



## Natick Finance Committee

Pursuant to Chapter 40, Section 3 of the Town of Natick By-Laws, I attest that the attached copy is the approved copy of the minutes for the following meeting:

### **Town of Natick Finance Committee**

**Meeting Date: March 6, 2018**

The minutes were approved through the following action:

Motion:	Approval (as amended)
Made by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Vote:	11 - 0 - 0
Date:	4/24/18

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Evans

Secretary

Natick Finance Committee

**NATICK FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**March 20, 2018**

**Natick Town Hall**

**School Committee Meeting Room 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

This meeting has been properly posted as required by law.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Hayes, Chairperson  
Cathleen Collins, Vice-Chairman  
Bruce Evans, Clerk  
David Coffey, Member  
Robert McCauley, Member  
Philip Rooney, Member  
Jim A. Scurlock, Member  
Dirk Coburn, Member  
Kristine Van Amsterdam, Member  
Linda Wollschlager, Member

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Michael Linehan, Member  
Daniel Sullivan Member  
Cathy Coughlin, Member  
Jerry Pierce, Member  
David Gallo, Member

**AGENDA:**

1. Public Concerns/Comments
2. Meeting Minutes for Feb 13, 15, 27 and March 6, review and approve
2. Town Administrator's FY2019 Budget – Public Hearing
  - a. Natick Public Schools – FY'19 Budget
4. 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing
  - a. Article 10 – Bus Transportation Subsidy
  - b. Article 11 – 1 to 1 Technology Stabilization Fund - Transfer
  - c. Article 24 – Acquisition of Mechanic Street
  - d. Article 2 – Committee Reports
5. Adjourn

**CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairman, Patrick Hayes

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/CITIZENS CONCERNS:**

None.

**Town Administrator’s FY2018 Budget – Public Hearing**

**MOTION**

Open the Town Administrator’s FY2018 Budget – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Ms. Van Amsterdam
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote:	10-0-0

**Natick Public Schools FY19 Budget Proposal Presentation**

Presenters:

Anna Nolin, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching, Learning and Innovation  
 Tim Luff, Superintendent for Student Services  
 Peter Gray, Director of Finance

FY19 Natick Public Schools Budget was voted and supported unanimously by the School Committee.

Mr. Luff: Our FY2018 appropriation was \$61,250,150, our FY19 increase would be \$3,702,289 for a total request for FY19 of \$64,952,439 for a total percent increase of 6.04%. Major personnel increases in this budget are contractual steps, cost of living adjustments, subs, merit adjustments and lane changes. We are looking at an additional 14.2 FTE in staffing. The total salary impact for FY19 is \$3,258,641 for a total salary budget of \$51,399,581 that is a 6.7% increase in our salary line. Staffing requests are compliance-driven, enrollment-driven and 21<sup>st</sup> century growth: compliance (mandated positions).

Ms. Nolin: All changes made since the draft 8% budget since the discussion with the town. The majority of cuts came through the personnel side. \$401,977 worth of cuts – 7.5 full time equivalents resulting in just the compliance and enrollment positions being funded. As revenue becomes available through the year the town and schools have put together priority lists for restoring those items that have been cut from both budgets. Reductions on the school side of \$1,196,678.

Mr. Gray: Currently the proposed expense budget is \$64,952,439 which represents 20.8% of the total budget request. Net reduction in the expense budget was \$39,777.00 so this year we are requesting \$13,552,848 which is a decrease of .29%. One of the principal drivers on this year’s expense budget is the transportation budget. Overall there is a \$394,800 in transportation line. When the transportation budget is spent first we access our operating budget, then our bus fees and finally the warrant article request to help balance transportation budget. We are asking for the 2.5 annual increase for the town warrant of \$9,087 for the town appropriation for an overall regular transportation cost decrease of \$30,784.

Mr. Luff: Enrollment has increased an average of 84 students per year since 2007. Our estimates have been very close to real numbers over the years.

