

**Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**December 5, 2009**  
**7:30am**

**Meeting Attendees:**

Larry Ballin (Chair), Mark Kaplan (Selectman), Jessie Levine, (Town Administrator), Peter Bianchi, Robert Lavoie, DJ Lavoie, Jack Harrod, Hardy Hasenfuss, David Harrison, Barbara Brown, Rick Anderson, Bill Clough, Dave Payne, Gary Lineberry, Peter Messer, Bob MacMichael, David Dunning, Rich Anderson, David Kidder, Hugh Chapin, Rip Cross, Noel Weinstein, Stephanie Wheeler, Anne Loeffler, Gary Markoff, Howard Hoke

Also Present: Bob Odell, Randy Foose

Chair Ballin called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 AM. He announced that State Representatives David Kidder and Randy Foose and Senator Bob Odell were present at the meeting. He noted that, due to the hard work of the Town and of the representatives, the Main Street project was recently put back on the 10-year plan for the DOT. He said that they have \$2 million allocated towards the project that will repair Main Street from Crockett's Corner to Homan's Corner. Chair Ballin opined that it is a deserving project and was not actually on the list until the last minute. Both he and Mark Kaplan would be going to the final hearing in Concord to see that it is rubber-stamped. Chair Ballin shared that the State is also going to be doing some paving on Main Street this coming year, and the Town will encourage them to do some drainage work at that time as well in preparation for the final project to be done sometime in the next 10 years. His guess would be that the project would be done towards the end of the 10-year mark.

Noel Weinstein asked how much the Town would be responsible for with this project. Chair Ballin noted that the Town was not committed to anything at this point. He said that part of the lobbying to be put back on the 10-year list included the offer of help by means of labor and equipment for the project. He felt that it was helpful that the Town was willing to be part of the process. Chair Ballin explained that if they need to, they may have to come to the voters to do a portion this work.

Chair Ballin thanked Bob MacMichael and Maureen Prohl for their help in winning the Elkins grant. He noted that the Town had been ranked first by the Regional Planning Commission for the grant application for Elkins, and it was likely that the project will move forward. Ms. Levine said that the grant includes upgrading sidewalks, increasing traffic safety, and purchasing the former Mesa building with help from the owners, who have indicated that they would donate half of the purchase price of the building to the Town. She noted that this offering did not include any building work that was necessary or repairs to the existing dam behind the building. Ms. Levine felt that it could be a very exciting project.

Hardy Hasenfuss asked when they would know, for sure, whether or not they would get the funding. Ms. Levine said that they would hear a few months after the final presentation was given to the State Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee in February. She explained that the funds for the project would not be available until October 2010. New London would be responsible for 20% of the cost of the project.

Gary Markoff asked when they wanted the work to be completed. Ms. Levine said that they'd work out the time frame with the engineers, but she estimated conclusion in the fall of 2011. Mr. Weinstein asked if there was an existing diagram of the proposed changes and work to be done. Ms. Levine said that they had a conceptual design that came from the charrette in 2008, but that it was only preliminary and they still have to get input from the residents to see what and how they want things done.

Sewer: Changing subjects to the wastewater treatment plant upgrade in Sunapee, Mr. Kaplan said the engineers will give a cost estimate at the sewer meeting in Sunapee on December 10. Right now the numbers look like about \$8 million. The US RDA was talking about granting them up to 45% of the project contingent upon the towns saying they are going to follow through with the project. Mr. Kaplan stated that the towns are reluctant to agree to do it unless they know they are going to get the grant. They have proposed the project but it is contingent upon getting the grant. New London would be responsible for about \$5 million. Mr. Kaplan opined that the cost is tremendous but the need is great. The plant is 35 years old and the State has been on them to do something about it.

Mr. Markoff asked if total share for New London was \$5 million or if that was just for the first phase. Mr. Kaplan said that that figure was for the entire project. He noted that the project would probably take over a year to complete. Ms. Levine said that they would seek the bond once and then pay it out over time.

