

Town Of Candia
Budget Committee Meeting
Approved Minutes
January 22, 2025
Town Hall Meeting Room

The Municipal Budget Committee meeting was called to order at 7pm.

Attendees:

Lynn Chivers, Chair
Susan Gill, Vice Chair
Brenda Coughlin
Katrina Niles
Joshua Reap
William Saffie
Ryan Young
Susan Young (Selectman's Rep)
Stephanie Helmig (School Board Rep)

Chair Lynn Chivers opened the meeting with the pledge of allegiance. The Chair informed attendees that the meeting was being recorded using artificial intelligence and requested that all speakers state their names for the record, even if previously identified. The Chair then moved to approve the minutes from the December 11th meeting, clarifying that a shorter version of the minutes would be used. A brief discussion ensued regarding the distribution of the minutes, and the Chair asked for any changes or corrections to the shorter version. Motion made by William Saffie to approve minutes as edited, seconded by Katrina Niles. Stephanie Helmig and Susan Gill abstained from the approval vote. Joshua Reap makes a motion to approve the minutes of the December 17th meeting. This motion is seconded by William Saffie. Stephanie Helmig abstained from the approval vote. The motion passed.

A request was made to discuss the school budget before the town budget. The Chair put this to a vote, and a count of eight votes indicated a preference for addressing the school budget first.

The Chair opened the meeting by stating the order of business: school budget first, then town budget. A question arose regarding the availability of budget documents for the audience; the Chair confirmed there were no extra copies of the school budget available, although Susan Young mentioned she might have an extra one. The Chair clarified that the discussion would focus on the most current budget document. The Chair then presented the key figures for the school budget: the school board's request of \$11,303,509, the default budget of \$11,100,810, and the budget committee's recommendation of \$10,716,750. The Chair opened the floor for public comment.

This segment begins with a statement from Stephanie Helmig that current enrollment is 284 students. A discussion follows regarding a five-year enrollment change, showing a decrease of one student. The increase in enrollment from other schools is discussed, clarifying that none of the new students are high schoolers, who are under a separate contract. Stephanie Helmig offers a cost-per-pupil analysis from the NH Department of Education website, showing that the school is spending \$382 above the state average, but is still within the average spending range for the state. The analysis is based on data from the entire state, including Bedford and other areas, and excludes warrant articles from the budget.

Stephanie Helmig presents a budget analysis to the board, highlighting discrepancies. She clarifies that the provided budget excludes warrant articles. She emphasizes the need to analyze percentage increases within the budget, noting a 6.7-6.8% default increase. She provides a document detailing increases in healthcare, salaries, and other contractual items. A significant concern is the 2025-2026 default budget being based on the current budget, which already reflects adjustments from the previous year. Currently, only 1.7% of the budget remains; with proposed cuts of \$385,000, the district could face a \$212,000 deficit, requiring borrowing or a special meeting to raise funds. The committee's budget cuts are reviewed to minimize impact on student education. Potential cuts include high school busing (\$195,000) the Spanish program, a new access portal similar to Facebook, the School Board stipend, and an Admin Assistant position among other areas of potential savings which would decrease the budget by \$384,060 below the default budget to meet the operating budget proposed by the Budget Committee.

Discussion ensues regarding potential savings by having parents of students provide partial payment for student transportation and other potential savings. Helmig emphasizes that the default budget was a recommendation from the budget committee, voted on by the town, and highlights the need to consider the impact of last year's adjustment when evaluating the current financial situation. Susan Young clarifies that the voters, not the budget committee, ultimately decided on the default budget, a point another committee member confirms while reiterating the committee's recommendation.

A speaker inquired about a \$43,000 budget addition mentioned in a previous meeting, specifically whether it covered anticipated wage increases for the next year. Helmig clarified that the \$43,000 was allocated to individuals with separate contracts, not subject to the town's teacher contract voting process. Susan Young added that these were three-year contracts.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment, prompting a discussion about the proposed budget. A speaker expressed a desire to understand the rationale behind a \$384,000 reduction from the default budget. Judith Szot a former six-year member of the budget committee, explained that significant budget surpluses had been common in previous years. They recounted instances where approved budget amounts were consistently higher than the actual appropriations and spending, citing an example involving healthcare funding where \$440,000 was approved, \$379,000 appropriated, and only \$229,000 spent. Szot pointed out that the school is required to have an assistant principal if enrollment reaches 500 students and that given the current enrollment, removing the position of assistant principal would be a potential area to cut the budget, stating that schools functioned effectively without assistant principals in the past. A teacher counters this argument, asserting that the role of an assistant principal is crucial in today's educational landscape, which differs significantly from the past. They emphasize the assistant principal's invaluable contribution to the smooth functioning of the school and the support they provide to