Mr. Hayes: Invited the school committee chair to tell FinCom about the committee vote on the budget.

Lisa Tabenkin, Natick School Committee Chair

I'm very happy to report that it was a unanimous vote in support of this budget.

**Questions:**

Mr. Hayes: We are going to walk through this budget (see page 49) the first 7 items on the list will give us the categories we will ask questions about.

**Technology Questions:**

Cathy Collins, Sub Committee Chair: The sub-committee met on March 6 and 15 2018. Mr. Luff and Mr. Gray attended. It was a very productive process. There were a couple of “takeaways” and some submissions to the administration in writing – all the answers came in and were made available for review. Sub Committee didn't vote on the revised budget request because the School Committee hadn't yet voted. There are no items in the budget that I'm aware of that any of the members were uncomfortable with. We went through every line item in the presentation and some that were not. Technology like all the other sections we went through every line item in the presentation. Adjustments that were made in order to close the budget gap were: no iPad replacement; no additional new laptops for teachers; freshmen laptops will be funded (\$100,000 of the \$214,000) will be funded from the 1 to 1 technology stabilization fund. They eliminated the “Let's Talk” platform. In the technology PowerPoint there's a description of retired versus new – and one of the questions that was asked was “why are we retiring so few compared to how many we're purchasing?” We rolled out 1 to 1 to the seventh graders this year so there was nothing to retire. There's a number in the Tech column some of that is new devices and they are trying to figure out who will benefit from them the most. The switch hasn't been made yet.

Mr. Rooney: There was a question on the Technology Budget why they are not combined to drive economy. (The response to Mr. Rooney's question was from Ms. Collins) The answer was neither the Town Administrator nor the Superintendent wants to give up supervisory control – Ms. Nolin: I will speak from my understanding of how all this fits together. The platforms of the school system are very different from the office administration system. Dividing the largest technology scenario that you have to be curated by its own technology administrator and many towns do that. That leaves the town technology director free to service many more buildings without having to scale an education environment that is concerned with very different data privacy issues. If you ask my personal opinion there are potential efficiencies to be made mostly in the larger infrastructure about fiber and the backbone infrastructure that supports the town. I think that we've made progress in that area. There is some collaborative work going on in that area – but the places where the environments are vastly different we have different leadership. Mr. Rooney: Is there not a central purchasing function that tries to drive the best prices we can get for either platform? Dr. Nolin: There is a Town Procurement Officer who is the glue that binds us all and makes sure that that we are complying with and obtaining the best deals for the town. Mr. Rooney: But are you purchasing separately from the “administrative/operational side” of the town? Dr. Nolin: We don't purchase the same devices so yes. The person we go to, to request those purchases, is the same person – Mr. Leblanc.

**Curriculum and Online Learning Questions:**

None.

## Student and Pupil Services Questions:

Cathy Collins Summary of Sub Committee Information: 8.8 of the 14.2 are compliance related and I'm including the ELL evaluation requirement. ELL the population has grown from 87 in FY16 to 147 in FY8 and it's projected to be about 180 next year. That represents about 70 different languages students come in speaking. We plan to add a first grade at Lilja because we created another ELL kindergarten last year. One of the things that drives what we have to do is a requirement to monitor kids for four years after they are done with ELL services. Mass has a requirement that all content providers have to obtain an SCI endorsement – they have to pass a 3-credit graduate course – if they have ELL students in their class. This also puts pressure on the steps and lanes because it pushes them across the lanes. On the SPED side 14.7% of our student population is receiving special education services compared to a state average of 17.4%. The out of district population hasn't increased despite large increases in the total. To deal with it they've developed 12 sub separate programs to try to deal with this – keeping students in district. There are three staff members that will be funded with Circuit Breaker this year so it's considered another out-of-budget source.