School District: Chair Ballin said that they had a joint select board meeting with the towns in the Kearsarge Regional School District (KRSD) last Thursday night. The issue at hand was the school budget. Chair Ballin acknowledged that CAC member Rich Anderson was a member of the KRSD Municipal Budget Committee. Chair Ballin said that the school budget, as it stands now, is going to be 1.83% higher than last year, coming in at \$34.5 million +/-, which was an increase of \$620,000. He noted that the numbers are still changing and that the School Board has been working hard to grind the numbers down. Chair Ballin explained that an alternate budget had been proposed. Rich Anderson noted that the MBC suggested lower budget. On Tuesday, they will have another meeting and make more decisions to see if they can go lower than they are right now.

Chair Ballin said that one issue the Selectmen asked Jerry Frew about at the joint meeting was the status of the teacher contracts that are still under negotiation. He said that there was not any available news on those contracts until they are finalized, which would be December 15. Mr. Weinstein shared that when he has been at the deliberative session where people vote to accept the budget, it seemed like there wasn't a large attendance from New London or other places. He suggested the members of the CAC show up. Ms. Levine said that the deliberative session would be held the morning of January 9 at the high school.

State Legislature: Chair Ballin handed the floor to Dave Kidder, Randy Foose and Bob Odell to explain how things were going in legislature. Chair Ballin noted that there were a couple of issues that the Town of New London was particularly interested in hearing about: that of the donor town tax structure coming back into play and what they can do to halt and reverse that; and Andy Peterson's Homestead Exemption bill, which Chair Ballin felt would be tough on this area that relies on second homes to support the tax structure.

Mark Kaplan said that the Town had been advised by the Portsmouth Coalition, of which New London is a member, that the donor town law would come back in 2011. He said that this would be tremendously expensive to New London and he felt it was incumbent upon the Board of Selectmen to bring the representatives in to their meeting to discuss this. Mr. Kaplan explained that the statewide property tax rate would increase to \$3.19 from the current \$2.19. He indicated that that \$1 per thousand on their tax rate raises \$1 million. Mr. Kaplan indicated that this increase amounts to an average of \$600 per person or \$1200 per household. The Selectmen feel that they have to do what they can to prevent this tax. Mr. Kaplan noted that the collar was currently in effect and would be removed in July 2010 or 2011. He suggested hanging on to the collar or doing away with this kind of a tax altogether and added that New London has a very high grand list, but when comparing themselves to cities like Manchester, which has commercial and industrial property, bars, parks, hotels, etc., they come out being five times as large as New London. To raise the same amount of money, they would have to raise the tax rate in a city like

Manchester by 20 cents. He felt that this town donor tax was not equitable and he wanted the representatives to understand this.

Mr. Markoff asked for a summary of where the donor tax came from and how it was distributed. Randy Foose said that the donor town concept was similar to the donor street concept. If one person lives on a street in New London and pays a certain amount of tax to the Town and they look at next street down and see that that street is getting more services than they are, it is human to think that they are paying an unfair share of the taxes. In the educational funding structure, the State has attempted to be as fair and equitable as they can to share the costs. As the formulas to determine funding have been developed, it ends up that some towns pay more than their proportional share of the funding. Representative Foose said that the Governor has been absolutely clear that he is not in favor of expanding the number of donor towns and he is held to that principle in everything he has done. As a consequence, as they were developing the funding formula for educational funding, the legislature and the Governor ended up saying that where there were towns that deserved more money under their funding formula, they wouldn't give all that they deserved in the first two years. Instead, they would "collar" them and thereby structure the formula to reduce the burden of the "New Londons" of the state to pay a higher share. That was the structure they were dealing with.

Rep. Foose went on to say that the Governor said that donor towns are not something that they want to create more of, but that the educational funding formula was reliant upon it. The formula included structure so that towns wouldn't be hit all at once and would have time to prepare. He noted that the Coalition was correct that the towns need to talk to the legislature again.

Mr. Kaplan said that he was glad to hear that the conversations were building in Concord about this issue. He said that come June 30, the decision had to be made. He felt that it all comes down to money and politics and decisions have to be made that haven't been made in the past. Mr. Kaplan said that he was glad to hear him bring up the analogy of the donor street because to New London, the next "street" over was their neighbor and they do want to help their neighbors. Mr. Kaplan explained that New London is part of a seven-town school system. When they negotiated this idea many years ago, the result was that New London paid 29% of the total cost of running the school system even though they only have 20% of the students enrolled. They are spending 9% more than they need to in order to help the other six towns in the system. Mr. Kaplan said that it doesn't make any equitable sense for the State to ask New London to pay for people in cities like Manchester. He said that they are already helping their neighbors. He pled with the representatives to do something for New London.

