

HUDSON, NH BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Minutes of the October 27, 2016 Budget Review Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - by Chairman Maddox the meeting of October 27, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen's Meeting Room at Town Hall.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - led by Selectman Coutu.

3. ATTENDANCE

Board of Selectmen: Ted Luszey; Roger Coutu, Pat Nichols, Marilyn McGrath, Angela Routsis

Staff/Others: Steve Malizia, Town Administrator; Donna Graham, Executive Assistant; Kathy Carpentier, Finance Director; Jim Michaud, Assistant Assessor; Police Chief Jason Lavoie; Recreation Director Dave Yates

4. BUDGET PRESENTATIONS

Assessing (5410)

Chairman Luszey recognized Assistant Assessor Jim Michaud.

Good evening Board members. Jim Michaud noted you have in front of you the Assessing Department's proposed budget for the Fiscal Year 2018. Following the Board's directive outside of the 100 codes, the Assessing budget has come in flat. Beyond that, this budget takes us from 7/1/17 through 6/30/18. We'll be into re-evaluation mode right during when this fiscal year begins and the current fiscal year ends. The funds for that re-evaluation are coming from the capital reserve fund set up for property revaluation. The only reason I mention it is because it will be all hands on deck of course when we arrive at the numbers and then when we send them out and then we welcome folk's thoughts on where we're at. I have included and given a memo to the Town Administrator and Finance Director what we estimate for real new net growth next year not re-evaluation growth. That's not within the document in front of you but you have that under separate cover and that helps you look at the tax rate implications as you work through this budget process. I'm here to welcome questions that the Board may have.

Chairman Luszey asked if there were questions from the Board.

Selectman Routsis had a quick question. The automobiles - again I'm new to this so I will ask random questions - the automobiles went from \$5,000 to nothing. What was that for last year you don't need it this year? Jim Michaud said the Assessing Office had two older 2003 Chevy Impalas and they've been nearing if not at the end of their use economic life. Within this current fiscal year, the Board had allocated in the budget process last year some funding to replace those and the differential for getting the vehicles some hand me downs from the Police Department, much better hand me downs, and that \$5,000 bridged the gap.

Selectman Coutu noted second page - 5410-234 lodging. Can you explain that please? Mr. Michaud said if members of the staff are going to an educational conference out of State, then we would either fund either mileage or air fare and also any lodging. This is meant to cover lodging at the IAAO - International Association of Assessing Officers Conference or NRAO - the Northeast Regional Association of Assessing Officials Conference.

Selectman Coutu asked can you tell me the value of these conferences. Mr. Michaud said in terms of what it adds to our knowledge of what is going on today in terms of valuation, whether it's a mixed use life style centers, or if its valuation of say poles or conduits, by going to these conferences we not only get continuing education hours that we need for our certifications but we're also exposed to a greater breath and scope than we would if those seminars are not being offered within the State of New Hampshire. So you get a much broader scope than you would get within a smaller State such as New Hampshire.

Selectman Coutu asked how often do members of your staff, including yourself, have to be recertified. Jim Michaud said once every five years with the Department of Revenue. I also have certifications with the International Association for Assessing Officials as well as certification with the New Hampshire Real Estate Appraisal Board. Selectman Coutu asked about other members of your staff. Are there any others that have to be certified? Mr. Michaud stated there's myself and Mike Pietraskiewicz who is our Assessment Technician. Amy McMullen doesn't hold a certification. She is more on the administrative end. Selectman Coutu asked are the registration fees are those for these conferences. Mr. Michaud agreed including NHMA for that matter which is the lesser cost out of all of them.

Selectman Coutu questioned educational reimbursement is that something that is refresher courses on assessing over and above what you are able to get out of the conferences that you go to. Is this over and above that educational reimbursement? Jim Michaud said correct. The difference in the conference is that you're going through a 1, or a 2, or a 3 hour seminar whereas the education reimbursements are more for either a week long course or a 2 to 3 day full course with exam. I think the differential would be the seminars are your attending, you're listening, you're communicating and working with your peers. The education reimbursement is you're in a focused, dedicated class with workbooks, exam, as well as continuing education hours. Just so the general public knows, Selectman Coutu said

those three items, we're talking a total of \$2,200. I just want just in case the Budget Committee is going to ask these questions. Let people know what it is about. Thank you Mr. Michaud and I applaud you for coming in level funded again this year.

Selectman Coutu asked how many new properties in the past say couple of years we have under our charge now. Jim Michaud said the parcel count for this tax year, we're very close to 9,900. To be honest with you, I would have to look back into prior years to see where our parcel count was. I would estimate compared to five years ago, you're probably in the range of 9,300 properties. The 55 and older active adult condos have added the most number of individual accounts or individual units to the town with some division activity but as you recall, we went through the great recession or so-called and that finished out approximately 2012/2013. So there really was some flat growth leading up to that and really took them to 2015 or so for that growth to really start. So you're really talking about the last 2 to 3 years that we've had that major account activity.

Selectman Coutu said what impresses me Mr. Michaud is that you've come in level funded for almost as long as I've been here with the exception of the pay increases which were approved by the voters. Our parcels counts have increased as a result of the economy. Up until last year, we had a significant amount of challenges on appraisals that you had to address. Again I applaud you for being able to come in level funded. I know you've asked for additional help. We've accommodated you somewhat this year. Excellent job. Thank you Sir.

Chairman Luszey had a quick question on line item 269. You have a database contract and then back on page 2, your 252 you've got this little narrative that in there it specifies that database subscription. How much of that line is for your database subscription and why doesn't that fall under the IT. One page 6, line item 269 it says software maintenance. He's got WebPro assessing data posting contracts. I'm trying to assess how much of these two line items are IT related and why they're not in the IT budget. Looking at that page 2 for account 252, line 252, Jim Michaud said the narrative after my forward / says "LexisNexis Fraud Prevention (for tax exemption, tax credit, tax deferral, asset, and residency verification purposes) database subscription". So that is for a specific database that we access to see yes folks are telling us where their assets are and where their residency is and then we're reviewing what they're telling us by looking at that database. Chairman Luszey said I got that but why isn't that cost part of the IT line items just like all laptops now and all computers and hopefully almost all the software we got. We're trying to get all the IT spending in one cost center so when we take a look at IT spending, we can see what it's costing the town for software and relate it.

Jim Michaud said I would not and I don't think Lisa Nute would classify that as an IT subscription as opposed to the other one which is Patriot Properties AssessPro. That is a software subscription to actually have that software in house. The prior one the LexisNexis, we're going out on the internet. We're accessing their database. Their database isn't sitting in this building. We're on their server accessing their software and their information that they provide. Chairman Luszey stated if I was to try to help people understand. Most people that have laptops buy a subscription to a malware antivirus protection. You're buying a subscription to a database that allows you to access and get information out of it. That's an IT cost by pure definition. Mr. Michaud said if that's where the Board wants to place it, that's fine but in the past we've funded - we have an MLS database. So we access MLS. We access NH CIBR - NH Commercial Industrial Board of Realtors database and those subscriptions have traditionally in the time that I've been here have been covered within the assessing budget and not in the IT budget. If the Board wants to change that, that's fine. We're just saying we've repeated what you've done in the past because it's not been seen as an IT cost. I think that would be my best explanation.

Chairman Luszey asked about the WebPro hosting. Is that the same type of...Jim Michaud said our Patriot Properties is the name of a company and AssessPro is the name of the software that we use for mass appraisal. They also host our assessing data out on the internet so when you go through the town's website and you're looking for assessing data, you're going on their server. It's a soup to nuts contract. So yes software support; you have software upgrades; we contact them for any issues that we have day to day work but also they host their assessing data. That's one company that we contract with. Chairman Luszey indicated this would be a cloud base software as a service provider that you're paying.

Jim Michaud asked Patriot Properties. Nope that's software sitting here on the server and if it's sitting here directly on this server or if it's sitting in the cloud that IT - some of our servers are hosted in the cloud I believe. I'm going outside my area of expertise here but we're not going to Patriot on their server to access AssessPro. We have that in house installed. Again I get a little cloudy - no pun intended - on is it on the server here or is it on a server cloud. Chairman Luszey stated I'll take it off line because this to me I believe this is an IT cost but I'll take it off line.

Selectman Coutu said that was one of the questions I was going to ask in reference to this. The Chairman had asked and I certainly supported identifying what it costs the town to operate IT services - all of these little items. We're going to have to research the budget to find all of these little things or is there a way for you to pull up - would you have caught this one and identified it as an IT expense? Kathy Carpentier said no because as Jim said, it's always been that way and it was determined to be different than in the IT world. So no it wasn't rolled up in the 77s. It can easily be put in the 77s but no I wouldn't have recognized this as an IT expense.

Chairman Luszey believed this is something that we'll take off line but it really gets to - when you say because it doesn't

roll up in the 77, it's really around what we have defined information and technology as. Because of that, it's where you physically account for it. That doesn't necessarily mean that this isn't an IT cost. This is software. This is hardware. By all traditional test, this would be an IT cost whether his cost center is paying for it or the police are paying for it, it's an IT cost. We should be able to recognize that and say here is the total IT cost for the town. We'll get there one of these days.

Kathy Carpentier commented this is an easy enough thing to take it out and put it into the 5477 account. So whose action item mine, Jim, Lisa's? Chairman Luszey said it's a you and I right now action item because this is part of that big list that she started.

Kathy Carpentier believed he submitted Warrant Article M. Hopefully you put it all in your books. It has to do with all Veteran's tax credit.

Chairman Luszey asked Jim do you want a say a few words on it please.

Jim Michaud stated currently the Veteran's tax credit is defined as Statute only available to those Veterans that served during a Department of Defense war defined periods. So there are gap years between Vietnam and the Persian Gulf War as the largest number of gap years and there's also gap years between Korea and Vietnam. Less so between WWII and Korea. So for many years the legislature had bills in front of it and they never went anywhere to basically allow communities by local option to allow a Veteran's tax credit for a Veteran 90 days of service, honorable discharge, they live here, residency for them to also receive a Veteran's tax credit. So in the last legislative session, the legislature passed it and the Governor signed it by local option and communities can choose to offer a Veteran's tax credit. It would be in the same dollar amount as our "regular Veteran's tax credit" and we would no longer then be duly served Veterans that you cannot obtain the Veteran's tax credit because you didn't serve during a war defined period. You can imagine not telling them they're not a Veteran. You're telling them they can't receive the tax credit. So that's been difficult for many years. The legislature was thinking of mandating that communities had to offer this and then I don't know if we call it compromise but at the end of the day they decided to pass legislation. It's a local option. There's going to be a number of communities that will have it on the ballot. That's how we'd adopt it is to put it on the ballot unless we're in a city. I thought it was incumbent to me to offer this up to the Board and there is no down side per say but there is a fiscal impact to it. If we offer more tax credits, then we're going to add some pennies to the rate because of that.

