

TOWN OF DEERFIELD  
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE DELIBERATIVE SESSION  
January 11, 2012  
MINUTES

---

**Call to Order:**

6:30 pm Chairman Don Daley called the meeting to order.

**Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag:**

Chairman Daley asked all to rise and pledge allegiance to the flag

**Roll Call:**

**Present:**

Don Daley, Chairman; J. Spillane, Vice Chairman; H. Cady, Kevin Chalbeck, F. McGarry, D. Pitman and K. Verville Committee Members; Maryann Clark, School Board Representative; Steve Barry, Board of Selectman Representative

**Excused:** T. Dillon and Liz Murphy Committee Members

**2012 Town Budget and Warrant Articles:**

**Article 1:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into a long-term lease/purchase agreement in the amount of \$266,426.20 payable over a term of 48 months for a new engine for the Fire Department, and to raise and appropriate the sum of \$66,606.55 for the first year's payment for that purpose. (3/5 ballot vote required.) (\$0.125)

**Discussion:** S. Barry explained that this is a continuing appropriation bill, the Town has set aside \$90,000 for the last two years and the cost would be approximately \$435,000 to purchase a truck outright, this is a responsible way of securing the funds to purchase the Engine. No public questions or comments.

**Article 2:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$114,540 for the purpose of purchasing land at 8 Church Street from the Deerfield Volunteer Fire Association and the Deerfield Rescue Squad. (\$0.214)

**Discussion:** S. Barry explained that this Warrant has been presented before the Town before. The Board of Selectmen feels this is an important piece of property to own. No public questions or comments.

**Article 3:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of purchasing a new or used front-end loader. (\$0.187)

**Discussion:** S. Barry commented that the current equipment is more than twenty years old and is not able to handle the loads required of it at the Transfer Station. No public questions or comments.

**Article 4:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$86,000 for the purpose of paving the portion of Nottingham Road from Mountain Road to the Parade. (\$0.161)

**Discussion:** H. Cady asked how many yards the piece of road represented. Highway Agent A. Cote answered roughly 3,600 ft and later corrected that figure to 2,100 ft.

**Article 5:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$43,058.79 for the salaries and benefits, such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those of the appropriation of current staffing levels paid for in the prior fiscal year.

**Discussion:** S. Barry noted that the Town employees have not seen a raise in wages since before 2008. This amount represents a 2.5% increase. H. Cady asked how many employees would be affected by this amount. Jan Foisy, Town Finance Director, answered thirty one employees.

**Article 6:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$35,000 for the purpose of replacing windows, siding and energy improvements to the George B. White Building. (\$0.065)

**Discussion:** S. Barry explained that this is a continuation of work that was begun in 2011. Last year the front of the GBW building had windows and siding replaced, this will be to finish out the rear of the building. Peter Menard of Nottingham Road asked if there were grant monies to offset this cost. S. Barry responded no; the funds used were directly from taxes collected. H. Cady asked if any grants had been applied for. S. Barry indicated they had applied for a grant two years ago that went along with Swap Shop improvements and the Town was not approved, the is not aware of any current grants that the proposed improvements would qualify for.

**Article 7:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$31,000 for the purpose of purchasing a chipper. (\$0.058)

**Discussion:** S. Barry indicated that the current costs and availability challenges with renting of chipping equipment justify this purchase. The equipment would be expected to last the town more than twenty years. No public questions or comments.

**Article 8:** To see if the Town will vote to establish an Expendable Trust Fund under the provisions of RSA 35:19-a for the purpose of repairs to Municipal Government Buildings and related Infrastructure, and to raise and appropriate the sum of up to \$25,000 (from surplus) towards this purpose and to name the Board of Selectman as agents to expend these funds. (\$0.047)

**Discussion:** S. Barry noted that the Government Buildings are exceptionally old, the Town Hall is 150+ years old and the Town Offices are 60+ and 40+ years old. This Trust Fund would be a proactive way of setting aside funds for the inevitable improvements that will need to be done to the buildings. Don Gorman of Mountain Road commented that he feels this is an excellent idea. The School has a similar Emergency Trust Fund in place and recently had to expend over \$80,000 for repair of the septic system. Because the funds were set aside they did not need to take out loans or dip into other areas of the budget. He encourages the MBC to support this Warrant.