both the principal and students. The teacher argues that the increased workload and complexities of modern schooling make an assistant principal almost indispensable. A member of the audience expresses concern over the potential removal of the assistant principal position at Henry Moore's school. She argues that the assistant principal provides crucial social and emotional support to students beyond academics, addressing issues not typically handled by other staff. Removing this position would necessitate finding alternative support, potentially requiring a new budget for social workers, case workers, or additional special education staff to handle the increased behavioral and emotional needs of the students. She emphasizes the significant workload already placed on staff and the detrimental impact of removing this vital support system.

Stephanie Helmig explains a shift in how health insurance projections are calculated for the school board. Previously, projections were based on the assumption that everyone in the building would utilize health insurance. Now, projections are based on the current number of individuals actively enrolled. This change means they can no longer predict future health insurance costs based on the entire staff, as they cannot ask teachers about their insurance plans for the following year.

Stephanie Helmig explains that budget figures are based on current staffing. She then expresses concern about the potential loss of an assistant principal, highlighting the significant increase in behavioral issues, IEPs, and special education needs that would likely result. She emphasizes the increased costs associated with these issues and criticizes the lack of community involvement and understanding regarding school operations and staffing needs. She questions the basis for budget cuts without sufficient data or analysis of staff roles and responsibilities. Dana counters by stating that having an assistant principal is not unusual for schools of similar size, citing Dunbarton Elementary as an example with fewer students but a similar administrative structure. Helmig clarifies a Facebook post misrepresenting the number of administrators in the building.

Susan Young expresses her agreement with the proposed 3% budget cut but opposes cutting the assistant principal position due to its daily necessity in the school. She suggests exploring other areas for cuts, citing historical data showing yearly budget surpluses of \$200,000-\$300,000. Helmig clarifies that the \$385,000 figure represents the budget below the default, which includes only contractual obligations and excludes one-time expenses. She suggests potential cuts to programs like high school electives and the Spanish program to achieve the necessary savings. Susan Young acknowledges this, noting that past surpluses occurred with non-default budgets, highlighting the discrepancy between historical data and the current default budget.

Helmig points out a potential deficit of \$112,000 in January if the current financial trajectory continues. Mark Chalbeck explains that the school's default budget is based on the previous year's budget approved by voters and existing contractual obligations. He advocates for the board to reconsider their vote and revert to the default budget to ensure the school can meet its financial responsibilities. He thanks Lynn for previously suggesting sticking with the default budget. Helmig proposes that any leftover funds will be returned or used for necessary upgrades, such as fire system improvements, only after obtaining board approval.

A speaker explains that she prefers that the school not end the year with a budget surplus as high as in years past. A speaker states that the School Board budget grows every year by such a large amount and points out that they requested a 9.8% increase to their upcoming budget but suggests the school board might need to make difficult cuts due to the school budget's continuous growth. A speaker highlights the town's marginal approval of the proposed budget in the previous year.

(passing by approximately 25 votes) and the subsequent adoption of the default budget, suggesting a growing trend among townspeople to advocate for tighter budget control.

The Chair redirects the conversation back to public comment, stating that budget discussions will occur later. Susan Young agrees with the need to hear public comments. A member of the audience emphasizes the importance of considering the impact on families and children before making decisions that could potentially drive them away.

Charlana then adds her perspective, expressing concern that current programs might leave children behind, particularly regarding fundamental learning. She shares her experiences as a substitute teacher, highlighting the school's struggle to find sufficient staff and the resulting strain on existing personnel. Her comments emphasize the financial implications and the challenges faced by the school in providing adequate support for students and staff. Johnson expresses deep concern over budget cuts impacting the ability to hire sufficient staff, particularly substitute and paraprofessional teachers. She highlights the critical need for a sixth-grade teacher and emphasizes the ongoing struggle to find substitutes, leading to situations where students are left without adequate supervision or instruction. She explains that due to insufficient staffing, students, especially those with IEPs, are not receiving the required support and services. The lack of personnel is described as leaving children "stranded" daily, directly resulting from budget constraints. The discussion concludes with the Chair opening the floor for additional public comment.