Jim Michaud asked how many is that? Who has the number on how many of these gap year Veterans we have. I was in touch with the State Veteran's Council. I also gathered statistics from the NH Employment Security. I also gathered some other statistics on line dealing with home ownership rates for Veterans in New Hampshire. I reached out to other communities and shared my methodology and they said it's better than nothing. Really nobody had any real idea. By inference, we could be looking at a couple of hundred Veterans who could additional receive this Veterans tax credit. It's not just the Veterans themselves but it's also the surviving spouses of Veterans who also would be able to qualify. I absolutely do not believe it would all in one year. You can put this to the warrant and the voters approve it, 400 folks are not walking in the next day to receive it. As a matter of fact, my analogy we have Veterans who served in war defined periods that come in monthly saying I never realized I could get this and they could have been getting it for 10 or 15 years. By that inference, I would say we would not be receiving those couple of hundred. Again that's by inference that I estimate a couple hundred. We would certainly "advertise" it and put it up on the website, cable, let VFW know, American Legion know. Obviously something in the HLN because if the voters approve it and that is a credit like all our other credits and exemptions the folks that are qualified should receive that. They have to apply for it. I put this in front of you for that purpose.

Selectman Coutu said reservists would qualify. Jim Michaud stated as long as their reserved duty has an active duty component. If I'm on reserve and I did not serve in the military but if I'm on reserve and I do two weeks of DUTR - active duty under training - two weeks a year and I gather up 90 days of active duty then I would qualify. That was a change in the Statute actually the last couple of years to clarify that that active duty training is in fact active duty. Its 90 days they qualify.

Selectman Coutu asked does basic count - 10 weeks of basic. Mr. Michaud believed it does. I would have to check with the Veteran's Council to confirm that. Selectman Coutu said that would be 2/3 or it right there. Mr. Michaud said you are under the direction of the military. I would qualify that I would check on that but my supposition is that it would qualify. Selectman Coutu said I get questioned a lot by reservists why they don't qualify. I think you did one for my neighbor next door but he was in between the Gulf War and Vietnam and he didn't qualify. He could have really used it now he requalified. Jim Michaud stated it's a \$500 tax credit. You don't have one tax credit for a war period Veterans and a different tax credit that would not only be unwieldy, it would be very difficult to explain that to folks. Selectman Coutu said it's a decision the voters should make.

Selectman McGrath told Jim in you Memo you stated there could be upwards of 400 not 100 correct. Mr. Michaud said that was correct. What I was trying to state was my high end estimate is the range of 400 but I don't think we're going to get them all in one year so that this wouldn't all "impact" the 2017 tax year. Over time as more and more folks find out about it and there's a filing deadline as there is with everything of April 15th. So they pass it on March 8th or 9th and

April 15th is the deadline, that's not a big window. Especially in the first year I don't think it's going to be in the 400 range. I could easily see in the 100 or more range. Selectman McGrath stated if it were so it's clear, it would be a \$20,000 for all 400. It would amount to \$20,000 to the taxes. Mr. Michaud said \$200,000. Steve if I may in the range of \$.06 to \$.08. Kathy Carpentier said \$.08. Based upon our current tax base which of course will change next year but based upon what we know today, Jim Michaud said over time it would have that impact. I don't think it would have that impact in the first year. Selectman McGrath was sure it doesn't but just so it's clear.

Selectman McGrath's other question that I had and I read this material last week. I didn't reread it today. I probably should have. Is it not they can apply for it if they've had service that exceeds 90 days? Mr. Michaud said absolutely. It's the deminimus of 90 and beyond. So 90 days or more. Selectman McGrath asked it doesn't require that they serve in a war area. Say using Vietnam as an example. Mr. Michaud said that's correct. That is the adoption. That is the change in law that this would be for all 90 day plus honorable discharge.

Selectman McGrath did agree. I think the voters ought to be given the opportunity to vote on this.

Chairman Luszey asked so we shall submit this as Warrant Article M - consensus of the Board. Selectman Coutu was for it. Chairman Luszey said we'll make it M and then we'll vote later. I want a consensus that we were going to move forward.

Kathy Carpentier noted there's no financial impact reflected in your reports right now.

Jim Michaud had two last things. One is it's not zero work that we offer this. We have the personnel. We'll handle it. It's the continuous process of trying to make sure that we maintain our credits and exemptions. We welcome the Board putting this to warrant, and the voters adopting it, and us processing it as you will be processing the approvals for the Veteran's tax credits. The last thing is I think I saw an e-mail saying come back on Tuesday. Are there any questions that the Board thinks they may have for me to come back on Tuesday? If they do, that's fine. If they feel I'm all set, then I don't know what I'll do. I'll do something different Tuesday night.

Chairman Luszey noted at the end of this meeting I'll ask who we need to bring back. Selectman McGrath wasn't here so I asked her to make sure she put together those that she wanted to see and I'll ask the Board the same question. We may or may not see you.

Police (5610-5673)

Chairman Luszey recognized Chief Jason Lavoie.

Once again Chief Lavoie said I brought with me Captain Kevin DiNapoli Services Commander and Captain Bill Avery the Operations Bureau Commander. We spent some time working on the budget. The Board had requested that we come in at zero percent which we were able to meet that goal as well. I'd also like to thank my Administrative Assistant Sherrie Kimball who helped us to put this package together for you. Pretty much this package is the exact same one that the Board has seen since almost 2003. We are open to questions.

Selectman Routsis asked what is the equipment rental - page 1, 5610-221. Chief Lavoie indicated that's for copier leases. It's contractual. We're currently working on that with the Finance Director.

5615 - Police Facilities, page 6.

Selectman McGrath had a question on cost center 5615 - 208 telephone. That's gone up by 3.4k. What the reason for that? Chief Lavoie said some of the costs have gone up. Based upon our expenses, we've had to add a few more cell phones and what not. We found that with the way the job has taken us and with technology, we found it best that we provide one of the big cost savings was for cell phones for the individual cruisers - not every officer just the cruisers. We assign a kit with the officers when they take to the street. That we found to be very successful in helping us solve crimes such as there's been a couple of bank robberies including the robbery was the Walgreens one. We were able to get surveillance images of suspects immediately to our officers and because we were able to get information out - one of which was to the public - we've been able to solve three major felonies with that by expediting that information. Selectman McGrath said it just popped up to me that it jumped up. I thought I would ask the question.

Captain DiNapoli noted it also cuts cost and time with the downloading the images to the officer's reports. Chief Lavoie agreed. We were actually going to find an added benefit with that. That's a good point. We're also seeing that we're using those phones there to take photos of crime scenes and the images are better than the cameras that we were using. Cameras were part of that package. I was talking about a box that goes out. It's a pelican box. Inside that would be a recording device to all your record statements, a camera to take pictures of crime scenes, and we had older technology for a cell phone I think it was still like a flip phone which all you could do is dial with really. With the addition of these phones, we're looking at - hopefully it goes as well as what it has been where we have tested it and it's been very successful with us doing so. That added cost is going to save us on - we can now download audio statements right to our reports. We should be saving a lot of time for the officers as well as less opportunities for things to be

corrupted along the way.

Chairman Luszey asked to stay on that same line for a minute - the 208 line. All of the school data circuits, digital school to Gemni, what are those specific for? I was of the opinion that the schools were now on the town's fiber and Comcast provided free data to schools for internet access. What is this all for? Chief Lavoie believed that's going to be the antenna that we have out here - School Street. You see Merrill Hill above that. That's what that stuff is for. That's for our repeaters.

Just for clarification where it says "school", Kathy Carpentier asked that's School Street. Chairman Luszey said yes.

Police Communications - 5620, page 10,

Chairman Luszey asked if there were any questions. The only question I have and it's in the 403 line the UPS backup because it has equipment large and equipment small. Is that for your servers in the police station or what are those backups? Chief Lavoie believed it is backups for the servers that we have. That is an item based upon the last discussion. If you felt that more appropriate with IT, IT really manages that. I obviously have no quorums with moving that. Chairman Luszey asked because the police station has a generator correct. Does the generator have a UPS attached to it where you have uninterrupted power on a failure? Chief Lavoie said it will kick over. Not the entire building. We have a bunch of red plugs throughout the building, including the Seabury Room in case there was a...Chairman Luszey said right so there is a bank of batteries if you will that will allow you to transition through them so I wonder why these things have a separate UPS on them and they're not on your red plugs. Chief Lavoie didn't know.

Police Patrol - 5630, page 13.

Selectman Coutu asked about line item 563304 gasoline. I know that we anticipated for the 2017 fiscal budget an increase in gasoline and we went to \$92,000. We approved the line item. Do you think we should continue to maintain the \$92,000 line item for FY18? I don't think we're going to spend \$92,000 in FY17. Steve Malizia said we did \$2.50 a gallon. Presumably if the gallons are correct, that's the calculation we used across the whole town.

Chief Lavoie said we've been using a number with the Highway Director Kevin Burns and his suggested dollar value. Chairman Luszey asked if the gallons were correct because that's really what would calculate that out. We agreed at the 250 rate so it's really are we consuming the 37,000 gallons. Chief Lavoie indicated we've been using about 34 to 35,000. I can't predict vacancies when someone retires or whatever. In recent years sometimes we have less officers working the street and patrol. So we'll have less cruisers going. Right now we're at full capacity and we added one officer last year by warrant. That's where I'm expecting to kind of be.

Selectman Coutu asked are we buying more fuel efficient vehicles to kind of offset that. Chief Lavoie said a few gallons a mile yes. With the type of driving, what type of call volume will get to go to different calls, it all depends on the mileage that the officers are driving. Chairman Luszey said and the total run time a year per vehicle. Chief Lavoie said the idle time runs gas. There's a formula for that. Chairman Luszey said your increase number of electronics increase the wattage of your alternators which increase your power consumption. So it all ties in.

Police Investigations - 564, Page 18.

Chairman Luszey asked if there questions from the Board. Chief line item 325 - that's flat and that's where your narcotic kids are. Is that the ones that have the Narcan in them? Chief Lavoie said we do not carry Narcan. The Fire Department does that and discussions with the Fire Chief, that seems to be the preferred method. Chairman Luszey reiterated we're not going to carry it in the cruisers. Chief Lavoie said our response time is about the same. We're right there.

Selectman McGrath had one question. The last line item 403 small equipment. Can you explain that because it was at zero for the last few years and now it's up to almost 5k? Chief Lavoie said it's up because we haven't used that account. We haven't had the zeros. We are looking to replace our polygraph equipment that we use. We use it every week a few times a week it's being used whether it's for cases or for hiring purposes. This is just to replace that equipment.

Just on that one last note because it says to include laptops, Chairman Luszey asked does that come as an integrated package or do we provide laptop and then you add the equipment and software on top of it. Captain DiNapoli said there were a few versions behind just on the software for the polygraph. Chairman Luszey noted I got that but what I'm trying to do is the laptop a generic purchase that we would buy and then you would load your software on top of it. So the laptop portion of this should be and IT related. Captain DiNapoli said correct. Lisa Nute has been assisting us with purchasing the proper one.

Police Animal Control - 5650, page 20.

Selectman Coutu stated as much as I hate to assume anything, your second line item 5650-102. The part timer is working out well. Chief Lavoie said yes he's working out very well. He's been doing great. Especially recently with this

- you are probably aware of the situation that we've been working with Hudson and collaborating with Pelham. I know recently you've talked about animal cruelty stuff. I can't say enough about our Division and the fine job that they did trying to help speak for about 35 to 40 canines.

Police Information Services - 5660, page 23.

Chief Lavoie believed Ms. Nute has already talked to this. I'm sorry no this is records not 5677. I got ahead.

