at CSDA (EOL) is estimated at \$15,000. The exterior camera to increase coverage at RMMS is listed as \$7,000, and the main office flooring replacement (EOL) at CSDA at \$4,000.

The Maintenance Trust is utilized annually as a mechanism to address smaller maintenance items.

MOTION MADE TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION ON ARTICLES 3 AND 4
MOTION SECONDED
MOTION CARRIED

MOTION MADE BY ERIC PAUER TO AMEND ARTICLE 5 BY REDUCING THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION TO A SUM OF UP TO SEVENTY-SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$76,000)
MOTION SECONDED BY JOHN LISKA

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

The tax impact is \$0.13/\$1,000. Every little bit adds up when you are paying the taxes and getting more for an increase. This motion brings it down to about half of what was requested, but still lets them have enough money to perform all the planned projects with some funds remaining.

Katherine Elkins, 95 Mason Road

Asked for clarification the intent is to add \$156,000 and utilize \$106,000 in FY25, which would result in a surplus. Superintendent Corey stated the guaranteed items the district intends to do have been identified, which would result in an approximate surplus of \$50,000. When added to the current balance of \$30,657, the ending balance for FY25 is projected to be \$80,657. Those funds would be available for an unanticipated expenditure, e.g., should a boiler fail, etc. The surplus provides the school board with some flexibility with regard to maintenance to address things that could come up.

He explained, when we start the budget process, we are 18 months away from when we will implement the budget. Identified are the priorities, but it cannot be known if a maintenance item of more urgency will become apparent next week which would change everything.

Jesse Bassett, 8 Rock Ramond Road

The explanation provided indicates the funding source comes from the June 30th unassigned fund balance (surplus). He asked what would occur with the surplus that would not be used for this purpose should the proposed amendment pass.

Superintendent Corey stated if there is not \$156,000 in surplus, we only fund up to the available amount. If we reduce it to the \$75,000 and there remain funds in surplus, those funds would be returned to the tax base and used to reduce the amount that must be raised through taxation to support the budget.

Mr. Bassett asked if there are items identified that would not be achievable were the amendment to pass. Superintendent Corey stated there would not be any cushion available were an unanticipated maintenance issue arise.

If something were to fail resulting in a cost that must be incurred, given the district cannot utilize the funds earmarked for special education (expenses are mandated), the funds would have to come from the general education line items within the budget. What those line items will be cannot be known until the administration sits down with the School Board with an understanding of what failed, and the cost involved.

School Board Member Zakar commented during the first three rounds of budget discussion, some of the items that were removed and/or delayed include items such as tree removal. Having removed the \$4,500 for tree removal, should there be a heavy windstorm that causes a tree to fall on a roof the result could be a much larger expense. If the rain basin at CSDA (\$5,00 repair cost removed from the budget) causes flooding, we would have to have a special school district meeting (at a cost to the taxpayers) and have people come out once again to vote for funding for these unforeseen expenses. The point of having this trust fund is so that those who you have elected to represent you can decide in a timely manner to utilize these funds for an unforeseen maintenance or facility issue.

MOTION FAILED

No further discussion was offered on Article 5.

Article 5 will be placed on the official ballot as written.

Article 6 – Petition Warrant Article

To prevent taxpayer dollars from funding lobbyists, shall the Brookline School District zero out budget line item “Dues” 10.2310.810.00? **The School Board does NOT recommend this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee does NOT recommend this article 1-0-2.**

**MOTION TO MOVE ARTICLE 6 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED**

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

At least two dues and organizations have been lumped together here; the New Hampshire School Boards Association (NHSBA) and the New Hampshire School Administrators Association. Both of those organizations do lobby with our taxpayer dollars up in Concord. Part of that is used for training and part is used for lobbying. They do not let us split it out. The only way we can stop the lobbying is by zeroing out this line item so that it cannot be used. He recommended the article as he does not believe anyone should have taxpayer dollars funding lobbyists.

MOTION MADE BY TOM SOLON TO AMEND TO READ: “TO END MEMBERSHIP IN THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, SHALL THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT ZERO OUT BUDGET LINE ITEM “DUES” 10.2310.810.00?

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Tom Solon, 2 Shady Rock Road

As Mr. Pauer stated, the main thing that this line item funds is membership in the NHSBA. It is only the Brookline portion of the dues as it is funded collectively as an SAU. This would end Brookline’s participation in that association, which as Mr. Pauer said provides training, legal services at no additional cost, and a large

variety of services, but they do gather and accept member input on areas where the membership would like advocacy done at the state legislative level. He understands what the intent is, but he wishes the article to be clear about what would be eliminated.

Ed Perry, 4 Muscatanipus Road

Supports the amendment to clarify the language as voters should understand that is what would occur. Anyone who hasn't served in any capacity in town might not know, but the people who do this are the same as the people who coach the soccer team. They realize that nobody else is going to serve, they raise their hand, and the next thing they know they are spending their nights and weekends away from their loved ones. They are sitting in cold town office buildings and are arguing over money. It is not fun. You do it because you care about the town. The limited amount of resources that you have so that you don't make big mistakes is these associations. We can ask basic legal questions. If we lose those resources, it is very likely we will start to make some critical mistakes. Anyone who has been paying attention to the way things have been going in town lately, legal mistakes cost a lot of money, millions of dollars. People should understand that if we are going to restrict these dues, we are going to lose all those services. It should be very clear to people that this isn't just to prevent lobbying, which is just one thing that they do.

