

**HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL BOARD
JANUARY 17, 2018
MEETING MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board was conducted on Wednesday, January 17, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Hollis/Brookline Middle School Library.

Chairman Elizabeth Brown presided:

Members of the Board present: Cindy VanCoughnett, Vice Chairman
 Melanie Levesque, Secretary
 Holly Deurloo Babcock
 John Cross
 Tom Solon
 Krista Whalen

Members of the Board Absent:

Also in Attendance: Andrew Corey, Superintendent
 Gina Bergskaug, Assistant Superintendent
 Linda Sherwood, Assistant Business Administrator
 Rick Barnes, Principal, Hollis Brookline High School
 Bob Thompson, Principal, Hollis Brookline Middle School
 Mary Martin, Student Council Representative

APPOINTMENT OF PROCESS OBSERVER

Chairman Brown appointed Holly Deurloo Babcock to serve as Process Observer.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

A request was made to amend the agenda by adding, under Deliberations, consideration of the request for the 2019 Summer Field Trip to Budapest, Vienna & Prague, which was included as part of the Principal’s Report.

Policy BEDB was inadvertently added to the agenda, and should be removed.

There being no objection, the agenda was adjusted, as requested.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board December 20, 2017

The following amendment was offered:

Page 3, Line 14; delete “program” following “of the”

**MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO ACCEPT AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN
MOTION CARRIED
7-0-0**

Joint Budget Committee and Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board. December 21, 2017

**MOTION BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK TO ACCEPT AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LEVESQUE
MOTION CARRIED**

6-0-1

Member Cross Abstained

NOMINATIONS/RESIGNATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE - None

PUBLIC INPUT

Tom Whalen, 218 Worcester Road, Hollis

Noted he is a member of the Facilities Committee (Committee), and the President of the Booster Club for athletics at the Hollis Brookline High School (HBHS). He stated the community has agreed there is a need for updating the educational, specifically STEM, curriculum space, and the athletic space. This is known as there was a vote on the matter a few years ago. The previous vote was majority in favor of the project (47 votes short of the required 2/3 majority).

The fields have improved since a dedicated effort was made to maintain them by budgeting for them. Despite that, there simply are not enough fields to maintain the teams we have practicing and competing on them. Field teams have grown significantly since the HBHS was built 20 years ago.

As for the STEM curriculum expansion, most understand that learning must change as the world changes, and that we aren't educating future factory managers, we are developing the next generation of tech workers, and need to be equipped to do so.

We have a solid proposal. The research and prep. work has been done in depth and detailed. Many people from the community provided input, and it is believed there exists a solid platform to work from. There has been professional support from architects and extensive resources. Two well-advertised and well-attended public forums have taken place, and another is planned for February 1st. There have been articles written in local newsprint, and information placed on the SAU website. A 3D presentation was made to the Board at its last meeting.

The Committee believes the recommendation provided answers the need efficiently and as economically as possible, and leaves the opportunity for future investment, private or public, to continue the process of updating facilities.

The only question that remains is can we execute. Successful execution of this plan requires leadership and persistence. That is the main reason it did not pass in 2016; a concern for who would do it. The person who must make this happen is our Superintendent. We have a solid form of leadership at the School District that we haven't had in recent memory. Superintendent Corey has experience in raising funds from his private school background, has shown sincere dedication to the school district in his time here, and has a track record of successful bonding and building in the Hollis School District.

The details of funding the renovation will be discussed at length. They are not and cannot be finalized until the Board recommends a Warrant Article. This will be a public and private effort that will be unique in its structure, but not in its nature. The seats in the auditorium in the high school have nameplates of the donors who gave to build it. Some donations have already been pledged, and some are waiting to learn that the School Board agrees with and supports the project.

Mr. Whalen requested the Board approve the submission of a Warrant Article to fund the renovation project recommended by the Committee.

PRINCIPAL REPORTS

Bob Thompson, Principal, Hollis Brookline Middle School (HBMS), noted the 3rd Annual Wrestling for Change will be held on January 25th. The fundraiser is a joint effort of the United for All (anti-bullying) group and the wrestling team, and consists of bake sales, t-shirt sales, etc. Money raised will go to support suicide prevention.

Rick Barnes, Principal, HBHS, spoke of the NEASC Two-Year Report, which highlights progress that has been made.

After mid-term testing, a survey will be put out to staff, students, and parents seeking feedback on the process of mid-term testing.