Steve Malizia indicated it's basically our labor pool of people. All the other equipment has been transferred but this is still the labor that's remained. These are the salaries and benefits for this group and the appropriate uniform allowance that's in the contract. All the other software, hardware, whatever has been moved.

Just for the public, Chairman Luszey said this is everybody they see when they enter on the left hand side of the police station. It's not an IT related function. It's your records I guess. Chief Lavoie said all the information that we collect and disseminate within.

Police Support Services - 5671, page 26.

Crossing Guards - 5672, page 28.

Police Prosecutor - 5673, page 31.

Steve Malizia explained this is where the Victim Witness Advocate is. As you recall earlier, you made that a full time position so you see some disparity with part time and full time. A decision was made to make the Victim Witness Advocate to full time. That explains that.

Chairman Luszey asked line item 215 under publications the RSAs that are on line. Chief Lavoie said I'll take one more look through this again and make sure that all of those items will be transferred over. There's a couple in here. LexisNexis, the RSAs and the other ones are books.

Chairman Luszey asked if the code books were on line. Chief Lavoie said no we have hard copies as well because of the officers and stuff like that.

For clarification, Kathy Carpentier asked are you moving that. Chairman Luszey said we're not moving it for now but I'll sit with you. These things that are subscriptions if there's some way we can add a sub note to that thing that we've been creating that says "all subscriptions" regardless of where they are we still capture it so we get that full picture. Ms. Carpentier said you're not talking about it for this budget process. Chairman Luszey said no.

Steve Malizia said the last one is IT which you've already covered.

Chairman Luszey asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Selectman Coutu asked to deal with page 31, line item 5673-101 - salaries. The number at the end \$175,989 - what is the base pay for that position? Kathy Carpentier said there are three positions so which position are you referring to. On page 33, there is a list of 3 individuals - the Legal Clerk, the Victim Witness Advocate, and the Police Prosecutor equal that \$175,989. Selectman Coutu asked shouldn't it say "prosecutors". Okay. Ms. Carpentier said it's just the prosecuting department. There's really only one prosecutor.

Chief Lavoie stated I know what he's referring to if I may. Selectman Coutu said I'm referring to somebody making a lot more than you when I looked across at that one item. I looked at the 175 at the end and thought it was for one person. There's no way that this person is going to be making that much more than the Police Chief. You were getting a raise. I'm good thank you. I see it now.

Chairman Luszey asked if there were any other questions or comments. Nice job.

Selectman Coutu asked we're going to be reviewing these again right. Chairman Luszey noted Tuesday as a wrap up for those that have...Selectman Coutu said I want to look at that gasoline line. I'm just letting you know now.

Chairman Luszey said on the gasoline line if you would like, we could ask - could you get yours off of these tanks out here. We have the new meter. We should be able to get a reading of actuals for over a year now. That would give you I think what you're looking for.

Selectman McGrath noted again being a news hound, the reports are that gasoline and oil prices are anticipated to be going up. I'm just throwing that out there so that even though it may be \$2.50 today a gallon, in a month's time it may not be. Chairman Luszey stated that \$2.50 isn't what like you and I pay \$2.50 at the pump. There's no State tax in it. Selectman McGrath said I'm throwing it out there because I just heard it the other day that those costs were estimated

to go up.

Steve Malizia thought the question is more what's the usage as opposed to the price. Selectman Coutu said our gas just went down \$.10 a gallon.

Kathy Carpentier pointed to the summaries on page 16 there is a page for gas and diesel costs. It has all the gallons that were estimated. Throughout the whole budget, everybody was requested to use \$2.50 for both gas and diesel. We were currently paying around \$1.80 but it was estimated to go up to the \$2.50 by the Road Agent. I realize that you might be questioning usage gallons.

Selectman Coutu said that and the cost. Ours just went down \$.10 a gallon down to \$1.93 and we don't pay anywhere near \$1.93 right now outside. Kathy Carpentier noted right but this is 18 months from now that we're budgeting for. It's a crystal ball type thing unfortunately. Chairman Luszey guessed gasoline like you put in your car. Selectman Coutu said yes. We have an abundant supply of gasoline in this country right now.

Chief Lavoie wanted to close with like I say in the Annual Report, I appreciate working with the Board in prepping the budget and allowing us to move forward as well as all the department heads. The collaborative work certainly helps us be successful in what we do. Thank you.

Chief Lavoie mentioned there is one other thing. Just for the Board, I was asked to contact Castle Bows and receive an estimate as to what it be for them to sketch up a plan or does he do like a needs analysis. That estimate came in between \$45,000 and \$60,000. They prefer to have a direct conversation with whether it's the Board or someone else that irons out the variables to find out in detail as to what exactly you would be requesting and have that conversation between them to go back and forth with. Again that estimate came in between \$45,000 and \$60,000 where they would guesstimate it at.

Kathy Carpentier noted this is a request outside the budget and not included in.

Recreation (5810-5845 & Warrant Article F)

Chairman Luszey recognized Recreation Director Dave Yates and Senior Services Coordinator Lori Bowen.

With me, Dave Yates said I have our Senior Coordinator Lori Bowen. So when we get to the senior page, she'll be happy to answer any questions.

Recreation Administration - 5810.

Selectman McGrath had a question on line item 221 equipment rental. Can you explain the increase in that? Dave Yates indicated that is up due to the new copier that we got. It is a higher speed copier than the one we had in the past. It's just more expensive.

Follow up to that question. Chairman Luszey said speed isn't a driver of cost only the number of copies that you make. So is my assumption that you're making more copies now? Mr. Yates said we have always made a lot of copies. Chairman Luszey asked are you planning on making more copies than you are this year. That's a significant increase - a 35 percent increase in copies. Dave Yates said yes we are. We make a lot of copies. We distribute copies to all the schools on all the programs we run. Yes we do. We have a very small copier less efficient before. This one is much more efficient.

Kathy Carpentier said if you look at 5810-302, the used to put their overage allowance there so the \$714 that was spent there would be now included in the 3972 that he's paying for.

Chairman Luszey said if we're going over on the usage on the current contracts, we got a new one and we're doing roughly 40,000 copies per year did we do a cost analysis that said if we were to drop them off like at a Staples for the one-day service turnaround what that would cost? Ms. Carpentier said no that was not part of our due diligence. What we did do is we have 11 machines now under the same contract. Each one has their own allowance but at the end of the year if his machine went over or under 5,000 and mine went over or under, they're bundling all of the copy allowances. There's where we hope to get the economy of scales. I'm not aware of any department head that wanted to offsite these copies. I think they're doing a basketball sign up. They're doing basketball copies and that type of thing.

Chairman Luszey guessed if you're doing 40,000 copies and you're sending it to the schools, you're probably doing 300 or 400 copies of something to a school. Dave Yates said yes. We send one for every student in every school. Chairman Luszey asked that we take a look at if we were to do an offsite copy like that. If you have something made and literally hundreds of copies at a Staples or an OfficeMax, it's relatively inexpensive. It may be cheaper than us doing it. Ms. Carpentier said I'd be more than happy to do that for you, however we just signed a three-year contract for all 11 copiers. We kind of need to use them now. Also then you'd have staff going to Staples to pick up and drop off. Chairman Luszey said no you send it electronically.

Selectman Routsis noted but they'd have to pick it up. Chairman Luszey said no they'll deliver for free. Its part of that cost but the whole point is it may be cheaper. If I take a look at the monthly cost of that copier and the number of copies he's doing per year, it's a significant cost per copy. It's \$268 per month for the copier. That's what I'm reading here. Then you've got a paper cost, and then you've got toner costs, and then you click costs. Ms. Carpentier indicated we don't have toner costs. That's part of that. Maintenance, labor, staples and toner are built into all the contracts.

Selectman Coutu asked not paper. Ms. Carpentier said not paper. Sometimes I know especially for recreation they use colored paper for different things as my water clerks do. They are part of my bulk buying for paper but not for some of the stuff that they send out in different colored paper. Selectman Coutu asked what line item would that fall under. It says \$1,000 for paper in 301. That's everything? That's what they buy with the bulk purchase as well as color paper that they...Ms. Carpentier said yes. Selectman Coutu said if we took the \$1,000, added it to the cost of the rental of the printer, divided by 40,000 copies we come up with what it's costing the town per copy for recreation. Kathy Carpentier said I'm at a loss of what to say. We just signed contracts. I didn't know this was - for five years we've been trying to get all the copiers on the same contract to get economy of scale. We are bulk buying our paper with the school. At no time was it a due diligence of sending printing outside. We did look at one point so send water bills out which is a completely different thing. It was more costly to do that than it was to do it in house. Chairman Luszey thought it was a missed opportunity. I would say that I would think that that should come down to the same cost. Thirty-five percent to me is a might rich to go up. It should be flat. Kathy Carpentier said is if you look at what he spent - \$2,700 and the \$797, it is slightly up - not 35 percent.

Selectman McGrath said looking at the total budget, you've increased salary and benefits by 19 percent. Can you explain that? Chairman Luszey noted part time to full time. Dave Yates stated the Administrative position was approved last year.

Recreation - Merrifield Park - 5815.

Chairman Luszey asked what do we do there. Dave Yates said we maintain it. Families use it. There's picnic tables there. There's a volleyball court that's used a lot. There's a small playground there. That playground is used. It's very shaded. The picnic area I think gets used a lot. We maintain the tables. Groups do call to reserve the volleyball court. It is used. It's a nice, small quant park opposed to going to the busier playgrounds.

Just so folks are clear, Chairman Luszey said this is the one down on Burnham Road.

Selectman Coutu said it is a nice park. A lot of people go there.

Selectman McGrath asked the picnic tables aren't damaged in that park. Mr. Yates said no. Selectman McGrath said it used to be a long time ago. Mr. Yates said we restrained them all this year. Selectman McGrath noted they used to be torn out. Selectman Coutu asked was that when you were a kid. Selectman McGrath said not it wasn't wise guy. There were volunteers that actually donated the materials and built the tables and installed them. Within a very short period of time, they were vandalized and damaged. Then they went back and they replaced them and they were damaged again and they gave up.

Chairman Luszey asked where would I find Merrill Park. Dave Yates said it's not on our records. Merrill Park was moved even prior to me becoming Rec. Director 18 years ago. It's never been in our budget. Chairman Luszey stated I know where it is but no where do we see it any budget. Mr. Yates said it's been closed. That was prior to me even taking over that was vandalized a lot. The Highway Department uses it in the winter to drop snow there. Chairman Luszey said if its closed then I really think that this Board should make a decision on what to do with that park like sell it.

Selectman McGrath thought the neighbors thought utilize that. I don't know that. I just know that in the past they did. If we don't have to maintain it and we don't have to do anything to it, I don't think that it's very large so therefore it's not like it would generate a lot of money to sell it I don't think. Chairman Luszey said it has caused us a number of times to go in and do maintenance to it. If it's a town park, we should be maintaining it. If we're not going to maintain it as a town park, then we should declare it and make it so. Selectman McGrath said if the Road Agent is utilizing that to dump excess snow, then he's using it. That's what they just said. Selectman Coutu said he does. Up on the top not down by the river. He does dump it in the back. Chairman Luszey said we'll have a whole discussion about it.