To speak to the point of lobbying, I hope they are lobbying. I hope they are lobbying in Concord all the time because this is Concord's fault. The reason why our taxes are so high is because of the way Concord has chosen to fund our schools. There are two funding mechanisms going on. One is Concord reaches into our right pocket for our contribution and then they sneak into our left pocket and take their contribution. If they could end that and start to have taxes and fees that are spread out across other groups that do not impact us all the same way we could alleviate that tax burden. You are not going to do that going to these meetings talking to volunteers who are trying to make \$1.00 out of \$0.15. That is not going to happen. Go and lobby Concord and hopefully there are others who know how to do it who are doing it on your behalf.

MOTION MADE BY JOSEPH HARTMAN TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED
MOTION CARRIED

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Is concerned about the amendment and the interpretation that it is not changing subject matter. He believes it is changing the subject matter as there is nothing talking about lobbyists in the new language. To him it is not a valid amendment.

Moderator Webb stated that to be a judgement call noting under SB2, the Legislative Body is not permitted to eliminate the subject matter. If we have a Petition Warrant Article that raises the issue of zeroing out dues, we cannot change it to zero out something else. That is changing the subject matter. The issue that has been asked for in the petition is to zero out the line item in the budget. That is not changing. The preamble is changing. He does not believe the motion on the floor eliminates the subject matter. Therefore, he will allow it.

Chris Adams, 10 Sargent Road

If changing this, we need to list all the dues that are included in this line item.

Moderator Webb noted there is a motion on the floor that must first be dispensed with.

The Administration clarified the line item is strictly for the NHSBA dues.

Vote on the motion to amend.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY BRENDAN DENEHY TO AMEND BY INSERTING THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE ARTICLE: “THE DELIBERATIVE SESSION DISCUSSED THIS ARTICLE AND DOES NOT RECOMMEND IT.”

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Attorney Johnston stated her opinion, it is not a proper amendment. It does not go directly to the subject matter; it is explanatory material. It is not part of the subject matter of the article. The Moderator does not agree. This is simply her opinion.

Moderator Webb stated the rules to be that the Legislative Body (those taxpayers in attendance) can vote on anything. Whether it is legal or ineffective, the process in this legislation before us is such that you make the rule you want to make although they may ultimately prove, were counsel to be correct, to be ineffective. He wished to err on the side of letting the Legislative Body deal with the proposed amendment.

Cindy LaCroix, Chair, Brookline Finance Committee, stated last year when we had a very similar petition warrant article, we had a debate on justification; explanation versus subject matter. She believes after the long discussion, you go to the ballot and there is a question in front of you, do you approve this or not approve this. There is not an explanation on the ballot. Adding an explanation to the subject she believes was debated at length last year. The subject is what is on the ballot. You don't walk in with your ballot with an explanation as to why something is being proposed.

School Board Member Zakar stated her recollection last year article 8 was the same, and at the Deliberative Session it was amended to read “to prevent taxpayer dollars from funding the Brookline School District’s portion of the SAU 41’s membership in the New Hampshire School Boards Association, shall the Brookline School District zero out the budget line item Dues?” Although not a legal expert, she wished to express that we have been through this before and have clarified the language so that the voters will understand exactly what they are voting for.

Moderator Webb stated his distinct opinion is that the law is clear you cannot eliminate the subject matter. Beyond that you can amend it. Based on that, he would stand by his opinion that it is a permissible addition that does not change the subject matter.

Brendan Denehy, 31 Mason Road

The reason for adding this language, in his opinion, is that the previous articles that were presented by the School Board, this body is allowed to discuss and amend, and the voters get the benefit of this Deliberative

Session's work on those articles. His purpose in adding this language would be to provide the voter at the ballot with the benefit of the opinion coming out of the Deliberative Session.

Clarence Skidmore, 42 Oak Hill Road

Believes this is an egregious offense to the voters. It is not our position or purpose to put our opinion in an article.

Moderator Webb stated we have been engaged in the process of amending and that is changing, and we are entitled to change and to add the majority opinion to these articles. You are mistaken if you think they cannot do that.

Mr. Skidmore clarified he does not think it is a good idea to put into the language of a warrant article that the members here don't recommend it. He has never seen that in an article.

Moderator Webb stated in every town meeting we have the recommendation of the Finance Committee and Select Board.

Mr. Skidmore continued by stating he was talking about the language of the article. Moderator Webb stated we are talking about the ballot and the only inhibition under the law is you may not eliminate the language. This SB2 situation means that however outrageous the subject matter might be it goes to the voters. The law is quite clear that this deliberative body can futz with the language and do with it what they want so long as they don't eliminate the subject matter. That is the law whether we like it or not.

Mr. Skidmore questioned the opinion of legal counsel. Attorney Johnston stated her opinion it is not a proper amendment. She went on to say, "but it is your meeting not hers".

Mr. Skidmore stated he opposes the amendment because he agrees with legal counsel. He does not think it proper to amend an article in that manner. By doing so, he believes this body in suggesting that we don't recommend this is egregious to the other voters in town.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Is opposed to the amendment believing it crosses the line. The RSAs are clear that recommendations are only supposed to be from a governing body or a budget committee or a non-advisory budget committee. When we start putting in what a deliberative session thinks that really is going over the line. He believes this would set a bad precedent.