Ms. Candice Hancock is the New Hampshire Family and Consumer Science Teacher of the Year for 2018. Her application has been submitted on to the national level.

Mary Martin, Student Council Representative, spoke of a survey sent out to the student body looking to identify the issues they are most passionate about. Results showed overwhelming support for an alternative to the gym credit, e.g., for students who participate in sports, allowing the time they dedicate there, and the learning received around body mechanics, etc. to count towards a gym credit. She noted the Youth Risk Behavior Survey showed the HBHS has a larger percentage than other schools of students who are engaging in healthy activities.

Another issue the student body is passionate about is composting, which came as a surprise as the Student Council has not seen a lot of support for that in the past. They are looking to get that into the cafeteria, challenges of transportation, etc.

DISCUSSION

- Facilities Update

Superintendent Corey spoke of information included with the agenda relative to the two projects. The first is the STEM lab/fitness center (STEM lab). As a result of the presentation provided last year by the Math Department Chair, changes in staffing occurred to ensure a position for the delivery of computer science, and the emphasis on that started moving forward. The STEM lab is intended to support the next direction the District must take for its students. Although often the discussion of STEM seems to go hand in hand with a discussion of robotics, what the lab would provide for robotics is a space to utilize, after hours.

Superintendent Corey spoke of what is taking place at the elementary level, and the need to be able to support that right through. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug is working on the computer curriculum. It is believed many of the courses being taught at HBHS will be shifted down to HBMS to create new, challenging courses at HBHS.

He noted the discussion before the Board was that of funding and warrant articles. The Board had questioned if the language of the articles could target private donations. Examples were provided.

Information on possible funding levels, e.g., 90% taxpayer funded/10% private donations, was provided for both the STEM lab and the synthetic multi-purpose field (field). Total cost for the STEM lab is \$1,980,000, which does not include much of a contingency (approx. \$150,000). The consensus of the Committee was for

the bump-out (dirty space for robotics and storage area for athletic equipment) to be included as part of the project (approx. \$215,000). To accommodate that without impacting the estimated overall project cost, the contingency was reduced. The Committee has taken the position of a funding mechanism of 85% taxpayer funds (\$1,683,000) and 15% (\$297,000) private donations.

There would be two other pieces funded through private donations; STEM equipment estimated at \$100,000 and fitness equipment estimated at \$75,000.

Superintendent Corey spoke of the proposal for the field. The two main reasons for this type of field are the maintenance required, e.g., a grass field would require the hiring of a part-time person (at a minimum), and the concern over water. An 80,000 sq. ft. field is estimated to utilize 1-3 million gallons of water. Wells could be dug, which would cost around \$100,000. It is likely if wells were dug it would result in taking water away from others in that area or potentially the HBHS.

For the field, which has a total estimated cost of \$1,660,000, the Committee supported an 85/15 split. The projected cost does not include lighting (est. \$300,000, which is expected to come from private donations). The cost also does not include bleachers, snack shack, bathrooms, etc.

The cost difference between a synthetic field and grass is approx. \$500,000. Other items, beyond the cost of maintenance personnel and water for a grass field include seeding, pesticides, and loss of use when the field has to be shut down for maintenance/rehab. A multi-purpose field will allow for the hosting of multiple games, one after the other. If funding is achieved for lighting, the availability for use will increase tremendously. Superintendent Corey spoke of having discussed lighting with the abutter, who is supportive.

Also included with the agenda was information on the process and timeline involved with putting this matter before the voters.

Examples were provided of language that could be utilized for the warrant article. The language would allow for acceptance of donations for the project thereby reducing the amount to be borrowed. The language could include the total dollar amount to be raised reduced by the amount of private donations, an escape clause, and could be contingent upon the District receiving a pre-determined amount of private donations.

With leasing, although there would be a slightly higher interest rate, there would be the ability to pre-pay, e.g., private donations received could go towards the principal, year-end surplus could be allocated toward principal, etc. thereby reducing the term of the lease.

He spoke of having spoken with a number of community members who have indicated a willingness to financially support these projects. A consistent question posed is what the taxpayers are willing to support. Some have gone so far as to say they don't want to be associated with a loser. They don't want to come out and commit to a project before hearing the stance of the community-at-large.

The Committee believes the private donation amount of approx. \$540,000 is realistic. Fundraising would continue for lighting, bleachers, equipment, etc.

Superintendent Corey stated the desire for a discussion of the warrant article language to be put forward, and the Board's opinion on the level of split.