Mr. Coffey: These are state mandated programs but they only reimburse us 75% but now it's only 65%? Mr. Luff: There's always been a reimbursement of approximately 75% the state is going to reduce that to 65%.

Ms. Van Amsterdam: Twelve sub-separate programs, as the staff is hired over time for these sub-separate programs does the staff follow those children through graduation?

Mr. Luff: We have tried to create programs on a continuum throughout the district with separate staff from elementary, middle then high school.

Ms. Van Amsterdam: Curious as to how we've leveraged the collaborative schools in these sub-set programs so we're not incurring all the cost in-district but it's not as expensive as residential?

Mr. Luff: There are three different types of programs, the Collaboratives are the first tier, outside of a public school setting – they are public school settings, and they're created and developed programs for many schools that are small in size. The Collaboratives are built similar to what are sub-separate programs are – we do have some students in Collaboratives if our programs don't work, the most inexpensive Collaboratives are around \$45,000 with no reimbursement back so it's still a much higher rate than creating a program in-district. If the Collaboratives are proven to not be working then students go to private special education schools and if there is some intertwined home issue then they may go to residential.

Mr. Coburn: Can you give a range of historical tuitions low end and high end – case by case –for individuals?

Mr. Luff: Collaboratives cost is about \$40,000 to 45,000 on the lower end and high end could be \$350,000. The volatility is there that any student could come to Natick at any time and add to that cost.

Mr. Coburn: What are the resources that Natick Public Schools can go to if it gets one or two high expense students into the system?

Mr. Luff: We try to carry \$800,000 in Circuit Breaker every year so if there are three or four kids that might come in that is there to cover costs.

Mr. Coburn: Would you characterize the way you use circuit breaker as addressing the issue or smoothing the curve and perhaps deferring the issue somewhat?

Mr. Luff: We're allowed to use Circuit Breaker funds for Special Ed costs that come up throughout the year. We use \$2.2 million to cover tuitions in general to bring down the

funding that we're actually asking for. I do believe that the \$800,000 per year that we have is sufficient to cover year to year anything that comes up.

Ms. Collins: There are three staff positions where you don't see as reductions in staffing because the original plan was that these three people would be funded through Circuit Breaker – there's two paraprofessionals and an AVA Tech. So we talked about the risk of using those Circuit Breaker funds for this with the schools and they believe that – they know they need these three positions and they know they have limited funds available – they believe the risk is somewhat low in needing those funds for something else.

#### Transportation Questions:

Mr. Coburn: What is the potential for volatility with transportation expenses coming up unexpectedly? Mr. Luff: The original model which was a per-pupil model was flawed and didn't take into account much of the IEP population – the in-district transportation will be resolved as we grow there's more of a need. I don't think the special ed transportation will be as volatile as we move forward and get back in the black.

McKinney Vento is much more volatile in my mind – the ESSA act has provided similar protections for kids in foster care as McKinney Vento, the right to school of origin, so if they're living in a town and get moved to foster placement those children have a right to attend the school where they are currently living or the school where they previously attended. So we've got more students to transport from outlying areas. Those costs are now born by Natick. Mr. Coburn: The bussing contracts – what sort of volatility do they have relative to fuel prices? Mr. Gray: We're in the third year of a contract and there's a fuel escalation charge – it's been fairly quiet because fuel prices have been pretty level – right now we don't anticipate any problems.

Mr. Collins re transportation:

We're required to do transportation through the end of the school year to where current housing has been obtained. If a student gets permanent housing in October we're still required through June. The foster care transportation, the district where the student attends is 100% responsible for the cost. There is no cost sharing. McKinney-Vento we get some reimbursement. The daily rate listed under McKinney-Vento is the average costs per year to transport a student. It's not \$1,200 per day.