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

Opposes the amendment. Agrees with making a warrant article clear.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Is this meeting a governing body?

Moderator Webb explained this is called the Legislative Body. The Governing Board is your school board or selectmen depending on what meeting you are at.

Linda Saari, 7 Meetinghouse Hill Road

Disagrees with the amendment. Everything that gets on the ballot is something that went through the Deliberative Session, so you don't need to say that the Deliberative Session agrees with it. They let it go to the voters in a certain form. That is what we should do.

MOTION FAILED

Cindy LaCroix, Chair, Brookline Finance Committee, remarked this line item totals \$4,000. Superintendent Corey stated that to be correct.

Jesse Bassett, 8 Rock Ramond Road

Asked if the bold text is part of the article, e.g., the schoolboard does not recommend. ...”, Moderator Webb stated in town meeting that would be read. It would be a part of what is in front of the voter. He continued by stating he honestly cannot recall if that is on the ballot also.

School Board Member Zakar stated the recommendation does appear on the ballot.

No further discussion was offered on Article 6.

Article 6 will be placed on the official ballot as amended.

Article 7 – Petition Warrant Article

Shall the school district rescind the provisions of RSA 198:20-b “Appropriation for Unanticipated Funds Made Available During Year” so that the school board is required to hold a public hearing to accept or expend unanticipated money? **The School Board does NOT recommend this article 4-0-0.**

**MOTION MADE TO MOVE ARTICLE 7 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED**

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

A few years prior the voters provided the authority to the School Board to expend funds without holding a public hearing. This article would rescind that authority. He believes it has been changed by the legislature whereby amounts under \$20,000 don't require a public hearing. We gave a blanket authority. This would take that authority back for transparency so with large amounts coming in through grants etc. we would have a public hearing when monies come in and are expended.

Attorney Johnston wished to clarify the process under the Statute is the school board is allowed to apply for, accept, and expend unanticipated revenue. Any amount above \$20,000, they must hold a public hearing before doing that. It is below \$20,000 that it is optional.

Tom Solon, 2 Shady Rock Road

Especially considering the clarification provided that it is small dollar amounts, the main reason for this was for expedience and cost savings. Having a hearing every time an expendable amount needs to be address on these small amounts is very time consuming, frequent, and costly especially in these days when there is a lot of pressure to apply for grants and obtain funding from sources other than the local taxpayers. This would mean that if the district received a grant of \$150 to pay for a speaker to come and present, a hearing would have to be conducted to spend that money to pay from that funding source. We did it out of courtesy and value of the time of our board members, community members and administrators, and he believes it continues to be a wise thing to extend that courtesy for these low dollar amounts.

Attorney Johnston wished to provide further clarification that the effect of rescinding the authority would not require a hearing to be held before any money was accepted. It would require that the school board come back to the annual meeting and put it on the warrant. It would have to be part of the warrant articles. There would be no ability to accept or expend unanticipated money during the middle of the year.

School Board Member Manion questioned if that would include donations by the PTO and was told it would.

Unidentified Female Speaker

Asked what the impact would be if the school board is not allowed to accept funds. Superintendent Corey provided the example of the Administration having applied for state security grant funding. Both RMMS and CSDA have been awarded \$100,000. He would not be able to meet the state timetable and ultimately that money would have to go back to the state. Money that is going to be used for safety pieces in the buildings would be turned back.

Unidentified Female Speaker

Asked for clarification the process could be if unable to utilize such funds and having to turn them back, the necessary funds may come to the taxpayers through the next budget?

Superintendent Corey stated there to be a high potential for that.

Ann Webb, 48 Mason Road

Questioned a motion to amend to read "The school district shall not rescind the provisions of RSA 198:20-b....."

Moderator Webb stated that could not be done as the law says we cannot eliminate the subject matter and the courts have ruled interpreting that to mean you cannot say "no". You cannot say "not".

School Board Member Zakar asked what recourse the Legislative Body has if an article, as written, is not legally correct. Her understanding from legal counsel is it would not be rescinding the provisions under RSA 198:20-b, would not require the school board to hold a public hearing it would require the school board to place the funding on the annual district warrant. If the article is not factually correct do we have to put it on the ballot as submitted by the petitioner?

Moderator Webb stated the article could be fixed by an amendment. Theoretically, if it were not amended it has to go forward even though it were a nullity under the law or illegal under the law.

Attorney Johnston stated she reviewed this in advance and discussed it with some of her colleagues. The effect of this would be to rescind authority to apply for, accept and expend unanticipated money during the year. The fact that the description is inaccurate we don't think would change the fact that it would rescind the authority.

School Board Member Zakar remarked as a district we try to gain grant funds to reduce the taxpayer burden. If she understands Mr. Pauer's intent, he is trying to be fiscally responsible and decrease the burden on the taxpayers, but it seems like the unintended consequences if this article were to pass would be to potentially increase the burden on taxpayers.

Judy Cook, 10 Main Street

Does not understand why we are wasting time on these articles that have no dollar amount. As far as she understands the only thing we can do to the petition warrant articles is change dollar amounts. We can probably change wording, but it must basically stay the same.

Moderator Webb stated his opinion that is not the case. A number of cases have gone before the courts asking the question is the tweaking we have done eliminating the subject matter, and it is a hard judgment call. In his opinion anything short of elimination is permissible.

