

HUDSON, NH BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Minutes of the October 30, 2014 Budget Review Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - by Chairman Coutu the meeting of October 30, 2014 at 7:06 p.m. in the Selectmen's Meeting Room at Town Hall.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - led by Selectman Brucker.
3. ATTENDANCE

Board of Selectmen: Roger Coutu, Ben Nadeau, Rick Maddox, Nancy Brucker, Pat Nichols

Staff/Others: Steve Malizia, Town Administrator; Donna Graham, Executive Assistant; Kathy Carpentier, Finance Director; Jim Michaud, Asst. Assessor; Lisa Nute, IT Director; Fire Chief Rob Buxton; Police Chief Jason Lavoie; Dave Yates, Recreation Director; Mike O'Keefe; Len Lathrop; Leo Bernard;

4. BUDGET WRAP UP

Chairman Coutu indicated we've reached the portion of the budget deliberations that are most serious and most critical in determining what the tax rate will be in the next year. I'm sure there will be a lot of discussion tonight. A lot of motions made to transfer money and to do other things. We'll deal with them in a specific order so that we can get through this. Before you this evening, Kathy Carpentier our Finance Director and the Town Administrator had a suggested order of business. I've reviewed it. I think it's appropriate and we'll proceed in that order in order to have some semblance of order in the process in which we're going to go through. So with that KC if you would discuss the handouts that you provided us this evening.

Kathy Carpentier noted in front of you is the list of suggested order of business for the day to expedite our evening discussions. The second document in front of you is the health insurance and after I tell what the documents you have, we'll quickly just go over the health insurance. The third package is a roll up of all the summaries, the revenues, the tax rate, and the "W" list. Similar to what I handed out the other night but this is as we stand today. The fourth package is the default broken out by fund - general fund, sewer fund, and water fund. As we touch on these matters, we can go through the sheets. They are all numbered in the right hand column. They are dated as of today. With that I can jump into the health insurance if you'd like Sir.

Ms. Carpentier said if you look at the health trust page that was handed out, you'll see our rates. Our Comp. 100 went up 6.6 percent. Our Comp. 300 went up 7 percent. Our Matthew Thornton went down 5.3 percent and our Medicare for our retirees went down 10 percent which is an overall decrease of 1.2 percent which is great news. The tax impact to the town is \$27,629 and I rolled it into all the departments. Overall there's a decrease in our flex due to the contractual items that we passed last year. There's 138 people on our insurance, including 29 of the retirees. That was a snapshot of the health insurance.

Chairman Coutu asked if there were any questions or comments before we move on. That's great news. Can we move on please?

Kathy Carpentier mentioned the next thing we're going to discuss is the revenues. It is on page 3 of your package that has the warrant articles on the front of it. There are two revenues. The Town Administrator and I identified if you choose to make them because of the additional revenue we got in the meals and rental tax, you can increase the revenues by \$91,923 and you could also look at motor vehicle permit fees because we're trending a little higher. So there's another \$50,000 potential here.

Chairman Coutu questioned on the meals and rental tax, we're at \$1,091,074. Is that the number with the increase if we were going to increase it? Steve Malizia noted there's a motion here. If you took \$1,091,074 to \$1,182,997, that would be the increase. Chairman Coutu said isn't it presumptuous on our part that we'll receive another \$91,923 again next year. Mr. Malizia said they set an annual number and basically when they give you that number and this is their pattern. They give you that number - I'm trying to think of the last time when they gave it to us - 10 years. I'm not sure. It's presumptuous. I think that this reflects that they've done better and they're passing it to us. I don't think it's a risk to take it quite frankly. Chairman Coutu commented you're the numbers guy that's why I asked.

Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to increase revenue account #4841 from \$1,091,074 to \$1,182,997, an increase in the amount of \$91,923.

Selectman Maddox asked did anybody make a phone call. That's nice to presume but the legislature has also cut this amount through my tenure.

Kathy Carpentier indicated every year what we've done is we've budgeted what we last received. I was just continuing on with that pattern. Chairman Coutu thought about that after he gave the explanation. We have been - it's been a traditional increase almost every single year.

Selectman Maddox said it's always been the same for the last 5 years is that number.

Steve Malizia said the legislature a few years ago raised the rate from I believe 9 percent to 10 percent. Selectman Nadeau indicated 8 percent to 9 percent. Mr. Malizia said I stand corrected. They kept all of that percentage and they kept us flat. We received the same number for the last few years. Presumably the rooms and meals tax has gone up. Presumably that's why they gave it to us. We've always budgeted it. It's a trailing number. We've budgeted the last number we've received. We do the same for the highway block grant.

Vote: carried 4-1. Selectman Maddox in opposition.

Chairman Coutu said the other one is line item #4201. Ms. Carpentier noted it's budgeted at \$4 million. Chairman Coutu asked what is the revenue this year. Ms. Carpentier said \$3.8 million. We're currently trending at 36 percent. If we had a linear revenue source, it would be 33 percent so we're trending to hit at least approximately \$4.1 million this year fiscal 2015. Steve Malizia said last year we brought in \$4,143,000. Chairman Coutu stated that there was a national trend. It was becoming obvious here in New Hampshire that there were more vehicles last year being purchased new because of the markdowns. I said that we expected that revenue should increase significantly in motor vehicles. I don't see that trend continuing from year to year. Eventually there's a gap where people stop buying cars. I'm a little nervous about increasing the revenue line. We're trending at \$4.1 million based on numbers for July, August, September, October. Kathy Carpentier indicated I ran the numbers as of today so we're missing today and tomorrow's revenue. Chairman Coutu commented without today and tomorrow's revenue we're trending at \$4.1 million. Ms. Carpentier said 4.1 if it was a linear revenue source.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to increase revenue account #4201 from \$4 million to \$4,050,000, an increase in an amount of \$50,000.

Selectman Nadeau felt you putting in \$50,000 is a little excessive. I've seen over my tenure that we've had to back this line out. I think that we had cash for clunkers for two years. We had a lot of people buying cars in those two years. I think that this number is a little bit inflated. I would like to see it at about \$25,000 if you're going to increase it at all but that's just me.

Chairman Coutu had a question of Mr. Malizia. We've spent since Tuesday night a lot of thinking about a lot of things in the budget. We all know how serious this is when we get down to the nitty gritty. It is my objective this evening is probably the same as it was 8 years ago when I said we're just going to try to avoid raising taxes. I know that raising the revenue line helps us in achieving a more balanced budget. I don't want to just do that for the sake of achieving a balanced budget. I want to do it feeling comfortable about what we did. Assuming we project all of our revenues at X number of dollars and all our expenses at X number of dollars, we overspend because the revenue is offset some of the expenses but we overspend, including the revenue. How do we offset that expenditure? Steve Malizia said we're technically not allowed to overspend. We can't spend without an appropriation so you cannot exceed the bottom line.

Chairman Coutu asked so on June 1st of next year we've spent all of our budget, the government ceases to operate for the rest of the month. Mr. Malizia said or else you petition the court because you have some emergency that caused you to do that. Chairman Coutu said technically we cease the operation of the government without a decree from the court. Mr. Malizia said there is no spending without an appropriation so if you've reached your appropriation limit, my understanding is you cannot spend further. Chairman Coutu said this does not bring us to that critical. Mr. Malizia qualified that. If you get an unanticipated grant, that you can adjust your budget for. That's I think the primary reason why every month we look at the budget to actuals so we understand where we are and we could make adjustments. That's why we do it every month quite frankly. Chairman Coutu stated if we saw this line item trending in a different direction and other revenues are either stable or going down a little bit, we can at any time - I know we can do this - we can impose a hiring freeze. We can say that's it no more, sharpen your pencils right down to the nubs and glue them together if you have to. That's what I did when I ran in my office. It's not that I feel warm and fuzzy about it. I just want to feel a little more comfortable about voting for this motion.

Kathy Carpentier spoke on the revenue piece. You can over achieve your revenues or under achieve your revenues. It doesn't have to do with the appropriations though. If you were going to miss your revenues by \$200,000 which we haven't done in the 14 years I don't think that I've been here, doesn't mean you have to under spend by \$200,000. It does dip into your surplus but the appropriations stand by themselves. You can spend up to the last dollar there. That's what you've been granted permission to do. Chairman Coutu understood that but you'd be dipping into our - I'm saying we can spend because that's what the voters said we could spend. We

have authority to do so. I would rather shut the government down than get into that situation in having to dig into our reserves even more. I feel a little more comfortable.

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

Chairman Coutu wanted to go right to the default budget.

Selectman Maddox asked are we leaving revenue adding revenue. Chairman Coutu said if you want at this time, this is the time to do it. I was going to go back to it but let's stay here. Selectman Maddox was staying on a kind of revenue sheet and I was trying to follow along. I'd like to take a look at 4730 - ambulance net revenues, page 4.

Chairman Coutu indicated \$600,000 is the number they're estimating - \$9,000 increase. Did you have a question specific because I have a question for you?

Selectman Maddox knows that you're softening to increasing the billing for revenue for ambulance. Chairman Coutu was willing to reconsider that position right now. Selectman Maddox was looking to put another \$20,000 into the revenue line so that I can take it and put it into the capital reserve for ambulances so it would be a net wash. Chairman Coutu asked do you want to discuss that revenue line in total and talk about - I'm willing to reconsider my position. Selectman Maddox said that's why I'm saying now is the time Mr. Chairman to take a look at additional revenues. Chairman Coutu has given that a lot of thought too. As a matter of fact, I think you and I had a brief conversation about it. I didn't side with you at that time but in hindsight, I think I made a mistake and I'm willing to rectify that this evening. We're going to talk about the revenue.

Steve Malizia interrupted and said when you said this evening if you want to adjust your ambulance billing rates, you need to have a public hearing which has to be advertised for the public. You can change the revenue but as you're seeming to go if you want to change the rates, that requires a public hearing. So you have to do an advance notice. You have to advertise that and the public would have the right to comment. I'm just saying if you want to change the rate. Chairman Coutu understood then there's not haste in having him discuss it then because we can bring them in at the next meeting and discuss it then. Mr. Malizia believed traditionally in the February/March time frame is when the Medicare rates come out and that's when we've had discussions in the past. In other words looking forward, I think that's generally the time of year that you do it. If for example you were to do that in the upcoming March, it would be in effect for the next fiscal year. That's what Chairman Coutu was concerned about. It will be in effect. Selectman Maddox was just trying to put the revenue in there. Mr. Malizia noted Selectman Maddox is just putting the revenue in without...

Chairman Coutu told Chief Buxton I'm not going to have you go away with at least giving you one question. The rate that you initially proposed, it was defeated. Chief Buxton said last February and in line with what the Town Administrator is saying, we came in and recommended going to Medicare plus 50. Chairman Coutu would be more favorable to doing that next year. Do you know off the top of your head because I don't think you have those numbers with you what that impact would have been had that passed? Chief Buxton didn't have that number with me. I know that they had estimated if we were to take that activity last year, we would have grown by \$25,000. My anticipation is depending on whether Medicare rates stay at Medicare plus 50, we're moving from Medicare plus 30 where you held us last year, and estimation would be an additional \$25,000 in revenue for ambulance revenue. Just for a second Mr. Chairman in line with what the Town Administrator said, the second that you have the public hearings and make that notice forward, you can make that change and then it rolls in line as you move forward. So you could actually realize some of that increased revenue come March, April, May, June.

Chairman Coutu noted to Selectman Maddox getting back to your point on that revenue line, you feel comfortable warm and fuzzy about 20 and not 25? Selectman Maddox could even go 25 because I think that the Fire Chief and I have talked about there is another issue that we need to address. We don't need to do it now in regards to ambulance calls without billing but, again, I think that if we put \$25,000 in here and offset the monies that I want to put into the capital reserve because we saw that we're buying ambulances for more money than we have in our savings. Chairman Coutu couldn't foretell what the Board is going to do in March. I am, again, one member of the Board. I know that I've had an epiphany about that revenue line and would like to see it erected but we can wait until March.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to increase revenue line 4730 ambulance net revenues by \$25,000 increasing the revenue line from \$600,000 to \$625,000, carried 4-1. Selectman Nadeau in opposition.

Chairman Coutu thanked Chief Buxton. I'm sorry I didn't get to thank you before you left. Any other items in the revenue side.

Selectman Maddox indicated 4762, page 4 down at the bottom. I could have sworn that the Recreation Director said that he would be revenue neutral having a \$107,000 program. Chairman Coutu asked on that revenue line 4762 on supervised play he's estimating an \$80,000 revenue. What is the problem? Selectman Maddox could have sworn he told us that he took in all this money at the end of this year. Chairman Coutu agreed. That's right. There was an additional revenue Ms. Carpentier as I remember in addition to the 8713 that came in at the last minute. Remember that discussion?

Kathy Carpentier did remember that discussion but I'm checking my timeline here. I think that would affect this year. Is he also projecting next year that he's going to be revenue neutral? Chairman Coutu said you're thinking that the same situation is going to happen next year. It could. Selectman Maddox noted we're going to change the dates. That's just foolish to leave the date to the last day of our fiscal year. Close it out on June 25th and not have this adventure. Chairman Coutu said there's no guarantee people are going to pay in on June 25th either. By June 25th - we can't get them to pay it by June whatever the date was. Selectman Maddox said no because we left it open until June 30th I believe.

Kathy Carpentier said one of the things the Town Administrator and I talked about and have not had a chance to talk to the Rec. Director about is try to get more of the timing into the year that the services are done and the revenues in the same stream so it's not branching two years. So we'll look at trying to fix that solution but I think his revenue is going to be over in fiscal 2015. Did he say he was would be revenue neutral in 2016? I don't know. Selectman Maddox said he implied that to me but...Chairman Coutu said they were also going to review the rates. They should have been reviewed long before we got into this budget discussion. We can force the issue, raise the revenue, and tell him raise the rates and bring them to us for approval. It's still the best bargain in southern New Hampshire. We need to review these rates.

Selectman Maddox was going to go up \$15,000. I was going to hedge my bet and kind of go half way in between Mr. Chairman. Chairman Coutu thought \$15,000 is an awful lot. Selectman Nadeau noted he's hedging his bet that he's going half so...Steve Malizia said if we get 500 participants, that's \$30 a whack. Is that unreasonable? Chairman Coutu said no. I don't think that's unreasonable for a whole summer. It's less than \$1 a day.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to raise revenue line 4762 supervised play under Recreation from \$80,000 to \$95,000 thus a \$15,000 increase in revenue.