Chairman Brown questioned the will of the Board.

Mr. Cross questioned what would occur if the warrant article indicated an amount to be raised through private donations, and the private donations did not reach that amount. Chairman Brown stated the District would not be authorized to bond/lease until and unless the fundraising goal were reached.

Superintendent Corey commented the Committee is hesitant to go beyond the private donation figures provided because the project would be delayed until the amount stated is reached, and were the delay to be extensive, project costs could increase based on escalating costs of materials, interest rate, etc.

Mr. Cross questioned, based on the first warrant example provided, how the District would be incentivized to fundraise. Superintendent Corey responded the incentive is that the project will be sold as a public/private partnership. His recommendation is for an article that identifies the amount to be raised through private donations as that clearly demonstrates to the communities that the borrowing is contingent upon achieving that partnership.

When asked, Superintendent Corey stated his belief 15% private donations is realistic. Ms. Leveque questioned how funds would be distributed were the private donations to exceed the anticipated amount. Superintendent Corey responded he would hope the Board would allocate those funds to other areas of the project, e.g., equipment and reducing overall cost.

Chairman Brown reiterated were the financing approach for the field be that of a lease, funds raised in excess of those stated could be utilized to pre-pay principal on the lease thereby reducing the financial burden on taxpayers. Superintendent Corey noted the municipal bond is a ten-year fixed rate (could not be pre-paid). Any additional monies raised towards the STEM lab would be allocated towards equipment, etc.

Mr. Solon suggested the language allow for the scenario whereby if the required private donation amount had not been reached by the target date, based on the contingency language, the bond could not be let. When the required amount is raised, and the bond let, the option exists to utilize private donations received to reduce the amount of the bond.

In the first example provided where the private donations would be used to reduce the total amount to be bonded, there remains the requirement to pick the time and amount for bonding. The time may be fixed, but the amount isn't. You are still faced with an unknown bond amount. Chairman Brown suggested it may be as simple as listing an "up to" amount.

In the first example the variable is the amount and in the second example the variable is the date. Mr. Solon remarked what he was asking was for both variables to be in play. Chairman Brown stated her guess would be the extra money private donors are willing to contribute would be for the purchase of the items not encompassed in the proposed bond.

Mr. Solon questioned why option 1 would be considered; if it is believed there is value, rather than be put in a situation of either/or, why not word the article to provide the flexibility. If it is believed that might discourage donors, that might be a valid argument. He suggested if someone is going to identify the donation for a specific item, they will target it regardless, and it may eliminate it for use in the purpose of reducing the bond amount, but there may be other donations that are unrestricted.

Superintendent Corey stated he could look to bond council for the appropriate language to encompass the suggestion made.

Superintendent Corey indicated were the entire amount borrowed (approx. \$3.5 million), the tax impact on a home assessed at \$400,000 would be \$89.00/year. If \$3 million were borrowed, the tax impact would be \$76/year. If \$2.5 million were borrowed, \$64/year. The calculation was based on both projects being bonded, and the life of the bond being 10 years.

Superintendent Corey reiterated his support for leasing the field portion of the project given the option for pre-payment.

He spoke of his belief there will be continued donations over time and the likelihood organizations may step forward to assist. Three public forums have been conducted, and another planned before the Rotary Club in early February. There are a variety of meetings ongoing with individuals.

Superintendent Corey noted HB Elevates is formed, has a Board, and the District is simply waiting for the official IRS notification of its charitable foundation status. That group has come together and met. Its work starts with this project, but it is a long-term organization to assist for what is believed will be many years to come. Membership will be announced in the February timeframe.

Superintendent Corey spoke of the tremendous amount of work that has taken place over the past 5 months and thanked all who have been involved in the process thus far.

Mr. Solon stated his complete support of the project in terms of what it provides to the school, students, and community. However, he disagrees with the proposed amount of the split between public and private contributions. Some of that stems back to the original discussions. Although there was not consensus, the tone when this began a few years ago was that there was a strong appetite for private funding of resources not just at HB but in this climate. He would like to see a smaller portion of the total cost, one that represents infrastructure that needs to be brought to completion to have viable milestone or breakpoint, being funded through the warrant article. While that work is being performed, there would be the opportunity to get significant external contributions to fund the remainder of the project. He is also of the belief there is a psychological impact; if this has support and is viewed as valuable, having the project committed and underway with clearly defined chunks of money that need to be raised makes it easier to raise those funds. On the other hand, if you don't need the funding you will not get it. He does not believe people will contribute above the stated need.