H. Cady suggested that the Warrant should be amended to state that a Public Hearing will be held so that the public will be informed when the funds are being spent and she would like to see the School Board do the same thing. She believes there is a DRA that requires a public hearing be held with expenditures greater than \$5,000. M. Clark said she believes this is part of the law and that the School Board does hold Public Hearings when needing to spend the monies from its Trust Fund. H. Cady would feel more comfortable if it were in the language presented. Vice Chairman Spillane commented that it would seem redundant. He supports the Warrant, but would like to see an upper boundary/cap put in place limiting the funds set aside. Deb Boisvert of Church Street commented that amounts would need to be voted on each time and so capping would be a duplication of efforts. Vice Chairman Spillane agreed, but felt the defined limit made that ceiling more concrete. H. Cady believed that once this piece was approved the Town would be able to take \$25,000 for the Trust every year going forward. S. Barry said no, that would not be the case. D. Gorman believes that the School's funds are capped at \$150,000. H. Cady commented that the specific language could be amended at the Deliberative Session.

**Article 9:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$10,000 as a stipend for the Fire Chief. (\$0.019)

**Discussion:** S. Barry expressed that the Board of Selectmen feel the time has come to put the Fire Chief position on a stipend and that the duties of the job warrant it.

**6:50 pm Committee Member F. McGarry was excused to attend the Planning Board Meeting**

Karla Hatem of Mt. Delight Road commented that she was appalled to hear that Mark Tibbetts does not already receive a salary. Vice Chairman Spillane indicated that Mr. Tibbetts is paid at this time. M. Tibbetts clarified that no, in the role of Fire Chief he is classified as a volunteer and does not receive a salary. Vice Chairman Spillane indicated he is in favor of this Warrant, but just wants to be clear that Mr. Tibbetts does earn an income as an employee of the Town. M. Tibbetts indicated that he is currently being paid in other capacities what equates to approximately \$25,000/year for 70 hours/week of work. Jeff Shute of Pleasant Hill Road noted that there is a line in the budget for a Part Time Employee under the Fire Department and asked what that represents. S. Barry responded that the line is currently at \$1 and that is where the

\$10,000 if awarded will reside. H. Cady indicated that the Deerfield Fair pays money to the Fire Department and asked how those funds are used. M. Tibbetts responded that the Fair currently pays \$8,000 for on call Fire protection, \$6,000 of that is used as wages for those individuals working the Fair and \$2,000 goes towards equipment. H. Cady asked if they also receive pay in the instance of a Forrest Fire. M. Tibbetts confirmed yes, that wages for fighting of a Forrest Fire is paid under State statute and they receive an hourly rate. The Fair and Forrest Fires are the two times the department's volunteers are paid.

**Article 10:** Shall the Town of Deerfield 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 the vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein totaling \$3,432,213.00. Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$3,349,890.00 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Deerfield or by law; or the governing body may hold on one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13X and XVI, to take up the issue of the revised operating budget only. Budget (\$6.42) Default Budget (\$6.266).

**Discussion:** S. Barry indicated that the Board of Selectman had worked thoroughly with each of the Department Heads and the Town Employees to present a budget that they feel represents what is needed. There is an increase over last year of \$89,000 with no increase in services. Chairman Daley noted that if anyone is considering a change to this Warrant Article that it should be discussed at this meeting. Prior to the Deliberative Session the MBC will vote only to Recommend or Not Recommend.

K. Hartnett of Thurston Pond Road raised a point of order. She needs to attend the Planning Board meeting at 7pm and asked if the MBC would discuss the Petition Warrant Articles relating to the Planning Board prior to that meeting. Chairman Daley responded that the remaining Warrant Articles, because they do not involve money, will not be discussed at this meeting. N. Shute of Pleasant Hill Road asked for further clarification. Chairman Daley indicated that at tonight's meeting the MBC is able to make cuts to the budget, traditionally, in fairness to everyone, the MBC airs any concerns or items they are considering cutting from the budget so that the public is aware. Any proposed increases to the budget 100% need to be addressed at this meeting.