Ms. Van Amsterdam: For regular transportation for the revolving fund what is the current balance? Mr. Gray: The fees collected for bus fees from parents? That's our revolving fund is fees paid by parents. Ms. Van Amsterdam: So the Town contribution never goes into that revolving fund? Mr. Gray: Correct. Part of the issue is timing, because we start enrolling students before the fiscal year ends and we collect a lot of our funds before school ends. Typically we get it down as low as \$10 or \$20,000 and then before school starts it can rise to as much as \$500,000 before we start to access it. So it's difficult – if I gave you a bottom line number now it would not be reflective of what the bottom line is – but ultimately we pretty much drain that account before we access town funds. Ms. Van Amsterdam: That's the strategy for your revolving accounts? Mr. Gray: Yes.

#### Other Operating and Maintenance Questions:

Ms. Van Amsterdam: General philosophy with regard to the revolving accounts – dollars spent in a fiscal year and why some of the balances in some of the revolving accounts are so high?

Dr. Nolin: For instance with a revolving account like the ASAP program - we are encouraged to keep several months of salary in reserve so we have an insurance policy for that particular program – emergencies and contingencies that program has a lot of personnel and a lot of volatility depending on what happens in a given year. So that's because their salaries are drawn from that percentages of hire / fire, there are different

levers that push on that particular budget. The preschool has to have some contingency in it but we generally try to do what we do for the bus subsidy, that when we don't have to keep a contingency for operating costs, we generally spend that account down as much as possible by the end of the fiscal year for which the revenues were obtained.

Mr. Gray: The revolving accounts in and of themselves are highly regulated by the department of elementary and secondary education. I'm not sure if there's a particular account but in all cases revolving account are set up for a specific reason and the funds have to be spent for that area. Most of the accounts that look like they have large balances are mandated to have balances of a certain amount. Ms. Van Amsterdam: I wasn't questioning the usage of them or with regard to the legality. I'm looking at a particular year, for example, with school choice, those monies could be utilized K-2 so I'm curious as to why you would be carrying any balances when the school district gets in tuitions every single fiscal year for those students. Why are those funds not expended in the fiscal year in which you're tying them to students?

Mr. Gray: In many cases they are. What happens is when we close a fiscal year such as June 30, 2017, no adjustments have been made to those accounts. As part of our closing procedures we will typically take \$1 million dollars of school choice that was put into the budget in order to meet our budgetary requirements. So a lot of these balances in some of the larger accounts occur after the fiscal year closes as part of our closing procedures.

Ms. Nolin: And particularly school choice is a rolling reimbursement by quarter because students move in and out – so you're going to see it ebb and flow in that particular budget. But after the end of year closure process happens that account typically comes down to almost - \$75,000 may be left in there because we just got that capture of money in the last quarter.

Ms. Van Amsterdam: What date would you encourage us to look at the balance of the revolving accounts?

Mr. Gray: Audit is completed by October/November, so after the audit.

Mr. Coburn: The heating fuel and electricity what is the potential for volatility? What kind of rate guarantees and floats do we have on those contracts?

Dr. Nolin: There are escalator clauses – we could manage the volatility to some degree and we have reached out to our town energy partners to help plan to manage the volatility. There are protections and caps built into the contracts.

Mr. Coburn: Have I probed all the areas in the budget that are likely to have volatility?

Dr. Nolin: In our online technology platforms: curriculum materials and online data repositories, student assessment systems become increasingly online there is the risk of conglomerate technology companies closing out services or creating volatility where we would like stability. We experienced one of those situations this year – Pearson simply and unilaterally decided to close out the product we were using and we had to buy the new materials (which we did not budget for) and had to train all our K-4 teachers during the first week of school. Also, within our district is our ability to go to bid for anything we have on the contract. Between now and the end of the fiscal year we have to go out to bid for our food service program, in district transportation and online payment vendors – imbedded within that, anytime we end a bidding cycle and go out for a new bid we may see a substantial increase or maybe stable prices but anytime we go out to bid it's a volatile situation.