Ms. Cook commented when she was on the Board of Selectmen if there was a petition warrant article it had to go on the ballot. Moderator Webb stated that to be a different issue. SB2 has this unique process of a Deliberative Session and this opportunity to play with the articles.

Ms. Cook remarked that if that is the case then we can re-write the article. Moderator Webb stated that to be the case, however, restated you cannot eliminate the subject matter.

Ms. Cook commented that we were foolish to enact SB2. It is just a waste of time. It was sold to us as a way to eliminate a lot of back and forth at town meeting and shorten the town meeting and all it does is create a second town meeting where we argue about things that we can't really do anything about.

She stated she would put in an article next year to eliminate SB2.

Jessica Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

Is against the article and believes it to be a shame that citizens are bringing this up to not give us the ability to accept grants, particularly the \$50,000 that tireless parents have worked years for the PTO to raise for our community so that it doesn't go back on the taxpayers. She is hopeful all of those in this room tell others what that article would do so that they understand when going to the ballot.

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

Wished to clarify we have given authority to the school board to accept and expend. Unless we rescind, it stays that way? Moderator Webb stated that to be accurate.

MOTION MADE BY JESSE BASSETT TO AMEND TO READ “SHALL THE SCHOOL DISTRICT RESCIND THE PROVISIONS OF RSA 198:20-B “APPROPRIATION FOR UNANTICIPATED FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE DURING YEAR” SO THAT THE SCHOOL BOARD MAY NOT ACCEPT OR EXPEND UNANTICIPATED FUNDS DURING THE YEAR?”

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Attorney Johnston stated the proposed amendment makes sense and would be proper.

Jesse Bassett, 8 Rock Ramond Road

Mr. Bassett stated he wished to clarify the language to bring it in line with what the consequences of the article would be.

**MOTION MADE BY ROBERT DANCKERT TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY LYNN POWERS
MOTION CARRIED**

Moderator Webb noted those who have already stood to speak will be permitted to do so after which a vote on the motion to amend will be taken.

Brian Rater, 31 Mason Road

The language would be clearer if we said, “current year”.

AMENDED MOTION BY JESSE BASSETT TO AMEND TO READ “SHALL THE SCHOOL DISTRICT RESCIND THE PROVISIONS OF RSA 198:20-B “APPROPRIATION FOR UNANTICIPATED FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE DURING YEAR” SO THAT THE SCHOOL BOARD MAY NOT ACCEPT OR EXPEND UNANTICIPATED FUNDS DURING THE CURRENT YEAR?”

MOTION SECONDED

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY STEFANIE GRAY TO FURTHER AMEND BY ADDING “UP TO AND INCLUDING DONATIONS, GRANTS, AND OTHER SOURCES THAT MAY ALLEVIATE TAXPAYER BURDEN” FOLLOWING “UNANTICIPATED FUNDS”

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Stefanie Gray, 24 West Hill Road

If we don't add that language, we are missing a critical piece of what needs to be understood.

Daniel Koenig, 13 Rock Ramond Road

Asked if the tax and spending schedule is such that the donation in the current year would alleviate taxes in the current year. Is it possible that monies donated this year could alleviate taxes this year?

Superintendent Corey responded if the district were gifted \$25,000, he would recommend the Board not utilize the \$25,000 included in the budget and instead return those funds to the taxbase at year end (would help reduce the amount that has to be raised through taxation in the following year).

Mr. Koenig suggested removing the language “during the current year”.

School Board Member Zakar noted the previous amendment had clarified not being able to accept or expend unanticipated funds during the current year and perhaps there could be a semicolon and then “including gifts, donations, etc.”.

AMENDED MOTION BY STEFANIE GRAY TO FURTHER AMEND TO READ “SHALL THE SCHOOL DISTRICT RESCIND THE PROVISIONS OF RSA 198:20-B “APPROPRIATION FOR UNANTICIPATED FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE DURING YEAR” SO THAT THE SCHOOL BOARD MAY NOT ACCEPT OR EXPEND UNANTICIPATED FUNDS IN THE CURRENT YEAR UP TO AND INCLUDING DONATIONS, GRANTS, AND OTHER SOURCES THAT MAY ALLEVIATE THE TAXPAYER BURDEN”

ON THE QUESTION

Daniel Koenig, 13 Rock Ramond Road

Commented on the last phrase regarding monies that could be utilized to alleviate the tax burden noting, with or without this, that could be done, and would be done in the following year. His only concern is that it may be misleading. It might imply that if we don't do this then the money could not be used to alleviate taxes.

Ed Perry, 4 Muscatanipus Road

It is largely a distinction without a difference. At the end of the day, most of us will be taxpayers this year and again next year. Most budgets run year after year. He would not worry too much about it as the savings would be gained in one of the years.

MOTION CARRIED

No further discussion was offered on Article 7.

Article 7 will be placed on the official ballot as amended.

Article 8 - Petition Warrant Article

Shall the Brookline School District rescind authorization under RSA 198:4-b II so that the Brookline School District no longer retains any unassigned general funds under RSA 198:4-b II and return all unassigned general funds to taxpayers? **The School Board does NOT recommend this article 4-0-0. The Finance Committee does NOT recommend this article 3-0-0.**

**MOTION TO MOVE THE ARTICLE 8 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED**

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

The article is intended to rescind the retaining of the unexpended fund balance. Up to 2% of unassigned general funds can be retained. To alleviate the tax burden, the intent is to ensure all monies remaining are returned to the tax base.