Selectman Coutu stated the question I had - Steve you might know - the boat ramp. That's where we were originally going to put the boat launch. Steve Malizia said it was contemplated but the steepness of it probably wouldn't make it. Selectman Coutu said he's got a boat launch property immediately to the left. He has his own personal boat launch and thinking about what we would have to do on our side. It would be so steep. He'd be running after the boats. The last time I visited the property was a couple of years ago. I don't know if you were with me Dave. There were a couple of people with me. We went down there and I met with a lot of the neighbors. I forget what we were contemplating at the time. I think they were a group of volunteers that wanted to go in there and clean it all up. Do you remember what it was? Steve Malizia couldn't remember if it was a senior center or we talked about something with the seniors. Something with the seniors doing something there. Selectman Coutu thought because of the aesthetics, the view over

the river. Mr. Malizia said the parcel is long and thin. I don't think you had enough buffer. There was a chain link fence at one point. There was concrete or cement structure, picnic tables or something like that at one point.

Selectman Coutu explained the one thing the visit did assist us with and I think you were involved in that Dave - no it was Kevin - I had to have him remove some trees on the overhangs because some kid once they threw a rope on there that tree was going in the river with them. We decided to eliminate it and the kids used to like to swim out to the old bridge. Steve Malizia thought it was becoming an attractive nuisance as they say. Selectman Coutu said I'd go out there and I'd see the kids jumping off the abutment to the old bridge that used to be there. Mr. Malizia said Selectman Maddox was here at the time and I think the neighbors came in and expressed some concerns. I think within the next day or two there were no more trees to hang a rope off of or at least that tree wasn't there. Selectman Coutu said if we went down there and we had them all cleared out. Mr. Malizia stated again it's an attractive nuisance so we did that. Selectman Coutu thought we should talk to the Road Agent. He could give us a complete update.

Chairman Luszey said if we're not as a town going to do anything, then maybe we could figure out how to put it back on the tax roll.

Recreation - Supervised Play - 5821, Page 8.

As you see, Dave Yates said revenue is on the top. Revenue for the summer program did increase this year.

Selectman Coutu noted revenues exceed costs by \$34,000. Mr. Yates indicated before and after care is a big part of it.

Chairman Luszey asked you provide daycare. Dave Yates said pretty much. Chairman Luszey asked are we charging daycare rates. Mr. Yates said it's not classified as daycare. It's supervised play. Chairman Luszey said call it what it is. Dave Yates said we call it supervised play. Parents may use it as daycare. We don't call it daycare. We call it supervised play. It's a summer recreation program. Chairman Luszey stated it's because what you just said right. You said it's the before and after. Mr. Yates said earlier than the hours we open, we provide an hour before...Chairman Luszey asked do you charge for those hours and do you charge daycare rates. Dave said we charge \$5 an hour per child per session.

Robinson Pond - 5822, page 11.

Selectman Coutu asked in the salary line did we use the - this is for the attendant at the pond in the summer time. Did we have an attendant there all summer last year? Dave Yates said yes we did pretty much every weekend. Selectman Coutu noted that line is based on full coverage but if it rained and we didn't need them there, that can fluctuate up or down. Mr. Yates said it's 6 hours a day - Saturday, Sunday and holidays.

Selectman Coutu asked have we ever had any incident where our attendant had to approach people - and I don't know the answer that's why I'm asking you - and because they couldn't ascertain that they were residents have to call in the police because they were argumentative. Mr. Yates said once or twice this summer but hardly at all. Usually they leave. The attendant we had, he was an adult so he wasn't one our 18 year olds. He's one of our middle aged guys. Selectman Coutu said we got rid of a couple of our 18 year olds. It's a beautiful pond and I'd like to see it maintained for our residents.

Rec. Ball Fields - 5824, page 14.

Tennis - 5825, page 17.

Selectman Coutu asked can we groom some of these kids for our high school teams. Dave Yates said we're hoping. Selectman Coutu asked are you still maintaining 100 percent. Mr. Yates said fairly good. A couple of lessons were thinner this year. We'd only go to one instructor during those times. Selectman Coutu said we only have so many spots for tennis. Mr. Yates said right there's 4 hours on two courts. That's why revenue went down a little - \$320 difference from last year. We had a couple of sessions that didn't quite fill. Selectman Coutu noted it still paid for itself though.

Lacrosse - 5826, page 20.

Chairman Luszey asked are we starting to lose interest. It's going the other way versus...Dave Yates said no. What happened there is the first couple of years the high school students were playing and now the high school has their program. So we did decrease the budget so the revenue did go down a little due to the high school students that didn't play that did the first year. We're balancing off a little. The lower numbers - the U9 team through U15, they're still the same numbers that we had except the older kids have moved to the high school. Chairman Luszey said that younger population decreased and do you see this decreasing year over year now. Mr. Yates said no. I think the younger population is fine. It was the high schoolers. The ninth graders were allowed to play at our level the first couple of years and now they're playing at the high school level.

Chairman Luszey explained that what I'm saying. If they continue that trend and under high school age is decreasing in population in the town do you see this decreasing over...Mr. Yates said no. The lower numbers the teams are just as big or bigger than they ever were. It was just the 9th graders were playing - I don't know exactly what you're asking but the 9th graders played the first year so it gave us more kids in the program. Now it's just strictly...Chairman Luszey understood but if our student population is dropping which means the 9th graders is not a constant - our student population is constant, it's shrinking, if the 9th graders are no longer playing in this that means your population is shrinking year over year. Dave Yates said that's why we decreased it a little based on those numbers. Chairman Luszey said I see that and I'm asking do you expect that trend to continue the next few years until...Mr. Yates didn't think so. We've adjusted to those numbers now. I think we're fine.

Selectman Coutu noted it's the fastest youth sport in America today. Chairman Luszey didn't disagree but we only have so many kids in the town. We're not growing kids.

Rec. - Basketball - 5831, page 23

Selectman McGrath questioned line item 252 - basketball, that's jumped up and then the one below that the basketball - rec. program materials. Is that an increase in numbers in the amount of players that you have. It's not substantial. Dave Yates said yes basketball is our biggest sport by far. It's anywhere from first grade all the way up to adults. So those numbers are going up and as our revenue - we're almost there where it's a break even. We're about \$5,000 off. It definitely is increasing between our travel teams and our rec. teams. It's definitely the biggest one.

Rec. - Soccer - 5834, page 26.

Selectman McGrath questioned line item 270 the materials. That's gone up as well. Selectman Coutu said the cost of shirts went up. Mr. Yates thought it was and the number of participants too. As you see, revenue went up in that one. The revenue just to bring it to your attention, revenue is a little misleading. We did soccer registration earlier this year. We typically do it in June and July. We did it in May so all those registrations came in May. Because we have so many late sign ups with soccer because school is not going on and we don't have that captive audience, we did soccer signups for the fall program in May. I estimate that \$20,000 - \$25,000 frame where this year it was 32. We're going to keep on the May timeframe. I just don't want to be misleading for next year when we come in and it should be lower and back to that \$20,000 - \$25,000. Soccer is a big revenue generator too.

Rec. - Senior Activities - 5835, page 29.

Selectman McGrath questioned line item 270. Can you explain the increase in that? Lori Bowen stated what we had last year was a little bit less office supplies. So we moved some of the monies around that's all just to accommodate. We had a more demand for more program supplies so we just manipulated some of the money back into it and took it out of small equipment. Selectman McGrath said those are programs that I'm talking about. Ms. Bowen said we just had an increase in the monies that we needed for programming - arts and crafts and cards. We purchased more items for things so I just wanted to actual out the budget compared to what we spent last year.

Selectman Routsis questioned line 221 went down by \$2,000. Is that to compensate for what you just said or is that for something different? Lori Bowen said no 221 the equipment rental was I was put on the account with the other copiers and whereas I didn't have one before. Because we had done a large number at the beginning to sort of accommodate what type of copier I would need and then once I worked with the Finance Department to get the correct copier for my needs, that figure was able to drop significantly.

Selectman Nichols asked about senior activity decorations that seems to have gone up - line 356. Ms. Bowen believed it stayed the same. Kathy Carpentier noted to actuals is what she's referring to. Ms. Bowen noted it moved up to \$1,000. Just to accommodate some of the more extravagant events that we put on like the summer luau. We don't have to do too much decorating as far as holiday seasons but just to accommodate that.

Chairman Luszey asked what's our enrollment now. Lori Bowen state as of today I believe that we had 476 as of last Thursday but I've enrolled 12 people this week. We're at 488. Chairman Luszey asked do we know what the breakout is for resident versus non-resident. Ms. Bowen said we'll go back to the 476 participants. There's 317 people from the Town of Hudson that are registered at the center and then the remaining are from surrounding towns. I'd be happy to list those if you'd like to know where everyone comes from. I can tell you our highest draw is from Nashua - 81 people and Litchfield is a close second at 33.

Teen Dances - 5836, page 32.

Dave Yates noted a very popular event.

Selectman Coutu realized I looked at page 32 and I look at the police detail, the professional services, recreation program where there's MTLs. Steve Malizia noted materials. Selectman Coutu noticed that except for 2017/2018 on professional services which has gone up \$300 from 2016, everything else has virtually stayed the same. On the

father/daughter dance we went to two nights in 2017. Dave Yates said I put that. We use community activities for that. This was for the dances we use for the 5th and 6th graders and the community activities is where we included the father/daughter dance. That's why the revenue for community activities is so much higher because we did two back to back nights.

Selectman Coutu asked what besides father/daughter is in that. Dave Yates said that's also the comedy nights. Selectman Coutu stated you put the father/daughter dances in here. These are the 5th and 6th grade dances on the first one. I'm good. Thank you. I see the difference on the next page 34.

Community Activities - 5839, page 34.

Kathy Carpentier stated the Rec. Director does have three requests outside the budget on page 38.

Chairman Luszey asked to go back to page 37 5877. Did you skip over that? Ms. Carpentier said that would be IT things. It rolls up under Rec. but its Lisa's.

Dave Yates stated the three requests and I think we're going to take care of from what I understand but the first one is the recreation equipment capital reserve fund that was established in FY15 for replacement equipment. We had big equipment that broke down and we'd have money in an account to repair playground equipment or any big equipment. Since that was established and approved by the voters, nothing has been put into that account. I think it's still at zero. I put it on here. Ms. Carpentier noted there's \$5,139. Mr. Yates had put \$5,000 again this year to see if we could increase it so we'd have more money in there if we need it. Just a request.

Selectman McGrath asked what type of equipment might you want to...Mr. Yates said mainly the playground equipment at Merrifield Park, Benson Park. Looking at the bigger items at the time, I think we had the skate park at the time. We don't have that anymore. More that type of bigger...Steve Malizia said you could have used it for like the lights which is his third item if you look at the list. If you had more of a reserve fund, you could even use it to do something like that that's part of that playground. Things that are more than a few couple of thousand dollars. Mr. Yates indicated and replacement lights at the ballpark which we're going to be getting to after the third item.

Selectman McGrath said instead of having \$20k for the lights if the funding were in the equipment capital reserve we wouldn't require that. Steve Malizia agreed. You could take the money out of that capital reserve. You could start saving for these things now.

Selectman McGrath stated there's \$5,000 in the account now. If we added enough funding to that to cover the lights then we wouldn't need the \$20,000. It would be 15 as opposed to 25. Dave Yates said it would save money yes. Selectman McGrath noted you'd be using it all in one swipe but then next year if you don't anticipate anything else in that next fiscal year. Mr. Yates said I don't anticipate but we never know.