Mr. Hayes: Regarding hedging the risk around technology in total in the Municipal Government as well as the Schools. It's a broad-based concept – when we make a capital expenditure into technology how do we deal with the risk and protect against volatility? I want the public to know we're talking about it through the FPC. Dr. Nolin: We had a conversation in the summer because I wanted to alert your committee to the volatility

around our online our instructional materials and technology platforms because I can see the landscape is changing around these products and how quickly the marketplace is moving. We take steps to ensure protections but it does beg the question for the need for some sort of stabilization funding around this area. We've talked about how we might deal with the volatility of this area. We may need to rethink the way we insure ourselves to protect as much as we can against this volatility.

Mr. Hayes: We talked about something akin to the reserve fund for technology in total for both the town and the schools – it's a broad-based concept – when we make an investment in technology how do we at the same time hedge the risk on that technology – possibly by putting a percentage of what we invest into a stabilization fund and some parameters around when you are allowed to access that fund. We are talking about this in a collaborative manner with town and schools through the Financial Planning Committee.

Mr. Rooney: What type of information or reporting do you do to follow the expenses and the impact rates may be having in the energy use and expenses for fuel and energy?

Mr. Gray: We get a quarterly update from our Facilities Director that looks at, depending on the type of utility, the amount of energy used and the costs and we compare to past usage taking into consideration any rate increases or decrease, weather etc. so we can monitor usage for any spikes or dips and find out why these things might be happening.

Mr. Rooney: Is any analysis shared with the School Committee or the school in terms of what actions they could be taking to contribute or help control?

Mr. Gray: The only time we would share the information with the schools is when there's a trend that causes concern. We don't sit down on a quarterly basis and go over the reports.

Mr. Rooney: Should I interpret that as you're not proactive in looking for opportunities?

Mr. Gray: No, as we review our costs in that area on the whole we talk about ways to be more efficient. In the past we have not done a diligent job keeping the unnecessary lights in the schools off at night and we've been working on that and discussed how to get the school community, teachers, students and staff, involved in reducing use and creating efficiencies in that area.

Ms. Nolin: The budget processes are good for us to realize the places we could make a stronger impact in reducing costs – we reached out to the energy coordinator for the town in this area because we found through discussion and research in this area that we could probably do a more directed and targeted approach to this area of potential volatile costs. For us that was a takeaway from our budget process this year – to research and implement a way to hit the ground running next year with a program to reduce usage and costs in this area that would make a difference.

Mr. Rooney: So you're working on something that would make the quarterly reports more useful and that you can take initiatives on and be proactive during the year?

Ms. Nolin: I hope that we can track the return on investment in time in a program like this and I hope that we can create a report that can give us this information in a useful way.

Mr. Scurlock: Do you run a separate utility from the town – separate utility billing or is it all one purchase?

Mr. Gray: No, it's purchased through the town but it's directed to each building. It's in our budget so we manage it with oversight from the town. We don't contract for electricity separately for the schools – but the buildings are all billed separately.

Mr. Coffey: The reading program K-4 that had to be totally re-worked? How much did that cost all in?



Dr. Nolin: There's no software associated with this particular deployment. Elementary reading is really a text, and professional development heavy scenario – so it's a 3-year phase in so we have expended \$50,000 in the first year for professional development, \$70,000 last year and \$70,000 this year. In terms of the refresh of the curriculum it depends on the grade level but it was about \$60,000 last year, \$60,000 this year and \$60,000 next year to replace all of the reading materials for all 5 of the elementary schools K-5.

Mr. Coffey: You said this was an unanticipated cost?

Dr. Nolin: No this was just reading assessments – that were - the reading assessment we've had for a long time they deleted that complete program and created a new program which was just different enough to cause a total new deployment. All totaled that was approximately \$90,000 for trainings, substitutes and materials. I took those funds from professional development and instructional materials this year which meant I had to defer some of those now-capitalized text requests to next year.

Mr. McCauley: Is there any possibility of Districts banding together for curriculum purchases?