Ed Perry, 4 Muscatanipus Road

Is opposed to the article. The unassigned fund balance is basically a savings account. It is a savings account that is tough to get money into. Basically, our boards come up with budgets, the budgets are spent over the course of the year, and if there happens to be money left over, it can go into this savings account. The purpose of having the savings account is every so often you will have an unintended expense that you are not able to identify funding for through other means. You end up with two options; you can dip into the unassigned fund balance or conduct a special meeting and seek approval from the taxpayers to raise additional funds. Doing so is expensive and may not even be possible in certain circumstances, in which case expenses would be delayed. One of the themes he has heard tonight is the increased cost of items. Costs will continue to increase and the trend we see in this town is sometimes we make the shortsighted decision to kick things down the road. Inevitably it ends up costing us hundreds of thousands of dollars more.

The unintended consequence of this is placing a burden back on the taxpayer.

Melanie Levesque, 2 McDaniels Drive

Asked for an explanation of typical unassigned funds.

Superintendent Corey responded, this year, because of an enrollment spike, we added a teacher to kindergarten. That was not budgeted for last year. When such a situation occurs, the first goal that the Board assigns to the Superintendent is to see if the necessary funds can be identified through the operating budget. If unable to identify funds through that mechanism, the unassigned fund balance is what would be utilized. He reiterated; the budget is created 18 months before we get into the year. Right now, the unassigned fund balance is about \$140,000. That covers a teacher and a little more or it covers a boiler or another such item.

Stefanie Gray, 24 West Hill Road

Asked what the impact would be on the tax rate if the funds were returned to the tax base.

Superintendent Corey stated \$100,000 equates to \$0.13/\$1,000.

Lynn Powers, 2 Parker Road

Suggested amending the language by adding “to cover unexpected expenses” following “unassigned general funds”.

School Board Member Zakar noted last year the article was amended to read: “To potentially reduce the Brookline property tax burden, shall the Brookline School District rescind authorization under RSA 198:4-B II so that the Brookline School District no longer retains any unassigned general funds under RSA 198:4-B II thereby leaving the School Board without a contingency fund for unexpected expenditures.”

MOTION BY LYNN POWERS TO AMEND TO READ: “SHALL THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT RESCIND AUTHORIZATION UNDER RSA 198:4-B II SO THAT THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO LONGER RETAINS ANY UNASSIGNED GENERAL FUNDS UNDER RSA 198:4-B II AND RETURN ALL UNASSIGNED GENERAL FUNDS TO TAXPAYERS THEREBY LEAVING THE SCHOOL BOARD WITHOUT A CONTINGENCY FUND FOR UNEXPECTED EXPENDITURES?”

MOTION SECONDED BY KELLY ZAKAR

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

There is a legal definition of a contingency fund, which we do not have in the Brookline School District. Saying we don't have a contingency fund is sort of saying we don't have something that we don't have. He wished to understand if the language makes sense or if it would be confusing legally.

Attorney Johnston replied she does not believe it would make a difference legally. It is a question of the wording that people want to use.

Mr. Pauer asked if the attorney is familiar with a contingency fund that can be adopted by a school district and was told she is. Asked again if she believes the language would be confusing, she stated it is citing a different statute that is not a contingency fund statute. She does not believe it would create any confusion about how to implement the warrant article.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Stated his belief the exact question was asked last year, and the answer given was that it is a plain language definition readily understood and not a legal definition.

MOTION CARRIED

No further discussion was offered on Article 8.

Article 8 will be placed on the official ballot as amended.

Article 9 - Petition Warrant Article

Shall the school district direct the Brookline School Board to cease the funding and use of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum and instruction in all of schools of the Brookline School District? **The School Board does NOT recommend this article 4-0-0.**

**MOTION MADE TO MOVE ARTICLE 9 TO THE WARRANT, AS WRITTEN
MOTION SECONDED**

ON THE QUESTION

Joseph Hartman, 51 Mountain Road

Asked for a definition of SEL.

Superintendent Corey stated Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a part of our curriculum that we do to teach children what he would phrase as proper behavior. The curriculum is under the authority of the School Board. This article is advisory only. The elected body decides on what curriculum is and is not in the schools.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Social Emotional Learning creates standards for attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions and it uses assessments with psychological measurements on children, which can be used with an SEL vendor. There are a lot of problems with it. One of the things you must worry about is what is it doing to the children, data privacy, where do you cross the line to being mental health without parental consent? There are a lot of vendors that are making a lot of money off this.

There is a student strengths assessment that is being used in schools that is really meant for child psychologists to use but it is being forced for teachers to be using in at least some schools. He is unaware if it is happening in Brookline. There is even a House Bill this year (HB 1473) that is going to prohibit SEL in schools. It makes sense for us to stop the implementation of this fad. This is also expensive. There is money for curriculum in the budget.

Johanna Shriver-Halligan, 17 Birch Hill Road

As a child psychologist can speak to SEL. She has worked in adolescent and child mental health for many years. Has worked in acute psychiatric care at state hospitals and in schools. She currently works in out-patient. Her specialty is 5-18.

Social Emotional Learning is something we do every day. It is something we do as adults. We do it naturally when we read social cues, when we pick up on behaviors, when we are in weird situations where we are trying to find our way out, that is also SEL. What we are doing in schools is basically empowering our kids to have tools to effect these situations proactively. As someone who is picking up pieces for a lot of kids, reactive is never a positive. Proactive is always preferred. You can't just give assessments if not trained to give mental health assessment. It won't be validated and it won't be counted.