Selectman Coutu asked are you proposing we increase it to 20. Selectman McGrath said increase it to put in \$15,000 as opposed to \$5,000 and then eliminate the \$20,000 for the court lights. It could be all in that just one capital reserve account as opposed to having two. Dave Yates indicated it would save us \$5,000. Selectman Coutu said it would still leave the \$5,000 for...Kathy Carpentier believed the motion would be to increase the budget 5810-450 from zero to \$15,000. The \$15,000 would go over to our capital reserve fund. You'd have 20 in there to do the lights next year. Selectman McGrath said that would accomplish what you need.

Chairman Luszey said I'm not sure. I have a question. If you go down to the Greeley Park request, isn't that capital reserve fund basically to take care of those types of requests? Ms. Carpentier said yes but there's no funding in it. By putting this \$15,000 in there, you'd be able to accomplish this light project next year and get the money back from the capital reserve fund.

Chairman Luszey's other question is when I went through the budget where is all the maintenance and projected maintenance for all the other fields - Jette Fields and things like that. Dave Yates indicated that is under ball fields. Chairman Luszey asked do we have a separate capital reserve for when you have to replace those or fix those. Mr. Yates said no we don't.

Chairman Luszey said you actually brought up a point when you said the playground at Benson. We moved the care and maintenance under the Highway Department. So would now the Highway Department use this fund also to replace equipment like that at Benson? Kathy Carpentier said the capital reserve fund was established for the purpose of improving/renovating and replacing capital equipment at recreation facilities. So based on your example, I would say yes but I'm not the gatekeeper of the capital reserve fund.

Steve Malizia stated they resurfaced that particular basketball court this year. The light stand to the light pole was so rotted that it immediately crumbled and they couldn't do anything with it. They weren't going to spend this kind of money to replace it but they did resurface the court. When you get to dusk for summer time and kids are out there, there is no light. Light is also good for the police when they drive by it and they can see who's over there. It serves as a dual

purpose. Dave Yates indicated they also thought ahead and they put the conduit under the pavement where the wires were above the courts before. The conduit was under the pavement ready for lights if we do it.

Selectman Coutu asked what is the time of operation. What time do they shut the lights off? Dave Yates said the RSA that's on the sign I believe is 10 o'clock. Its summer hours. Obviously at this time of year it's too cold and nobody is out there. Selectman Coutu said the field next door there's lights there. I don't remember the last time I was there. It was in August and here we are two months later and I still forget. Who pays for the Hudson Youth - Mr. Yates indicated Hudson Youth Baseball pays for the lights.

Selectman Coutu reiterated the proposal now is...Steve Malizia said to take these two requests and instead of granting \$25,000 put \$15,000 into the capital reserve fund and then you'll be able to replace this. Selectman Coutu said you're saying 15 plus the 5 that's already in it. Instead of having a \$24,000 request we'll only have a \$15,000. That makes more sense.

Motion by Selectman McGrath, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to increase department 5810-450 Capital Reserve Fund from zero to \$15,000, carried 5-0.

Dave Yates noted the second item was the recreation field space construction capital reserve for \$75,000. \$75,000 would get us to where we need to be to construct Freedom Field II but I believe...Steve Malizia indicated Warrant Article G which I proposed divvies up land sales from last year to three capital reserve funds and one of which is the field one and would put \$119,000 into that field which is more than we need to complete that project should we move forward.

Selectman McGrath asked for clarification. Steve Malizia explained we have Warrant Article G which is taking money from land sales we had last year and allocating it into three capital reserve funds - communications, fields, and major town building repairs. We did that last year with a warrant article the voters approved so I proposed and it's in your book in G to do it again. This year all of those funds would get \$119,000. That's the net proceed divided by three. Last year I think it was \$95,000. So slightly more this year. By doing that and if that passes, we would have sufficient funds to complete a multi-purpose field next to Freedom Field which exists right now and have money left over. There's more land there. We'll have to see how it will work out.

Selectman Coutu said we'll have to see the uses of this one before we commit to another one. Steve Malizia said it's estimated to be about \$258,000 soup to nuts. This would give us with the \$119,000 we have almost \$50,000 extra which we would just leave in the fund and then that could be allocated down the road. He doesn't need to do this if Warrant Article G moves forward but he didn't want to leave it without anybody seeing it.

Selectman Coutu stated let's assume worst case scenario Article G were to fail. I don't think it will but in the event that it should, where does the \$75,000 put us? We'll need a couple more thousand. Mr. Malizia said you would need right now as we speak today if Article G failed, we're about \$70k short. If we found money at the end of the year in the budget, if we're getting developer impact fees could still come in but you need to get \$70,000. That's about what we're short.

Just to follow onto that question, Chairman Luszey indicated if Article G fails what happens to those monies that...Steve Malizia said they would sit in the surplus and they could be appropriate until further appropriation or they would basically sit there. We're looking to appropriate out of that.

Kathy Carpentier believed the next place we're going is Warrant Article F.

Dave Yates said this is two part. The Senior Affairs Committee and Chairman Porter through his strategic planning information that he came up with had recommended that the senior center be open five days a week. If this is what the Board wishes to do and open it five days a week, the request would be for the Senior Coordinator to go full time to accommodate that fifth day. This warrant article would include longer hours during the Monday through Thursday. The hours will now go from 8 to 3 and 8 to 3 also on Fridays. It would be an additional \$19,807 with increase in hours and benefits for the Senior Coordinator.

Chairman Luszey had one question. When we opened up the senior center there was an underlying premise that the majority of the programs would be managed by volunteers. What happened to that? Dave Yates wasn't aware of that. That's why we hired a part time Senior Coordinator. Volunteers do help with programming and assist Lori. Chairman Luszey said there was a discussion at the Board of Selectmen when we were making the decision to go forward with the senior center that many of the programs would be administered by volunteers much like we loan out the Community Center and let dances happen. When I raised money for the First Team by hosting dances there and it was all by volunteers. There was no town employee there other than a hired officer. We were doing that type of philosophy was to go forward with the senior center. I'm wondering where did the shift take place and there was a strategic plan that was due out by the committee to say how they were going to do all of what they wanted to do. I've not seen that. Mr. Yates said I don't recall it to be honest with you. Part of the plan was when we did build a senior center we hired a part timer. I don't know the plan you're talking about to be honest with you. I don't know if Steve can help me on it. Steve Malizia said if I'm not mistaken, that's what the Senior Affairs Committee is working on and I'm not sure of they've ever

presented anything. Mr. Yates indicated part of their strategic plan was to go out and take a poll. They were at voting last year. They took a poll and asked people what they would want. I know we've talked amongst the seniors, the Senior Affairs Committee members and they would definitely like that fifth day. Just for your consideration.

Selectman Nichols stated I know you'd like to move the part time to full time but don't we have someone that's already full time that's supposed to fill in. Can't they do it Friday? Mr. Yates said fill in as a substitute. Selectman Nichols advised substitute a Friday. I know it was said that they were going to use some of the seniors to help. Now some of the seniors do help at lunch and they do help at selling the Bingo tickets and they do a few things like that but they could open up too on a day and run it just as well as anybody else. I'm thinking of the money that would be two full timers being paid for insurance, benefits, and...Mr. Yates indicated the increase would be \$19,000. Selectman Nichols said I would like some feedback on that because I really am not too crazy about it right now.

Selectman Routsis said I was at the last Senior Affairs meeting and every person that was around the table was for this position going from part time to full time. They did discuss how a lot of the programs are currently full and people aren't able to get into it. They also discussed that people get there before the senior center actually opens. Some people are there about a half hour before it opens waiting for it to open to get in. So everyone that was at the Senior Committee did think that this would be something that would be beneficial to the community.

Chairman Luszey had one other question. Last year when we brought the part time Rec. Administrator from part time to full time, part of your justification was to help Lori out. What happened with that? Dave Yates said she has. When Lori is sick or on vacation, she has gone up there and filled it. Chairman Luszey asked that's the only time that that time is available. Mr. Yates said we support Lori in different projects. If she needs help with different projects, both us are there to help her. It was mainly due to vacations, sick time and...

Chairman Luszey noted I'll speak for myself right now. I think Lori is doing a great job however I would need a lot more detail of what the full time recreation assistant does in the day. I will now need to see what is consuming their hours and then I will need to see what's consuming Lori hours. Again I'll go back to do we have the right people in the right place doing the right work at the right time. Right now, I can't support this. Mr. Yates said that's mainly because you don't understand what she does. If I give you that justification, you...Chairman Luszey didn't think that would change my mind but I'll tell you I need a lot more details than four lines of text. Mr. Yates stated she's extremely busy. Do you need this now to press forward for this year or are we looking into the future? Chairman Luszey said before I support this warrant yup.

Selectman Coutu asked this will come up for review when. Chairman Luszey said Tuesday. Kathy Carpentier stated Tuesday night is what you determined to be your wrap up night.

Selectman McGrath stated the backup that you provided about salary there are no health benefits included in that and if we change this to a full time position at some time in the future if the employee whether its Lori or someone else wanted to access those benefits...Dave Yates said it would increase. This is because Lori's husband had good insurance and she will opt out of the insurance. Selectman McGrath said that can change. Kathy Carpentier said it could also change with all due respect if her circumstances changed. Selectman McGrath stated if you husband changed jobs or lost his job. There's all kinds of things that can happen. That salary number would change substantially because health benefits are expensive and dental and all of that. That's the reason why it's not included now. It's because the current employee has other insurance and she doesn't need it. I'm with Selectman Luszey and Selectman Nichols that I'd like a little more information too before I can support this. I remember the conversation about the other employee going to full time when you came in. I was under the assumption that she'd be a bigger help to the senior center as well. I need more justification.

5. WARRANT ARTICLES

Chairman Luszey said I'll go through the warrants. Before we actually get there, one of the action items we asked the Fire Chief to go off along with the Town Administrator and the Finance Director is to take a look at alternate funding for the proposed fire station. That was the first action item. The second action item was to take a look at doing similar lease purchase program for pumpers similar to that on what we do on larger equipment. With that, we'll start with the fire station.

Kathy Carpentier noted it is Warrant Article I. You were given the documentation on Tuesday night. If you don't have it, we do have extra copies.

Chairman Luszey welcomed the Chief and let's take up the fire station first.

Chief Buxton said on the 18th meeting you had tasked myself, the Town Administrator and the Finance Director to look at potential for alternative funding mechanism for the station. We provided you a memo this evening that offers you four different scenarios for the funding of the fire station and with one recommendation. That ranges from a straight out bond as we originally proposed for a \$2.9 million with a cost of \$317 over the life of the bond to a hybrid of \$1.5 million in removing some money from fund balance and reducing that amount to \$164 to borrowing \$2.1 million from the

account unassigned fund balance and then raising and appropriating \$800,000 at a cost of \$78 to the taxpayer or a straight out raise and appropriation which is a cost of \$281 to the average taxpayer in town.

Selectman Coutu said you used the term "borrowing" \$2.1 million from the unassigned fund balance. Is that what we're going to be doing is borrowing it? Steve Malizia said we're not borrowing. We're just taking it. We would take the money out of surplus. Selectman Coutu said I just want to put out this fire before...