Dr. Nolin: We do that with the Accept Collaborative and the Tech Collaborative the issue is that for some scenarios, all curriculum is local, so unless everyone is using "Investigations Math" in the region, Pearson will not bargain with you along particular text book lines nor will they allow block collaboration – smaller vendors do encourage block collaboration – so it really depends on the vendor.

Mr. Evans: The Watson project – could you briefly state what's on the horizon now that we've delayed the Watson project.

Dr. Nolin: We have an interface that is integrated with our data and we are at the point where we were ready to beta test with this – but given the conceptual framework for reductions that we have agreed to with our town partners i.e. all other departments cut new initiatives of this type – I could not justify moving forward with this type of expense in this budget. So we have laid the groundwork and that won't change with this delay. IBM is ready to go forward with a per-pupil cost and subscription fee and I'm not willing to pay what they are asking right now.

Mr. Rooney: In the preschool program we're spending more than we're taking in and the question was about fees – the school committee was going to vote on that topic can you update us?

Mr. Gray: The school committee has approved an increase for FY19 that will raise the revenue of about \$75,000 and conceptually another increase for FY20 that will bring us up to another \$75,000 or also providing tuition assistance to some of our less fortunate families. We feel confident that we will be in the black and able to continue on with that program.

Salaries – 76% of the budget

Ms. Collins: The school budget largely represents salaries, about 78% of the budget means that salaries are a little over \$50 million of the \$64 that's being requested and about 77% of that is for teacher salaries. When you add in paraprofessionals, coaches, medical services you're up to almost 87% of the salary budget. FY19 is the third year of the teacher contract so they will be going into negotiations and there is \$232,982 embedded in this budget that is an approximately 2.25% increase for the administrative people who are not in a union – merit and salary adjustments.

Mr. Rooney: Lane changes – do teachers who go out and get an advanced degree automatically get a lane change?

Ms. Nolin: Most likely however teachers are on a five-year licensure period and within every 5 years they must obtain a certain amount of education to keep that license current. The smartest thing to do if you're a teacher is to take graduate courses that keep you certified, keep you highly qualified in your field, and moves you along the salary lanes.

Mr. Rooney: If I'm teaching the same courses with basically the same requirements but I get a higher degree I'm going to get more money for the same job?

Ms. Nolin: Yes because you have obtained a deeper credential.

Mr. Coffey: Will the new Superintendent be at the same level of compensation as the last?

Ms. Lisa Tabenkin, Chair of the School Committee: Because we are in the middle of the hiring process I can't answer that question right now but will be able to soon – I don't know.

Mr. Coffey: Why did we choose the Dean of Student position over some of the teacher positions? Ms. Nolin: The data that we have received from the MetroWest Healthcare Survey regarding students who are at risk this particular job is to curate the relationship between families and students to ensure that we're doing every front-line thing we can do to create trusting relationships between kids and families – what this does is help students feel like they have a house within the high school and a point person within school system. It's about student connection and student health and wellness. When a house system is created within a high school that Dean will follow the student from day one to senior year. These are the type of measures a school can employ to guard against students turning to drugs, suicide and violence.

Mr. McCauley: Steps and lane changes: Do we have an idea of where our teacher population falls within the step and lane changes? Are a lot of people more towards the top or bottom of the scale?

Dr. Nolin: We know where people are at this point but we don't know exactly where every teacher is in the education trajectory.

Lisa Tabenkin, School Committee Chair: Thanks everyone for their hard work and diligence particularly Mr. Hayes and Ms. Collins.