He would support a smaller number with a warrant article that he feels would get greater support and provide the ability to start construction on time for both projects, continue it, and have very clear compartmentalized elements. The most obvious one is the elevator; it is a large cost that is, to some degree, standalone construction. You must build the place to accept it, but the fact that you can replace an elevator highlights the fact that it is a standalone element. Without an elevator in the structure, you can't necessarily use it for students and classroom, but it doesn't mean the area degrades, etc.

In the worst-case scenario of funding not being obtained, and the project being 9 months in, the District would have to go back to the taxpayers for additional funding. It would be more expensive in that the rates would likely be higher, but it won't necessarily be more expensive from the standpoint of timing because you are not losing schedule time. It does make a strong statement to the public and individual taxpayers that there is a willingness to acknowledge their concerns about taxes.

He stated his belief to go forward with the amount proposed would potentially be inflammatory in two ways; for the people who are not committed to the schools to the same level as others, it will show a disregard for their concerns, and we have to acknowledge the fact that at the last apportionment discussion there was a significant voice that was fearful that the apportionment of capital expenditures was going to fuel the further subsidization of Brookline by Hollis. The larger the amount in the warrant article, the more that belief is reinforced.

He stated his belief the community extends beyond Hollis and Brookline; it is the southern tier.

He stated his preference for the amount to be put forth to be \$800,000 - \$1,000,000 for the STEM lab and \$700,000 - \$800,000 for the field. Those numbers are based on what he sees as breakpoints from the standpoint of having a structure that would not degrade and would carry a long way and be combined with private funding believed to be firmly committed if the project is approved by the voters.

When asked how those numbers correlate to breakpoints, Mr. Solon responded Superintendent Corey had provided him with information on what he termed as a Phase I construction that had a cost of approx. \$1.5

million, the elevator alone is \$200,000, there are a couple of items for which he identified rough estimates, and there are private funds believed to have a high probability of commitment.

Superintendent Corey stated having received Mr. Solon's point of view, he reached out to the architect. He was informed there is a total cost of \$1,980,000 for the STEM lab. If we were to break it up into 2 phases, \$450,000 could be deducted off that cost for a total of \$1,530,000, but because we would be phasing and delaying it, instead of needing to raise \$450,000, he believes the need would be to raise \$550,000.

One of the first things the architect stated needs to occur is the ordering of the elevator. Because an elevator is built specifically for a location, it takes over a year before delivery can occur. If waiting until the end of the project, it could be completed and unable to be used for a year.

Mr. Solon stated he does not agree with the cost of escalation as he is not inherently proposing that there be a delay, just that you pay as you go.

On the field piece; the earthwork, drainage for turf, \$50,000 for conduit for light bases, paving (ADA compliance issue) and final prep. (\$325,000) total \$875,000. A contingency fund of \$150,000 added to that would bring the amount to the \$1 million. What is missing from the field would be the turf element (\$500,000) and the fencing. Beyond that are the lights, bleachers, scoreboard, etc.

Although what was suggested is an alternative strategy, the Committee is concerned that although it is believed some funds can be raised, there is not the personnel needed to be dedicated to fundraising.

Ms. Deurloo Babcock commented the Committee has discussed the concept of phasing in. It struggled with how that would work for the STEM lab, had not considered not including the elevator as it is needed. For students and staff, a construction project is a strain. Starting a project with an unknown completion date is part of the issue. When it comes to the field, there is more of a natural spot for phasing, e.g., can have it all set and then address the desire and cost associated with turf. She believes there to be more flexibility for phasing with the turn field than there is with the STEM lab.

Ms. Deurloo Babcock added she is concerned with talking about the amount of private donations being suggested when there is no one coordinating that effort on a full-time basis. She stated a willingness to participate in that process but would not be able to raise \$1 million. With the structure proposed, the total amount hoped to be raised through private donations is around \$1 million, and she believes that to be a reasonable amount to ask for.

She remarked this is needed, is curriculum, and is for the students. The taxpayers need to be aware of that, and they get to decide. She stated the desire to put forth what she believes to be the right thing. She believes this is the right thing to do for the student population; it is where the future is (STEM), and the field is needed.

Mr. Solon agreed it is the right thing and is needed; however, stated he would rather propose doing it in a way that has a higher probability of success with the voters.