The Chair suggests closing the public hearing. Prior to closing the public hearing Ryan Young suggested finding common ground regarding budget sustainability, prompting a show of hands, including both the board members and audience, to determine whether the requested 9% increase to the school budget was considered sustainable moving forward. Ryan Young noted that, including the audience and board members, there was unanimous agreement that the 9% increase was unsustainable.

The Chair closes the public hearing portion of the meeting.

The Chair initiated a discussion regarding the school budget, specifically focusing on actual expenditures. There was some confusion about the documents being reviewed; the Chair clarified that they were working with a "school budget evaluation" document, not the materials distributed that evening. The Chair explained their budget calculation method: starting with actual spending in the 23-24 school year, they added 2% for inflation to project the 24-25 budget, and then added 2.5% for inflation to project the 25-26 budget. The Chair confirmed that this was the approach she were using for budget projections.

The Chair presented a budget breakdown totaling \$10,650,660, excluding contractual obligations. This figure includes cost-of-living raises to account for inflation. Further analysis of contractual increases, primarily stemming from a town vote on contract and support staff contracts, added \$600,000, bringing the total to \$11,220,960. This amount closely aligns with the current default budget. The Chair expressed concern about reducing the budget below this figure, as it wouldn't cover actual expenses and contractual increases. Speaker inquired whether the warrant was included; the Chair confirmed it was not, clarifying that the warrant, approved by the town last year, is part of this year's contractual obligations and therefore already factored into the \$11,220,960 figure.

The discussion centers on a budget amendment. Susan Young points out that a retroactive contract request is included in the materials to be voted on, creating a conflict with another item. A speaker clarifies that this relates to a previous year's warrant article concerning teacher contract increases. Josh distinguishes this from the current budget navigation, which is not teacher-related. Susan Young confirms her understanding. The speaker specifies that the current issue involves support staff for \$25,000, with an additional request above the existing budget. Susan Young reiterates the duplication. The Chair expresses concern about incorporating inflation and contractual obligations while simultaneously reducing the budget by another \$300,000, deeming it unfeasible. Dana Buckley clarifies that the proposed budget was \$11,300,000, leaving \$303,009. The Chair confirms this, questioning the proposed changes. Dana highlights that the difference is only \$80,000, a point Susan Young reiterates as the proposed amendment.

The Chair explains their budget approach: starting with the default budget from the previous year (2023), adding contractual obligations, and incorporating small inflation increases. They clarify that this preliminary budget is significantly lower than the previously voted-upon amount of \$10,716,000. The Chair emphasizes that this is not the final budget but a starting point for discussion, acknowledging that they are working with a default budget. Susan Young inquires about additional staff compensation from the previous year. It was clarified that there was a town-approved warrant article last year that is now included in the current budget. Susan Young confirms that this additional amount is now factored into the current budget calculations.

Susan Young expresses concern that some people don't understand the impact of tax increases. She clarifies that the rising taxes are not just pushing families out of the community but also elderly individuals, citing calls she receives from both groups struggling to afford the increased tax burden. She emphasizes that the issue isn't the school's quality but the inability of families to pay their taxes. She mentions a suggestion to address the need for a sixth-grade teacher, questioning class size implications if additional grades are added or removed. Helmig interjects, mentioning something not being in the default, to which Susan Young clarifies she's not referring to the default setting. Susan Young shares her concerns about taxpayer calls regarding tax payments. Stephanie Helmig shares positive news about the school's progress in a competition, emphasizing their achievements despite current budget constraints.

Susan Young expressed frustration with receiving crucial information right before a crucial vote, stating that it hinders responsible decision-making and leads to a sense of having already decided on a matter. She voiced concerns about the lack of responsibility in the information presented on the ballot. The Chair presented a choice: continue the discussion or proceed with the existing budget. A motion was made by Stephanie (unclear amount specified, but a speaker clarified it as \$11,100,810 excluding additional requests, representing the default budget) and seconded by Susan. Following a brief period for additional discussion, Josh raised a concern that using only the default budget would limit voter choice.