Selectman Maddox was going based upon the department heads when he sat here at the table and said that going forward that that would be revenue neutral based on how much money he pulled during this year. I'm just trying to capture that revenue, put it into our income to be able to again be more balanced on that item. Whether we raise the fees a little bit but I think, again, it's a driver of if it's crossing two tax years, that's something we can fix. I'm just looking to say based on what we were told and everybody else here what I heard that it was going to be - he said he brought in an extra \$30,000 this year. So that again takes me to the fact that this should be a little higher. I kind of split the difference not knowing exactly Mr. Chairman. If there's a friendly to go up another 5, I'm not going to fight it.

Selectman Nadeau was thinking of going down another 15.

Chairman Coutu didn't want put Selectman Brucker on the spot did you want to speak to your second or did you second it for the purpose of discussion.

Selectman Brucker thought that he said that he got that money in and I think that this is modest if he said there was another \$30,000. \$15,000 is not outrageous.

Chairman Coutu asked Selectman Maddox if he was going to stick with the 15. Selectman Maddox said yes.

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

Selectman Brucker asked about the sale of town property, page 5 line item 4704. It looks like a low number to me if we're going to be selling 18 parcels but I don't know where the number came from. Chairman Coutu didn't disagree with Selectman Brucker. KC do you want to speak to the \$4,000 or Mr. Malizia.

Kathy Carpentier said this is for the Sustainability Committee. This is if they have \$3,000 or \$3,500 in their budget to buy kitchen pails and compost. Selectman Nadeau said no we're talking about sale of town property. Ms. Carpentier indicated then we sell them and we take in the revenue. Chairman Coutu said that's what that line is actually. That creates - so if we sell a house it also goes in that line item? Ms. Carpentier stated yes. Chairman Coutu said you have no idea what the Board's intent was so that's why you left it at \$4,000 to sustain the cost so if the Sustainability's request for their pails...Kathy Carpentier said a couple of years back you increased their budget by \$3,000 or \$3,500 and there's the offsetting revenue. So if they don't buy the pails, they don't get the revenue and those two are a wash. I did not take any land property sales because I wasn't directed

to and I don't know the timeline that this Board is...Chairman Coutu was sure we'll have a healthy discussion about that.

Selectman Maddox believed that we said that that money would go into those capital reserves. So we don't have to...Chairman Coutu said we still have to show a revenue line for that money. More importantly, Kathy Carpentier said you have to show the appropriation to get the money over to the Trustees. You can have unanticipated revenue. If you were to sell something right now, its unanticipated revenue, you have no permission to spend it. Chairman Coutu said we would have to identify a number in that line in anticipation of the funds and then we can easily transfer it to the capital reserves. Ms. Carpentier said as long as you have an appropriation. Chairman Coutu said we need to identify a number to put in there. Selectman Nadeau stated we a number - \$4,000. Chairman Coutu said that's already in there. Selectman Nadeau said if we got \$25,000...Chairman Coutu said you can't do anything with it unless you identify it in your revenue line. It sits there. There's no appropriation for the \$25,000. It sits there. Ms. Carpentier noted you have to both entries - increase the revenue and the appropriation.

Steve Malizia said so or example if you wanted to fund some capital reserve funds, you may put - I'm just going to throw a number out - \$100,000 here and you may choose to put \$25,000, \$25,000 into appropriations into the capital reserve funds thereby creating a net. I won't affect your budget. It doesn't go up. It doesn't go down. You've got your revenue. You've got your expense. Chairman Coutu said to remember we're talking after July. Its 5, 6 months out and then we have a whole year to raise the revenue. It might behoove us to look seriously at selling the property after July 1st. It doesn't impact it one way or the other? Mr. Malizia said if you sold it now because remember we need to be marketing these properties should you get the monies, I'm anticipating it would flow to your surplus. You could then appropriate next year out of the surplus into those accounts. That's a viable option 2. Chairman Coutu said let's identify a number, my opinion, we should identify a revenue number here and then we'll discuss how we'll talk about which capital funds were created last year and how we would want to disburse that money so she can create those lines.

Selectman Nadeau was okay with it going into the surplus and then just moving it over. Selectman Maddox said that's takes a year. Chairman Coutu said we're pushing it off. Selectman Nadeau asked if anybody was in a rush. Chairman Coutu didn't know what a new Board is going to do. They may not want to put any money in capital reserve funds. You've been hot and heavy about capital reserve funds. We all agree with you. We need to have them because it's the safeguards but there's nothing in them and the next Board might not want to put anything in it. The safeguard is the money at least through 2016. Selectman Nadeau hated to raise and appropriate something and for some reason we don't get it, we're screwed. Chairman Coutu said we're not screwed. Selectman Nadeau said we are. We're raising and appropriating money and we're putting it in these accounts. For some reason tomorrow morning the real estate market tanks for the third time in five years, we just raised and appropriated that money and now we're not going to sell these properties because they're well below value and now we're already guaranteed that we're getting that money in those capital reserve funds.

To you argument, Chairman Coutu said we've raised and appropriated \$1,182,997 and shared revenues in meals tax. We've raised and appropriated \$95,000 for supervised play. We've raised and appropriated \$625,000 for ambulance revenue. We've raised and appropriated \$4,050,000 for motor vehicles. We're assuming all that money is going to come in. It may not. People may not be calling for our ambulance. We might have a very healthy year and we may have a decrease of 20 percent in revenue. We could have people suddenly stop buying cars. This will be the last year they buy new cars. Next year they won't be and that revenue is going to dissipate. I had that explained to me earlier and I thought there were safeguards built in there. We're not going to fold up shop. I don't see the problem with appropriating money in that line item on the revenue side and creating a source where that money will go to which would be those capital reserve funds. Selectman Nadeau noted if that's what the Board wants to do then the Board may wish to do that. Chairman Coutu was hoping to have a health debate and I'm glad you're engaging me in this debate. I welcome it. My mind is not 100 percent set. I have to listen to what everybody has to say. Do you have opinions? I think we should all engage in any discussion on the budget.

Steve Malizia pointed out that I think what Selectman maybe trying to say in a different way is the more money we appropriate, the bigger the difference between our default budget and our operating budget. Chairman Coutu said we're offsetting this by revenue. Mr. Malizia indicated you don't see that on the warrant. You see the big number. You don't see the offset. You simply don't. We're going to add some money to the budget. The default budget is fixed. We're adding money here. There's no revenue offset on the default budget as compared to the operating budget. So the wider the gap, maybe the greater risk you don't get your budget.

Chairman Coutu said the State has to approve it right. I know the numbers came in today. Steve Malizia said the State does not approve the default budget. This Board does. Chairman Coutu asked was the default budget - are the revenues for the previous year factored into that default budget? Mr. Malizia said the default budget is a gross appropriation number. Chairman Coutu indicated we don't spend \$29,583,000. Yeah we do. Mr. Malizia stated you're authorized to. Chairman Coutu said the taxpayers aren't funding that full \$29 million. Mr. Malizia said no. Some is coming from sewer. Some is coming from water. A good portion of it - \$14 million is coming

from other revenues - the ambulance, car registrations, rooms and meals tax, all the things you've cited. The voter when they go into the booth and mark the ballot, they don't see that. That's all I'm trying to point out. I'm not trying to discourage you. I'm just trying to tell you that you don't see that. They see two numbers on a piece of paper. They see a budget and they see a default budget.

Chairman Coutu asked to go back to Selectman Nadeau's observation. In that event, we would be better off not doing anything, leave the line at \$4,000, and just waiting for the revenue to come in and then we just peck at it when it comes in and hope that whoever is serving here does the right thing and puts it in the capital reserve funds. That was always our intent in selling the property. Kathy Carpentier said next year you could put it in your operating budget or you could have a warrant article that says take last year's unassigned fund balance. Say it was \$100,000 that you mentioned and put it into the capital reserve fund. So you have two options the following year. Chairman Coutu asked do we have to identify specifically which capital reserve funds they're going into. Ms. Carpentier stated yes. Chairman Coutu indicated if we put so much in buildings and so much in parks and whatever we do. Ms. Carpentier said you could put that in the operating budget because the capital reserve funds are already established or you could put it on the warrant article and let it be a standalone decision to the taxpayers.

Chairman Coutu told Selectman Nadeau you were right. If anyone wishes to make a change to this line item let me know and I'll entertain a motion. Seeing none, let's move on. Is there anything else in revenue?

Selectman Maddox, again, a question of the Fire Chief - 4218, page 3, building permits. The actual for 2014 was \$259,969, and we are budgeting \$250,000, and the Chief tells us he's going like gangbusters. Chairman Coutu indicated that's before July 1st of next year. This building stuff is going to stop sooner or later. Selectman Maddox said all of a sudden I'm the optimist on this group. Selectman Brucker said no I'm with you. Selectman Maddox was trying to find some money to put into that temporary person or that 252 line. I thought, again, he was - tell us where we are Chief rather than me babbling.

Chief Buxton noted last year in 2014 building permits brought in \$271,823. The year before that, we were at \$129,000. Chairman Coutu asked what are we trending right now. Chief Buxton didn't have the current report in front of my. I apologize. Chairman Coutu said we use a trending number for ambulance. Let's use a trending number for this not that I will support it. Selectman Nadeau didn't see that there's that much more building that's going to be happening. Chairman Coutu didn't either. We're talking about next July and not this year.

The other thing Chief Buxton would caution is that we had several large projects come in last year when you think about Comcast coming in and that number probably skews that project. It skews because of the building permit value. That was \$20,000 plus just in that one building permit. Chairman Coutu would like to think that there will be a few more buildings in that park that will do the same thing. Selectman Maddox commented and it's not finished. Chairman Coutu said it's conceivable. My conversations with them is they're seriously looking at upstairs right now. Seriously looking at the second floor. That's going to generate a lot but in this fiscal year because they want to get it all done by spring. I'm concerned about that.

Kathy Carpentier thought this number is already - well last year we had \$130,000 budgeted. When I last brought my revenue recommendations to you, we increased it to 250 because that's what we were trending at. Right now we have \$66,000 that has come in which has a run rate of about \$199,000. However this kind of bell curves, right? In the spring it goes up. Chief Buxton said right. You're going to have another push come March. So that will depend on - and you're actually in the end of that season right now. So you're going to get a push here before frost and then you'll get another push come March. Chairman Coutu thought it better be \$51,000 worth in order to meet this number of 250. Ms. Carpentier indicated last year we hit almost \$260,000 in Fiscal 2014.

Selectman Nadeau indicated Sparkling Rivers is coming to an end. Oakridge is coming to an end.

Chief Buxton stated you're just starting the engineering on Phase IV of Oakridge. That will be through another year and Sparkling River, they're starting the last phase and changing a builder over there. I would assume that that would stall through the winter and into the spring. So that will probably carry for another...Selectman Brucker asked have all the permits been pulled for the Hogan's lot. Chief Buxton said they're just in the process of getting foundation permits and those types of things. Selectman Brucker asked plus beyond Hannaford shopping center that whole thing is going to be done. Chief Buxton indicated those are all pending.

Chairman Coutu asked Chief Buxton who came up with the number 250. Kathy Carpentier said it would be me. Chairman Coutu inquired in consultation with the Fire Chief or it was an arbitrary. Ms. Carpentier didn't believe so. I don't believe we've ever had that conversation. Our practice is to look at what our latest best guesstimate would be our fiscal 14 actuals. Department heads have had a chance to look at them and if they saw something way out of whack, I've asked them to tell me but no I don't believe we've had a conversation.

With all due respect Chief, Chairman Coutu indicated this is all new to you. It's all new to all of us now. To be honest with you Mr. Chairman, Chief Buxton believed that Kathy looks at the trends and she's very conservative

about her projections. Chairman Coutu noted as she should be. Kathy Carpentier noted again I get buy in from all department heads or asked for buy in. I don't always get it which I assume means it's a good trend and I also confer with the Town Administrator but I am the one who puts the numbers in.

Selectman Maddox was just trying to look at revenue to offset some of the things we said we wanted to do. Chairman Coutu commented you wanted to do. Selectman Maddox said some of us wanted to do. I guess you just don't even count anymore. Selectman Brucker stated apparently not. Selectman Maddox noted I can see where we're its going. We'll move on. Chairman Coutu didn't feel comfortable about that line item going above 250 right now. I just really don't. That's me. That's one person. You still haven't got the (inaudible) from everybody. Selectman Maddox stated I'm looking at the nod and the winking and I'm going to leave it as it is Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Coutu asked if there was anything on the revenue side. Kathy Carpentier made a note. You do not have to commit to a firm number right now. You can always come back and revisit if you do something in the operating budget. Chairman Coutu wanted to see if anybody has read this and made any opinions or changes they wish to make now and we can review it again.

Selectman Maddox was having a senior moment - 4999, page 5, use of fund balance. Chairman Coutu asked we're going to change that to \$500,000. Kathy Carpentier said no I changed 15. We're in 15 right now. You just authorized me to use 500 this year. I didn't change the 600 because that's already what we submitted to you. This is your opportunity to change it to anything you want. Selectman Maddox stated that's why I'm putting it on the table Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to know if the Board has where we might be thinking we're going with this. Ms. Carpentier said I wouldn't change anything after I presented the budget to you in this current year. I did change 15 because that's what you approved. You have not discussed 16.

In order to make an intellectual decision on that particular line item, Chairman Coutu thought that's why Selectman Maddox is raising it based on how I'm seeing him move his shrug your shoulders is that we need to have an intellectual decision. No one knows the numbers better than you and the Town Administrator. So I'm soliciting your opinion. Steve Malizia indicated 600 has been a benchmark that we've used for some number of years based on how things actually work out during the year. We've had an upward trend of our revenues. You saw this year we picked up an extra \$91,000. We were able to reduce it to 500. Normally we would have used 600 which is sort of our constant is what we're shooting for. We try to maintain a reasonable fund balance. We know we don't spend every last dollar here so those surplus monies go into the fund balance. We know or frequently do fairly well on our revenue side. I'm not remembering too many years where we were ever below the number we had. Bottom line, we've always managed to add to our surplus every year as we call it. When we looked at it, 600 has been the benchmark that we've put out there. That's why we put it here. The Board certainly can do what they choose to do. We put it here because we're consistent. Basically what KC just said was because this year we had budgeted 600, we only ended up using 500 because you had unanticipated. Key word "unanticipated" revenue. You decided to leave some into the surplus, into the kitty sort to speak. Again, we're just taking the trend that we've been using.