Ms. Levesque stated if going to start working on the project, especially the field work, you really must bring it to completion. Her desire is that as funds are raised it defers the cost for the taxpayer.

Superintendent Corey stated he would question legal counsel about donations being made to the School Board, which would come in as revenue, and the donor willing to offset the cost of the bond or lease. He is uncertain if that is a means of offsetting the cost of the bond piece. The problem with bonding is municipal bonds don't allow for pre-payment. Bond council has suggested, if approved by the voters, it be shopped to non-municipal agencies as well.

Chairman Brown commented she is not certain how compelling it would be to ask for a private donation to offset public bond payment versus asking someone to donate towards lighting of the field.

Mr. Solon remarked he does not see the fundraising effort as being a multi-year effort. He does not like it being locked in to have an early start date. He would not be making the same suggestion if the proposal were to start the project in 18 months as he believes where the process is now, if intended to start in 18 months, and having a clear plan and a clear budget, a lot could be accomplished. The issue is we are so far down the road for when we want to start to now build momentum for fundraising we are at a disadvantage. The fact that the project is likely to span 12-15 months is a reasonable amount of time to get a lot done, and he believes within that period you can still do the kind of fundraising envisioned.

Believing the structure of a bond would be such that the first year's payment is not as great as future years, time would be afforded to fundraise, during construction, in the hope of offsetting future year costs. Superintendent Corey stated the question could be posed of bond council.

Ms. Whalen spoke of respecting Mr. Solon's ideas noting they are very thoughtful and consider all parties. She stated her concern to have been that the 85/15 split is not enough. The Board, in its ongoing review of curriculum, has been talking about putting these STEM programs forward. Now we want to do that, we don't have the equipment or a place to house it. We don't have the ability to move forward a curriculum that has been determined important on a national level. She stated the belief we need to move forward as a district that prides itself on being careful, meticulous, and educating its children in the best way possible. She stated her appreciation for the proposal brought forward by the Committee as she does not believe it to be disrespectful to the taxpayers, but rather as a means of being respectful to the taxpayers through a proposal to utilize an area of the existing building that is currently underutilized.

One of the issues that has been bantered about is, is the space being contemplated sufficient. She spoke of the two communities having historically proceeded cautiously and in a manner, that is fiscally prudent, and provided the example of when the HBHS was built; built small and has been added on to. She believes the approach recommended is conservation. She stated concern with starting a project and not being able to complete it. She does not want to be in a situation where voter approval is requested to bond a project that cannot be completed or utilized. She stated support for fundraising to fund the cost of the items outside of the actual building process, e.g., bleachers, snack shack, etc.

Ms. Whalen commented the difference between borrowing for the entire amount of the proposal (\$3.5 million) and a million dollars less is \$30/year on a \$400,000 home. The headaches, aggravation, and frustration that she believes would result if the project were not completed, would far outweigh the financial cost of addressing it all from the start. She spoke of the increased level of work and frustration that would be experienced by the administration were the projects done in phases, and noted there is no project manager or facilities manager.

Vice Chairman VanCoughnett commented she is on the Committee, and agrees with Ms. Whalen that there are times she is concerned the estimated cost is not sufficient to complete the desired project. She agreed the District is extremely conservative in its approach to such things. She spoke of projects in other communities that range from \$7-10 million. The District is not trying to add on space that is not needed, it is looking to utilize existing space more efficiently. She touched upon remarks by the Superintendent relative to the STEM activities occurring in the elementary schools noting if those students reach the HBHS and there is not the space needed to continue that curriculum it is a disservice to the students. She stated her belief this project is the right thing to do for the students.

Mr. Cross stated his belief the reason for the approach proposed by Mr. Solon was to increase the probability of success of the project with the idea that would come from a proposal for a lesser tax burden. He commented the opposing voices he has heard seem to imply the problem is not necessarily the tax burden but the justification for the need of the field and facility. He remarked he has trouble saying what is the acceptable tax burden that

would increase the level of success. It seems the level of successful may be increased by more effectively justifying the need.

Chairman Brown remarked it is unlikely every voter will be able to be convinced of the need, the best the Board can hope for is to gain enough support to achieve the required number of votes to pass the article.