**Highway Department –** A. Cote read from a prepared statement regarding the Brown Road paving project (See Appendix A). S. Barry noted that the issue is with the portion of Brown Rd above the Transfer Station, he addressed concerns that it is costing too much to maintain as a gravel road, noting that the Selectmen felt it belongs in the budget as recommended by the Highway Agent. Vice Chairman Spillane noted that one justification for the project was that it is a safety issue for the School Bus to turn around on the unpaved portion of the road. He suggested that the students on that piece of the road be required to meet the bus at the Transfer Station, as many other families in town, his included, have to go to a specified meeting point to catch the bus. H. Cady noted that at a previous Planning Board Meeting there was a subdivided lot on Brown Road where the owner had to pay impact fees for fixing. A. Cote responded that he does not get involved in impact fees, but was aware that the resident had to pay to ditch and re-gravel a portion of the road under the supervision of the Hwy Dept. K. Chalbeck commented that he would be interested in removing this project based on the budget itself, he would like to see the bottom line numbers brought closer in line with the default budget, he feels this is something that could be put off a year in hopes that the economy will improve. Vice Chairman Spillane thanked A. Cote for his work in putting together the research for his rebuttal, but agreed with Mr. Chalbeck that he does not feel it is necessary at this time.

S. Barry asked the public in attendance if anyone wanted to see this project removed from the budget and received no response. A. Cote said that he informed the Town in 2011 that the Department is falling further and further behind, soon the road situation will be challenging and the repairs won't be an option of choice. D. Boisvert of Church Street asked A. Cote if he could say that this would actually be a cost savings for the Town when viewed over a number of years. A. Cote confirmed yes. J. Wilson of Holt Drive asked how many families were impacted by the bus. A. Cote estimated 3 families. J. Wilson went on to ask how many homes total were affected by this portion of road. A. Cote estimated eight. J. Wilson pointed out that none of those impacted by this project felt enough concern for it to attend tonight's meeting.

K. Verville asked what was done with the waste materials when ditching is done. A. Cote responded that it is currently being used to fill in the parking lot across the street from the GBW building. K. Verville feels that the maintenance costs are conjecture, but asked if paved what the life expectancy of the road should be. A. Cote responded twenty years for the pavement, six or seven years before re-ditching would be necessary.

**Police Department** – Chief Greeley opened discussion by addressing concerns from the MBC Meeting held on January 3, 2012. He indicated that the number of the officers on the force is not to support mutual aid calls, the number of officers is actually lower than what we should have for a town 64 sq/miles in size. Regarding the presence of Deerfield cruisers at the accident in Chichester, they were not there, it was confirmed by the Deerfield and County Sheriff's logs that there were no Deerfield cruisers responding at that accident. Regarding Mutual Aid calls where the Officers of Deerfield assist, in 2011 Deerfield went out on 139 Mutual Aid calls and received Mutual Aid on 105 instances, a couple of which were very significant. Regarding the Cruiser Purchase, it was not presented as a Warrant Article because of past discussions. Cruiser purchases were put as Warrants in 2005 and routinely failed to receive the Town's support. As a result the Department fell behind and was forced to purchase two cars in 2009. S. Barry explained his test as to whether something belongs on a Warrant Article or not is "Can a Police Officer do his job without a cruiser" and that in Deerfield the answer to that question is no. He asked if anyone from the public thinks the size of the force should be reduced and received no response.

Vice Chairman Spillane refuted the point that there were no Deerfield Cruisers/Officers present as the Chichester accident as he witnessed it with his own eyes. Chief Greeley presented the call logs for the month of December to the MBC.