Susan Young expresses concern that a proposed ballot number will not be well-received. Stephanie Helmig clarifies that this number will be on the ballot as the default, regardless of other proposals. The Chair explains that while this is the proposed number, voters can choose the default if they disagree. Josh questions the approach of presenting only one option, suggesting that it's not appropriate. He expresses concern that presenting only one option isn't truly democratic. Helmig explains her hope that the default number will be used, acknowledging that proposing a

higher number would be unreasonable and likely fail. She believes the current proposal is more likely to pass.

The Chair proposes a motion to recommend the default budget of \$11,100,810. A roll call vote ensues, with the Chair recording the votes: Stephanie (yes), Ryan (no), Susan (yes), Josh (no), Lynn (yes), Brenda (no), Katrina (no), Sue (no), and Bill (no). The motion fails with 3 yes votes and 6 no votes.

William Saffie motions to keep the previously agreed-upon 3% budget increase, amounting to \$10,716,750. The motion is seconded by Sue. A vote is taken. The motion fails with four yes votes (Brenda, Katrina, Sue, Bill) and five no votes (Ryan, Stephanie, Susan, Josh, Lynn).

Following the failed motion, the Chair suggests exploring a compromise figure between the previously rejected proposal and the initial suggestion. Josh expresses concern about presenting voters with only one option, citing last year's voting results and current inflation. He advocates for a slightly higher budget increase than initially proposed but still below the default amount to provide voters with a meaningful choice. Josh suggests a "Solomon approach" to find a middle ground, but doesn't offer a specific numerical proposal. The resulting percentage is calculated to be approximately 4.8%, or \$10,908,780. A vote is taken. The motion fails with two yes votes (Ryan, Josh) and seven no votes (Stephanie, Susan, Lynn, Brenda, Katrina, Sue, Bill).

Discussion ensues regarding if an increase or decrease is supported by the board members followed by how to adjust to get to a number all are agreeable to.

William Saffie proposes makes a motion to recommend a 4% increase to the school budget which is \$10,820,796. A roll call vote ensues, with the Chair recording the votes: Stephanie (no), Ryan (yes), Susan (no), Josh (yes), Lynn (no), Brenda (yes), Katrina (yes), Sue (yes), and Bill (yes). The motion passes with 3 no votes and 6 yes votes.

This chapter discusses the Candia School District's vote to approve cost items within a collective bargaining agreement between the previous school board and the Candia Educational Support Professionals. The agreement outlines salary and benefit increases at current staffing levels: \$12,654 for fiscal year 25-26, \$18,982 for 26-27, and \$25,309 for 27-28. The warrant article requests approval of these increases. Lynn clarifies the estimated tax impact as two cents per thousand. Susan Young questions the wording, specifically the phrase "and further to raise an appropriate," noting that the contract covers three years but the warrant only addresses the first year's funding. The Chair clarifies that the warrant seeks approval of the entire contract and separate appropriation for subsequent years. Susan Young requests adding "two cents per thousand" to clarify the tax impact. After discussion, Susan Young moves to recommend approval of the warrant article as amended to include the tax impact clarification. A motion was seconded, and a vote of eight in favor and William Saffie opposed resulted in the warrant article's approval. The board thanked everyone for their attendance.

The public hearing on the town budget commenced. There was discussion regarding the number of full time and part time police officers throughout the years. Newly hired Police Chief Chad Shevlin clarifies and answers questions pointing out the number of officers for certain shifts. Chief Shevlin explains the current status of his department's staffing. Two officers are undergoing field training after completing the academy (delayed due to academy capacity). By November/December, he projects all officers will be fully operational. A speaker clarifies that this includes five full-time

officers (including the Chief, Lieutenant, and a female officer) plus the two completing training. Discussion turns to additional hiring; one certified officer's application is in the background check phase, with the process expected to take a month. A speaker proposes considering five part-time officers to supplement the full-time staff, addressing vacation coverage and preventing overtime costs. Chief Shevlin confirms they currently utilize five part-timers in this capacity, primarily for covering absences and preventing burnout among full-time officers.

Chief Shevlin explains the current staffing situation, highlighting the crucial role of part-time officers, especially those with experience, in handling complex cases and mentoring new recruits. He emphasizes the limitations on part-time officers' working hours due to retirement benefits. A speaker proposes a revised budget allocation, suggesting funding for six months of an additional full-time officer instead of fully funding seven full-time and four or five part-time officers. This approach would provide time to find a certified officer to fill the seventh position. A speaker also mentions the availability of surplus funds in the town budget, expressing confidence in covering the cost even if an officer is found sooner than six months. The discussion centers on finding a balance between immediate staffing needs and efficient budget utilization, leveraging existing part-time officers and strategically allocating resources to recruit a new full-time officer.