Chief Buxton said we felt as a committee when we sat down and looked at this that if we were bonding, we were bonding. If we were removing from the unassigned fund balance, we were removing from the unassigned fund balance and raising and appropriating. We didn't feel that a hybrid of a bond and removing money from the unassigned fund balance would be successful because you have the same 60 percent that you need to raise on the ballot box. So that is a consideration we brought forward for you this evening. The Finance Director certainly can get into the land use change tax fund credit that was referenced in the Memo under #3 which was a \$200,000 value and reduce that actual impact to the average home down to \$60.

Chairman Luszey said the only other thing I would add quickly is in terms of bonding, we do what 10, 15, and 20 year bonds. I'm not sure what the length of this one would be but that's a long term debt that the taxpayer would incur. This way it is a one-time hit to the tax rate similar to what the Board did a couple of years ago when they moved to renovate Lenny Smith. It's a one-time expense. It's not a multi-year expense in terms of borrowing money.

Steve Malizia believed the bond was predicated on 10 years. Just for the audience, it was a 10 year bond.

Kathy Carpentier said it was a 10 year bond and it would have cost us \$273,000 in interest over that 10 year period.

Selectman McGrath indicated it's appealing to think that it's a \$78 one-time increase and it's appealing to have an \$18 decrease but what affect would decreasing our fund balance to that level mean for the town. If we had an emergency situation where we needed to tap into some money quickly, how would that affect us?

Chairman Luszey said that was a good question. I actually had a length conversation with the Finance Director and if you wouldn't mind.

Kathy Carpentier stated we have a fund balance policy that establishes five percent minimum. Selectman McGrath state that's the conversation that we have every year when we use that \$600,000 to maintain the tax rate at the previous year's level. There isn't a big jump one way or the other. We can adjust the...Mr. Malizia said we try to minimize the swings. Selectman McGrath agreed but we can use \$600,000 or a little bit more if we need to or a little bit less but \$600,000 has been...Kathy Carpentier said this town has strived to stay at least at 5 percent. What we have had the luxury of lately doing is creeping up. So we're almost at 9.7 percent. You've started to use some of it to fund your capital reserve funds. You're still using \$600,000 a year for tax purposes. The 5 percent though does - you are allowed to go under 5 percent if something catastrophic was to go wrong. We were trying to come up with some scenarios. The reserve that you do have does also is for schools, the county or anything related to the town. It's based on appropriations on everything in the town. By using the 2.1, we did the math to keep it at 5.1 percent. The reason that your surplus has been creeping up every year is like for example last year we gave back over \$300,000 in appropriations and we had unanticipated revenue of \$775,000 which is \$1.1 million we increased our reserve from. So we have a health reserve and that's why the three of us - the Town Administrator, the Fire Chief and I thought that this was a prudent measure to take 2.1 from reserve.

Selectman McGrath said I think in terms of some sort of catastrophic event such as a tornado or a hurricane where there's real devastation. If we start utilizing a large portion of this funding, we could be in trouble and our residents could be in trouble. I'm just trying to...Chairman Luszey said we've had those events though. We've had the Mother's Day flooding. We've had the ice storms. We get FEMA. We've been very fortunate yet we also have in other areas like in the utilities should a water tank get taken out by a tornado, the water utility has a significant amount of money that we could go after to offset that in addition to FEMA. We did try to come up with what would be a truly huge catastrophic event that we would need to go and use this money. The best one we could come up with is Central Fire Station collapsing on the 3 vehicles that are in there and we would have to go out and buy new vehicles in case that happened. Mr. Malizia noted they're insured. Chairman Luszey said they're insured but we'd have to go out and buy them but that's my point. Steve Malizia said by the time we got them, it would take 6 months because he's got to order them. Kathy Carpentier indicated that was the point. We tried to think of why would we need this money. By using the \$2.1 million, we'd still have \$3.3 million in the reserve and we haven't used it for anything in the 16 years that I've been here other than projects like this.

Selectman Coutu said the most catastrophic event would be everybody who has earned time filed and wanted it at the same time. Steve Malizia said we have approximately 35 or 45 percent of that money too. Selectman Coutu noted 35 or 40. We're missing 65 percent. Mr. Malizia said if everybody leaves at the same time, we have a bigger problem than that.

Selectman McGrath was not adamant about my position on this but I'm concerned about dipping into that money. This

is a large amount of money and I want to feel comfortable because I have to vote on it. Whether I vote on it here or I vote on it - I know how I'm going to vote in the ballot box. Like I said, it's appealing to think of a \$78 increase and it's a one-time increase only. It's also appealing for the \$18 decrease. I just worry about not having an adequate funding mechanism if something catastrophic happened. I haven't experienced any kind of tornadoes or the ice storm that certainly was not fun to go through but that's not the kind of catastrophe I think of. I think of the mid-west when tornadoes - and Massachusetts has experienced that where a tornado comes through and there's a real devastation. FEMA even though you might be able to get funding from FEMA, they're not Johnny on the spot. It takes them a while to come in, assess the damage, and determine whether or not they're going to give any funds. That's my concern and let me just state too for the record. I'm sorry to say Chief that I again can't support the fire station in the location that you're proposing it. I do think that we do need one but I just can't at this point support it in that location. Thank you.

Kathy Carpentier asked did I adequately answer the...Chairman Luszey wasn't sure. I know you're not on location wise. I'm not sure you're there funding wise. Selectman McGrath guessed it's something that I have to weigh in my own mind whether or not I'm comfortable with the amount that we're taking out of that fund. Yes KC adequately answered it. I'm not quite there yet.

Steve Malizia said as she articulated, our water and sewer have their own reserves so if we were to have some catastrophic event in water or sewer, they certainly have reserves unexpended fund balance that could easily compensate and cover that. We are insured. It's not a perfect world but we are insured. There's also I believe the ability that under emergency circumstances or catastrophic circumstances to petition the court to get the ability to spend money. We are restricted right now because of the appropriation of the voters but in an emergency or some situation that develops outside of the norm, you have the ability to go to court, petition to be able to spend money. What would that mean? You'd probably have to raise our taxes a bit but you still have the ability to petition court. Again we're not talking about something we can foresee. Let's say we don't fund our welfare budget. We can't run over and say oh we need to spend more on welfare. That's not what they're talking about. They're talking about true dire, serious types of emergencies where you realistically couldn't have foreseen it. You're allowed to petition. When I got here 19 something years ago, we didn't have five percent even. We operated on that without having that 5 percent. We've been fortunate and we've been probably spoiled by having a higher percentage of surplus. We are certainly within the adequacy guidelines. I would presume that if we don't do this again - in other words build another fire station, we will get back up within the next couple of years.

Selectman McGrath added the proposal that is presented is certainly more appealing than an increase of \$317 on the tax on someone's tax bill, \$164 on their tax bill, or \$281. It's appealing. I am not totally comfortable with what we're...Steve Malizia said if we weren't, we wouldn't have recommended it. Just so you know that when we looked at it, that's what we believe is in based on what you asked for, we believe this is a responsible or safe position. We wouldn't recognize any more. Selectman McGrath stated my position on this has absolutely no reflection on your assessment, or KC's, or the Chief's, or the Chairman of the Board. It's just it's my own comfort level. Maybe I'm being a nervous nelly and I don't need to be but that's my thought process.

Chairman Luszey said what the attempt here is we have an aging infrastructure in this town that we are further and further every year getting behind in. We're seeing the results of getting about 10 years out of Lenny Smith with about \$1 million worth of upgrades to it this year. Hopefully we can get this built. Right on the heels of this will be Robinson Road. Right on the heels of that will be this complex which we'll have met and has well exceeded its life expectancy and our ability to effectively and efficiently maintain it. We've got roofs that we're going to have to start repairing. All of the lighting, wiring. We need to start investing in our town. We started that really a few years ago with the roads and I think this is a great opportunity to invest in the town's infrastructure with what I consider to be a minimal impact which is less than what it's costing us to basically from a tax rate perspective to upgrade Central Fire Station.

Selectman Nichols wanted to know what is the money that would have to be bonded. If we took the bond out and it went for ten years, how much would that be? Again I didn't write it down. Steve Malizia noted it's a \$2.9 million bond and I believe the interest that you'd pay over the 10 years would be \$273,000. Effectively you're paying almost \$3.2 million because you're borrowing that over 10 years. The only good part is, interest rates are low. So you're not trying to do this like when the interest rates are 6, 7, or 8 percent. They were looking at 1.7 percent. These are historically low rates. If you're going to do a project with debt, this is not a bad time to do it.

Chairman Luszey said the reason we're speaking about it again tonight is last year when it was on the warrant it failed. When we bond, we have to get 60 percent. This we wouldn't. This would be a simple majority. Any other comments on this one? What is the will of the Board in terms of going forward with this or Warrant Article I?

Selectman Nichols indicated I'd like to go ahead and go with what you want rather than the Warrant Article.

Selectman Coutu said you can't make a motion on I want to go with this. This is nothing. What is this? What is the voters saying?

Chairman Luszey stated the motion be to eliminate Warrant Article I from the budget and to include the proposal...

Kathy Carpentier said it would still be Warrant Article I. Warrant Article funding mechanism would change from a bond article and he would reword Warrant Article I to take \$2,100,000 from fund balance and raise \$800,000 from tax. Selectman Coutu wanted to make sure that it will say the tax rate impact will be \$78. Mr. Malizia indicated for the average \$265,000. Chairman Luszey noted it said a tax impact would be 4. Something cents. Ms. Carpentier said you can't put that on the ballot as far as I know but that is what we will be selling. For the average single family home, it is a cost of \$78. A one-time fee, a one-time tax that you will be paying in Fiscal '18 if this was to pass. You're still raising and appropriating \$2.9 million with \$2.1 million to come from fund balance and \$800,000 to be raised from taxation.

Chairman Luszey asked would it be better if we have the warrant replacement worded and take that up Tuesday. Selectman Coutu understood it. It's just that I heard a motion made that we were going to substitute it with this. Steve Malizia indicated it you agree to that, the article will be written with that language that you just heard. Kathy Carpentier said it's about \$.30 tax rate impact - one time. Selectman Coutu said I'd rather put the \$78 than the \$.30. We'd have to have that language done by...Steve Malizia said the language will be pretty straight forward just like Kathy said. The language is prescribed by the Department of Revenue there and you legally have to do it a certain way. In your advertising materials or your promotion of this article in this particular project, you could state it it's a \$78 hit. It's a \$.30 rate. Whatever you think would be effective to the people out there. In the article, we're not really permitted to do that sort of language.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to replace Warrant Article I with the proposal from Chief Buxton dated October 24 - Warrant Article I Construction of a New Fire Station.

Chairman Luszey noted we would wait for the wording for Tuesday night to actually move this warrant so we can all see it in its final form.

Vote: Motion carried 4-1. Selectman McGrath in opposition.

Kathy Carpentier asked why did we just vote. Steve Malizia indicated what they want us to do for a warrant article. Ms. Carpentier reiterated we're voting on the change.