K. Verville asked Chief Greeley what he was using to calculate the statement that we are below the number of Officers required for a Town our size. Chief Greeley was basing his statement on last year's staffing numbers, in 2011 there were 8 full time Officers and the force is now below that number. K. Verville confirmed that the Department is now at six full time Officers with one position vacant and asked how long the position had been empty. Chief Greeley responded since November. K. Verville expressed that he feels times are lean, while he appreciates the Board of Selectman's test of what an Officer needs to do his job, he would prefer to see consistency between Departments, for example the Firefighters cannot do their job without a Fire Truck and yet the Fire Truck purchase is presented as a Warrant Article. S. Barry responded that the reason the Fire Engine is presented as a Warrant is because it is a lease agreement. P. Menard of Nottingham Rd, commented that as a past member of the MBC this is a decision that has been discussed on many occasions and one that it not arrived at lightly. His understanding is that the Fire Engine is presented as a Warrant because the cost of that equipment prevents a Town from purchasing it all in a single year. M. Tibbetts confirmed that the Town's Fire Vehicles last 30-35 years and cost roughly \$500,000 while a cruiser's life is closer to five years and costs \$25,000. J. Shute asked what the size of the force was as compared to the fleet of vehicles. Chief Greeley responded that, when fully staffed, there are 7 full time Officers and 2 Part Time, the Department has five vehicles that it rotates through, a '10 Chevy Impala, a '09 Ford Crown Victoria, a '09 Ford Explorer, a '11 Ford Crown Victoria and a '05 Ford Crown Victoria. J. Shute asked if there was 24/7 Police Coverage of the Town and Chief Greeley confirmed yes. K. Hattem expressed her support for this piece of the budget.

R. Wilson of Holt Drive commented as both a resident of Town and an Officer of the force. He works the 10p – 8a shift and confirmed Ms. Hattem's comment that it can take a long time to go across Town, the Department rarely has two Officers on the same shift and noted budget cuts of the State Police Troop A that have rendered them less effective in responding to local calls.

N. Shute asked for a point of clarification, were the purchase of a cruiser to be removed from the Budget by the MBC this evening it could not go in as a Warrant Article this year. Chairman Daley confirmed as the deadline for filing Warrant Articles was January 10<sup>th</sup>. He noted that there is the Deliberative Session on February 4<sup>th</sup> where additional changes can be made to the budget. K. Hattem, regarding the presentation of items on Warrant Articles, asked the MBC to look at the number of people attending tonight's meeting and to look at the number of people voting, she believes the general public will vote "no" across the board on Warrant Articles, just for the sake of voting "no". S. Barry noted that cruisers have been

consistently put in the Police Department's budget for the last four years. H. Cady commented that she hears public opinion that they would like the ability to vote separately on the purchase of cruisers.

**Legal Department** - Vice Chairman J. Spillane noted that the Legal Line had gone up to \$20,000. He understood the justification for that in 2011 was for defense against the Police Union, because that specific case has concluded can they make do with the \$10,000 that had historically funded that line? S. Barry responded that in addition to the Police Union the Town had to defend against another case filed by a Citizen that cost approximately \$7,800. The case was brought before the Supreme Court and won by the Town, however the same citizen will be bringing an additional suit this year and he questions if the \$20,000 will be enough.

#### **2012-2013 School Budget and Warrant Articles:**

**Article 1:** Shall the Deerfield School District raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$11,820,054? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$11,793,352 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Deerfield 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.

**Discussion:** M. Clark opened discussion by commenting that the School Board, Administrators and SAU had worked very hard to pull together the budget proposed here. She noted that the bottom line is \$104,969 less than in 2011 and that the Town has seen a steady decrease since the 2009-2010 budgets. Chairman Daley noted that the MBC had spent time in their meetings discussing staffing levels as it relates to the student population, there were also conversations on the proposed technology support services shared amongst the SAU and with the Receptionist position that was added back to the budget after the Public Sessions last year.

Regarding the Guidance Counselor staffing levels, P. Yergeau read to the public a letter from parent Lisa Brochu (Appendix B).