Chief Shevlin discusses the challenges of recruiting and retaining police officers, noting that it's not easy to fill positions. He aims for 24-hour coverage with certified officers and mentions having seven potential hires in the pipeline, three of whom are not yet certified. He's willing to compromise on the certification requirement to reach his goal of seven officers by year's end. A speaker asks for a breakdown of calls between midnight and 6 a.m. or 11 p.m. and 7 a.m., specifically regarding Candia calls and mutual aid responses. Chief Shevlin explains that the software doesn't allow for that specific data breakdown but notes that midnight shifts tend to be slower in terms of call volume but have a higher probability of higher-crime incidents. Day shifts, conversely, see more calls related to speeding complaints and other issues reported during daylight hours. He explains that some incidents occurring at night might only be discovered and reported during the day shift, leading to a backlog of calls for day shift officers.

Chief Shevlin explains the limitations of providing a more detailed breakdown of police staffing due to the constraints of the IMC program. He clarifies that surrounding towns offer mutual aid, but this is not an obligation, especially if they are dealing with their own significant calls. He notes that towns with populations under 4,000 often provide contractual policing, while those over 4,000 are not obligated to assist. Chief Shevlin emphasizes that while neighboring departments are willing to help, their availability is limited, particularly during overnight shifts when state troopers may be occupied with other emergencies. The speaker then proposes a potential short-term solution: paying a stipend to current officers to cover the night shift, with officers carrying beepers to respond to calls as needed, drawing a parallel to similar practices in nursing.

A speaker proposes offering time-and-a-half pay to incentivize officers during understaffed periods. Chief Shevlin explains that this isn't feasible due to the current reliance on state police for coverage during off-peak hours. He emphasizes the importance of rapid response times, highlighting instances where officers provide immediate first aid or CPR before other emergency services arrive. Chief Shevlin details the challenges posed by the town's large geographical area, which can lead to extended response times, especially for calls near town borders. He contrasts this with the current practice of officers patrolling and being readily available for quick responses. Brian Brock

adds that the hiring board had set clear expectations for the chief regarding response times and staffing. Discussion continues regarding police staffing and the police budget.

Mike Kelly reinforces this point by sharing experiences of delayed emergency response times due to understaffing, emphasizing the life-saving role of police officers during night shifts. My Kelly expressed concern about ambulance crew staging locations at night, citing safety risks due to increased nighttime incidents.

Katrina inquired about the funding allocated to the Smith Memorial Building. The Chair consulted the most recent budget (dated December 17th), referencing building expenses of \$33,495 on page 7. Katrina clarified her question regarding potential budget changes before the public hearing's closure. The Chair indicated that while the bottom line might be adjusted, specific line items would likely remain unchanged unless a formal proposal was presented.

The Chair confirmed the approved budget for the ambulance is \$357,409. Lynn clarified the bottom line of the budget is \$4,205,989, representing a 6% increase.

The Chair then read a statement from Selectman Chivers cautioning against using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as a benchmark for municipal budget comparisons. Chivers explained that CPI reflects urban consumer spending, not municipal costs. He suggested using the Municipal Cost Index (MCI) published by American City & County, which showed a 5.16% increase for 2024 over 2023. This is significantly higher than the 2.5% CPI change. Examples were given to illustrate the MCI's accuracy, including increased costs in ambulance payroll (\$13,960 due to certifications and stipends), highway department materials (asphalt, salt, sand), solid waste disposal, groundwater testing, police department ammunition and training, and state-mandated retirement fund contributions (\$29,463). Competitive wages added a further \$97,270.8 increase over 2024.