Rep. Foose said that they feel very seriously that they are in Concord to do something for New London. He hoped he was being clear that as they look at this issue at the State level, the neighbors are all of the folks in the State. He said that nothing was going to happen on this over the next six months and it would not have an impact until 2011. Rep. Foose said that sticking with the neighbor and sharing issue, one of the experiences he has had with school building aid. As the legislature considered suspending school building aid until they could figure out how to pay for it, he was handed a sheet that listed 150 schools and showed how much the schools received each year. Kearsarge was the 10<sup>th</sup> richest funded system in New Hampshire. Regardless, he said he didn't feel that they should now be asked to return this funding to other districts in terms of equity.

Senator Odell said that this was a two-decade long problem and that there are various solutions. He explained that New Hampshire was the only state in the country that is required to distribute funding per dollar, per pupil regardless of wealth or need within the community. They have had to distort the program with regards to the formula to determine funding. He also noted that they created their budget using the school funding formula but lacked a revenue source for it. Senator Odell said that currently, if

there is a pocket of poverty within a community, the entire community is seen as needing assistance, and that this fact, along with others, has inflated the funding formula until it has become out of control. Senator Odell opined that they would not have this donor town problem if the State could send a tax bill for property taxes directly to homeowners. Originally, it was to be a tax raised and kept by the towns; the way it is handled now is a phony accounting transaction. The legislature had the towns collect the money so that the towns could keep the "float" (interest). He said that if the state did away with the statewide property tax, it would resolve a lot of problems and the donor town problem would go away.

Senator Odell went on to say that he disagreed with what Rep. Foose had said about coming to an agreement on these issues at year-end. He said that several times they have finished up in late June with a total statewide funding review and expected cuts, and have adjusted and changed the formula in June for school to open in September. People in those communities go to vote in March or May and can't trust the legislature because they've let them down time and time again. He said it was not about the dollars but the predictability. Senator Odell said that he met with the Governor and three other senators the other day and they agreed that they have to solve this problem in the next six months. He wants to conclude the legislative session in May with this problem solved. He acknowledged that this was a huge financial burden on some towns.

Senator Odell said that the raw politics of this issue was that Keene felt they weren't getting enough money, so they plead with the State to increase their funding. Then, more and more towns came for more funding. The whole formula became distorted and now he feels that they have to begin again at square one. Senator Odell felt strongly that the spring of 2010 is the time they need to deal with this or it will be put under rug for someone else to deal with.

Chair Ballin asked what New London could do to help them. Senator Odell suggested keeping their working relationships with the Coalition and the legislators. Whenever people get the chance, they should remind the Governor that this a threat and a concern. He shared that he has always been against donor towns. He felt that the State of New Hampshire needed a constitutional amendment to say that they can distribute state aid to towns on a need basis. He commented that some towns looking for aid want to build stadiums, etc. The last time around, the amendment passed in the Senate but not in the House. Senator Odell felt that there was no other solution to this problem other than a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Doheny asked how Rep. Foose, Rep. Kidder and Senator Odell voted on this issue. Peter Bianchi was also interested in the commitment the representatives made to citizens of New London in the past with regards to donor towns. Mr. Foose said that he voted against the amendment and was in favor of donor towns. Rep. Kidder said that he agreed with Senator Odell on the donor town issue and was in favor of the amendment.

Senator Odell noted that Nancy Stiles brought in a bill to change the lunch program dollar amount and it got defeated in the House. The bill made all the sense in the world and was aimed at giving money to those who really needed it and not to everyone, and it got shot down. Rep. Foose said that if you follow that logic, you find yourself back to the donor street logic. The purpose of government is to get dollars to the folks who need it. New London, because of its wealth and economic structure, is going to be called upon to give money to other communities like Claremont who need support. Senator Odell reiterated that if they didn't have the statewide property tax, it wouldn't matter.

Mr. Kaplan said that the wealth of New London makes it easy to point to them and try to get funds from them. He said that when going to the other towns in the State, it is apparent that the other towns' grand lists far exceed their own. If the State really wants to raise money, they should go to the major towns for a tax increase of just a few cents on the dollar. To come to small towns and ask for funds doesn't really

make sense. Mr. Kaplan explained that they have one revenue source, which is property tax. He urged them to take a look at commercial areas. In Manchester, for instance, they have billions of dollars. Why come to New London to raise money?