Vice Chairman Spillane complimented the School Board and SAU on the work they were doing, specifically the forming of a Committee to look at Special Education classifications. He raised the issue of the Outside Technology Support contract proposed, he questions how the SAU will be able to find a highly paid professional willing to work under a year to year contract and questions how the services will be connected remotely in any sort of dependable way. M. Clark noted that the proposal had been discussed in detail at Saturday's MBC meeting and asked if D. Boisvert could provide her thoughts on the project as the DCS Technology Coordinator. D. Boisvert explained that the person hired as a result of this project would not be at the skill set Vice Chairman Spillane described, her understanding is that it would be a lower level individual who would be filling in the gaps in service created as the higher skilled technicians spent a portion of their time addressing SAU needs. Regarding the connectivity, she noted that the DCS already operates using cloud technology, the student services software is hosted in Pembroke. She said that they do strive to have redundancy of some features so that in case service goes down they are still able to access the tools. Vice Chairman Spillane asked what the benefit to DCS of this proposal would be. D. Boisvert responded that right now the Technology staff of the SAU is not able to keep with the needs of the districts. Vice Chairman Spillane feels that the positions would be better represented as a piece of the SAU Budget. D. Boisvert commented that it is providing a service Deerfield needs, not necessarily that the SAU needs, and she feels seeing it presented in this way makes it more transparent and gives Deerfield more control over it. An example of the benefit gained from centralizing is that Deerfield used to host its own student information packet, which included addresses, phone numbers, grades, lunch services, etc. One or two years ago this service was centralized under the SAU and as a result the cost of the contract was reduced and the upgrades of software are now more efficient. Additionally this person would be available to the district if there are times where an absence affects a school, for example one of the DCS Technology staff had major surgery last year leaving the Department short-handed and work suffered. She feels having an educated backup who is already familiar with the system would be heaven. K. Verville read the proposed benefits sheet and said that he feels this is a fragile scheme, relying on four other towns. P. Menard commented that the centralizing activities are

happening now this project would not result in giving up control, but rather would help what is already being done to be done better. M. Clark expressed that this is a way for the School Districts in the SAU to consolidate resources and it is the School Board's opinion that they will be getting more than \$7,000 worth of value from the initiative.

K. Verville noted that Deerfield's \$7,000 represents 0.1 of an employee does that mean the person is earning \$70,000 and is that considered a lower end Technology Technician? P. Sherman responded that no, the position would earn \$44,000, four districts paying \$7,000 each and Pembroke paying approximately \$16,000 of the salary. K. Verville asked what the plan would be for who gets priority in using the person. P. Sharman said it would be based on need with Pembroke having first refusal, in her years with the SAU she has never seen a catastrophic event that would create an overwhelming need and she pointed out that the SAU would still have an additional full time Technician o staff. S. Barry asked the public if there was anyone in attendance who wished to see this removed from the budget. He received no response. J. Shute asked how much the proposal represented on the taxes. S. Barry replied, not even \$0.01. K. Verville feels it is a bad investment and that the Town should avoid bad investments. N. Shute commented that there is no way of predicting the "what if" scenarios that some of the MBC had discussed. If the solution has never been tried she would like to listen to the experts who say it is worth trying. If it fails, then next year you don't repeat, but she feels it should be given a chance.

M. Clark addressed the MBC's concern with DCS staffing levels and reiterated that the School Board has reviewed and feels the current staffing levels are appropriate based on the needs of the student body. She emphasized that it is the makeup of the student body, not only the number of bodies.

H. Cady commented on discrepancies in the Average Salary and number of teachers data reported to the MBC and that on the State of New Hampshire website. Also the enrollment numbers shown at the State level to not match that reported by the SAU. M. Clark responded that the State has their own specific formula for calculating what is reported, it excludes librarians, guidance counselors, technology associates and nurses. She cannot speak exactly to any discrepancies at the point given there are many different formulas on many different reporting levels.

Chairman Daley noted the Receptionist position that was removed from the 2011 Budget and was added back in January by the School Board. M. Clark responded that the School Board reviewed the position in June and decided to continue forward with it.