Mr. Cross commented he does not believe the difference in dollar value on a yearly basis will be the determining factor in whether the project is supported. He proposed going forward with a phased plan, laying out a schedule and saying here is what we can do in the first 12 months and the dollar value for that, that is what we will ask for in year one, and the rest in year two. Ms. Whalen spoke of the difficulty in seeking approval for bonds two years in a row. Chairman Brown spoke of the recent meeting of the Budget Committee, where it was expressed that they didn't understand why we weren't including all the other elements, e.g., lights and bleachers. She believes such an approach is exceptionally risky. She spoke of the possibility of losing existing athletic space if only part were built, and the space was not able to be accessed because we didn't have an elevator. You would have moved all of that stuff into storage and now you have built it out in order to be STEM labs so now we have a football team that can't workout upstairs because we can't have them go up the stairs because it is not ADA accessible, so you can't access that space. Doing a phased approach to the field, she could see a situation where we end up clearing that mess out, site work done, and if funds are not raised, that would all end up becoming overgrown, and the Board hated by the public because we got them excited about a project we told them we needed, and we never completed.

Chairman Brown stated her opinion the 85/15 split proposed by the Committee is a compromise that allows us to be able to do what we said we were going to do, which is make it a public/private partnership. She remarked the Superintendent has a job, which is CEO of a school district not a fundraiser. Ms. Deurloo Babcock commented the idea of asking for money one year and then coming back the next year with another ask is something the community won't appreciate. It is one of the biggest complaints heard in the past during Annual Meeting. She stated her belief laying out what is needed with a small percent being raised privately is the way to go.

Mr. Cross questioned if there is language that would request total funding spread out over multiple years. Mr. Solon stated there to be a disadvantage to that in the bonding process because of the cost for initiating the separate bonds as well as the potential for an increase in rates.

Mr. Solon remarked he has listened to the conversation, and there were two points made that he finds extremely compelling. One is the statement made by Mr. Cross that objections are probably not going to be based on money, they will be based on need. That is something the Board can address, but it must be taken seriously. We're doing amazing things and putting our students in amazing places, and to say we have a problem with our STEM program does a disservice to what we have. We have opportunities to get additional excellence and expand it, but we're not doing bad. In terms of fields, they certainly are not ideal, but our students have wonderful opportunities that many people around the country would kill to have access to. He stated there to be a risk in seeming disingenuous if we don't publicize this as a terrific opportunity rather than a dangerous absence.

Regarding the second point, he commented he is carrying a lot of baggage into this because he truly wanted this to be a groundbreaking element to change the way the community supports things. He believes it important for our schools to continue existing on a national level. As a country we do a poor job of getting industry to invest in their future. In other nations throughout the world companies are big funders of the education of what will be their future. He was looking to seek out companies such as Google, BAE, etc. to support this. They are the ones who benefit from what we produce here as does our society. The kind of money we are talking about fundraising he characterized as chump change. It is not worth risking the project.

If there is not the desire to make this project a flagship activity to draw in community supporting education, then don't piece meal the project; seek 100% funding.

Ms. Levesque stated her support of the public/private partnership, and commented this is one project, and there may be another in 3-5 years. At that time, we will be even better at creating those types of relationships. This partnership will show the community that we're trying to find alternative sources. She is of the belief more than 15% can be raised through private donations, but she is not willing to increase what would be required.

Superintendent Corey stated the District has already stated it would be a public/private project. He is against requesting 100% funding.

Mr. Solon clarified he was not suggesting not to fundraise, but rather to not write the Warrant Article in a way that demands it; use that first format so that the project is not jeopardized by the success or timing.

Superintendent Corey questioned the will of the Board relative to the 85/15 split.

Mr. Cross questioned if what is understood at this time in terms of potential fundraising ability, is the reasoning behind the recommended 85/15 split. Superintendent Corey stated there is the potential, and he will know more in the next few weeks. He is of the belief the 85/15 split, with the wording of the first example provided for the warrant article, would be the ideal position to leave the meeting with.

Chairman Brown stated she was leaning towards the option, which makes bonding contingent upon the private donations. That language provides a specific number for the taxpayers, and the incentive from a fundraising point given if the specific amount of private donations is not received, the project would not move forward.

Ms. Deurloo Babcock remarked, as the Process Observer, she would recommend moving forward on a position relative to the split and consider the language of a warrant article at the Public Hearing.