**MOTION**

Move to recommend favorable action on the Natick Public Schools FY19 Budget in the amount of \$64,952,439 with a source of FY19 Tax Levy

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Coburn
Motions or Debates:	<p>Ms. Collins: Schools and budgets in general are about priorities it may not be perfect but it is well-developed and well-supported. I appreciate that the town and the schools sat down together and had difficult conversations.</p> <p>Mr. Coburn: I appreciate the work of the subcommittee and the school committee and administration for bringing forward this budget. I think it's important to support education.</p> <p>Mr. Coffey: Thank you all for a job well done on this budget.</p> <p>Ms. Wollschlager: Thank you for all your work. I support this budget – Ms. Collins</p>

	<p>Mr. Scurlock:</p> <p>Mr. Evans: I’m encouraged about the collaboration with the town and the examination of issues that may not yet be problems so we can anticipate them..</p> <p>Mr. McCauley: Thank you to Ms. Collins and her sub-committee and thank you to the administration – we do have to think differently in some cases</p>
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

**MOTION**

Move to open the Natick Finance Committee 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Coffey
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	10-0-0

**Article 10 – Bus Transportation Subsidy**

Received by FinCom Chair on March 15, 2018 via email

“Move that the Town vote to appropriate the sum of \$402,095 from Tax Levy for the purpose of operation and administration of the school bus transportation system for FY 2019, and to reduce or offset fees charged for students who elect to use the school bus transportation system for transportation to and from school, said funds to be expended under the direction of the Natick School Committee.”

Dr. Nolin: We are requesting in order to assuage the transportation costs we have vetted for you this evening in detail.

**Questions:**

Ms. Wollschalger: Just to clarify this is last year’s number plus 2 1/2%? Dr. Nolin: Yes.

**MOTION**

Move to recommend favorable action on Article 10 Bus Transportation Subsidy and to appropriate the sum of \$402,095 from FY19 Tax Levy

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coburn
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	<p>Mr. Coburn: This mechanism has worked well in what can be a very volatile area of the school budget.</p> <p>Ms. Collins: Town Meeting started this as a way to keep the cost of transportation low.</p>
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Mr. Hayes: We talked about this when we did capital – members will recall Mr. Chenard’s explanation the article language was not the right language so we found another way to correct that and we voted it previously – they have requested no action.

**Article 11 – 1 to 1 Technology Stabilization Fund - Transfer**

Sponsor Superintendent of Schools

From 1/6/2018 Questionnaire

To see if the Town will vote to appropriate and raise, or transfer from available funds, a sum of money for the purpose of operation and administration of the school bus transportation system, and to reduce or offset fees charged for students who elect to use the school bus transportation system for transportation to and from school, for Fiscal Year 2019 (July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019); or otherwise act thereon.

**Questions:**

None.

**MOTION**

Move to recommend no action on Article 11 – 1 to 1 Technology Stabilization Fund - Transfer

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Mr. Hayes: We are not doing Article 24 because the appraisals are not back yet and without the appraisals tentatively scheduled for March 29<sup>th</sup>, April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting possibly.

**Article 24 – Acquisition of Mechanic Street**

**Questions:**

**MOTION**

None.

**MOTION**

Move to close the 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Ms. Van Amsterdam
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	9-0-0

**MOTION**

Move to close the Town Administrator’s FY19 Preliminary Budget Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coffey
Seconded by:	Ms. Evans
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	9-0-0

**MEETING MINUTES**

**February 13, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ineligible to vote: Collins, Scurlock, Wollschlager

**MOTION**

Move to approve the February 13, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Ms. Van Amsterdam
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	7-0-0

**February 15, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ineligible to vote: Collins, Scurlock, Wollschlager

**MOTION**

Move to approve the February 15, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Ms. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	7-0-0

**February 27, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ineligible to vote: Evans, Scurlock, Wollschlager, Rooney

**MOTION**

Move to approve the February 27, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coburn
Seconded by:	Ms. Van Amsterdam
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	6-0-0

**March 6, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

Ineligible to vote: Wollschlager

**MOTION**

Move to approve the March 6, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Ms. Van Amsterdam
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	8-0-0

**ADJOURN**

**MOTION**

Motion to adjourn.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coffey
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote	9-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.