Chairman Coutu thought that 600,000 number has been consistent since I've been here. I don't think it's been lower or higher than that at any given time that I've been in here in the 8 years that I've been sitting here. I think it has been \$600,000 all the way through. Kathy Carpentier noted it's been 600 for a long time. Chairman Coutu asked Selectman Maddox what were you thinking bring it down to the 5. Selectman Maddox was wondering if we were going to the 5 because we just did that. Chairman Coutu said we did it because we had \$91,000 in unanticipated revenue. Selectman Maddox was just looking to see where the Board wants to go Mr. Chairman. Again as a new person is going to go to the budget if someone asked this very question, you lowered it this year, it's only because we had unanticipated revenues. That's why I'm just asking the questions.

Kathy Carpenter had a couple of facts. By using the 500,000 as you recall, our surplus is 6.8 percent whether you like that number or not. To use another 600, you'd be down to 5.8 but until this budget is complete, your 5.8 percent on last year's appropriation. You're dropping a lot but you're still over the 5 percent and you'll hopefully get more unanticipated revenues. I am comfortable. You didn't ask my opinion but I'm offering it up.

Chairman Coutu respected your opinion. I wish you would offer it more often. Kathy I appreciate your observation.

Selectman Maddox just brought it up. Chairman Coutu said is it just so we could have a healthy discussion about it. Selectman Maddox said yes. Chairman Coutu said the reasoning is there was unanticipated revenue of \$91,000. That articulates the reason why. We're going to stand with the \$600,000 I guess. I see no move to change the numbers. Is there anything else on the revenue pages?

Selectman Brucker was curious why the Hudson cable franchise fees are on here when...Chairman Coutu indicated because they're revenues. Steve Malizia said that's a revenue of the town. The expenses are paid out of the general fund of the town so the revenues come in to offset the general fund expenses. Cable does not

have their own fund, nor do they have their own revolving fund, or regular fund. They're in our general fund so because they're expenses are here and we're paying for the cable operation with the franchise fees, that's why the revenues are here.

Chairman Coutu asked if the Board was ready to move on. All right then. We can always return to revenue as KC suggested. If you would, we're going to go to our budget books. Steve Malizia said the default would be appropriate at this time.

Kathy Carpentier noted there was a 4 page document handed out to you. Kind of familiar to you although this year we've broken out general, water, and sewer. The Town Administrator and I sat down today. Because two years of default had kind of made it a kind of an easy exercise, there's not a lot of one-time things that have been in the budget because we've been on a default budget. What we did is affect all the contract changes and we can work through each fund if you want. Page 2 is the general fund. We adjusted it by the health insurance, a 2 percent contractual increase to the solid waste, all the approve labor contracts, and the retirement benefits is how we calculated. We start with what was approved on the ballot and changed those items. We're down to the general fund default budget. The next page is the sewer fund. Ms. Carpentier it was the same thing - the labor contracts, health, and retirement are the only adjustments that we made what was approved down to the default budget. The third one is the water. This one has a few more changes than the other two funds. We have a large bond so that changes a lot and then some of our contractual items with Pennichuck changes the numbers here.

Back to the first page. Kathy Carpentier indicated what this does is telling us that right now if the Board was done with the budget just for operating budget for the general fund, there would be a \$267,000 difference between the two numbers that would be on the ballot which represents approximately \$.10. Steve Malizia commented however the water and sewer default budgets are actually higher right now than the budget that would be proposed for next year. Chairman Coutu noted that's about \$.06. Mr. Malizia said it's immaterial. That's all in the range. It doesn't have anything to do with the rates.

Kathy Carpentier said this FY15 budget is locked and loaded. The default is locked and loaded. The Board does recommend this so if you see any changes that you need but there's really none that the Town Administrator and I can see that you make. The third column is what your proposed budget and that will be changing tonight I assume with any motions that you make increasing or decreasing the appropriations which would change the differential between the two numbers. This is a snapshot of where we start today. So if nobody has any changes to that Selectman Coutu, the Board does need to approve the default budgets. Again, the comparison will change but the default numbers are the second column there totaling \$29,457,426. There is a motion that I wrote up similar to what you've done last year.

Chairman Coutu asked are there any questions or comments on the default budget. That would be the 2016 column the second one in. I'll entertain a motion.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward the General Fund Default Budget in the amount of \$24,087,206, the Sewer Fund Default Budget in the amount of \$1,659,315, and the Water Fund Default Budget in the amount of \$3,710,905, carried 5-0.

Kathy Carpentier directed the Board to the "W" list. It's on page 10. Those were things that Donna Graham and I believe that you wanted to revisit. By all means you can revisit anything you'd like but these were the ones you asked us to put down.

In fairness because they've been identified and I think there's going to be other things, Chairman Coutu would like to do is the community center, the entire budget. Let's go right to it. Steve Malizia thought the item was just for the additional piece. It's not in the budget for the heating system that services the front of the building. That's all it was intended to be. I don't know why it says the entire budget. Ms. Carpentier said it's under the 5100 Selectmen section page 11. There's a request outside the budget for \$6,500 to replace the heating and cooling system for the front section the Community Center building. This is not currently in your budget. Chairman Coutu asked who made this recommendation and why. Steve Malizia said I received it from Wayne who monitors that building for me and it's my understanding that the system goes into failure, it has to be repaired, and it's basically a heads up that we're going to be at some point in the future replacing the front end heating and cooling for that building.

Chairman Coutu asked if the system was working presently. Mr. Malizia said today it's working yes. Chairman Coutu said we're talking X number of months out. Is it going to create efficiency in electricity do you think? Did he tell us this particular system is...as the systems get replaced and that one is pretty old because Steve Malizia didn't recall changing it at my tenure here? As we've seen, the efficiencies of all units are greater which theoretically leads to a savings because their efficiency rates are higher. I don't have any ratings for it. I can just say that things that are getting older are going probably 65 to 75 percent efficient. They tend to be more 85 - 90 percent nowadays. Are you going to save a lot of money? You're probably not going to save enough money to pay for it. Chairman Coutu said \$6,500 surplus at the end of the year.

Selectman Maddox said as something that is getting older, I'm going to willing to gamble on this one Mr. Chairman. That space is not used by the seniors any more. It's relatively little used. You had to turn it off until it's needed and gamble and if it does break, we'll dip into somewhere else.

Chairman Coutu asked we can't find \$6,500. Selectman Maddox said as far as the budget, I think it can...Chairman Coutu asked for a consensus before we move on. Is it agreed? Selectman Nadeau said yes. So we're just going to take it out. Chairman Coutu said we're not going to do anything with it. It wasn't in. Mr. Malizia just wanted to bring it to your attention that's all.

Senior center facility - 5135, page 13. It was Kathy Carpentier's opinion that the next three items were kind of the same topic. You were talking about janitorial services upstairs and downstairs. Chairman Coutu asked for the prepared document that I requested. This factors into all of this. I asked the Town Administrator - I had a conversation with him. I was going to recommend some changes. As a result of a conversation I had with you all relative to how I felt about this operation and as a result in part because of a conversation we had in nonpublic last week. I'm going to propose first of all that the senior center facility - well it is under our budget. Ms. Carpentier pointed out the building is 5135. It's not the programs. Chairman Coutu wanted to put it under the Town Administrator's control is my intent. Ms. Carpentier said this is just the building.

Chairman Coutu said what I want to do is on the janitorial we would have to add - well the salary line for the janitorial was my intent to put that under the Highway Department because he is going to be the immediate supervisor of that person. It was my intent to propose a part time position - this is new - would be a custodial/maintenance person that would do the following and part of the funds would come out of cable. They would maintain that facility 5 days a week for 4 hours a day preferably 8 to 12. I've had this discussion with the Road Agent. I've had the discussion with the Town Administrator in an advisory capacity only. I just asked him to put this document together. I would create this position on a part time basis and would be supervised by Mr. Burns. The duties and responsibilities of that position would be to maintain and clean the cable facility and the senior center, maintain the parking area and the landscaping around the building, observe and make recommendations on the port-a-toilets in Benson Park, maintain the playground on an as need basis, and be available. Mr. Burns said he can keep him busy more than 20 hours a week but he'd be happy to have him 20 hours a week because he feels like in the winter time for example when it snows, he plows. Somebody has to go in there and clean that all up around the entrance ways and sidewalks in that area. Maintain the parking lot and make sure it's kept clean. He would work directly for Mr. Burns and Mr. Burns assured me that he thought it was a great idea and he's more than willing to do it without reservation. He would do it and keep that person busy. I know the man's reputation. That would solve all of the maintenance issues. The money would come from - I'll have several recommendations but the first we would certainly take a portion of it from - I'm recommending a 20 hour a week position, 5 days a week, 4 hours. I was putting in a rate of \$9.00 an hour. So we're looking at \$180 plus whatever FICA and all that is. There's a job description. I haven't read the whole packet but I believe there should be a job description for the person. I think it's going to solve - Selectman Nadeau not that I thought we'd get too far but I think that several things came to light that needed to be come to light. The problem is how are we going to manage certain things that we're not happy they way they're being managed and I think this solves one of the problems. There's been questions raised about whose going to take care of the building, whose going to clean it, and we're going to put this guy over here, we're going to move over here. We need to have one person that's accountable and responsible to do both buildings. I think that to say that they're going to go in and dust and sweep once a week is not going to meet the needs of the traffic that's going to be created in that building.

Chairman Coutu said we want the seniors - we may even want to increase the activities in the senior building. We're hoping that cable - you keep referencing how many more productions are going on with this new studio, the lighting, and now setting up 4 or 5 studios to be able to do this kind of production on an almost daily basis. There's going to be a lot of traffic in and out of there. I think there's a need for the position. We need to have the toilets monitored so that if they need to be cleaned, he picks up the phone and he says look you need to come in here and empty these. They're full. That's what has been lacking. There was little or no work done in the playground and we assured our citizens that we keep that playground free of debris and keep rotating the mulch that's down there. He can do a lot of lawn mowing and whatever the aesthetics that they have outside the building, plants and all that, go out there and maintain that whole area around the senior center/HCTV facility. There's plenty of work for that person. I made it very clear when I talked to the Road Agent. He's aware of what we have for buildings and what's required. He's had a lot of experience. I said am I asking too much, too little. He said I could keep that person busy more than 20 hours a week just in that one area alone or 20 hours. He said I can manage it.

Selectman Nadeau said I never thought I'd get too excited tonight but...Chairman Coutu said that's all right. I'm here to calm you down. I have some Prozac for you. Selectman Nadeau thought this is a position that I would like to see Tuesday through Saturday and I'd like to see it 25 hours. That way we have somebody in the park on Saturday and it solves another one of our problems. Chairman Coutu commented you're correct. I like that idea better than Monday to Friday - Tuesday to Saturday - 25 hours. Can you justify? I worked hard on getting to 20.

How do you get to 25? I could go 22 and say have him work Saturday 8 to 2. Selectman Nadeau indicated 12 to 5 on Saturday to keep him plenty busy. Chairman Coutu said 12 to 5 is 5 hours. We're up to 21 - 4, 4, and I'm not going to bicker over 1 hour. Twenty-one is not going to kill me one way or another on this recommendation. Five might but one won't. So 12 to 5 I'd buy into that Tuesday through Saturday. That's a 21 hour a week. Selectman Nadeau was thinking 25 - 5, 5, 5, and 5 but.

Kathy Carpentier said if you were going to give this to the Road Agent, shouldn't you let the Road Agent...Chairman Coutu asked if he was here. Ms. Carpentier commented all you really need to do is put the money in yes or no right in the budget. Sorry. Chairman Coutu said I need the Board to agree to it. I'm not just going to throw it in there without consulting the Board and having them say where did this person come from - oh we created a position behind...Ms. Carpentier was just saying the one hour that we're talking about. Selectman Nadeau was thinking 5 hours a day.

Chairman Coutu's experience in the business world or employing people - I would hope - I know this government is different but when you say to somebody you've got 25 hours, or 20 hours, or 18 hours to accomplish this job, I want to see the work product at the end of 18 hours. If it isn't there, then we'll quickly cut his hours way back. I want to see work product. I want to have the seniors saying to me boy that guy does an awesome job. If anybody is going to tell us, it's them. I'm sure that Mike O'Keefe or Jim McIntosh whoever is operating the manager of the facility who we pay is Jim McIntosh if he's not happy with the cleaning, he's going to let us know. First thing we're going to do or they should let Mr. Burns know and I'm sure Mr. Burns will be right on top of that thing. Mr. Burns doesn't hesitate to can people when they're not producing. I like that in a person.

Selectman Maddox stated that you better get used to him coming in every week. This is a position that's going to be a no win for everybody. You're expecting one person to be a janitor, a cleaner, a landscaper, and a monitor...Chairman Coutu indicated he's going to be a facility and grounds maintenance person. Selectman Maddox said where I'm going Mr. Chairman is I don't think we need to hire another person. I think that here's our chance to do a couple of things. The monitoring of the port-o-potties is an issue we heard about. I walked that building today. I went over specifically broke in, it was really hard, and walked the facility. It is not that big. That senior center is not that big. How they're going to justify four hours a day Sir is beyond my comprehension. I am suggesting that whoever takes care of this building, Town Hall takes care of the senior center as part of his duties. You go out to bid on the cable facility and let's try a service. I think that would give us a flare for how that might work because it's their money and they can keep a better eye on it. As far as the playground, I think really just Mr. Burns needs to have his crew that is in there take a look at that. Hiring somebody to do this especially if you want them to work Saturday - 25 hours for \$9 I think you're going to have the Animal Control Officer part 61.