She can understand the concern that mental health might be included in schools without parental consent, but legally that cannot happen. We have rules and ethics and boards that we have to answer to as well. That would be the benefit of having a licensed social worker is that they will have taken classes in assessments, will have understanding of how to administer these assessments, they will know how to rate them and will be using fully validated research studies with years and years of data behind them.

It is happening anyway. Parents are engaging in SEL, teachers are engaging in SEL, and have been for decades according to the American Psychological Association. Right now, teen depression, child depression, child anxiety, child suicide and child self-harm are all on the rise. That is a concern. That will not go away. If we take away SEL we are taking away their tools.

Social Emotional Learning is language that has been attached to it to scare people. Were we to label this life skills there are studies that show that 80% of people would approve of this type of programming. Our teachers are going to be doing this anyway so do we want them to do it with tools, education and support or do we want them to have to wing it?

Diana Korczynski, 5 Wallace Brook Road

As a taxpayer she is saddened that this is even presented here. She is not surprised given today's political climate that people feed into the hysteria to try to eliminate programs like this. She is hoping those who have been attending or watching school board meetings were able to see the presentation that was provided to the school board on the positive impacts and data that shows the teachers in our schools have seen proven results because of this program.

School Board Chair Kellner responded there is data over hundreds and thousands of studies that show that not only does SEL reduce discipline referrals, improve classroom behavior and in general reduce anxiety and depression eventually, it also improves academics by 7-10% depending on which study you are looking at. She doesn't understand the idea of taking away from our students learning about self-awareness, self-management, how to be aware of your feelings, how to manage them, how to be aware of how your friend is, etc. These are basic things that have always been taught in schools. It has just become politicized just as history has. We don't want to teach our kids history; we don't want to teach our kids how to behave. Essentially there is a movement to make sure that our students are ill equipped for the real world. In the upcoming world where she can go on her phone and do AI and get everything done, these are the skills that you are really going to need. These are more important. Why anyone would oppose that is beyond her.

The presentation the Board received shows that our teachers really like it, that they are seeing a measurable impact already, that the suspensions have gone down, etc.

School Board Member Zakar stated the presentation was provided at the January 24th school board meeting. As part of that presentation the results of a staff survey were shared. One of the questions on the survey was "Have you observed any positive changes in student behavior or classroom dynamics since the implementation of the responsive classroom morning meeting?"

Responsive classroom is the SEL framework which our schools have adopted after teachers and staff spent time this summer researching different programs that would be appropriate for our schools. Our teachers themselves decided on the program that would be most beneficial to our students. The result was that 66.7% of teachers surveyed said yes they have observed positive changes in their student behavior. They were also asked how effective morning meeting is in contributing to building a positive classroom community. Sixty three point three percent said it was very effective. Ninety seven percent of staff members stated they wished to continue using responsive classroom next year. Eighty three percent of staff members responded that they would like responsive classroom training moving forward. Forty seven percent of staff members noted a need for more time in the schedule to adequately deploy morning meeting and other responsive classroom practices.

Our teachers, the experts on educating our students, had a very active role in choosing this program, see that it is working, and want more time, resources and training to implement it.

The Board cut the amount that had been allocated in the budget to \$25,000. She encouraged residents to view the presentation.

Ed Perry, 4 Muscatanipus Road

Everyone here went to school at one point and was left in the care of another adult for several hours in the day. There is no way that you didn't have emotional and social issues during that period. Some adult helped you with it. Some teacher, administrator took you aside and worked you through the weird emotions that you were feeling as a child or helped you with your interactions with other kids in school. In fact, most people send their kids to school just to pick up those social skills in the first place.

This is something that people are trying to make look like it is a brand new thing that has never been done before and it is meant to corrupt your kids. That is simply a bunch of hogwash. This is meant to give standardized best practices to all the teachers that will interact with our children so that we can have confidence that they are going to treat them in a similar fashion that we have some kind of input into. That makes sense.

MOTION MADE BY ED PERRY TO AMEND TO READ: "SHALL THE SCHOOL DISTRICT DIRECT THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD TO CEASE THE FUNDING AND USE OF SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING (SEL) CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION IN ALL OF SCHOOLS OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT, LEAVING OUR SCHOOLS WITHOUT STANDARDIZED BEST PRACTICES FOR HELPING STUDENTS WITH SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LIFE SKILLS?"
MOTION SECONDED BY LYNN POWERS

ON THE QUESTION

Kacie Petrin-Ellis, 7 Smith Road

Supports the proposed amendment. It is concerning with the MTSS position only being proposed to be offered at 400 hours. Clearly we have a need for SEL curriculum. As was mentioned, it has been politicized. She is concerned that we are taking out something that is crucial to our students. For any parent who has gone through the pandemic and given the situation with school shootings, now more than ever we really need this type of curriculum. The data supports it. She listens to the teachers and psychologists and is confident in their abilities. Our children really need this help right now and we would be foolish to take that away from them and our teachers.

MOTION MADE BY DANIEL KOENIG TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY STEFANIE GRAY

ON THE QUESTION

Clarence Skidmore, 42 Oak Hill Road

Opposes the amendment as this is a vanilla petition the way it is worded. It is a straight up yes or no. This amendment is steering the voter.