Article K - Pumper Replacement Strategy

Chief Buxton explained Warrant Article K was a warrant article to fund the replacement fire pumper to replace two 19 and 20 year old pumps within the Fire Department. That price came in at \$508,000. What I had suggested to you instead of placing a warrant article on the ballot for this purpose would be to look at at least purchase a plan as we do with the Highway Department's heavy fleet. I provided you three motions that would take place. You would put \$60,000 into 5730-404 for the purpose of leasing a fire pumper which is fire trucks and move forward with that program and become a lease payment and not a one-time expenditure on the warrant.

Selectman Coutu said the amount you brought it down from 550 to 508. If we went with the lease purchase - oh no I think there is no down payment. It's not like we're buying a car. It's the first year's lease we pay up front. Did we estimate the cost of the lease per year? Chief Buxton believed \$60,000 is the estimate that we brought in. Kathy Carpentier said that hasn't been shopped. The leasing piece of it has not been shopped but it was an estimate given by the vendor. Selectman Coutu noted we're looking at about \$.03 on the tax rate for that. Chief Buxton said no. What I'm suggesting is you not fund a capital reserve account. Selectman Coutu said the least payment is going to cost us. Chairman Luszey said we're reducing the capital reserve yearly cost by \$50,000. Steve Malizia said if we're going to do this, we don't need to put money in the savings account. We're going to lease it. So we're saving that. Chairman Luszey stated we're looking at anywhere from a \$10,000 to \$18,000. Mr. Malizia thought around \$10,000 or something which is not even a penny.

Motion by Selectman McGrath, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to eliminate Warrant Article K and reduce line item 5730-450 by \$50,000 and increase line item 5730-404 by \$60,000, carried 5-0.

Chairman Luszey asked if there were any closing comments by the Board members.

Kathy Carpentier asked so you don't want to forward the warrant tonight. So you want me to go first. Thank you very much. This morning I had a phone call from the Department of Revenue to set the preliminary tax rate that you approved two weeks ago. I was happy to receive a little over \$100,000 more in revenue. They increased our meals and room revenue by \$98,155 and our Highway Block Grant by \$2,629. That's a \$.04 decrease to the rate that I proposed to you back two weeks ago which is good news. They then called me back to tell me that the SAU understated their unassigned fund balance by \$200,000. Selectman Coutu commented they can't do their own math how do they expect the kids to learn. Ms. Carpentier indicated which is another \$.08 decrease to the tax rate that I proposed to you. So that is good news. The town tax rate is going down \$.04. The school tax rate is going down \$.08 and the total is down \$.12. That tax rate would be \$21.97. You gave me direction to decrease the tax rate if it changed but because it was such a large decrease I just wanted to make you aware before I accepted a \$.12 decrease to the rate that was proposed to you.

Selectman Coutu asked do you need a motion. Chairman Luszey thought a consensus for sure. Kathy Carpentier thought I already got it two weeks ago. Steve Malizia said usually you were talking a penny or something but this is a little bit more so it was just important enough to bring it to your attention so that you are aware that if you had some sort of hey let's not do that. Ms. Carpentier noted \$.12 is good. I guess the bad news is the tax rate still is going up \$.72 mostly driven by the school section. Selectman Coutu commented mostly? Ms. Carpentier said completely. Our tax rate is going down the \$.04. It would be \$187 tax increase to the average single family home which is better than it was two weeks ago but it still is going up \$187. I do not feel I need any more direction from you. You gave it to me two weeks ago. Steve and I felt it was prudent just to let you know before we hit the commit button. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Luszey asked do we want to go through and move the warrants to the ballot at this time or do you want to do it Tuesday. Selectman Coutu said we can do it now. I don't care. It's whatever the majority wants to do. I'm fine with doing it now.

Selectman McGrath asked to clarify for me what we're doing on Tuesday. Chairman Luszey indicated Tuesday would be bringing back the people that you need to ask questions because you missed two major nights. I don't know if you have questions of Highway. Selectman McGrath noted I don't need Highway. Chairman Luszey said I guess maybe I should ask you now. Do we need to meet Tuesday? Is there questions of department heads that you would like brought in to go over those sections that you missed out on?

Selectman McGrath indicated I have two questions. NRPC funding was zeroed out and I would like that to be reconsidered. So whether or not we do it tonight or we do it Tuesday night, I'd like to make the argument that that needs to be funded and not zeroed out. That's number one. Number two, I wasn't here for the discussion on Benson Park. I looked through it today to look at the inception to date costs that I had requested and whether or not there's going to be any warrant articles or additional funding requested for Benson Park. Chairman Luszey said we don't have any at this time. Steve Malizia noted at this time we do not have any. Selectman McGrath said I'll hold that as the information that I received I'll hold that going forward. If they're not planning to spend any other than what's in the budget. Chairman Luszey indicated we have no other warrant article right now for Benson. Steve Malizia presumed if anything came in it would come in to the Board as a whole at some future - not that I anticipate that but that would be the method. Selectman McGrath didn't know if anything else was anticipated because last year initially they were looking for ¾ of a million dollars to bring utilities in. Then they changed that value and then we also had \$100,000 that was spent for paving that wasn't anticipated.

Chairman Luszey answered that at this point in time is this Board has no warrant article going forward for Benson's. We don't anticipate anything other than what's in this book for FY18. What happens and how this Board gets constituted for FY18 is up to the voters and what happens at that point is what this Board chooses to do.

Where we have that information and I won't take a lot of time, Selectman McGrath said just for the people that are watching this to date we've spent \$1,369,623 on Benson's. That includes from 2002 to 2008 \$151,400 and I assume that that's in preparation of actually purchasing the park. The purchase price was in 2009 the spending that year was \$192,600. So just for people that are wondering what we've spent to date I think it's a good exercise. Again we've spent to date \$1,369,623 and the high hitters by the way were after the initial purchase FY16 where we spent \$262,000 and FY17 which hasn't ended yet, that will end June 30th \$115,447. So just for informational purposes.

Selectman McGrath asked to go back to NRPC.

Chairman Luszey said if that's the only other question you have to bring up NRPC, I'd need a motion to reconsider.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Routsis, to reconsider the previous NRPC motion.

Selectman Nichols said I asked around and I found that it isn't just the roadways that we use them for. They do the GPS for the fire stations. They do the maps for the Assessor's office. They do quite a few things. Not maybe as much as we'd like but for the money, I still think we get our monies worth. That's why I would reconsider.

Selectman Routsis indicated I'll speak to what Selectman Nichols had said. Part of the reason why I seconded it is I don't believe - and I'll let you know that they help us enough on the roadways. They come in a few times and we don't know what you want. We've told them what we want. That was my biggest reason for opposing it and asking for it to be zeroed out. Like you said, they do a lot with our emergency services and they also do a lot with our Assessing Department for some of the software that we use. I think until we know what the cost would be to potentially replace those, we may want to think about this or reconsider it.

Selectman McGrath asked do you want me to speak to this motion. I can't vote on the motion. Chairman Luszey said oh yeah you can on this one. Selectman McGrath said I can on the reconsideration even though I wasn't present. Chairman Luszey agreed. We haven't voted on that yet. Not on the reconsideration that's right.

Selectman Coutu asked to reread the motion please. I think the motion was not in order.

Donna Graham reread the motion: "Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Routsis, to reconsider the previous NRPC motion."

Selectman Coutu didn't think that's sufficient. I think the language is all wrong and I will challenge it if it passes.

Selectman McGrath stated if there is a demotion on the floor - Chairman Luszey noted there is a motion on the floor and I think maybe what...Selectman Coutu stated I'm giving you an opportunity to correct it. Chairman Luszey agreed and I'm going to try to help her. I believe what you may want to amend your motion to is: "Motion to reconsider the vote taken to remove the NRPC funding of \$19,434 from the FY18 budget taken by this Board on October 20, 2016."

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Routsis, to reconsider the vote taken to remove NRPC funding of \$19,434 on October 20, 2016.

Man oh man. Selectman Coutu indicated this was last Thursday this motion was made right? Last Thursday we had some well-informed members of the Board of Selectmen who agreed with me that we are wasting \$19,000 a year. Low and behold somebody did some research. That's what we just heard. Have been researching it. Asked around. This has been an argument I presented to the general public and to this Board for the last 5 or 6 years. We are wasting \$19,000 a year with the Nashua Regional Planning Commission for mapping, for roadwork and we have to correct a lot of the roadwork that they're involved in because it's not done properly by the engineering firms that are hired to do it. Mapping ladies and gentlemen. That's what I just heard for mapping. GPS and you're going to hear arguments. You might hear an argument that it's so valuable to our town to do this. Like GPS mapping hasn't been done, redone, overdone, and overly done for the past several years. This is a waste of taxpayer money. I know of at least one member of this Board who stated at candidate's night, and on television, and in ads that they were going to be here to vote for the people and get rid of wasteful spending. I haven't seen it yet. Here was an opportunity to do it and it was done and now they want to repeal it because all of a sudden they asked around and research was done. I know I'm repeating myself but I want you to remember this when you go to the polls next March that there aren't too many people looking out for the taxpayers here except me. This isn't a campaign speech. I am telling you this is a waste of the taxpayer's money and the motion should not pass. To continue to spend this money is saying to the voters of Hudson I don't care about your tax dollars I just love spending your money. That's all I have to say.

Chairman Luszey thanked Selectman Coutu and I think I'll say a little bit to that rebuttal. I was one that voted in favor of this. Mainly my vote was to send a message loud and clear to NRPC that I don't believe we are getting all of the benefits and services that we need out of them at this time specifically related to the traffic congestion and problems on Lowell Road. However, that does not mean should we eliminate \$19,000 from NRPC we do not have an accurate cost figure of what it's going to cost us to replace the services that they're providing for us. My proposal would be going forward would be to re-implement the \$19,000 for FY18 with the direction and guidance that this Board go forward with the full intention of putting in place a program to basically eliminate NRPC in the future. It would mean to bring in GIS capability for mapping; it would mean to bring in capability to do hazardous waste collection; it would mean to do traffic planning and simulation on our own. I'm not sure we have the means at this time to do that. I am still of the opinion that NRPC does not give us the bang for the buck but I am not one to cut off my nose in spite of my face knowing that they provide a level of service that we would need to plan and fund going forward.

Selectman Nichols guessed maybe I was the one who said that I would do what I could for the town. I will do the best I can for the town and I don't think this little bit of money - not that it's little because it isn't. It's a good chunk of cash. I just feel as though we need them right now. Maybe down the road when we've done some more investigation and we found maybe there's another place we can get like you said more bang for the buck somebody else I'll go for that. I just can't see like you said cutting you nose despite your face. It's just not worth it to me. I'd like to see them continue until we see what they can do and see what we can do to help the town.

Selectman Routsis stated I will say what I said before. I would agree with getting rid of them if it only involved our roadways. It involves other things that I don't think we took into account for when we made this initial decision - this initial motion - and until we know what the end cost ramifications may be for us, I think that's something that we need to know before we actually fully move forward with this. I also think everyone on this Board looks out for our taxpayers and not only one person. I do personally take offense to that statement. Selectman Coutu said good you should.

Selectman Nichols did too.

Vote: Motion carried 4-1-0. Selectman Coutu opposed. Selectman McGrath abstained.

Selectman Coutu said I will challenge it at the Budget Committee and if necessary I will bring a special warrant article to have it removed.

Selectman McGrath abstained just for the record because I didn't sit on this when it was before the Board. I'd like to make some comments if I could.