Since you've been a Selectman, Selectman Maddox, Chairman Coutu asked has Mr. Burns increased or decreased his staff. Selectman Maddox indicated he has maintained the same staff. Chairman Coutu asked prior to your coming on did he increase the staff or decrease the staff? Selectman Maddox indicated he decreased the staff. Chairman Coutu indicated we've had more road acceptances, more to plow, more streets to take care of, more to sweep and you expect that he's going to have time to find the guy to go check port-a-toilets? Selectman Maddox said if you were saying that we were going to add a person to Highway, I might be more inclined but to put somebody into dedicated into the senior - that building for that many hours I can't get there Sir. Chairman Coutu didn't understand why you don't understand maintenance. Maintenance isn't just going in and sweeping once a week. You have to stay on top of it - bathrooms. This facility needs to be sanitized on a daily basis. Bathrooms need to be cleaned. Sinks need to be washed. Paper towel dispensers have to be filled. Soap dispensers have to be filled. Floors in the bathroom need to be washed every single day. Every single day. They are in this building. Do you want Kevin Burns to take one of his truck drivers and go wash bathroom toilets? Selectman Maddox just said the person who maintains this facility - the Town Hall - put that underneath his responsibilities. Chairman Coutu asked how many more buildings are we going to give him. He does this building, he does the Community Center, he does the Fire Administration building. We're going to add another two story building for his...Selectman Maddox said I keep saying I'm only doing the senior center. Chairman Coutu stated if he's got that much time on his hands, then we've been doing something wrong honestly. Selectman Maddox was not going down that path but again...Chairman Coutu said let's go. Selectman Maddox said the Community Center is not being used anywhere near as much because the seniors are now in the senior building. Chairman Coutu noted basketball is going to be played there all winter long. There's going to be use of the facility. Selectman Maddox stated the seniors are no longer there.

Steve Malizia thought they had some of their activities there. Chairman Coutu said the cable facility has been kind enough to allow them to use the downstairs at the cable facility for their line dancing. Selectman Maddox was looking at other options Mr. Chairman. I just can't see justifying 20 hours a week, and at that pay, and all the things that are going to go on with it, it's just going to be a revolving door. Chairman Coutu's position is that we took on this responsibility of building a senior center and a Hudson cable facility, beautiful grounds, and we're just going to throw all this to the wayside now in my opinion if I were to go with what you're saying. Let's just throw one more responsibility on the maintenance man we have and god forbid we should build another building two years from now because you're going to want him to clean that one too. Selectman Maddox commented that's how business works Mr. Chairman. Adding more staff is government. Making more get done with what you've

got is how it works in the business world. Chairman Coutu said if Mike and Steve walked into their building - the two people you've worked for and they found the toilets weren't being cleaned and things weren't getting done because well we only have a 20 hour person it's really a 30 hour a week job, I'm sure he would extend it to 30 hours. I think seriously that this needs to have a dedicated person. I feel very strongly and I respect your opinion but I don't think that - and I'm going to come to his defense - that the maintenance person who maintains this building with all that he does and I'm aware of what he does, has time to take on the responsibility of an added building which will require more than 2 or 3 hours a day. If he has that much time on his hands, then shame on all of us for not recognizing it because he doesn't. He just doesn't.

Selectman Nichols was in favor of the Road Agent hiring someone for 20 hours at least. I see what's happening in the senior center. I'm not there every day but when we leave on Thursday, the girls are washing down the tables. They're sweeping the floors. They're emptying the trash. They're trying to do other things and then they go tomorrow morning and do more cleaning because it can't get done. This is a girl - Lori - who is the head of it she puts her hours in but she still goes back on Friday morning with a couple of the girls to finish up to do the cleaning, vacuuming. There's tons of work to do there. It may not look to you like a large building but there were 87 or more people there today. I'm not counting the back rooms, or where the pool table is, where my sofa is that I never get to sit on, and the other areas where they're working on crafts and whatever. That's a very, very busy place and I really think it needs somebody professional cleaning. The grounds - I see the port-o-potties should be checked constantly and I like the idea of someone doing that and reporting to Kevin. The same with cleaning the park for the kids. Some of those jobs won't be done for the winter as far as the playground goes. Nobody is going to be over there cleaning that up in the winter. In the spring and the summer, yes it has to be done. There's so many things that have to be done that I think Kevin can hire someone and keep an eye on them. He's very good with his employees as it is. I'm for that.

Selectman Brucker was thinking that it is a brand new building and it probably wouldn't need the kind of cleaning that an older building needs. In the winter, there is going to be a lot of traffic coming in with snow, dirt, and everything else. It will need some but it isn't open every day of the week. I'm not sure - it's only open 3 days isn't it? Selectman Nichols said right now its 3 days. That 3 days it's filled. It is filled.

Chairman Coutu didn't mean to cut you off but I will say this. I don't know if we want to go there but Selectman Maddox and I may come up with a plan because we think that we're going to be bulging at the seams at that building. Selectman Maddox discussed with me a proposal that I'm very much in favor of and I think we can make it work. There's the possibility if Selectman Maddox and I can articulate our position that this may be open more than 3 days a week.

In that case, Selectman Brucker could see the 20 hours but the way that it is now - I mean I don't think that the cable area certainly wouldn't get as much traffic through it. Probably not need as much cleaning. I could see maybe the 20 hours with the responsibilities outside. I don't think 25 hours or whatever.

Selectman Nadeau thought 25 hours. I don't think 25 hours at \$10 an hour is an unreasonable thing. I don't think you're going to get somebody for \$9 to do the type of work that you want done. If you do, that's fabulous. Chairman Coutu noted we hire people at \$8.50 an hour my company every day. Selectman Nadeau said this is a little different but if you think that you're going to get a quality candidate for \$9 an hour, that's great. I think it should be \$10 an hour and I think we should be looking at 25 hours a week. I see where the Board's going and I will defend myself in the next 3 months if I have to between now and then on this position. Chairman Coutu said we'll see about that Mr. School committee man. I'm not averse to anything that you said except I can't justify - you didn't justify the 25 hours. You certainly justified 21. I could be swayed in that direction. My recommendation would be Tuesday through Saturday I agree and it would be like probably 9 to 1 instead of 8 to noon. That way we're having clean up of all the coffee pots and everything before he leaves in the senior center and do whatever downstairs. I am sure that under the umbrella of Mr. Burns this person will be kept busy for 20 hours a week - summer, winter, spring and fall. He assured me that there would be more than 20 hours worth of...his assessment was that he required more than 20 hours of work. That was Mr. Burns' assessment based on what I told him I expected that position to do. He assured me that 20 hours isn't going to be enough but he'll live with it. If he needs to come in next year and ask for more, he'll document it and justify it then. There may be some validity to your 25 hours. Saturday is I think needs to go into the mix. So I accept that. The \$9 to \$10 an hour wherever the Board wants to go I wouldn't be adverse to it but I would like to create a position under the Highway Department. What would be the proper title? Steve Malizia said I just put part time maintenance person for the senior center/HCTV facility/Benson Park. Chairman Coutu said that would be the position.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to create a part time maintenance person for the Hudson senior center/HCTV facility/Benson Park to go into the Facility Department.

Selectman Maddox thought that this is kind of getting around the horn here. I think that Mr. Burns needs to come in and tell us how this is going to work because you have multiple uses going on here. You're going to fund it from multiple sources and again, I can't support this based on any hours in the facility that's three times bigger than this room that's brand new that can't be done in a much more cost effective manner.

Chairman Coutu told Selectman Maddox please. The facility is a little bigger than three times the size of this room. Selectman Maddox said it's not. It's not that big. Chairman Coutu noted its two floors. Selectman Maddox asked you're counting cable. Three people go into cable. Chairman Coutu asked when was the last time you went into cable. Selectman Maddox indicated I was there today Sir and there was nobody there. There was one car.

Selectman Nadeau would support creating this position. I don't support the amount of time that we're putting into it or the pay. Chairman Coutu indicated we'll get to that in a minute. We've got to get the position first. Selectman Nadeau said I'm just telling you I'm supporting it.

Selectman Brucker would support 20 hours but some of the things listed here - paints walls, building fixtures...Chairman Coutu said that's what maintenance men do. Selectman Brucker knew but it's a brand new building. Both floors are brand new. Chairman Coutu said if somebody were to come in and mar a wall, it has to be repaired. It needs to be plastered. We need to find a handyman/maintenance type person to do that. They're out there. Selectman Brucker didn't think that there will be as much of that kind of work. Chairman Coutu hoped not but you never know.

Steve Malizia said you try to put all the things in that you can anticipate being done. It does not mean it's going to be 20 hours of that. What you'd want to try to do is be as descriptive as possible so that down the road there isn't a misunderstanding if somebody says it doesn't say I have to paint walls, or it doesn't say I have to do that. We have something called "perform other duties" but there is an expectation that these are the types of tasks. So if you don't know how to hold a paintbrush, we probably don't want to hire you. That's really the intent. You may not be doing it full time and it may not be your primary function, but you sure as heck should know how to do light carpentry, light mechanical, and that sort of thing that a typical maintenance person would be able to do. Obviously we're not going to have them rewire the place. We'd hire an expert if we needed to do that. You're looking to set an expectation of what you're expecting him to do. That's why it's in there but it is not certainly going to be the primary focus in a new building.

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

Selectman Nadeau made the motion to establish the rate of pay at \$10 an hour and I will make the motion to do it at 25 hours a week because I think there's some park maintenance things that can be taken over there to alleviate some of the work from Kevin's workload. I think with the creation of the Saturday hours, I think this is going to be a big help going down the road to where it's working on other items in the park.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to establish the rate of pay of \$10 an hour at 25 hours a week.

Selectman Nichols said I will go along with the \$10 an hour but I would like to see what happens through the winter and into the spring for the 25 hours. I can go 21. I can't go the 25.

Selectman Nadeau noted there's benches that need to be maintained. The playground is still used all winter long. There's still trash around there. You're still going to have trash in the parking lots. You're still going to have stuff that needs to be picked up and cleaned up at the dog park. You're still going to have stuff to do at the senior center. You're going to be sweeping more, cleaning up the sand and the use at the facility. I think we're selling ourselves short at 20 hours. You know as well as I know Kevin can use 25 hours very well maintained.

Chairman Coutu's position is this. I had recommended \$9 an hour and I had recommended 20 hours a week. I hear what Selectman Nadeau said relative to the need on Saturday. He just brought up a couple of other things. I forgot that the playground is being used in the winter time when there's no snow on the ground and that's quite a few days when it melts it's open, or when the sun beats down on that, that's a section from the hill down that clears out relatively quickly. I've seen people in there in January and February. Not every day but every now and then. There's the problem with the trash barrels in the winter time not being put out properly. I think now in hindsight listening to some of the things he just said, there's two things that come to the floor. One is that I think there is - Kevin Burns said to me I'm sure I could make that a 40 hour a week job but I'll live with the 20 if that's all you want to give me. I trust Kevin Burns. I think most of us if not all of us trust his judgment. Like all out department heads, he makes sure his people get their work done and he's very mindful of his budget. He's never come in and asked for an increase. He's been very accommodating when we've talked about shifting money; he's even volunteered to shift money to help us.

Chairman Coutu said the point is that Selectman Nadeau you brought up some things that I had forgotten that need to be done and I can see why because I was trying to figure out why did Kevin say he could use somebody for 40 hours. I thought 20 might be a stretch. Then I thought about everything that needed to be done. Twenty hours is definitely a need. I can see the need for possibly 25 hours especially with the weekend traffic on Saturday. The rate of pay for me \$9, \$10 maybe you're right. Maybe we'll find somebody. A better quality at \$10

an hour. Again, I trust that Mr. Burns will do the interviews. Further I would think that we should not set the times. We should say you have a budget of up to 25 hours per week. If for any reason you don't need them if on a Tuesday he's scheduled to go in and there's a blizzard Monday through the night, he's not going to get to that parking lot. That's not going to be a priority. The senior center in a blizzard is closed. We know that. That's the rule. There's no opening the senior center on a snow storm. Mr. Burns is not going to need somebody to shovel something he's not going to plow for a couple of days. So he may call the guy and say don't come in the next two days. I think we need to leave it at his discretion. It's not a set 25 hours. It will be up to and he can ascertain what hours that person should work. Fair enough.

Selectman Maddox said you've already raised it 30 percent from what you started with between the hours and the rate of pay. It's now already up 30 percent. Chairman Coutu said we have an obligation. I'm not talking a \$1 million here. We're talking \$200 - \$250. Selectman Maddox said my vote will be no. I just don't see the rational.

Vote: Motion carried 3-2. Selectman Maddox and Selectman Brucker in opposition.

Kathy Carpentier asked for clarification. So you're adding \$13,000 to his facility budget and \$995 to his FICA and Medicare payroll taxes. That's \$10, at 25 hours, times 52 weeks. I need a number. Chairman Coutu questioned the \$13,000 total annual. Ms. Carpentier said yes. Chairman Coutu said I'll find the money. Trust me. We will find the money. Steve Malizia said this is assumed to be for next year's budget. Ms. Carpentier asked I'm putting it into the budget right? Chairman Coutu said not for this year for next year. The one we're working on. Selectman Maddox said not this year this year but this year this year. Chairman Coutu said the year that we're working in that we're working in but we're not working in that we're not spending this year that we're spending next year. That budget? Kathy Carpentier said you just made a motion to increase from zero to \$13,000 and from zero to \$995 for this part time position. Chairman Coutu said if it passes Mr. Burns, he'll take charge of that.

Chairman Coutu declared a 5 minute recess at 8:32 p.m. Sorry we're back a little late - 8:44 p.m. We were having such a good time. We'll continue on that vain.

Chairman Coutu indicated the next item on the agenda is we now need to fund that position. Janitorial services outside budget not including CCRF for equipment. What does that have to do? Kathy Carpentier said this was before the motion you just made. There was a request to add this to the budget for the janitorial services. I think you've just done that. Chairman Coutu said so now we need to find some money. What we need to do is we need to take some money out of the cable operation for maintenance and ground maintenance. Ms. Carpentier indicated the Cable Committee currently has \$6,000 budgeted in janitorial services. Chairman Coutu thought that was for their supplies. I was made to believe that that was for their supplies not that they need \$6,000 worth of supplies. How much did you put aside for a janitor? Ms. Carpentier noted it says janitorial supplies and services for the new HCTV access center.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau to decrease line item 5045-229 from \$6,000 to zero.

Kathy Carpentier asked what's your intention and I'll tell you what the motion is. Chairman Coutu said the motion is to zero that line out and move that. Selectman Nadeau said we still need cleaning supplies. Selectman Maddox noted that was only for labor. Chairman Coutu said no it was not. That was for everything in what he thought he would need in the HCTV facility. Selectman Maddox was talking about the labor you moved into Highway was only for labor. This still has money that he needs for the chemicals or whatever. You can't make that zero. Ms. Carpentier commented you'd probably need to leave him with a little bit for mops, rags, paper towels, toilet paper. Chairman Coutu stated July 1st of next year. He has money in it this year to do it for this year and he's going to have mops, buckets, and all that leftover and the custodial person will be the one I would think would be responsible for purchasing his needs. Does Wayne buy what he needs for this building? Steve Malizia said we buy what we need for this building and it comes out of a line item in our budget called "janitorial supplies".