MOTION CARRIED

Vote on the amendment: “Shall the school district direct the Brookline School Board to cease the funding and use of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum and instruction in all of schools of the Brookline School District, leaving our schools without standardized best practices for helping students with social and emotional life skills?”

MOTION CARRIED

Jesse Bassett, 8 Rock Ramond Road

Questioned the comment that the article is non-binding. Superintendent Corey stated that to be correct.

MOTION MADE BY JESSE BASSETT TO AMEND BY REPLACING THE WORD “DIRECT” WITH THE WORD “ADVISE”

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

We are getting a little close to the removing of the subject matter. We know most courts will probably think this is advisory, but to change the language like that is removing the subject matter. He would say that it is not allowed to be done under SB2.

MOTION MADE BY DANIEL KOENIG TO MOVE THE QUESTION

MOTION SECONDED BY LYNN POWERS

MOTION CARRIED

Vote on the motion to amend

MOTION CARRIED

No further discussion was offered on Article 9.

Article 9 will be placed on the official ballot as amended.

Article 10 - Petition Warrant Article

Shall the Brookline School District pursuant to RSA 194-C, I, create a planning committee to study the advisability of the withdrawal of the Brookline School District from SAU 41 in accordance with RSA 194-C:2, IV(a), for its organization, operation and control, and the advisability of constructing, maintaining, and operating a School Administrative Unit to serve the needs of the Brookline School District? **The School Board does NOT recommend this article 4-0-0.**

MOTION TO MOVE ARTICLE 10 TO THE WARRANT

MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

This is statutory language to look at withdrawing the Brookline School District from SAU 41. The expenses in SAU 41 have skyrocketed. This is not withdrawing from the COOP. This is just looking at doing a SAU in Brookline or doing the SAU services that you need. Looking at this to see if it makes sense. We have a very expensive SAU. If you look at the state forms we have the largest number of finance folks in the state.

We have expenditures that are going out of control. We used to have 8 people in the SAU and on the last count there are 17 with a drop of about 10-12% of enrollment.

We should look at this as a district to see if it makes sense to create an SAU for Brookline. It has nothing to do with the COOP.

Tom Solon, 2 Shady Rock Road

Stated his understanding that the formation of a committee to look at this is part of the formal process of initiating a withdrawal from an SAU. If you do it in the COOP environment that is the impact. Does it have a similar impact when looking at withdrawing from an SAU?

Attorney Johnston stated it starts the formal process. It is not the entire process.

Mr. Solon added it is not just an isolated event that happens without repercussions. He asked for a brief elaboration of what the follow on activities would be that would have to occur beyond this activity. Attorney Johnston stated, if passed, a planning committee would have to be appointed and they would have to study whether they thought it was a good idea.

Mr. Solon asked if the state would have to be notified of the process being undertaken, which would then result in a series of meetings being required to review the information and was told it would.

MOTION BY STEFANIE GRAY TO AMEND TO READ: “SHALL THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT PURSUANT TO RSA 194-C, I, CREATE A PLANNING COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ADVISABILITY OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM SAU 41 IN ACCORDANCE WITH RSA 194-C:2, IV(A), FOR ITS ORGANIZATION, OPERATION AND CONTROL, AND THE ADVISABILITY OF CONSTRUCTING, MAINTAINING, AND OPERATING AN INDEPENDENTLY TAXPAYER FUNDED SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT?

MOTION SECONDED BY LYNN POWERS

ON THE QUESTION

Johanna Shriver-Halligan, 17 Birch Hill Road

Is supportive of the amendment. She is opposed to the article as written as it is her understanding the study has already been completed. She believes it would be best to understand the cost of re-doing a study.

Unidentified Female Speaker

Wished to speak in favor of the amendment as she believes people voting should know that there will be extra costs if we must set up our own SAU. It would involve a Superintendent's salary, associated ancillary people, office space and equipment, etc.

Beth Gildea, 22 Ames Road

Is supportive of the amendment. She spoke of this matter coming before the voters two years ago. She questioned the amount the Brookline school district pays into SAU 41.

Article 4 states the proposed FY25 SAU 41 budget to be \$2,377,762 of which the Brookline portion is \$473,655.

Ms. Gilda questioned if there has been a study conducted and what the cost would be of another.

Superintendent Corey stated a study was conducted for the COOP in 2016. It was done by Dr. Ken DeBenedictis, former Superintendent, John Moody, former Interim Superintendent and himself. It was very cost effective to utilize individuals who were very familiar with SAU 41, each put in about 10 hours and were provided with the data from the SAU. The study was at a cost of about \$2,000. He does not believe the study would come at that discounted rate this time around.

MOTION MADE BY DANIEL KOENIG TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED BY STEFANIE GRAY
MOTION CARRIED

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Cautioned this is statutory language that you cannot modify per SB2.

Moderator Webb stated he was content to proceed.

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Vote on the motion to amend

MOTION CARRIED

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Stated his understanding if it is statutory language you are not supposed to modify it. That is one of the limitations of SB2 for the Deliberative Session.

He believes the attorney could verify that.

Attorney Johnston stated she was looking in 194-C:2 and did not see any statutory language for this question. There is statutory language for the acceptance afterward of the plan, which would occur at a meeting in a future year.