- Revenue and Expense Update

Linda Sherwood, Assistant Business Administrator, stated the last update was provided in October. At that time, the balance (under expenses) was \$378,765. Currently, the balance is \$450,843. She noted there to be no significant change to account for that difference other than savings achieved through the hiring process. The report provided with the agenda includes a category for FY17 Expense Carryover, which is new. Those numbers were previously included with the numbers in the table. The desire was to pull those numbers out to more clearly highlight them. What carryover means is that the auditors have said that \$155,833 budget is FY17 money.

Under Revenue, she noted, under State, the category of Special Education Aid, is what used to be called Catastrophic Aid. The \$1,915 listed under Other State Aid is what was received from the State for Charter School Aid. It is part of special education but referred to as Charter School Aid. It was unexpected, which is why there now appears a balance on the revenue side.

The unreserved fund balance after reductions is \$119,077. Below that is a list of potential expenses for which quotes are being obtained. With an estimate of \$80,000 for the items identified, should the Board voted to fund those items through use of unreserved fund balance, the amount available to be returned to the general fund would be \$39,077.

On the list of potential expenses is the fire panel. Some patchwork was done on the fire alarm panel at the HBHS about 4-5 years ago, which served the District well in that it lasted 4-5 years. However, after a recent issue, the Fire Chief has indicated replacement is something that will likely have to occur this spring. The panel

has been serviced and is functioning fine, but it is an issue that has been put off, and he is asking that it be looked at in the spring.

When asked about the underground tank repair estimated at \$20,000, Principal Thompson stated there was an inspection of the oil tank back in December. The tank did not pass inspection (despite having passed every other year). It is being re-tested to see what the specific issues are, and how they might be mitigated. He explained the tank is large (3,500 gallons) located beneath pavement. Whether it needs replacement should be known in the next few weeks.

The pipe issue is a hot water pipe that is leaking. It seems to be a design flaw from when the new addition was done that there is no shut-off valve in the end of the building where the leak is located. Essentially if there are issues with hot water pipes the entire hot water system must be drained. When the pipe is replaced, valves will be added at that end.

- Hollis Brookline COOP – HESSA Contract Update

A copy was provided with the agenda packet.

DELIBERATIONS

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Hollis Brookline Cooperative Support Staff Tentative Agreement

MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO APPROVE THE TENTATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL BOARD AND THE HOLLIS EDUCATION SUPPORT STAFF ASSOCIATION (HESSA)

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK

ON THE QUESTION

Mr. Solon questioned if the motion should include reference to needed edits. Chairman Brown noted the agreement is tentative. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated edits could still be made.

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the request for the June 2019 trip to Budapest, Vienna, and Prague

MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR THE TRIP TO BUDAPEST, VIENNA, AND PRAGUE SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 2019

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN

ON THE QUESTION

Principal Barnes stated the trip is to support the AP World History Program. This year they are going to Greece and Italy, which was approved last year. Questions have been asked about conducting the trip in June. He is pleased the trip is taking place after the school year has ended. When trips are scheduled before the break week, students return to have to take exams. Those targeted for this trip are this year's AP World History students, next year's AP World History students, and potentially, if they needed to fill slots, some students in the college prep. sections; anyone who would be a graduating senior would not be eligible. The 10-day trip (8 in country

and 2 for travel) would be at a cost of \$3,600, but if booking early the cost could be reduced to \$3,400/student.

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the recommendation from the Facilities Committee

MOTION BY MEMBER VANCOUGHNETT TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE TO PRIVATELY FUND FIFTEEN PERCENT (15%) AND PUBLICLY FUND EIGHTY FIVE PERCENT (85%) OF THE TWO FACILITY PROJECTS

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK

MOTION CARRIED

6-1-0

Member Solon voted in opposition

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the nomination of a COOP Board Member to the SAU 41 Strategic Study Team

Chairman Brown questioned if member(s) wished to volunteer to serve as the Board's representative on the study team, which was formed to evaluate central office needs, e.g., staffing, facilities. Ms. Deurloo Babcock offered to serve; however, stated a willingness to allow another to serve if a member of the Board had such a desire. Ms. Levesque volunteered.

Chairman Brown appointed Melanie Levesque as the Board's representative to the SAU 41 Strategic Study Team.

MOTION BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF MELANIE LEVESQUE AS THE BOARD'S REPRESENTATIVE TO THE SAU 41 STRATEGIC STUDY TEAM

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **KHB** - Advertising in the Schools

Given its first reading;

Chairman Brown commented the Board discussed this theoretically at its last meeting when discussing the ability to have naming rights for donations that might come in. The policy was discussed with counsel who recommended revisions to existing policy.