**Article 2:** Shall the Deerfield School District vote to approve the cost items set forth in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Deerfield School Board and the Deerfield Education Association for the 2012/13 and 2013/14 fiscal years, which calls for the following estimated increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing level: 2012/13 = \$101,432 and 2013/2014 = \$101,422

**Discussion:** Chairman Daley noted that the MBC decision on Saturday, voting to not recommend Warrant Article 2 by a vote of 2 to 6 was the result of the Committee members not having the Contracts available to them to review. M. Clark noted that the Salary Schedule previously reported had been corrected. The total numbers presented were accurate, but she wanted to clarify the breakdown. She noted that the teachers have remained at the same pay for 2 of the past 3 years and that during that time they have increased their classroom time by 2.5 hours/week and their insurance and retirement benefit costs have gone up. H. Cady asked what the average salary increase was. Would she get that by dividing the \$101,000 by the 57.1 members of the bargaining unit? M. Clark answered no, the Step details were provided. She does not have an average figure available.

D. Boisvert commented that generally the rule of thumb is that a teacher's salary doubles in ten years, but with recent contract failures that process of reaching a full salary takes longer, perhaps twelve years, and the average teacher leaves their position in the first five years of teaching. She feels that it can take many years to reach the top and would urge the MBC to support this Warrant. N. Shute noted that the MBC opted not to recommend the Warrant with their vote on Saturday and many of them said the reason for voting that way was because they did not have the contract available for review. She would like to know that, now that they have had a chance to review the contracts, will their vote stay the same or change. Chairman Daley responded that he had voted not to recommend, he is concerned with staffing levels and feels

that many members of the community have not received pay increases, some have even taken pay cuts, over the past several years. He was disappointed last year to see the School pay raise pass when the Town Employee's failed and would like to see those individuals receive a raise. Vice Chairman Spillane would like to clarify that in the past years, even with the recommendation of the MBC, that the voters have failed the Educator's contract. K. Chalbeck indicated that his concern with the contract is the percentages of the raises between each step. In three years an individual can be seeing a 15-20% increase in salary and that figure seems disproportionate to the current public sector.

H. Swanson has been an educator at DCS 12 or 13 years and expressed that she is gravely concerned that this item will go before the voters as Not Recommended. She feels the DCS staff is hurting just as everyone else is and she is bringing home less than she did last year. As a member of the negotiating parties she feels that the Staff were reasonable in their requests and did not shoot for excess as they know the state of the economy. They just want to get back onto the Steps they should be on. She noted are staff members who are on the salary step 3 when they should be on 5 and she would ask the MBC to reconsider their vote to Not Recommend at the cost of losing good staff. Vice Chairman Spillane expressed his appreciation for the Teachers, but he feels the Town voters will view this Warrant as a raise, and feels that will be the sticking point. M. Clark added that 62.5% of the Bargaining Unit are at the top of the wage scale and would only receive a 1.5% increase should the Warrant Article pass. G. Williams of Nottingham Road commented that, more important than the dollar figure, is the support for our Teachers from the School Board and the leadership of the Town. He feels that support sends a strong message and to not support defeats and hurts the moral of the Educators. V. Camron agreed, and noted that the first thing she looks at when voting on Warrant Articles is whether or not it was recommend by the MBC, she emphasized that the opinion of the MBC does matter very much. K. Verville asked in how many of the last ten years Teachers had not moved up a step. M. Clark answered 2 out of 10 years, or 20% of the time.

R. Wilson commented that anyone would be foolish to think that this increase in pay won't be spent back in the classroom on the students and he urged the MBC to recommend support of this Warrant Article. S. Weiss asked that the MBC support and noted that she does look at the recommendations made by the MBC.

H. Cady commented that she is bothered to hear the justification "we will lose teachers". By her calculations there are seven teachers on steps 1 – 6, the rest have been with DCS for ten years or more. To her that means obviously people are staying on with the school. She feels it is unfair that under the contract you have no control over who is receiving the increases, that we cannot weed out those who are not deserving. C. Liabis of Maple Avenue commented that the reason the MBC cannot pick out is because they don't know them, that is why a School Board is elected and she feels there has been very little respect shown for the School Board opinions by the MBC. N. Shute expanded that it is the job of the School Administrators, not the MBC to evaluate the job performance of the teachers.

D. Gorman summarized, he would like people to not loose site of what is being asked for. This contract has been thoroughly debated and vetted, the bottom line would be a 1.5% increase in salary for more than 60% of the teachers and the rest of those on the step scale would still be behind where they normally would be.