Brian Rater, 31 Mason Road

The article, as it is written, suggests that this is a committee that is advisory in nature. It is basically a study committee. But by citing the RSAs, this is really the beginning of the process of withdrawing from the SAU. You are basically declaring an intention to move along with that process. You are activating the laws. That doesn't mean that you must go through to the end, but for the average voter reading this, they will not realize that they are actually starting the actual legal process of withdrawal.

MOTION MADE BY BRIAN RATER TO AMEND TO READ: "SHALL THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT PURSUANT TO RSA 194-C:2, I, BEGIN THE PROCESS OF WITHDRAWING FROM SAU 41 BY CREATING A COMMITTEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH RSA 194-C:2, IV(A)"
MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Melanie Levesque, 2 McDaniels Drive

Indicated the desire to make a point of informing the voters that this would start the formal process of removal from the SAU.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Asked for clarification the way the petition warrant articles are generally done is that a petitioner writes one, doesn't matter the language, it can be factually wrong, they can write it and that is how it is presented. Our process of amending these articles right now may or may not help us to ensure that they are as correct as they can be when presented to the voters.

Diana Korczynski, 5 Wallace Brook Road

Is in support of the proposed amendment. The way some of these petitions are written is purposefully vague. For full transparency with the voters, they need to know that this is going to kick start the withdrawal review process for the SAU.

Stefanie Gray, 24 West Hill Road

Believes what Mr. Pauer takes exception to in her proposal is that she cannot change the language as it is quoted RSA.

Moderator Webb stated that would not be accurate. There are certain times when you must use statutory language. You can quote statutes. The legislature has said if you are going to propose the following issue to your voters you must propose it in this language. You can't tweak it.

Vote on the motion to amend to read: "Shall the Brookline School District pursuant to RSA 194-C:2 I, begin the process of withdrawing from the SAU 41 by creating a committee in accordance with RSA 194-C:2, IV(a)"

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road

Stated his belief the first RSA quoted was not accurate.

Noted was that the RSA cited in the presentation has been identified as incorrect by legal counsel.

Mr. Pauer questioned what the petition language stated for the first RSA.

After reviewing the citation and language with the maker of the motion, the Moderator re-read the proposed amendment as follows: ***"Shall the Brookline School District pursuant to RSA 194-C:2 I, begin the process of withdrawing from the SAU 41 by creating a committee in accordance with RSA 194-C:2, IV(a)?"***

MOTION MADE BY CLARENCE SKIDMORE TO FURTHER AMEND BY INSERTING THE WORD "POTENTIALLY" BEFORE "WITHDRAWING"
MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Clarence Skidmore, 42 Oak Hill Road

The intent is to conduct a study to determine should we or not.

Diana Korczynski, 5 Wallace Brook Road

Asked if clarification could be provided that it is accurate to say "potential".

Attorney Johnston responded she does not think it is inaccurate. It doesn't present a legal problem.

Brian Rater, 31 Mason Road

Wished to clarify that this starts the process, but there are other opportunities to end the process. That is where "potentially" comes into play.

Vote on the motion to amend to read: "Shall the Brookline School District pursuant to RSA 194-C:2 I, begin the process of potentially withdrawing from the SAU 41 by creating a committee in accordance with RSA 194-C:2, IV(a)?"

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY CLARENCE SKIDMORE TO FURTHER AMEND TO READ: “SHALL THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT PURSUANT TO RSA 194-C:2 I, BEGIN THE PROCESS OF POTENTIALLY WITHDRAWING FROM THE SAU 41 BY CREATING A COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ADVISABILITY OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM SAU 41 IN ACCORDANCE WITH RSA 194-C:2, IV(A)?”
MOTION SECONDED

ON THE QUESTION

Tom Solon, 2 Shady Rock Road

Is opposed to the proposed amendment. The explicit references to RSA have with it explicit processes that are followed. If you read the RSAs referenced, there is more to it than just studying the advisability. It is very well detailed and defined and talks of doing analysis. Granted some might interpret all the analysis to be advisability but there is more to it than just studying the advisability when you enact that RSA. He would say to not do this because you have a conflict between studying the advisability and doing it in accordance with RSA.

MOTION FAILED

Clarence Skidmore, 42 Oak Hill Road

You are asking the voter to go look up 194-C:2, IV (a). He was just suggesting that we put in the language that you are creating a committee to study.

Moderator Webb stated the Legislative Body has voted down the recommended amendment.

MOTION MADE BY KATHERINE ELKINS TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION SECONDED
MOTION CARRIED

No further discussion was offered on Article 10.

Article 10 will be placed on the official ballot as amended to read: “Shall the Brookline School District pursuant to RSA 194-C:2 I, begin the process of potentially withdrawing from the SAU 41 by creating a committee in accordance with RSA 194-C:2, IV(a)?”

Article 11

To transact any other business which may legally come before said committee?

MOTION TO ADJOURN
MOTION SECONDED
MOTION CARRIED

The February 7, 2024, first session (Deliberative) of the Annual Meeting of the Brookline School District was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

Kenneth Haag, Chairperson, Brookline School Board

Date: _____

Colleen Micavich, Vice Chairperson, Brookline School Board

Date: _____

Tracy Perry, Secretary, Brookline School Board

Date: _____

Alyson Manion, Brookline School Board

Date: _____

Kelly Zakar, Brookline School Board

Date: _____

Alana Justice, Clerk, Brookline School District

Date: _____



DRAFT