Chairman Coutu said should that not be the same, he would be in charge in buying the supplies for whatever he thinks his needs are for the upstairs and downstairs? Mr. Malizia asked are you talking the individual you're hiring? Yes that would be the same. Ms. Carpentier stated then you've shifted the budget to Kevin then. Kevin would go buy the rags and stuff for his employee. Chairman Coutu asked if you think it would be best that we left a little money in his budget to buy rags and stuff and a little bit in the senior budget. Ms. Carpenter said no. You can take the whole \$6,000. I have that line under...Chairman Coutu asked to zero that line out.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to decrease line item 5045-229 from \$6,000 to zero, a \$6,000 decrease, carried 5-0.

Chairman Coutu noted we've got \$6,000 worth of supply and partial labor. Now we've got to move some of that money into a labor line in Kevin Burns' budget? Kathy Carpentier said you already did that. You put \$13,000 into Kevin's facility budget for a part time maintenance person and the payroll tax is \$995. You've decreased the operating budget by \$6,000 so you've increased the budget by \$7,000. Chairman Coutu asked so you think that

\$6,000 is going to be enough for supplies for upstairs and downstairs for the whole year? I think so. Selectman Nadeau didn't know where you're finding it. Selectman Maddox said you just zeroed it out. Ms. Carpentier stated you don't have any supplies. All you've done is offset half of the person you've hired. Supplies I'm sure Kevin - if you want to give him a couple more thousand you can but I'm sure he can buy his rags in bulk. Selectman Nadeau indicated I'm going to give him some money down the road. Chairman Coutu was sure cable can move some money around to buy some supplies.

Kathy Carpentier indicted the next thing on the "W" list is the legal 5200 - value defense - \$40,000.

Chairman Coutu told Selectman Maddox he believed didn't you want to bring that down to 25. Wasn't that what the intent was? Selectman Maddox noted not with me. Maybe somebody else. Chairman Coutu asked what was the problem with the legal value defense.

Steve Malizia said last year in the budget when you were going through this exercise, the Board put in \$25,000 for value defense. Value defense is basically to defend predominately our utility, our commercial industrial values in either the BTLA or Superior Court. Our values are being challenged because you can afford to challenge them so you have to have expert appraisals - whatever documentation and assistance you need to defend your value. Last year during the budget process, the Board put \$25,000 in the budget. Because we got default, that got sent back to zero. However when we moved money around after evaluating what we needed for this fiscal year, you put 25 in this fiscal year from other sources within the year. So we've now advanced the number of \$40,000 which was what I think the original request was last year. So you have - and I have no crystal ball - I can't tell you how much you're going to need. It's greater than zero. I don't know what the upper end is going to be. These cases tend to span a couple of years where in the court system or the BTLA they are not instant gratification. These cases are lengthy or can be lengthy. They're not simple homeowner disagrees with their value. This is more like the utility says I don't think our utilities are worth \$10 million. I think they're worth \$8 million and you if you want to maintain your value have to defend that value. We need some amount of money in this line item or we recommend to put some sort of money in this line item. If you were to say put 25 in here, hopefully we have a good year legally, we could move the money in the legal budget. Again, that's if we have a good year in legal.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to decrease line item 4153-5200-278 - legal value defense - by \$15,000 leaving \$25,000 in that line.

Selectman Maddox noted we saw the last meeting. We spent \$53,000 defending a pond. I think this is one that's just too big of a gamble for me. The \$40,000 I could see us eating up on 2 or 3 cases. This is one I just can't make that gamble Sir.

Chairman Coutu said you point is well taken but the \$51,000 or \$52,000 that we spent defending that pond we're seeking retribution. Selectman Maddox said we don't have it. I was getting at that's how much time the hours and the money that was spent on defending a pond. That's my concern. Chairman Coutu said the Judge threw the case out several times. So I think he may find in our favor. The taxpayers had to pay \$51,000 - \$52,000 to defend that pond. It's a frivolous lawsuit. Steve Malizia said it's in water utility. Chairman Coutu said it didn't come out of our budget. I understand what you're saying. What side of the fence it happens on, it doesn't matter. I hear what you're saying but I think \$25,000 is more than enough at this time.

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

IT - Kathy Carpentier said in 5330-208 there's a line item for telephone. On page 4 is the backup. It's phone upgrade for Town Hall. The original request was also a 50 percent reimbursement from capital reserve. Just as a footnote, that capital reserve revenue is not currently in the revenue so if you forward this, it would change the revenues if you so choose.

Chairman Coutu asked what are you recommending. Steve Malizia said she's recommending if you go forward with this and keep it in the budget to put \$35,000 in revenue from the capital reserve fund that's been established basically for this purpose. Ms. Carpentier commented as recommended by the IT Director. Chairman Coutu said that makes sense because there is approximately \$35,000 revenue but is that going to be the amount. Ms. Carpentier believed that was the amount I was told.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to add \$35,000 to line item #4922 - IT telephone

Selectman Maddox said it whizzed by me Mr. Chairman. We're going to spend 70 but you're trying to put the \$35,000 in first is that what we're doing? Chairman Coutu said yes. Selectman Maddox stated we haven't decided if we're going to spend the money. We're deciding we're going to put money in first. Chairman Coutu said I'd back out of that if you want to discuss the expenditure first. I'm willing to back out of it. Selectman Maddox just wanted to make sure what we were doing. Just wondering what we were doing. We can always reverse it if we go another way. Chairman Coutu said with reconsideration if somebody on the majority side. Be

careful of how the motions are made and how we deal with it. Do you want to talk about...Selectman Maddox said no we have a motion. We'll vote on the motion. Most times you argue about whether you're going to spend the money before you transfer the money. It's Thursday. Let's do it. I was confused.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Selectman Maddox asked if we were going to spend the \$70,000. That's what it really comes down to. Chairman Coutu asked do you object to spending that amount of money. If so, why and what do you propose? Are you all set then? Selectman Maddox said yes.

Selectman Nichols said the IT Department in anticipation of having a warrant article for a full time technician, the IT Director did not budget for her current student intern who helped out during school breaks and some afternoons after school. Where that is out, she would like a motion to increase line item 5330-252 by \$2,760 for student intern not to exceed 230 at \$12 per hour.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to increase line item 5330-252 to \$4,760, an increase of \$2,760.

Selectman Nichols felt as though if we couldn't have the full time help, this student comes in and helps out when they can and they're fairly well trained. I think she'll have him for at least another year or so. That's a good thing because now that's the extra hands that she needs.

Chairman Coutu said I'm going to support the motion. I had a discussion with the IT Director. I was aware that you were going to bring this in. I'm aware that she did not budget the person in anticipation of the warrant article. Failure from us to forward that warrant article. She had asked if she could have that money budgeted in which is what she had originally intended if she was not going to go full time. I told her I would certainly support that move. I'm aware of his work. I'm aware that all 3 members are full time members of the IT staff are very satisfied with his performance and I think he fills a need in that department and shy of giving her a full time employee if she can get by with this, good luck. I certainly will support the motion.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Administrative Aide - review with Fire warrant articles. 5571 - Land Use. Chairman Coutu indicated we don't have that position so we're going to be talking about creating a part time position in the Fire Department. Kathy Carpentier believed Selectman Maddox put this on there to discuss. Chairman Coutu had a "W" on the 5571-101 which is the Planning salaries full time staff. Selectman Maddox I believe that was your wish.

Selectman Maddox thought we were looking at that in conjunction with the part time in the warrant article. I was talking about the 252 line item - professional services. We had a discussion...Chairman Coutu indicated you wanted to hire a company to hire a person. So what do you want to do? Selectman Maddox had a couple of questions of the Fire Chief. Chief you came in and wanted a part time person which we have since not forwarding to the warrant. You said earlier this evening that the income we don't see rising. It would be what it is today.

Chief Buxton said to Kathy, and correct me if I'm wrong and I don't mean to cut you off, we had increased the revenue stream already to \$250,000 from \$130,000. So there's already been an increase to that revenue stream for next year because we were built on that. So we're already made that adjustment. That's why we didn't think there should be further adjustment on that line. Selectman Maddox said so you're saying that right now as we work you're working at a pace of \$137,000 or \$250,000? Kathy Carpentier did the run rate and it was 199. We're going to ramp up hopefully for the spring season. Selectman Maddox indicated you're seeing another \$50,000 worth of work at that counter. Again depending on where you lie on how busy that is, we need to decide whether we're going to put any more hours to the counter Mr. Chairman. That's really what it breaks down to. As far as the \$66,000 at the 5571, I'm not there. I thought we talked about putting in \$15,000 or \$20,000 into the 252.

When Selectman Brucker talked about it, I wanted to do it now - do the professional services hire under that. Chairman Coutu didn't know that that's what you planned but that's not relevant tonight. You can bring that up if you want that as an agenda item. Tell Donna and we can bring it up later if you want to put it in for this year. Is that your intent? Selectman Brucker said yes. Chairman Coutu noted it will also carry over to the new budget. Selectman Brucker indicated it would continue with the 2016 budget? Chairman Coutu said it wouldn't continue. This would be a separate appropriation. We'd have to find the money if we were going to do it this year. It's not budgeted but we have to discuss this as a new item in this budget because he has a zero request on that line. I'm just not cutting you off. What you want to do this year is not germane to this particular budget but if you want, I will have Donna put that as an agenda item. You don't ask to have too much on the agenda at the very next meeting that we're going to meet as a full Board. I will put that on it if that's your request. Selectman Brucker indicated that is my request. Chairman Coutu said we will discuss the potential of having that position funded somehow this year.

Selectman Maddox said just to get this moving so that we cannot see dawn, I'll make a motion.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to increase 4191-5571-252 professional services by \$20,000.

Selectman Maddox said we see in the increase in use at the senior center. We're seeing the increase to use at the counter. This person is going to bring in revenue. I think this is one that if the Board went the way they went, this one kind of has to follow suit. I guess we could look at making it a part time person as you did on the last round. I put it into here so that the Chief has as much flexibility as he can have to when they bring him in, how often they bring him in, and that type of thing. How we do it Mr. Chairman I think is really just a function of workload at the counter.

Selectman Brucker agreed with what Selectman Maddox has said. I thought that was reasonable.

Chairman Coutu said I'll chime in. I'm not going to support the position because the senior center/HCTV facility and the problems that we address that exist at Benson Park which all came to light the other evening not that we weren't aware of them and we're trying to rectify. There's nobody doing it. There's absolutely nobody doing maintenance, nobody taking care of the grounds. It's hit or miss at Benson Park right now. Here we have bodies. There are bodies up there. The unfortunate thing for me is that if I want to do anything to show you some of the problems, I can't get the numbers. Why can't I get the numbers because there's no way of finding out who's out sick, who's out on vacation, who's out on earned time, and how much absenteeism there is in that office. I'm not saying that it is. I'm saying there's no way of knowing because everything is hidden in one pool. We don't have sick time per say so we don't know if it's being abused. Somebody has 140 days of sick leave and they're out two days every other week and they're using sick leave, we have no way of knowing it. If that person is that sick, after a certain period of time, I'd want to see a doctor's note. I'm not saying that exists. I'm just saying that if I were able to get all of the numbers I might be able to show you a true picture and that's any department but we have no way of knowing it. Everything I'm getting is here say. As usual, nobody wants to step up to the plate and say this is happening. This is what the problem is on such and such a day and these are the people that are involved. We have a hard time getting that in any department and I understand that. I understand that. I just wish we had sick leave, vacation time, everything clearly defined and we know whose using what and when. When I review employees one of the first things I look at is how often are you out? Is it because you're sick? Do you really need medical help maybe so I can have somebody working this job that can be here 5 days a week because that's what I need you for? If it's a five day a week job and people can't be there 5 days a week and the jobs are getting done, it should be a 4 day a week job.

Chairman Coutu's argument is there's people up there that can do this work. It's a matter of assigning priorities. These people in the winter time are not going to be out in the field every single day. You can't convince me that our field inspectors are out there Monday through Friday 8 to 5 or whatever they work, 8 to 4 and they're constantly on the road. That somebody's not in the house that they can't go to the desk and assist. I don't see the need for this person. An argument can be made where we just created a position. Yes because there's nobody to do it and we get women and women seniors that are washing dishes and washing down counters. That's not their responsibility no more than it is to have the taxpayers come in here and clean this building because they happen to use this building. It doesn't make sense. This position to me is not justified. I have not heard an argument yet or anything presented to me to justify the position. I will not support it.

Selectman Brucker will support it. To the custodial person at Benson, we do have people from the Highway Department working at Benson. I was not under the impression that there was nobody there doing the clean up and all of that work. The only thing that I'm not sure about that I know is that there is nobody officially cleaning the building. Also we've heard from a number of people about the need for some extra person for just a few hours every day at lunch time to fill in in that department. I know that Mr. Malizia has had people come to him and discussed this with him. I know that the Chief and Deputy Chief O'Brien, they've all heard about it. It's not something that just..Chairman Coutu said its news to me. I heard it from the Fire Chief. Selectman Brucker said I've heard it from other people. Chairman Coutu respected that. I don't doubt you.

Selectman Maddox had a couple of things. Mr. Chairman if you're going to be touching earned time, beware the third rail with the blue ballerinas. Chairman Coutu said I avoid it. Selectman Maddox said to the thing that nobody's cleaning the senior center, I was there today and Mr. Bernard was there who told me he's there two hours a day. Chairman Coutu said that's news to me. Selectman Maddox commented is that not what you told me today? He's there two hours a day. If somebody is there, not probably on the official capacity of how it's being set up. He said Mr. Yates was sending him there. There is somebody there supposedly. Again I met him there but by happenstance.

Finally, Selectman Maddox said that this motion Mr. Chairman if he doesn't spend it, he doesn't spend it. I have the faith in the Fire Chief that he will not spend this willy nilly. That if in fact things can be worked out, then this

number will not be up to anywhere near the \$20,000. Again I think we need to give him the tools if we want this to run as efficiently and as profitably as we expect it to be.