Senator Odell said that the statewide property tax was not designed to be redistributed -- the lottery was. He said that one of the important measurements is equalized property value behind each student. One of the lowest towns for funding per child was Charlestown, where it was estimated that there was \$300,000 of property value behind each student. A town like New London has about \$1 million behind each student. Statewide money should be distributed to towns like Charlestown to help raise them up.

Mr. Kaplan said that he agreed with both Rep. Foose and Senator Odell on certain things. The method they are using to determine educational funding is distorted. He felt that they should change what they are doing. Rep. Foose said what Senator Odell wasn't saying was that if the State stops giving the proportionate share to New London on behalf of the Town, the New London citizens will have to pay a higher rate directly to the school district or the school will have to cut its budget. He said that it was a zero sum game. Rep. Kidder said that they keep working at a structure that everyone can say is fair and understandable and sustainable for more than a couple of years. Each year they have been changing the formula. This time they set it up to stay current for four years instead of just one year.

Ms. Levine said that the donor street analysis does not make sense because everyone gets to vote at the local level, and the townspeople set the budget and priorities together and there is an understanding that some people may pay more or less to support the town budget. When talking about donor towns, the problems are apparent: towns like Lincoln with high property value per student and low median income are giving to towns like Amherst with high median income levels and a lot of students. This problem should raise the discussion to another level. She said that in a functioning society resources are pooled to help those who need it, but while the current formula takes into account lack of wealth, the payout does not take the wealth of a community into consideration. She recognizes that New London is in the middle -- not a poor community but not a wealthy one either. They have a high median income and high property values, but the notion that wealth is taken into consideration when determining need but not when distributing it doesn't sit well with her.

Michael Doheny thought perhaps the discussion they were having was not the right vehicle to use to tell the representatives how New London wants them to vote on this matter. He wanted to have a vote of the people in the room to see what the majority was in terms of a constitutional amendment to do away with the donor town tax structure for funding education. Rep. Foose said they should amend the question to say to that they (the neighbors) can direct money to school districts on a need base as opposed to being required to direct state aid to every student regardless of need. Senator Odell said that the towns will be the masters of school funding and not bound by the State's interpretation of school funding, which has put them into this box.

Howard Hoke explained that the term "donor town" emerged out of towns like New London who grouped together with other towns to create a school district, and who called themselves "donor towns." The Legislature adopted it as their own. The concept of "donor town" came from their end of things to identify something. They are voting on a budget that fails or passes. They are not voting on whether New London pays their share or not. If the vast majority of them are going to vote in favor of the budget, it may give a chance to make a statement. To try and impose their feelings or suggesting amendments to the Constitution, they were getting off track. Certainly in his opinion, the Constitution needs to be changed. He felt that the right way to do it may be debatable at this point. Mr. Hoke stressed that equity is needed. There is a tolerance for the concept that there is wealth in these areas and perhaps they can afford to pay a bit more. Right now, the residents of New London are bouncing against the ceiling.

When they are trying to go above this level they've already absorbed, they don't like it. Perhaps they can make it better. If the State is in a crisis and needs more money, where can they get it? He would like to see this discussion happening instead of how it is currently metered out by some convoluted sense of wealth.

Mr. Hoke went on to add that there are wealthy people living in Charlestown, but maybe not enough. Perhaps there are untapped resources where there is a very large grand list. Although there are citizens of low income in those areas, perhaps they can afford \$0.10 per thousand than better than New London residents could afford \$1 per thousand. He said that he can't compete with businesses in Souhegan because their property taxes are lower and he has to recover these costs. Mr. Hoke said it was time to go back to their peers and colleagues and let them know that New London is bleeding. They can carry their present load, but they need to contribute their equitable share. Instead of having to contribute a per student amount, the purpose of government is to give aid where it is most needed to elevate the entire population. He opined that everyone would agree that this would make them better off in the long haul. He felt that in the short term they need to do what they can to keep the dollar per thousand off the taxes by asking other communities with broader tax base to contribute more.