The proposed amendment is in the addition of the last paragraph, which reads:

"Nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the School Board from providing attribution to entities or individuals that contribute, financially or otherwise, to the School District, or from naming educational facilities after corporations or individuals who have made extraordinary contributions to the school community. Such determinations shall be within the School Board's sole discretion, but shall require consultation with the Superintendent and shall reflect the educational mission and shared community values of the School District."

It provides the ability to acknowledge gifts.

MOTION BY MEMBER SOLON TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF POLICY KHB - ADVERTISING IN THE SCHOOLS AS PRESENTED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK

ON THE QUESTION

Principal Barnes stated strong support for a policy that provides the Board the authority to take this action.

Ms. Levesque questioned if there are examples of what would be non-controversial. Chairman Brown responded that probably is subjective. It would have to be determined by the Board as elected officials/representatives. She reminded the Board State law requires the Board to conduct a Public Hearing before acceptance of any donations over \$5,000. If a donation is controversial, she would expect that would be apparent by the level of public participation/input.

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **BEDG** - Minutes

1st Reading: October 18, 2017

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO AMEND POLICY BEDG-MINUTES, BY DELETING THE REFERENCE TO CATEGORY AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER SOLON**

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding **BEDG-R** - Access to Minutes and Public Records

1st Reading: October 18, 2017

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO ACCEPT THE SECOND READING OF BEDG-R - ACCESS TO MINUTES AND PUBLIC RECORDS, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK**

ON THE QUESTION

Mr. Solon questioned if it requires Board approval given it is a regulation not policy. Superintendent Corey spoke of his experience in districts where they wished to approve regulations and districts where they have chosen not to. As it has been past practice in this District, he recommended the process continue. When asked, he stated his opinion any amendments to this regulation require Board action. Mr. Solon stated his personal preference that the reference to “thumb drive” be deleted. Chairman Brown stated her impression the reason that specific language is utilized relates to a case that went to the Supreme Court, which was over a thumb drive; someone brought in one that was opened, and district policy was that it had to be a new one, and if you didn’t bring them a new one in the packaging, they would sell you one for \$7.99. The case law was over whether that was an undue burden.

Superintendent Corey suggested the question be posed to the Policy Committee, and a recommendation provided in time for the third reading.

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **IGE** - Parental Objections to Specific Course Material

1st Reading: October 18, 2017

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO AMEND POLICY IGE- PARENTAL OBJECTIONS TO SPECIFIC COURSE MATERIAL, BY DELETING THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Brown noted the discussion that occurred at the time of the first reading regarding language included in this policy around sexual education content. The language was removed, and a second review by the Policy Committee resulted in the belief the policy, as currently written, meets the objective.

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

Member Cross was not in the room at the time of the vote.

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **JICFA** - Hazing
1st Reading: October 18, 2017

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK TO AMEND BY DELETING THE CATEGORY REFERENCE AND BY REPLACING “BOARD OF EDUCATION” WITH “DISTRICT” THROUGHOUT, AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN**

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

Member Cross was not in the room at the time of the vote

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **IHAM** - Health Education

Given its first reading;

Chairman Brown noted the inclusion of language regarding sexual education in this, the appropriate policy.

**MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF POLICY IHAM – HEALTH EDUCATION, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK**

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

Member Cross was not in the room at the time of the vote.

REPORT OUT BY PROCESS OBSERVER

Ms. Deurloo Babcock commented on the healthy discussion, and noted Deliberations required less time than anticipated.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

**MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN THAT THE BOARD, BY ROLL CALL, GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3 II (a) THE DISMISSAL, PROMOTION, OR COMPENSATION OF ANY PUBLIC EMPLOYEE AND RSA 91-A:3, II (c) TO DISCUSS A MATTER, WHICH IF DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC, WOULD LIKELY AFFECT ADVERSELY THE REPUTATION OF A PERSON, OTHER THAN A MEMBER OF THE BODY OR AGENCY ITSELF
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK**

A Viva Voce Roll Call was conducted, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Tom Solon, Krista Whalen, Elizabeth Brown, Cindy VanCoughnett, Holly Deurloo Babcock,
Melanie Levesque

6

Nay:

0

MOTION CARRIED

The Board went into non-public session at 9:15 p.m.

The Board came out of non-public session at 10:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MEMBER DEURLOO BABCOCK TO ADJOURN

SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

The January 11, 2018 meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Date _____ Signed _____