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

5585, page 23. Steve Malizia spoke and said it's actually not in the budget. It was one of those outside the budget requests. As you recall, we have been talking about or the theme was the MS4 storm water permits that we've talked about. This Board put \$25,000 into this year for those activities. Again it's just another \$50,000 to consider. It is not in the budget. Chairman Coutu asked if we had any in last year. Mr. Malizia said the Board has moved \$25,000 into this cost center through the shuffling around of money. Chairman Coutu thought that this was all going to take place this fall. Selectman Maddox thought we put \$75,000. The additional \$25,000 into our contingency to cover it. I didn't know we put it in this particular line item. Mr. Malizia apologized. I stand corrected. You did put it in the budget - the contingency budget.

Selectman Maddox wanted to do the same thing Mr. Chairman with this budget. I want to put 75 in our contingency taking it from 50 to 75 and splitting the baby where there's \$50,000 engineering possible expense. Chairman Coutu noted which was going to happen this year. Steve Malizia said it's going to happen. Chairman Coutu said not in my lifetime. Selectman Maddox stated it could all change next Tuesday. Chairman Coutu said the Governor will change those rules because there will be such a human cry. Mr. Malizia stated there has been a human cry to be frank with you. There is a consortium of communities which we have been monitoring and we are not putting money into but we are monitoring. There has been an effort to at least push it back to modify it. I can't tell you that the effort is succeeding. I can only tell you that it's managed to stall. Chairman Coutu said when the Republicans take control of the House and the Senate it will change. Deregulation.

Kathy Carpentier asked for clarification. I didn't follow your thread. Selectman Maddox's thread is made out of bread and is being eaten by the birds. I was going to take, again, not put the money into engineering. Not put \$50,000. I want to increase - I'll make that motion.

Motion by Selectman Maddox to increase line item 5940-298 Selectmen's contingency fund from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Selectman Maddox said and gambling that if we do need to spend some of this money, we at least have half of it in our contingency. Chairman Coutu asked when have we ever used our contingency. Steve Malizia indicated we have. You've transferred money out of it.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to increase line item 5940-298 Selectmen's contingency fund from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Selectman Maddox asked that that be noted by the Budget Committee Rep. that is our intent rather than putting \$25,000 into engineering and just have it languish if you would.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Kathy Carpentier stated police patrol gasoline has \$112,000 in there. There was some discussion on cutting it back \$10,000. Chairman Coutu commented it was 5630-304 page 13. The default was 95. Who raised the question? Mr. Malizia did not recall. Selectman Maddox believed we just talked about it in general because it had gone up from 95. The new vehicles were supposed to be as efficient or more efficient. So we had a question if that was an area that we could hit. That's I think really what it comes down to.

Chairman Coutu asked we don't have a breakdown of what we've been using for gasoline by department. We have 3 months anyway. We can see how much the police department has been using. Kathy Carpentier did not have that for 15. There is a document that has 14 actuals in your book but not 15. Chairman Coutu indicated we don't have those new vehicles in the 2014 cycle. We know what the actuals were in 2014 \$101,529. The question of we have a default budget so he only has 95 to spend. If he spent at that rate, he's going to come up \$6,000 short. My question is can we safely cut \$10,000 and leave \$102,000 is there enough efficiency...

Chief Lavoie indicated those vehicles have only been on the road since August. So I really don't have stuff I can report to you on those readily available. I would throw to the wind though or speak when we're planning our budget, we took a look at some of our concerns obviously and gasoline is one of those areas where we need to have it to put in the vehicles obviously. Given the parameters that come in with a budget that's essentially level funded, we're looking at our operational spending of additional equipment that we did not look into that we haven't been replacing or things to deal with - some bio hazard stuff when dealing with evidence that's soaked in blood, etc. We really need to maintain the gas budget because we don't know what's going to happen 18 months out. Gas has been volatile up and down and that's why we took some of those monies and we made sure that we had enough in there because we have been spending high in recent years.

Chairman Coutu asked if we still had the fuel contingency. Kathy Carpentier said we do. It is currently budgeted at \$25,000. Mr. Malizia indicated in your control. Chairman Coutu asked if it was in this budget. Ms. Carpentier said the other expenses FY16. Chairman Coutu said it's in the 2016 budget at 25. We have 25 in the budget correct? Ms. Carpentier said yes because you budgeted for it last year, we left it in there for you to decide to take it out. Default did take it out and you transferred money there. Yes there's \$25,000 currently in this budget. Chairman Coutu noted you're recommending 25 in the 2016 budget correct for fuel deficiency. Mr. Malizia agreed.

Chief Lavoie said the only thing I would add again is I was unaware that the Board had a contingency fund for the gasoline. My recollection was that it was at zero. Had that been the case, then I would have come in a lot tighter to what we've been spending and taking an additional...Chairman Coutu said it was at zero because of default but we moved money in there just in case. On my end, Chief Lavoie was not aware of that change made by the Board. Therefore monies that I would have probably used for equipment related issues or things I put in the gasoline account to make sure that we have enough to run the cruisers. Thank you.

Chairman Coutu said the question was raised whether or not we could comfortably cut, and I believe the conversation was around \$10,000 from that line item. When I thought about it, I knew we had a contingency but I was worried about the default but the default we covered it. If we go into the same default next year, we're going to have to do the same thing.

With that Mr. Chairman whether these vehicles are more fuel efficient or not, Selectman Maddox indicated we do have a cushion. I'm ready to make a motion to remove from 5630-304 from \$112,000 to \$102,000 a decrease of \$10,000.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to decrease 5630-304 from \$112,000 to \$102,000, a decrease of \$10,000.

Selectman Maddox was trying not to hurt the Police Department. We do have a resource to be able to make that up and hopefully at the point that this starts, they're going to have 7 of these vehicles that are hopefully more fuel efficient so maybe we won't even hit the 102 that's in the budget. Let's see where we go.

Chairman Coutu was going to support the motion because common sense dictates that should we exhaust that line, we're not going to pull the cruisers off the road. We're going to continue operating those cruisers and we'll make the funds available for the Chief to do that.

Voter: Motion carried 5-0.

Police Patrol - 5634-402

Chairman Coutu noted the line item is \$120,000. There was a discussion - you wanted to look at all the vehicles and develop the trade in policy on the vehicles. Is that a discussion for the budget and if so, how so is it because you're anticipating whoever brought it up. We're looking to cut the 120.

Selectman Maddox said at this point I'm going to leave that number where it is. I think that at some future date this Board needs to take a look at our policy but I don't think it's going to affect the budget. By the time he replaces X number of vehicles with the changeover of all of the equipment, the Chief can make a decision whether he wants to outfit or do some of the other equipment needs he has based on vehicle needs and wants. I think that the vehicle policy is not germane at this juncture Sir.

Fire Department 5730 - fire suppression

Chairman Coutu indicated we were looking at 404 trucks. It's an \$8,000 line. Who was questioning that? Selectman Maddox said probably me again. Mr. Chairman I think this is going to roll into our discussion about the vehicles and how they rotate primarily out of the Police Department because they're the ones that buy vehicles every year. This is for another command vehicle is what it says in the budget. If the Chief wants to come up and define that better. I am hesitant to put that monies in there. I would like to withdraw it but the Chief can certainly convince us otherwise.

Chairman Coutu said the \$8,000 was going to...Selectman Maddox said it's the first year of a lease for a four year. I'm not ready to commit us for another command vehicle and I didn't bring my vehicle listing tonight. Chairman Coutu asked wasn't this to replace the note I have was the 2004 Tahoe at 83,490 miles on it.

Chief Buxton stated we were actually proposing trading in two vehicles. One is the 2006 Ford Crown Victoria that has 100,000 miles on it and a 2004 Chevy Tahoe that has 83,490 miles on it. Trading in both those vehicles, looking at a smaller command vehicle, and continuing with our rotation of vehicles downward. Right now we're running a 2004 Chevy Tahoe with 60,000 miles on it in the Emergency Services Division. We're looking to rotate

that to services. That's a 10 year old vehicle now and rotate the command staff vehicles. We have been trading down vehicles over the years. That is the replacement plan that has been in place. We're looking at going to a smaller command staff vehicle than the Tahoe that we were budgeting those at about almost \$9,000. This is encompassing a small vehicle and looking at that change. With the influx of the squad and those types of things, we're overlaying the program similar to the Police Chief. I don't have any data on what that's going to look like because the squads are not in yet. We're trying to solidify some of our program. With the additional of Building, Zoning, and Health, we inherited a couple of vehicles on the town side that are getting up there in mileage. I'm trying to stabilize where we're at with some of that. I know Selectman Maddox has talked about the trade in program and how that's going to play out. We have a 2006 Trail Blazer that has 81,000 miles on it and I have a 2005 Colorado Pickup Truck that was moved down to us two years ago with 90,000 miles on that. Where we're budgeting 18 months in advance, I've got a couple of additional vehicles that are getting a little longer in the tooth there for staff.

Chairman Coutu asked whatever happened to the conversation of buying these expensive front line vehicles and trading them down. We never get to get the cheaper cars at the lower end. We always get these expensive cars that just keep going down the line. I thought we were going to have a conversation about getting out of this type of vehicle and getting into something a little more affordable for us. Based on this, he's estimating \$32,000 for a vehicle.

To that end Mr. Chairman, Selectman Maddox indicated I'm going to make the motion to decrease 5730-404 trucks from \$8,000 to zero.

Motion by Selectman Maddox to decrease line item 5730-404 trucks from \$8,000 to zero.

Selectman Maddox indicated it's a Tahoe. Selectman Nadeau said no he says it was going to be a smaller vehicle. Chief Buxton said it is not a Tahoe. When we were lease purchasing, the Tahoes were at about \$9,000. Selectman Maddox noted that we have one Tahoe that has 12,000 miles on it. Another one has 25,000 miles on it. We've got plenty of life left in the command staff vehicles.

Chairman Coutu asked to bring this back to order. We have a motion on the floor. Do I have a second? I will second the motion.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to decrease line item 5730-404 trucks from \$8,000 to zero.

Again if you look at the list Mr. Chairman, Selectman Maddox thought that this is no disrespect to the Chief or anybody else. I think that we need to get a handle on this and this can wait a year. We keep on adding stuff in this budget. You keep on saying you're going to be making cuts. We have to start somewhere and I think this is one that has minimal impact. Chairman Coutu agreed and I will be supporting the motion for that reason.

Selectman Brucker said but you're not just waiting a year. You're waiting two years. It will be two years before...Selectman Maddox said my chins hurt from all the people kicking me from training in vehicles with very low mileage. The citizens are keeping cars into the hundreds and we're trading them in. I think we need to get a handle on it and waiting a year here is not going to break the cycle.

Selectman Nadeau said I'm kind of there but I'm kind of not. We're going down to a smaller vehicle. I don't think 32,000 is the right number. If the number was 5,000 for the lease purchase, we'd definitely be getting a smaller vehicle we would know that. You look at the State bids - I could go with 5,000 in that line. I can't go with 8 but I can go with 5. I know that we have to keep our command vehicles up and running and they do need to be four wheel drives and there are smaller four wheel drives that are out there. I think we could probably get a lease purchase closer to \$5,000 for a vehicle.

In Chairman Coutu's opinion what Selectman Maddox said that strikes me most about this is that we need to be concerned about trading in our vehicles at 70,000 - 80,000 miles. I can beat up a vehicle a lot harder. My own personal vehicle than they do with these vehicles. They should be able to get a lot more life in them than we're allowing. I think that to put \$8,000 aside for the next three years - if we agree to your 5,000, that would be 20,000. If we took out the 8, we'd have 24,000. So we're talking the difference of \$4,000 here. Six one way half a dozen the other. I think just take it out this year and we'll discuss it next year and see how the economy is next year. That's my opinion.

Selectman Nadeau stated we're going to start putting holes in the system like we did before and then we're going to end up with cars with 160,000 - 170,000 miles and breaking down. I just think that...Chairman Coutu commented the suggestion Selectman Nadeau was not to go to 160,000 - 170,000. We just think we can get better use than 83,000. Selectman Nadeau indicated we came back from those years. Now we're going to start going down to that direction. Like Selectman Maddox said, Chairman Coutu stated, again, he articulated that the average citizen - unless you have a lot of money tries to hold onto their car as long as they can. They try to get

130,000 - 140,000 out of a car today before they trade it in. Then they trade it in and they know they're going to get little value for it but they stretched it out long enough that they avoided car payments for a while. I think we should have the same practice. We should not have to go to 150,000 - 160,000 but not trade them in at 75,000 - 76,000 just so we can have a brand new shiny new car. If it's functional and it works, why do we have to trade it down? Keep it.

Selectman Nadeau said we've been doing that at a pretty good rate, reasonably lately. These vehicles are not like what you're thinking of like my F150. I drive my F150 very hard. These trucks are driven a lot harder. A lot faster, start, stops. The transmissions on these things are a little bit more durable than mine but when you start hitting 80,000 - 90,000 miles on some of these transmissions, you're talking \$10,000 for a new transmission. Where our replacement plan is starting to work, I'm willing to lower the amount but I'm not willing to cut it out.

Selectman Maddox didn't suppose that we're going to have a command cars at 80,000. I think that, again, once we get a better handle on where we're going to go with this but none of them are even getting close to those kind of numbers. Again the 2011 has 25,000 miles. I put that on my car in the last 6 months. Again, we need to find some money somewhere Mr. Chairman. We're putting other things in. We've got to find a place to balance this all out. This is where I picked the number.

Selectman Brucker had a question. It sounds to me like we want to go to a smaller, cheaper vehicle but have it last longer. Is that what we're saying? Chief Buxton said what we were looking at was reducing from the full size Tahoe down to an Explorer size. There's money in there for the up fitting of the equipment within the vehicle - radios, lights, those types of things. That adds \$4,000 to \$5,000 on the fire side. We don't have to do the plastic backseat and the cage like the Police Department does. It just drives their costs up a little more. One of the things I would point out is the second 2004 Tahoe that we were transitioning in services to take the place of the other two vehicles was about 60,000 miles. Certainly by the time we get the new vehicle in place, we're trying to keep our emergency response vehicles under 60,000 miles. That was when we put the program into place with the command vehicles, we were trying to drive those to about 60,000 or a little north of that and then transition them down. If the wish of the Board is to look at how those low end vehicles are being filled, that's a discussion that is almost separate I think from what we were talking about. We're talking about an emergency response vehicle that is utilized by the command staff. When you start taking that into account that that vehicle were transitioning down to services is also 10 years old, you have some impact there.

Vote: Motion failed. Selectman Nadeau, Selectman Brucker, and Selectman Nichols in opposition.