Bill Clough said that another way to look at the issue would be to make sure that they know where their representatives stood on the "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) mandate and the unintended consequences of it raising the cost of education. Right now the timing is right to make sure of where they stand, from the bottom up, to get the law off the books and replace it with a better one. Senator Odell said that there are better ideas coming up from the bottom. He had a chat with Charlie Bass, who was in favor of NCLB, but he hoped that he had changed his mind about it. Mr. Foose said he was not in favor of NCLB. He was, however, in favor of the new Education Commissioner Virginia Barry and her efforts to make New Hampshire a top competitor to get money from the government to improve efficiency in delivering education. They don't and will not have an opportunity other than to rub elbows with Hodes and Shaheen arguing for work at the national level. There has been, within the Department of Education, a frustratingly slow effort to develop databases need to measure efficiency in schools. Commissioner Barry is out in the schools at this point. He noted that Jerry Frew was an ally of hers. Work is currently being done to make the education system more efficient.

Dave Kidder said that he was against the NCLB concept. He felt that it represented the federal government taking away the sovereignty of the states. He said that it was the state's rights vs. the feds. What they were seeing was the feds trying to take over more and more. States are letting them do it because they are get money in return for giving up control.

Senator Odell said that there are problems with NCLB but when Senator Kennedy and President Bush initiated it, they were not getting outcomes from the schools they wanted. The states are constantly bought off by money from Washington and there is potential for the same thing to happen with the upcoming healthcare changes. From his standpoint, if America is going to be competitive, they have to do something about the education of our students. Twenty-five years ago the US had the same number of college graduates as they do today -- there has been no obvious increase. If they want to be successful in the marketplace, they have to have a well educated workforce. Currently, the US is not competing with other markets around the world. Mr. Harrod commented that a lot of people from China and other countries are coming to the US to get their college educations.

Vahan Sarkisian said that he'd like to talk on a more local level. The selectmen were asking the representatives to vote the way the Town of New London wanted them to. In his belief, they should not be asking but telling them the way they want them to vote. The Donor town, dual tax rate, has been a mess. State government is broken. As a State, they are not doing their job to raise revenues to educate

their children. He said that it all started with Claremont. When they got their money for education, they did not put it all into education. Instead, they built a new fire station and purchased equipment. If the money is intended for education, that is where it should go. He remarked that people in New London believe in educating their children and they pay a lot to do so. Amherst should not be a town that gets money from everyone else. He felt this was disgusting. Manchester gets money too. A lot of people are unhappy with government because it is out of control and has to be changed. He said enough of the politics; the time has come. The US is reveling in the dirt right now. They are not the richest country in the world and are getting kicked and punched around. It is time to settle down and stop demanding raises and expenses that fall on the taxpayers' shoulders. He felt that they are succumbing to socialism and communism. If they take from rich and give to the poor to spend the way they want, that is not right. There needs to be a better way to make these funds work as intended.

Gary Lineberry said that he was intrigued by Senator Odell's comment about Medicaid. He found it deplorable that people were being bought off by federal dollars. The whole system was rather broken, he agreed. Senator Odell said that part of the proposal is eligibility for Medicaid. This program is intended to help poor people get medical services, including the elderly and those who need to go into nursing homes. There is currently a 50/50 match program. The fed has bought off their portion with ARRA money. The State sets the rates for nursing homes and they bill half of it to the federal government, which sends money. For special education there were mandated things and the State was told that they'd receive federal funds but did not. This leaves a gap. Senator Odell said that they want to opt out of these programs if they can't afford them.

Mr. Hasenfuss, who works with and represents elderly in New London via the Council on Aging (COA), said that he knows for a fact that most of the COA's clients can't afford another dollar in increased taxes. There are many people they serve who will not be able to afford it. They cannot even afford to drive to where they need to go and so the COA is providing this service. Their value of their homes and properties is not representative of what they can afford to pay.