Susan Young opened the public hearing by raising concerns about significant errors in the town assessment. She stated that approximately \$5 million worth of properties were incorrectly included in the assessment, leading to an inaccurate tax base. This error has implications for property tax rates and potential abatements. Susan questioned how the town would address this \$5 million discrepancy, suggesting the possibility of a supplemental tax bill. Susan Young highlights a specific example where a property was assessed at \$156 instead of \$16,000, illustrating widespread assessment inaccuracies. The discussion centers on the impact of these errors on tax collection. The current tax rate is 18.36, and the question arises about the exact tax revenue loss due to the underassessment. Brian Brock suggests that the issue will resolve itself after the abatement process, where property owners can appeal their assessments. However, Susan Young points out that this only addresses over-assessed land and that the assessment of houses is yet to be reviewed, potentially increasing the \$5 million discrepancy. She expresses concern that this information wasn't available before the school budget vote and questions how to proceed. A speaker clarifies that the \$5 million represents the difference in assessment, not necessarily uncollected taxes. The Chair asks how this information affects the committee's voting on the town and school budgets. Susan Young explains that the incorrect assessment means taxes will be higher than anticipated, but she refrains from commenting on whether the budget should be adjusted, stating that it's a matter for the selectmen to decide. She emphasizes the importance of this information for the committee's decision-making.

Susan Young explains that due to previously unknown information, the budget increase per thousand will be \$2.50 instead of the initially considered \$2.00. A speaker inquires about having a

clearer picture of the budget by February 1st, specifically regarding Deliberative Session. The Chair suggests that if new information emerges, adjustments can be made at the time of the Deliberative Session. Josh proposes postponing further discussion until Monday.

The Chair presents the current budget recommendation of \$4,205,989, which is \$50,000 below the selectmen's request (approximately a 6% difference). A motion to consider a different amount is not made, and the group seems content with the presented figure. A speaker clarifies that the remaining balance is 4%, and a question from the public is dismissed as the public hearing is concluded. The speaker states the actual remaining balance is \$564,213, revealing an extra \$500,000. Susan Young, however, only has a figure of \$2,935,048 in her records, creating a discrepancy of \$500,000 between the two figures. The discussion ends with a disagreement on the exact remaining balance.

A speaker then brings up the departure of the town administrator and the resulting salary increase, suggesting cost savings with a new hire at a lower salary than the previous \$90,000.

Brian Brock discusses potential cost savings of approximately \$30,000 from a town administrator position change, but notes uncertainty regarding offsetting costs from filling the land use secretary position. The process of filling the land use secretary position is ongoing, and the final cost is yet to be determined. The possibility of returning city employees to the New Hampshire retirement system is mentioned, but it's noted that there wasn't enough time to address it fully during this meeting. This is considered a future option for employee retention. A speaker inquires about the process of switching back to the New Hampshire retirement system and whether the current contributions would be eliminated.

Discussions ensue regarding encumbrance of funds.

Encumbered funds for the cemetery committee are discussed. Pricing of contract work for tree removal is discussed. It was asked if this contract work is put out to bid to obtain the best pricing. The history of working with various contractors throughout the years was discussed.

Discussion continues with countless people speaking.

Susan Young wishes Ryan Young good luck typing up the minutes to this meeting. Ryan chuckles in an effort to keep from crying.

There is a brief discussion with the audience on how budget surpluses and encumbrances work.

There is a motion made to continue with the 6% increase to the town budget amount previously voted on which is \$4,205,989. Discussion ensues before a vote. Stephanie (yes), Ryan (yes), Susan (yes), Josh (affirmative), Lynn (yes), Brenda (no), Katrina (no), Sue (no), Bill (no). The motion passes with a vote of five yes votes to 4 no votes.

The warrant articles are discussed and voted on.

Article 2: Recommended 5-4

Article 3: Recommended 9-0

Article 4: There is a discussion about the lack of response from the CYAA regarding their increase and the committee having a copy of their budget. An additional discussion regarding the CYAA charging town school children to use the facilities while the town gives them money. It is suggested that the committee see the CYAA budget prior to authorizing the proposed warrant article.

Recommended 6-3.

Article 5: Recommended 8-1

Article 6: Recommended 9-0

Article 7: Recommended 9-0

Article 8: Recommended 7-2

Article 9: Recommended 9-0

Article 10: Recommended 9-0

Article 11: Recommended 9-0

Article 12: Recommended 7-2

Article 13: Recommended 9-0

Article 14: Recommended 9-0

Article 15: *Not voted on*

Article 16: Recommended 9-0

Article 17: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 18: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 19: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 20: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 21: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 22: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 23: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 24: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 25: Not Recommended 8-1

Article 26: *Not voted on*

Article 27: *Not voted on*

Article 28: *Not voted on*

The time, date, and location of the deliberative session was briefly discussed.

Katrina makes a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bill seconds. Meeting adjourned at 9:58pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Ryan Young