Kathy Carpentier commented that the next three items on the list are items outside the Fire Department budget that the Chief...Chief Buxton said thank you for saving me the exercise...if the Board wants to entertain them. Chairman Coutu was not interested. What do you want him to do? Do you want him to go over those three items again?

Selectman Maddox said sure.

Steve Malizia pointed out that earlier in the discussion you talked about a revenue for the ambulance revenue of \$25,000. I thought I heard at that point in time you wanted to fund more into the capital reserve fund which is one of these three items.

Selectman Maddox said I'm just one. If the other three don't want to Mr. Chairman, we move on. Selectman Brucker said I'll hear it.

Chief Buxton said the first piece of infrastructure is the new radio tower that will be located on Constitution Drive outside of the police station. That is a joint project that would move all of the police and fire antennae equipment onto a higher tower - 100 foot tower located. Increasing efficiencies in that area for transmission and reception for both fire and police. So that's what that project entails. That came in at \$100,520.

Selectman Maddox had a couple of questions. The other day the Police Chief stated that one of the things when he came in with that request for the half a million dollars was that he didn't have good coverage. I don't believe that has anything to do with the radios themselves. It is with the tower being able to broadcast up over the trees. Is that a correct statement? Chief Buxton said the project that the Police Chief was talking about was the control site of the radio system. The transmission side of the system is the tower heights, and the antenna locations, and that's what I'm talking about on the infrastructure side. Selectman Maddox asked about the \$100,520 includes...Chief Buxton said a new tower, new antennas, cabling.

Ambulance - \$15,000. Chief Buxton said capital reserve for the ambulance we had come in with a budgetary request of \$200,000 for the ambulance this year. We had reviewed the capital reserve accounts. Currently we're putting \$45,000 in there. I'd request an additional \$15,000 be put in there. I believe Selectman Maddox had looked at identifying some revenue to offset that this evening to bring us closer to the purchasing amount of the new ambulance.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to increase 5750-450 from \$45,000 to \$60,000, an increase of \$15,000.

Selectman Maddox indicated that we did fund this earlier in the evening. We increased revenues on the ambulance line item to cover this. Chairman Coutu noted not necessarily to cover that. We increased the ambulance revenue. I will not be supporting the motion. We need to make some cuts. So we're going to have a significant increase in the tax rate. Adding more stuff to the budget is not going to do it. \$45,000 is not a breaker right now to keep in there. Bringing it up to \$60,000 - I'm not going to support the motion.

Selectman Nadeau said I've always been a big proponent of these capital reserve funds. As we've seen over the few years that we've had these, the cost of these ambulances are starting to go up. They're getting bigger. They're getting more complicated. They're not like the first Cadillac ambulance that we had that had a bubble gum on the top of the roof for a light. These are a much bigger machine now and they do a lot more for us. We have to realize that when we go to buy the next one, it's going to be \$200,000. We need to have the money starting to be put away in these accounts so that we don't have to get hit with a \$200,000 bill when our ambulance breaks.

Selectman Brucker thought its wise budgeting to be prepared.

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

Fire equipment. Chairman Coutu commented you want to add \$20,000 to capital reserve funding. Kathy Carpentier said it was in 5730-450 has a budget of \$20,000 in there right now, page 14. Chairman Coutu noted you've had \$20,000 in there for the past 3 years. You had nothing in it for 2012.

Chief Buxton indicated this capital reserve account was created for the purpose of specialized fire EMS equipment. Traditionally we've used this account for fire equipment. We've started to examine our EMS capital equipment and basically what drove that was the stretcher that we lost in mid cycle last year. It really forced us organizationally to sit down and look at our capital equipment. That stretcher alone was \$18,000. So we sat down and we said what should we be purchasing out of there. We felt we were falling behind. So we've asked for an increase of \$20,000 into that account line. It covers self contained breathing apparatus, some imaging cameras, portable pumps, stretchers, defibrillators, IV pumps, cardiac thumpers, and those devices.

Chairman Coutu asked you're asking us to make that line \$40,000. Double it? Chief Buxton said yes I am. Chairman Coutu asked who wants to spend that money. Any motions? Seeing none, let's move on.

Selectman Brucker asked have we been spending out of that fund. Chief Buxton indicated we've been using it. Last year I came in and we did some protective clothing. We've done some portable pump repairs and those types of things out of that account yes. Selectman Brucker asked how much is left in there. Kathy Carpentier said at the end of this fiscal year, there's be \$50,000 with no expenditures with the additional 20 that you're budgeting now.

In all fairness, Chairman Coutu said we paid and found the money to replace that. Chief Buxton said we did. We had an open position at that point in time. Chairman Coutu noted we didn't have to dig anywhere.

Community Grants - 5920. Kathy Carpentier stated in the 5900 section, page 5 of your book is a list of organizations we give grant money to. I do not recall why you wanted to revisit. Chairman Coutu commented we just said we will talk about it later. That's why. Has everybody reviewed the monies that we are giving and who we give them to? Is there any questions? Why do we pay Nashua Transit money? If I can recollect correctly, Steve Malizia indicated folks that are transported generally the older population, the handicapped. Chairman Coutu commented I see it in town north and south. Is there any problem with any of these numbers? Anybody wish to make any changes, additions, decreases? If not, we can move off this item.

Selectman Nadeau asked do you have any suggestions of ones that we should be looking at. Chairman Coutu said I tried to get some information as to how much of the services are provided to Hudson visa vie our donation versus their budget and I can't get information. I can't make an intelligent decision. Selectman Nadeau asked what the one that you asked was on. Chairman Coutu said many of them. There's some of them I don't think provide as much service as others do. I'm a strong proponent Selectman Nadeau of keeping our money in our community. I'm a very strong proponent of that. The reason why my wife and I donate to certain charities is because we know it comes back to our community. That's the way we've been. I think a lot of other people that I've talked to feel the same way. Why are funding all these other agencies out of town. There are some like - Town Administrator I think I've raised this question before about the Nashua Transit. There's a service that's being provided to take people to doctor's appointments and things of that nature and that's our contributory share. They had requested \$16,799 I think for the budget this year and we're offering to give them the same as

we've been giving for the past four. There are others as well that have asked for more money. I don't know what Keystone Hall is. I tried to look...

Selectman Nadeau said I can tell you what Keystone Hall is and what they do for services for us. Keystone Hall is an alcohol program. If we have a resident who has a problem, they go there and if they do not have insurance or means to pay for it, this is where the money comes from for this.

Chairman Coutu asked does anybody wish to make any changes so we can move on. I'm willing to leave it alone for now.

Selectman Nadeau noted if there's any other ones that you have questions on, I might have the answers for you.

Kathy Carpentier stated that concludes all the tax rate impact items that were on your "W" list that was agreed upon by the group to put that on the "W" list. It is not my list.

Chairman Coutu directed the Board to go to the 5400 tab - Assessors. Why do we need \$400 for transportation? I'm talking peanuts but I'm looking at peanuts. Why do we need \$400 for transportation - 5410-232 the bottom of page 1. Kathy Carpentier pointed out it was airline transportation to the IAAO conference in Indianapolis. Chairman Coutu said we don't need to go to any IAAO conference in Indiana. What are we sending our Assessor - is he suggesting we send him to Indiana. Please. Is there an airplane ticket in this budget? Kathy Carpentier believed that is what that is - airline transportation.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to cut \$400 from line item 5410-232.

Chairman Coutu didn't think our Assessor should be in Indiana. He should be here in Hudson and getting some assessing done so we don't have to spend all this other money for other things.

Selectman Nadeau stated then you might want to look at the next line item - lodging.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

5410-234 - lodging. Chairman Coutu said he spends money every year on lodging. Steve Malizia indicated (inaudible) New England for example that you would drive to or maybe either upstate New Hampshire, it could be in Maine, it could be in Vermont. So it's lodging that's generally local.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to cut from line item 5410-234 by \$400 leaving \$200 in the account.

Selectman Maddox asked the Chairman I don't know where we're headed here. I don't know where your target is so I'm kind of guessing. Maybe there's value. I don't know what, again, we're assuming that we're not going to get value.

Chairman Coutu said the conversations that you and I have had I can't believe you made that remark. Selectman Maddox said but we don't know. Now we're just blindly cutting. If he came and said it was to study telephone pole infrastructure assessing, maybe not. I don't know. We're just blindly cutting. I just don't know where we're going with this. Chairman Coutu said we have internet conferences. They can discuss it over the internet. It's pretty cheap. Indiana of all places.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

5410-402 - automobiles. Selectman Nadeau stated this line item in here is for miscellaneous repairs, oil changes, inspections for two Chevy Impalas. Our small vehicles in town are all serviced over at the Highway Department. Kevin takes care of these types of things.

Chairman Coutu asked is this the one you and I had the conversation we're talking about the mint on the front seat. I'm not going to go into it. Is that the one we were talking about? Selectman Nadeau indicated that's the one we were talking about.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to decrease line item 5410-402 from \$5,000 to zero thus leaving a zero balance.

Selectman Brucker was curious. Tires? We might want to leave something in there. Selectman Nadeau was going to put into the Highway budget. We can't drive around on bald tires. We want them inspectable.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Selectman Maddox was hoping that our vehicle replacement project will fix most of this Mr. Chairman but I think to be fair to Kevin if he's going to have to maintain this, I would transfer \$2,000 into his maintenance.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to increase line item 5553-205 by \$2,000, carried 5-0.

Chairman Coutu was going to make a public recommendation to the Library Board of Trustees that you take another look at your budget before you submit it to the Budget Committee and you cut at least \$40,000 from that budget and bring it under \$1 million so it's more palatable. Common sense should prevail here. That's not going to happen. I thought I'd throw it out there. Where do we stand on the bottom line?

Chairman Coutu declared a recess at 9:58 p.m. The meeting resumed at 10:04 p.m. We're still in the operating budget. There's one item I would like to bring up.

Steve Malizia has information but whatever you'd like to do.

Chairman Coutu indicated we're going to discuss if it is the Board's pleasure the topic of nonunion salaries. If the Board does not wish to speak about nonunion salaries, there's not a consensus to discuss this, we will not discuss this. If there is a consensus, we will discuss it. The discussion will involve whether or not we would 1) entertain a pay raise, 2) do we put it in our operating budget, or 3) do we go to a warrant article and we can have a discussion about that. What is the consensus of the Board on discussing raises for nonunion salaries?

Selectman Brucker wished to discuss it. Selectman Maddox did not. I just got this. I would have like to have read it before we're going to jump into all kinds of discussions Sir. I'll go wherever we're going to go. Selectman Nadeau was on the same thing. I just got this. I'd like to...Chairman Coutu said there's a consensus to discuss it. I'm sure that the Town Administrator is going to review this with us. I think it might have been you Selectman Maddox suggested that the Town Administrator do an overview of what other towns are paying. You had requested that and he's provided that data on page 2 for each of the positions. Page 3 for each of the positions that are nonunion and also if you look at page 4, he summarized increases at 3 different levels - what the salary is for each of the positions that are nonunion - a 1%, 2%, and 3% increase. It shows you the affect.

Steve Malizia indicated the last one is just an internal comparative document. We've talked about this before. In the past the Board has tried to maintain up to a 10 percent separation between compression. So I put that in as part of a discussion. Again that's simply put. This is a chart that outlines that.

As you know, Chairman Coutu stated the Town Administrator, the Police Chief, the Fire Chief, the Finance Director, the Road Agent, Parks & Recreation Director, IT Director, and the Executive Assistant are nonunion employees. We can put in a warrant article to increase their wages by a percentage or by a dollar amount. We can pick and choose the various ways of doing it or we can put it into our operating budget and it would be our decision if we were to do it either way what percentage they should merit. In the past, we've had discussion about compression. The last page gives you a little bit about the differential at what percentage it is. You can see that when union employees get a pay raise and their department heads they creep closer to their department heads in salary, we talk about compression. That's where that subject comes in. While I was talking I think you all had an opportunity to review the document. Is anybody prepared to start the conversation?

Selectman Nadeau asked the Town Administrator what the average pay raise last year for the employees. Steve Malizia indicated it varied because we did some different things with some different groups. For example in the Highway unit, I believe they forewent a COLA and we added a step. I believe in the Supervisor's Association we added 1 ½ percent and added a step. In the Police Department it was 2.75 I believe for the out years. In the Fire Department due to the real compression issues, we looked at these 6 communities and tried to adjust them so that they were somewhere in the average of those communities. There was no one percent or answer for anybody. I do believe last year the Board advanced a warrant article. I'm not sure of the number - 2 percent. It did not pass the voters. Chairman Coutu thought it was 2 percent last year is what we forwarded to the voters. Needless to say, Mr. Malizia said it didn't pass. I don't remember the specific percentage. It was close.

Selectman Brucker stated you're saying that we can put this in the operating budget. Chairman Coutu indicated yes we can. We can do either, or, or not do anything.

Selectman Nichols asked do we have to increase all at one 1 percent or all at 2 percent or can that be messed around with. Chairman Coutu said it's not a question. It's not the right term "mess around with". It can be adjusted. It could be all inclusive, only some. It could be dollar amount. The last time we did it I think we did it on the basis of a dollar amount. The last time we did it for the department non-union, we did it by dollar amounts. There were some that were different than others because there needed to be some adjustment. Or we can do a flat out just percentage rate. It's a wish of the majority of the Board. Whatever motions you wish to make, however you want to approach this, or totally ignore it. It's up to the Board.

Selectman Brucker asked when was the last time they got a raise. Steve Malizia believed the majority of the group was July of 2011. There was one adjustment that I'm aware of that I could recall. I don't think there are any other ones. Kathy Carpentier believed the same thing. Selectman Brucker said by 2016 the budget...Steve Malizia said we're looking at 2015. This would be July 2015.

In the past, Selectman Nadeau stated we've put money in a pool and we've divvied it out that way. We put 2 percent in the pool and divvied it out accordingly to adjust compression our way. It's been done differently in the past by different boards. I've always thought that putting the money in a pool and then doing it that way has always been a better way to do it so that you can fix some inequities. I think that's what I would like to do this year is put an amount in the budget. Do we have a line item that we can do that in? Selectman Maddox said you'd have to put it in the 101 account right. Kathy Carpentier asked is that your intention to put it all in one place in the budget. So like a 5940-101 line. Is that your intention? Selectman Nadeau said that's my intention.

Selectman Maddox indicated that would make it easier for the Budget Committee to take it all out at once and not have to do it by each line item.

