



**TOWN OF PEMBROKE**  
**Budget Committee Minutes**  
**Meeting of January 21, 2016**  
**Held at: Pembroke Town Hall**  
**311 Pembroke Street**

*Members Present:* Mark LePage, Chair; Gerry Fleury, Vice Chair; Michael Connor; Brian Seaworth; Marie Chouinard; Sandy Goulet; Clint Hanson; Tina Courtemanche, Selectmen Rep.; Patricia Boucher, School Board Rep.; David Doherty, Alt. School Board Rep.; Daniel Crean;  
*Absent:* Karen Yeaton

Mark called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Chouinard offered a motion to approve to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2016 which received a second from Mr. Crean. The minutes were approved as submitted.

**School**

Superintendent Patty Sherman and Business Administrator Amber Wheeler were present to address questions on behalf of the Pembroke School District budget.

Ms. Sherman provided the Budget Committee Members with a summary of the goals and objective of a Honeywell project which has been designated “Phase III” in a series of energy savings initiatives designed to be financed and paid off with the cumulative expense reductions which will be realized as a result of the project, if approved. Ms. Sherman also provided the Budget Committee with a cursory report on the results of an engineering study which had been received the previous evening. That study identified more than \$10 million in repairs and renovations across the district.

Mr. Fleury stated that he had received an advanced copy of the study and had had the opportunity to review it quickly. He expressed concerns about some of the items and their relative merit. Ms. Sherman replied that little time had been available for the District to review the study but that they shared many of his concerns. Other Budget Committee Members question whether a number of projects identified by the study might be redundant with items in the Honeywell project or whether any could be included in the

Honeywell Project if it proved practical. Ms. Sherman agreed to review the study more closely and to report her finding back to the Budget Committee at its next meeting.

Ms. Sherman then went over the packet that had been provided to the Budget Committee. That packet included the draft School District Warrant Articles and Ms. Sherman called attention to various pages which needed to be omitted and/or replaced with version which had been provided in an earlier packet.

Discussion then ensued on Article #2 for the Honeywell Phase III Project. At a previous meeting, Committee Members had questioned whether more attractive interest rates might be available and Ms. Goulet asked whether a cheaper interest rate had been found. Ms. Sherman replied that no lower rate had yet been identified but that alternatives were still being explored. Mr. Fleury asked who had provided the financing for Phases I and II which had been done by Honeywell. Ms. Sherman replied that she believed that the financing had been provided by Honeywell. Mr. Fleury then inquired whether language regarding “fiscal funding” should be included in the article. Ms. Sherman replied that she would find out.

Mr. Crean asked whether the words “raise and appropriate” should also be in the language of the article. Again, Ms. Sherman replied that she would find out. Chairman LePage recommended that Ms. Sherman check the language which has been used for the warrant articles for the Phase I and Phase projects.

Discussion ensued and Mr. Connor asked about the method in which savings were being calculated. Ms. Sherman responded that she would research the question and come back with an answer at the next meeting.

Ms. Sherman then addressed Articles #3, #4, and #5 which resulted in few questions. She noted Article #5 for \$120,000 may be reduced to \$20,000.00 depending upon whether the correction of an electrical issue estimated to cost \$100,000 can be added to the Honeywell project. She then continued by addressing Article #6 and explained that the funds would be allocated for paving. Articles #7, 8, 9 were read but few questions arose.

Discussion ensued about the budget and the tax increase.

Mr. Connor had prepared a schedule of possible cuts to the District’s budget request and copies of his recommendations were circulated to those in attendance. He noted that while his recommended cuts decrease the budget by \$113,000 they are still not significant enough to change the tax rate.

The Committee agreed to review Mr. Connor’s schedule and to pursue matters of the School District Budget at the next weekly meeting.

## **Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 PM was made by Mr. Crean, seconded by Mr. Hanson, and passed by unanimous vote.