Motion by Selectman McGrath, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to reinstate the \$19,434 to fund NRPC.

Selectman McGrath heard that this Board had eliminated that funding. My immediate thought was about the work that they are currently doing for us that may not have been recognized. There's two things. Number one they're working on looking at the Sagamore Bridge westbound access that John Cashell talked about when he was before us a few weeks ago. They're preparing the paperwork and the application for the CMAQ Grant that would enable us to receive funding to accomplish that. The other thing that they're doing for us is they're in the process of doing a traffic study on Lowell Road. That too I think was not recognized when this vote was taken. Therefore I think that the - let me back up a bit. I agree with Selectman Routsis that I haven't been happy either with the level of assistance that we've gotten from them concerning our roadway problems. We all know what they are. I would be more than happy if within the next - they have funding now up until July 1, 2017 to accomplish the access road for Sagamore Bridge Road, CMAQ Grant, and perhaps the traffic study that they're doing for Lowell Road. If we don't see real movement within that time span, I would be willing certainly to make a motion to not fund anything further even though the money was in the budget to not fund anything further for NRPC. They're going to be tasked with proving themselves to I believe a majority of this Board in order to spend that money. After the vote, I'd like to speak also.

Chairman Luszey said just my position on this. I'm kind of where you're at around the funding. Putting the money back in doesn't mean we have to give it to them. Your comment about what they're doing now. Over a year ago, they sat in those seats right there and said that they were going to do a simulation of all of the changes that have been proposed for Lowell Road and present them to us. That includes the work that they're working on right now for the Sagamore Bridge. We have yet to see any progress on that simulation. I know our Town Planner when I talked to him about what we had done said geez they just started doing the data collection for the traffic count. I said they don't need to do another traffic count. All they have to do is look. They know Lowell Road is congested. They can use the data that they collected two years ago, three years ago, four years ago, five years ago to generate the simulation and plug those numbers in to see what impact any change would make on Lowell Road. The other thing that kind of bothers me and that's why I'm saying I'll vote to put the money in but if I'm here next year I may not vote to actually give them that money because no one has called me around what we did from NRPC. I don't know if they've called any one of you. I don't know if they've called...Steve Malizia said they called me. Chairman Luszey hoped so because I personally stopped in with the Town Planner and I said you may want to call them and let them know what we did. Don't know what their reaction to it and you might want to say a few words on that but that's where I'm at right now.

Selectman McGrath said I completely understand that. Like I said based on what they're doing for us now, I think that it's to put the funding into the budget. I think it's necessary. That doesn't mean that we have to authorize spending it if they don't prove themselves. I'm with you. I don't think that they've done enough for us and I've said that in the past. Because of what they're doing now, I think that we'll have a benchmark as to whether or not we're satisfied with what they're doing.

Steve Malizia indicated the Director was going to speak to his board obviously before they had any kind of reaction. They're well aware of your displeasure that I think that message has been delivered on more than one front. They are keenly aware that there's a very good likelihood that they be discharged from our service. At this point in time, they haven't done anything else.

Vote: Motion carried 4-1. Selectman Coutu emphatically NO - waste of taxpayer money.

Selectman McGrath asked to continue with a comment. I suppose I should take offense at being told that I don't look out for the taxpayers' money but I don't. I can tell you this, you may get away with bullying and intimidating other people. You're not going to get away with it with me. I make my decisions based on what I think is the right thing to be done at the time. That I am going to continue to do as long as I am sitting in one of these chairs. I think it's probably fair to say that that applies to all of our members. Not one person here whether it's you Selectman Coutu, whether it's me, whether Selectman Routsis, Selectman Nichols, not one of us should be talked to in the manner that you just spoke to us nor in the manner that you would normally speak to the employees that come in before us. I think it's uncalled for. I wouldn't do it to you. I don't think anyone else would do it here to you. It's unfortunate that you had that reaction but I can tell you you're not going to intimidate me and you're not going to bully me. Thank you.

Selectman Coutu noted I'll have plenty to say later.

Chairman Luszey recessed for a five minute break at 9:38 p.m. Reconvened at 9:42 p.m. We have a decision to make and that is whether or not we meet next week to wrap things up or we make our wrap up part of our normal agenda on the 7th. The Finance Director believes if we do it on the 7th we have plenty of time. The only outstanding item would be I believe we could not bring forward Warrant F because we asked for additional information to come forward. We would make the decision either to forward that one or not on the 7th if we move everything to the 7th. What is the will of the Board? Do you want to meet next week to go over those few items or do you want to do it as normal agenda?

Selectman Coutu said don't look at me. I'm always on the losing side. Ask the people that control.

Selectman McGrath said I'll offer my opinion because I'm not shy about offering my opinion. I think that we can probably accomplish it on the 7th and not require all of us to come to Town Hall on Tuesday to spend a few minutes together.

Selectman Routsis indicated I don't know what the process is for doing it. If it's believed that it can be done then, then...Selectman Coutu noted it can be done that way.

Chairman Luszey stated the consensus is we'll do it on the normal meeting. Kathy Carpentier said Monday the 7th we'll have wrap up. That's the direction of the Board.

Chairman Luszey asked if you would bring us through the warrants that we can forward tonight.

Kathy Carpentier asked what is the will of the Board for Warrant Article D wage and benefit increase for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector in the amount of \$1,307. Did you want me to read them? Chairman Luszey advised yes.

Steve Malizia read: "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1,307 which represents an increase in wages and benefits for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector. This appropriation is in addition to Article A the Operating Budget."

Motion by Selectman McGrath, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward Warrant Article D to the ballot, carried 5-0.

Wage and benefit increase. Steve Malizia stated this is Article E. "Wage and benefit increase is for full time employees of the Rodgers Memorial Library. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$8,925 which represents a two (2) percent increase in wages and benefits for the nine (9) full time employees of the Rodgers Memorial Library. This appropriation is in addition to Article A the operating budget."

Chairman Luszey said we asked them to do that to 1.5. Did they come back? Selectman Routsis said they said they were going to discuss that at their next meeting. Do we know when that was or is? Steve Malizia indicated we have not received anything back. If you don't want to forward that right now, don't forward it.

Selectman McGrath asked to take that up on the 7th if they were supposed to come back with a different number.

Steve Malizia noted we'll skip F and go to G. "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$357,000 of which \$119,000 will be added to the communications equipment and infrastructure capital reserve fund previously established, \$119,000 would be added to the recreation field construction capital reserve fund previously established, and \$119,000 would be added to major repairs to town buildings capital reserve fund previously established. This sum is to come from the June 30, 2016 unassigned fund balance. No amount to be raised from taxation. This appropriation is in addition to Article A the Operation Budget."

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Routsis, to forward Warrant Article G to the ballot, carried 5-0.

Article H. Steve Malizia noted we already forwarded this one. We did this quite a while back.

Steve Malizia thought we want to get the language from I before we actually present it to you.

Warrant Article J. "Ambulance replacement. Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$200,000 for the purpose of purchasing a replacement ambulance and to authorize the withdrawal of \$200,000 from the ambulance capital reserve account."

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman McGrath, to forward Warrant Article J to the ballot, carried 5-0.

Steve Malizia stated K was removed already. That was the pumper. Kathy Carpentier stated shouldn't you make a motion not to forward it to the warrant. To be on the safe side, Steve Malizia said.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Routsis, not to forward Warrant Article K to the ballot, carried 5-0.

Article L. Steve Malizia stated I don't know where we left off on that discussion for the fees for Benson Park. What is the pleasure of this Board? I don't remember if we had that conversation. Chairman Luszey indicated we had the conversation and we did not vote on it. Selectman Routsis said we were going to wait to do them all together to vote on it. Chairman Luszey stated there was no action. It would now be whether we want to forward it or not.

Warrant Article L. "The establishment of Benson Park user fees. Shall the Town of Hudson vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to establish user fees for Benson Park. This article is advisory only."

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman McGrath, to forward Warrant Article L for user fees at Benson Park for advisory purposes only to the ballot.

Selectman McGrath advised someone had suggested to me the other day that if some reason this does not pass that perhaps one of the options that Benson Park could adopt is having a recommended contribution for those people that

use the park and would like to continue to have it maintain. They do it other parks and other areas that I don't utilize but it might be something if this doesn't pass on the warrant they could consider that.

Selectman Coutu was going to vote no not to forward this to the warrant article but Selectman McGrath just said something that kind of - it was food for thought. Whether this passes or not, it's advisory. There's no sense - it does make sense to forward it to the voters. All they're going to do is give us an opinion one way or the other. As Selectmen McGrath suggested based on conversation she had with someone who recommended it to her, ultimately a sitting Board of Selectmen is going to make some sort of a decision one way or another. Either we're going to have user fees or we're not. We may as a Board establish user fees tomorrow and next year the Board may say no we're going to get rid of them. We're going from year to year.

Beyond what Selectman McGrath states is that Selectman Coutu thinks that we can have an intellectual discussion on some sort of funding mechanism whether it's by a volunteer user fee, holding some sort of events to raise funds at the park. I went to the first concert held at the park and there were about 100 - 150 people. It wasn't exceptionally well attended but for a first night a few kids from Alvirne High School and the Junior High, I thought it was pretty good to have 100 - 150 people show up. I think there might alternative ways to come up with some financial resources for the park. Ultimately it's our burden because we took ownership. Now we're either going to have to commit monies through the budget process or come up with some sort of a user fee to have maybe never a wash but at least some contribution to assist local taxpayers. I would say the motion has been made to send it. I'm going to support the motion at this point.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Article M. Steve Malizia noted this is the Assessing article. "Shall the Town of Hudson adopt a provision of RSA 72-28-b the all Veterans tax credit in the amount of \$500 from property tax for the Town of Hudson based on assessed value for qualified taxpayers..." You understand the tone. You're basically forwarding the expansion of the Veteran's tax credit to the warrant.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward Warrant Article M to the ballot, carried 5-0.

Steve Malizia believed Article N "Established Library Improvements Capital Reserve Fund. "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to establish a Capital Reserve Fund under the provisions of RSA 35:1 for the purpose of improving and renovating the building and replacing and repairing capital equipment at Hudson Libraries and to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1 to be placed in this fund and to further appoint the Hudson Library Board of Trustees as agents to expend from this fund."

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward Warrant Article N to the ballot.

Selectman Coutu said the reason why I am moving this recommended warrant article is because it is shown to be prudent for us as a municipality and the school system to establish capital reserve funds. It is a municipal building regardless of how the funding and whether or not we have control over the funding. I feel that to do otherwise is doing a disservice to the library users and it's contrary to what we've been doing in the past. I am supporting sending this to the ballot.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Steve Malizia believed that's the conclusion.

Just to reiterate, Chairman Luszey thanked everyone for putting the time in in going through this. KC will wrap up the final numbers, create the default. We will go over the revenue numbers, the default, and the outstanding warrant articles on our regular meeting on the 7th of November. With that, there will be no meeting next week. Seeing there is no other business before the Board at this time, I'll entertain a motion.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 9:56 p.m. by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nichols, carried 5-0.

Recorded by HCTV and transcribed by Donna Graham, Recorder.

Ted Luszey, Chairman

Marilyn E. McGrath, Vice-Chairman

Roger E. Coutu, Selectman

Pat Nichols, Selectman

Angela Routsis, Selectman