**Article 3:** Shall the Deerfield School District vote to approve the cost items set forth in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Deerfield School Board and the Deerfield Para-educators Association for the 2012/13 and 2013/14 fiscal years, which calls for the following estimated increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing level: 2012/13 = \$26,769 and 2013/2014 = \$18,770. And to further raise and appropriate the sum of \$26,769 for the 2012/2013 fiscal year, such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits required by the new agreement over those that would be paid at current staffing levels?

**Discussion:** M. Clark noted that the breakout of FICA, Life Insurance and Workman's Comp figures had been provided. In 2010-2011 the Para-Educators contract was passed, but there was no rate increase to go along with that. She explained that the funds associated with the buyout language had not been included in the Warrant at the advice of their legal counsel. Chairman Daley noted that because the dollar amount is not in the Warrant, the total requested as a result of the contract will need to come from elsewhere in the budget. P. Kilham of Ridge Road expressed her support for the change in the Para-Educators contract to bring everyone onto one salary scale. She feels there is very little difference between the

Class Aid and Special Ed Aid work it is important to dignify the positions. Ms. Weiss commented that the Para-Educators have one of the toughest jobs in the school.

**Article 4:** To see if the Deerfield School District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of up to \$25,000 (to begin to replenish the funds used to replace the septic system) to be added to the Facilities Repair and Improvement Expendable Trust Fund previously established. This sum to come from June 30 fund balances available for transfer on July 1.

**Discussion:** S. Barry confirmed that this money would come from the School's surplus? M. Clark answered yes, only if there is a surplus of \$25,000 or more. Approximately \$84,000 was expended this year and this is an effort to replenish that money.

**Adjournment of Deliberative Session**

9:25 pm

The Minutes were Recorded, Transcribed and Respectfully Submitted by Katie Libby.  
Pending Approval by the Municipal Budget Committee

Alex Sturt  
re: Article 10

Based on the minutes from the Budget Committee meeting held on Saturday, I would make the following statements to the questions that arose. Although not in the order that the questions or comments arose my statement is as follows:

During 2011, there were no impact fees used on Brown Road to complete any work. The funding for the work came from the full time employee line of the annual budget. This line is used to fund "Normal Roadside Maintenance Practices", which include ditching, brush cutting, shoulder repairs and culvert replacement. All of this work was done on that section of Brown Road. There impact fees that were used in 2011, were used on the paving project done on Church Street. The latest figure provided from the town treasurer shows a balance in the Highway Impact fee account of \$20,246.00.

The history of this section of Brown Road is as follows:

2005 at the time of the flooding in Alstead, Deerfield also sustained considerable damage. Although substantial for a small town, the entire county was well below the FEMA thresh hold for funding availability. This section of Brown road washed out making the road impassable. Were we didn't get funding reimbursement, the repair costs were not documented in a way that allows me to pull them up readily now. Based on documented repair costs from 2006 and 2007 where we were reimbursed by FEMA, I would put the costs at \$7,500.00 to \$8,000.00. We simply filled in the washout with a base gravel, then top gravel, cleaned the ditches leading directly into the culvert and regarded that section of road.

The road washed out again the following two years. In 2006, the road was impassable and the culvert was repaired as well as the ditches repaired again. The ditches did their designed job and kept the water from flowing down the road but the existing culvert pipe could not handle the additional water flow. The repair in 2006 was nearly \$9500.00. In 2007, the road washed out once more exposing both culverts and destroying the upstream and down stream head walls. The ditches were once again cleaned and reshaped, the road base repaired and the head walls repaired. A good part of this was done by outside contractors due the magnitude of town wide damage. The cost of this project was just shy of \$14,000.00. There was also considerable damage done to the upper Part of Brown road this time around. Mitigation money was sought and received to stone line the ditches with erosion in an effort to slow down the water in hopes of maintaining the integrity of the ditches longer.

During the melt of 2009, apparent debris from the ice storm that winter clogged the culverts causing the road base to was out again.

During the wind and water event of 2010 the road was damaged once more needing immediate attention.

On both of the previous events, the FEMA project worksheet was for all of the damage on Brown Road and this section was not directly broken out.