Mr. Markoff wanted to know how they determine who deserves aid and how much. He said that judging by the proposed increase due to the donor town tax, it would be an increase of 45%. This leaves a long term liability in the town that is unsustainable. The appearance of wealth that is the basis for taxes, if there is no increased income in the town, leaves a consequence of income absorption. There will be less money around to purchase things in town. The economic base gets rotted when existing income goes into a tax bill and doesn't get returned to the town. It looks to him like they may be getting a million dollars in federal benefits but will be spending \$3 million dollars against it. He asked if that was fair and if perhaps they should get more money because they were getting more NCLB candidates. Mr. Markoff opined that the allocation of resources was going out the window. Real estate prices are down 10-20%. There are a lot of people hanging on by their fingernails. It is unsustainable to think that they are wealthy and can afford it. New London is a town that has been bailing out those who need it for years. It is an outrage. One of the things they wanted to communicate was the amount of outrage here. They can't do it any longer. Mr. Markoff asked the representatives to please not go ahead and vote like it is okay with New London, because it is not. He asked Marilyn Kidder what percent of properties in Town is for currently up for sale. She said that she didn't know the percentage, but it was a pretty high number. Mr. Markoff said they are looking at ways for the Town to grow its tax base and at the same time decrease the tax expense. They are doing this to try to keep up with what is going on but they can't keep continuing. He recommended examining the notion of wealthy and deserved. They have given more than they can contribute and he wanted that to be very clear as to how dangerous the donor town tax structure really was to the Town of New London.

Mr. Markoff asked Senator Odell if through their taxes they are paying towards teacher's retirement. Senator Odell replied that they don't run the retirement system and that the portfolios were handled by a professional team. He was told that compared to all state retirement plans, New Hampshire is in the upper half of the returns. However, there is a major gap between their obligation and what is on hand.

Mr. Kaplan said that benefits have been increased. Certain segments of retirees are eligible to retire as early as 45 years of age. He explained that this poses for a huge amount of money that needs to be paid out. As a result, there are billions in the fund but they are billions under water. This explains the vastness of unfunded obligations. Chair Ballin said the State has already pushed back a lot of the obligations that they originally said they were responsible for back to the towns and the towns are fighting this battle.

Noel Weinstein asked Senator Odell if some of the problem would be helped or made worse by other forms of taxation such as capital gains, income tax, etc. Senator Odell said that it would change the way they do business in New Hampshire. The House did propose a capital gains tax. Mr. Weinstein said his idea was regarding a replacement tax and not a new tax. Senator Odell said again, that they should do away with the statewide property tax and a lot of the problems would go away.

Chair Ballin asked about the political will in Concord for gaming. Rep. Foose said that there are two issues. The work of the commission that is studying this noted the "trickle down," and for those who are not on the commission, gaming is far lower in revenue than what it was six months ago. There is concern from a number of people that an organization called "Millenium" was the sole player in this game. There are legitimacy issues with this organization.

Dave Kidder said that he was against gambling. The bottom line is the social costs of gambling. They gloss over this a bit when trying to sway the decision. He went into the discussions with an open mind, but found the revenues to be fuzzy and there was nothing convincing to him that social costs would outweigh the revenue. The whole idea was that gambling would help reduce property taxes. Mr. Kidder opined that \$50 million was not going to help property taxes that much and he felt it was bad politics.

Senator Odell said that the gambling bill had come to him in the context of a model called "Delaware North." It included counties, LChip, the horse racing people, etc. The Commission consists of 15 members that meet every other week and their final report is due in May. He has listened to a wide variety of people who compare the social costs with the revenue promised. Senator Odell said that he has not voted for gambling bills recently, but wanted to pose a problem that exists: if Massachusetts puts a casino on their side of the border on Route 93 and they look at the area within 35 miles of the casino, a high percentage of the patrons would be coming from New Hampshire. New Hampshire will still have to pay for the social programs that arise from having a gambling facility nearby, but they won't receive any of the revenue. He wondered what a reasonably prudent person should do. He was upset about how it was going. They ought to have an open bidding process and have a gambling commission regulate the system. The numbers of people he has seen in the street say this is easy money and should be taken advantage of.

Chair Ballin said that they would like to adjourn meeting at this time.

Mark Kaplan asked if they would like to take a straw vote on the issue of the amendment and how the residents present would like their representatives to vote. Bob MacMichael said he would not be voting because he was so confused over everything that was said. He wanted people to know it wasn't because he didn't care, but that he was just confused.

Senator Odell said that a constitutional amendment is very serious. It should not be specific to a year or to a dollar amount or a current contemporary circumstance. The philosophy should be to say that the legislature shall determine how educational funding would be handled as opposed to the current construct, as interpreted by the Supreme Court to take each dollar raised and distribute it to each student.

A vote was taken. 3 were opposed and the rest were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary  
Town of New London