To address the maintenance difference between paved and gravel, it is tough to put in an accurate cost. On an average, it takes a minimum of 2 men 2 hours to get out with the grader period. One in the grader and one in a support truck, most often a 6 wheeler spreading gravel as a top dressing for the repairs. The amount of gravel used depends on how bad the road is washed out which depends on how much rain and so on that we get during the year.

Much of the repairs needed on our gravel road system are weather based from rain, wind and snow. When the roads wash even a little, no matter when the ditches were last cleaned and reshaped, they then become filled again with materials from the road. Much of this material from the ditches becomes unusable because of the contamination from leaves and other earthy materials. The end result is the gravel becomes unusable because it will no longer pack in place and once wet, turns into mud and if we get enough rain, yearly ditching of these troublesome places. The areas that are most prone to this type of erosion problem are typically hilly areas. Some of the surrounding towns have gone in and paved just these hill sections of road in an effort to reduce summer repair costs. The pavement stops the top gravel from washing into the ditches simply because there isn't any. The pavement allows the water to freely run into the ditch.

The work that was done on Brown Road this year wasn't scheduled. It was a direct result of a wet spring and subsequent prior rain events in the fall of 2010. The road was becoming grown in and the brush needed to be cut back. Once the brush was removed, it was found that we were able to clean the road side further back into the town's right of way creating shoulders that never have existed. We took full advantage of the situation and got it done. We were able to change the culvert where we have had issues in the past creating smoother, uninterrupted water flow hopefully minimizing future culvert restrictions from happening. We also built up the road at the culvert crossing an additional 12 to 16 inches allowing that much more protection to the road base itself. At the same time, we dug out the mouth of the culvert creating a fire pond for a valuable water supply for all of Brown Road. Brush and ditch work was done on the entire length of Brown Road during the summer of 2011.

In recent years, I have turned sections of paved roads back to gravel. Because it in fact was a cheaper alternative namely Harvey road. It was a cheaper fix due to the extremely poor road base. To repave, what was there would have been a financial waste. We ground up the existing pavement and graded it out mixing in 1 ½ crushed gravel. We now allow the water to seep through the gravel and grade as needed. To properly repair the section of road that formerly was paved, would cost the town in excess of \$150,000.00 to achieve the pavements life expectancy. For a road with the traffic count of Harvey road and a distance of 2800 feet, not fiscally responsible.

EQUIPMENT RATES:

FEMA CODE #	EQUIPMENT	RATE PER HOUR
8572	Back Hoe	* \$39.00
8331	Grader	* \$55.00
8720	Dump Truck	* \$43.00

\* Prices do not reflect operators' rates.

When ditching there would be 2 dump trucks and some times 3.

My name is Lisa Brochu and unfortunately could not attend this evenings meeting. I am responding to the issue surrounding the suggested elimination of a guidance counselor from the budget. I have been involved with DCS for the past 13 years. During that time I have had two children in the school. It is hard for me to even imagine the number of children these two dedicated professionals see on a daily basis. Each age has its challenges and emotional upsets. Without the ability to reach out to the guidance counselors I believe many children could fall through the cracks. 2 guidance counselors for the number of students in this school are by no means unreasonable and in my opinion absolutely necessary.

It is my feeling that my son would not have made it through DCS without the support of the guidance department. The support he received allowed him to move his life in a positive direction. He still has a picture of his guidance counselor and him on his board in his room. That is the impact that this person had in his life.

My youngest is now in 8<sup>th</sup> grade and utilizes the guidance department when she feels she can't settle something herself or just needs to vent about her disease. Anyone who has had a middle school aged daughter can well understand the emotional ups and downs that they go through. Without the ability to reach out to the guidance department I believe that turmoil would be inevitable.

Throughout the years I have watched this team deal with bullying, loss of classmates, death, student disputes and emotional upset. Both have done so with open and loving hearts and have made a difference in the lives of children and their parents at DCS

This is a safe haven where kids can go and deal with things that they can't deal with on their own. With all the pressures on this generation the guidance department grows MORE important not less. Please do not even consider cutting one of those two necessary positions.