Selectman Nadeau said you're so negative. Selectman Maddox indicated well I've been hanging around you guys. I was positive earlier.

Chairman Coutu stated if we can't get our budget passed and the school budget passes, there's something wrong with the Budget Committee. When we're finished with this budget, then people will see where we're at.

Kathy Carpentier commented that would be my suggestion. If that's your intention, its 5940 is the Board of Selectmen's other department like where your gas contingency is. Create a 101 line because that's your intention.

Chairman Coutu said we can apportion it out if the budget passes at that time right to active to July 1.

Kathy Carpentier noted your option which doesn't seem to be where you want to go is you put it in Police, Fire, and Town Admin., and Finance. Chairman Coutu asked why do we have to wait until the budget. If you want to assign certain numbers to certain people, you can do it right now and put it right in their line items. I don't mind. I'm not bashful. I don't want everybody to get a raise. I'm not being diplomatic about how we spend town money.

Selectman Nadeau was going to put \$15,000 in an account and if it passed, then we apportion it out.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to increase line item 5940-101 by \$15,000.

Selectman Nadeau came up with about 1 ½ to 1 ¾ percent depending on how you do your rough math.

Kathy Carpentier said you wouldn't be handing out \$15,000, you'd be handing out something less than \$15,000.

Selectman Nadeau indicated that's my intention.

Selectman Maddox thought you're going to put this into the budget in that fashion without deciding how it's going to be distributed. You're just setting up Selectman Nichols for a terrible, terrible tar and feather. I think that if we're going to do this, we need to spend a little bit more time and decide where it's going to go and put it in the 101s Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Coutu indicated that's where I'm leaning. Why don't we just say who we're going to give the money to and how much and get it in the budget line by line.

Selectman Nadeau said if you want to go that route. If this motion doesn't pass.

Selectman Maddox stated you just asked where I'm coming from and I'm having a tough time.

Vote: Motion failed 2-3. Selectman Maddox, Selectman Nichols, and Selectman Coutu in opposition.

Chairman Coutu noted you see the ranges of salary increases at 2 percent, 1 percent, and 3 percent. I would think that the Board would be negative towards the 3 percent. So we're going to deal with 1, or 2, or a portion thereof. Is anybody prepared to make motions relative to each of these so we can get them in the line items?

Selectman Nadeau indicated I'm not. Chairman Coutu commented you were ready to do this and now you're not.

Selectman Maddox was looking more at the compression Mr. Chairman. That's what I've been trying to look at. Chairman Coutu said you're looking at internal compression as opposed to how the other towns are doing it.

Selectman Maddox looked at what - again - they're all over the map also. If they're paying a Town Administrator \$83,000 and then some are paying \$130,000.

Selectman Nichols asked does this mean the tax rate impact for the 2 percent would be a penny. Chairman Coutu said it's a little less than a penny but she rounded it up. It's a \$16,000 cost when you take in FICA and pension. The one penny level is \$25,000. This recommends a \$16,000 increase. If nobody is ready to make motions, I'm ready to make motions. I'm going to sit here and I'm going to put down a pool of money and I'm going to sort it out to where I think it should be given. I'll make motions. You can either vote yea or nay - vote them up or down. Selectman Nichols was good with that.

Kathy Carpentier believed if you just use titles, we can back track into departments if we need to.

Chairman Coutu decided to be blunt. I'm going to recommend all of the pay raises on the 2 percent line with the exception of the Recreation Director. Bring in that \$13,183 to \$12,083.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to increase non-union salaries to \$12,083, a 2% increase, with the exception to leave the Recreation Director the same.

Chairman Coutu asked for discussion because Selectman Nadeau asked for it. Listen we need to put this to bed. I don't think 2 percent is an unreasonable request. The Recreation Director is solely being eliminated. This is not a punitive thing. We made an adjustment of \$5,000 recently. I got taken over the coals for it. I thought it was a fair adjustment and I don't think he's going to cry for \$1,100 because the government is going to take it all away from him taxes anyways and all the others. They're not going to see that much of this money. I think 2 percent is fair. I can't see sitting here and trying to play games with numbers and favoring one position over another. We've been doing it on a percentage basis except for the last time we did a pool of money. We were serious about trying to make adjustments. Every time we do this kind of thing if we start looking at what all these other towns do - if another town builds a \$10 million fire station, we're not ready to build a \$10 million fire station. We're certainly not willing to pay what other towns pay and why we look at these numbers all the time except to show how cheap Hudson is when it comes to paying their employees. If I were to look at the Finance Director, it says Goffstown - \$67,000. We pay ours \$84,000. Bedford pays \$137,000. The Goffstown Finance Director I bet you is a part time job. She has probably less than half the budget we have. It's probably a small, tiny little budget. It's not fair to do these kinds of comparisons. It just doesn't make sense. It is what it is. We have to achieve something here tonight.

Selectman Maddox said we cannot always work in a vacuum. I think we need to be cognizant of what is out there on the other communities. Whether we like it or not, we are not an island and if other communities are paying X, we need to at least be aware. So that's what the request was for Mr. Chairman is see where we sit. I haven't even gotten to that page but it looks like we're in the middle on some. We're high on some and we're low on others. Do we correct that? Do we try to adjust that? Just putting the 2 percent I think just keeps us in that same tunnel.

Selectman Nichols felt as though our non-union salary employees haven't had a raise since 2011. This is going to be 2015/2016. That's quite a while to stay stagnant. I think they need the boost and the Town should see this. These people work very, very hard for us, for this whole town. They really do. They put in their hours. They work very, very hard. You can go to any one of them and ask any questions and get answers. It might not be what you want but you'll get an answer. To me that 2 percent is not exorbitant I don't think. We're not giving them \$1 million. We can't afford it but we are doing the best we can and I think that's my idea anyhow.

What Chairman Coutu was going to say Selectman Maddox is if the motion should fail, I'm prepared to make individual adjustments with justification for each one? Selectman Maddox asked how are we doing it. That's what I was wondering. Chairman Coutu said these here are going to be the 101 accounts for all of these positions. It's not lumping anything. It's for the 101 accounts. Any further discussion?

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

Before we do the Warrant Articles, Chairman Coutu asked with that addition do we have a new number please. Selectman Brucker thought a penny. Chairman Coutu said less than a penny. She'll have it more accurate by making that adjustment and then I can explain what just happened or the net result of everything we've done so far. The warrant articles are up to the voters. Kathy Carpentier said the operating budget is at \$6.44.

Chairman Coutu noted it's staying the same. This is what I wanted to explain so that the voters and I know a lot of members of the Budget Committee watch this. I said initially that this Board, and I know the Budget Committee as well, takes the budgeting process very seriously. We've had to stay here a little later than we had anticipated to achieve a goal. This year I wanted to minimize the impact of what the raises that were approved by the voters. So in affect ladies and gentlemen, our tax rate right now is \$6.35. Right now that's our tax rate. The town side of the tax...Kathy Carpentier said on the bill that you're going to receive. Chairman Coutu said you'll

see it on your tax bill. On the bill that you're going to receive the tax rate for the town - not the school, not the State, County, or whatever is \$6.35. The voters approved last year pay raises for our employees. That in effect raised the tax rate \$.10 per \$1,000 and raised it to \$6.45. The State Retirement board raised an additional \$.04 on the tax rate bringing the rate to \$6.49. So before we started the budget, we knew the tax rate was going to be \$6.49. With this budget and all of the adjustments that we just made, we're coming in at \$6.44. Thus decreasing the budget with obligations by \$.05 per 1,000. I think we did an outstanding job. We should pat ourselves on the back. I know some people are not going to like some of the things that we did but they're not doing the work and they're not sitting here. If they want to do it, they're welcome to run for the Board of Selectmen and take on the responsibility. There will be at least one seat available next year.

Warrant articles.

Steve Malizia stated the articles you need to consider are letters I, J, L, M, N, and O. The others you have either disposed of or forwarded. So the first one is I - construction of a new fire station.

Chairman Coutu read "Shall the Town of Hudson vote and raise and appropriate the sum of \$2,100,000 for the design and construction of a new fire station on town owned land located on Lowell Road and authorize the issuance of \$2,100,000 in bonds."

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to forward Warrant Article I to warrant.

Selectman Maddox said earlier this year that I was tired of sitting on my hands. I think that we all want to keep the tax rate low. We all want to squeeze every nickel we can out of the monies that the voters give us. We have an opportunity here to fix a problem that has been lurking in the background. We're going to talk about the Lenny Smith Central Station in a minute but the Burns Hill Station was on the CIP for \$850,000 to renovate. It is undersized. It is not on town water and sewer. It was never meant to be lived in 24/7. This will give us a new modern fire station on Lowell Road. It will give our citizens a quicker response time based on the information provided by the Fire Chief. It needs to get done. There's no good year. I think this is the year that we need to put this forward. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Selectman Nichols thought it was a good idea.

Selectman Brucker said it's a very good model. It's economical. It does the job very well or it will. We have an employer in the Industrial Park that's going to have up to 600 people there eventually or more. There may be other companies coming in there as well as all the citizenry in that part of town that may need their services. I'm very much in favor of the shorter response time. I think it's getting closer to the 4 minute response time for that area. I'm in favor of it.

Chairman Coutu asked what is the contingency in this budget for the \$2.1 million. Is there a contingency built into this? Selectman Maddox said I'd have to ask the Fire Chief but it's mostly 5 percent. Chairman Coutu repeated we have a 5 percent contingency - \$105,000. Selectman Maddox agreed. Just in case we find some of that a stuff.

Chairman Coutu made an observation. I'm going to support sending it to the warrant article because I've had - I want the voters to make the decision. I have had I'd say the ratio of people who have come to talk to me about this is probably 4 to 1 against it. They're just not in favor of spending \$2.1 million and turning that into a garage. Somebody said to me he went over and looked at it and he said you could put a 10 foot addition on one side and it will solve all your problems. I kind of think he's right. I like the idea of it being on a main road. Obviously I'm going to support it. Let the voters decide.

Selectman Nichols is in favor of it for the simple reason that the land is ours. It belongs to the town. There is water, sewerage, electricity. I believe there's a gas line in there. Those things are already there. That's something we don't have to go and get extra help from or expend more money. It's local. It's in a great spot to take care of a lot of the new developments, the companies, plus all the families that are moving in. It's a good area. I think it covers a good area. I like the idea of it.

Chairman Coutu didn't disagree. I think we're going to have a hard time selling it. We'll put it on the warrant and see where the voters go with it.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Warrant Article J - renovation of the Lenny Smith Fire Station. Chairman Coutu noted we're looking to raise the sum of \$1.1 million for the purpose. I'm not in favor of the amount but.

Selectman Brucker thought at the meeting on Tuesday night that you and Selectman Nichols mentioned that you thought we didn't need to do the elevator on the building. Chairman Coutu didn't think we needed to do the elevator but. Selectman Brucker indicated that would be reduced.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward Warrant Article J to the warrant with the following adjustment - "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$900,000 for the purpose of renovating the Lenny Smith Central Fire Station".

Selectman Maddox said we haven't gotten an answer yet but I believe that there is an exemption for the fact that the public isn't going to that second floor. I'm not willing to spend more than \$1 million for the renovation. I think the \$900,000 fixes a cornucopia here in the fall season of things that we need to fix on that station. We talked about building a new central fire station. The number came in well north of this. I think depending on what number you want to use and watch the Chief cringe, \$6 million for less than 20 percent of that we can possibly get another 20 years out of that station. The station is structurally sound. It's just tired. Anything that's 61 years old is probably tired. That's where the laughs come in folks. I'm 61. We need to do something. We cannot just keep trying to put band aids on this building. This is a rehab of almost the entire building - the electrical system, the roofing system, upgrading the doors to be able to get bigger vehicles into the left side building. We've already done the HVAC but the upstairs living space is where it's kind of built helter skelter to rework all of that to make the body level handicapped accessible. They're going to be putting the ramp on so that a handicapped person could get into the building on the first floor to conduct business if so needed. Put in a stairwell for egress from the second floor but not an elevator. I think all of these things put together I think that if the Chief held an open house and showed what this building looks like, people will understand that we have gotten our monies worth out of this building. It needs to have upgrades to its integral systems to keep that building operational. With these kinds of expenses, I'm hoping that we will see a 20 year extension to the life of that building. I know that you Mr. Chairman was concerned that this is just a band-aid but when you really look at what is proposed in this work, this building will be standing in probably a fire station in 20 years. Thank you Sir.

Chairman Coutu supported the motion enthusiastically only because if we don't put this on the budget, we're not going to get anything for the Lenny Smith. I'd rather tear it down and build a brand new one and forget the one on Lowell Road only because I think this is a priority and Lowell Road isn't. We have a fire station at the south end of town. Apparently I'm not going to get any support to do that. I will certainly support enthusiastically at the ballot spending the \$900,000. Less enthusiastic about the other fire station but we'll see where it goes.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Warrant Article L - Establishing a Hudson Community Television Revolving Fund. Chairman Coutu asked to please explain the purpose in wanting to make the change.

Mike O'Keefe stated the change I was going to propose - I brought this up last week when we discussed the budget. It's the same article that was put on the ballot last year. Last year the Board of Selectmen recommended it 5 to zero. It seemed like it got less than enthusiastic response last week. What I would propose is we change the wording of the warrant article to say that 80 percent of the franchise fee goes into a revolving fund leaving 20 percent to the general fund to do as whatever the town wants to do. I think we could still certainly operate our annual budget on the 80 percent versus the 100 percent. If you want numbers based on the current revenue estimates that we're putting in this FY16 budget of 355, that would drop to 284 and would give the town \$71,000. It would actually end up being more to the town because that's a conservative estimate. By the time the budget kicks in, they'll actually be more revenue. It will probably be closer to 80 or 85. So that would be my recommendation to the Board. I would ask for support for that.

Selectman Brucker did attend a media session at the New Hampshire Municipal Association conference last year. What I heard from many of the towns is that they do share the money with the Cable Committee. It seemed to vary anywhere from 1 percent which I think is...Mr. O'Keefe said it's a little less than 1. Selectman Brucker said if you get 5 percent. Mr. O'Keefe indicated we get 4 percent in Hudson. Selectman Brucker said when Comcast was giving them 5 percent of the fees, they were getting 1 percent or 2 percent of that. So this is about what that is. A little less.

Selectman Maddox was not going to vote to forward this to the warrant article. A couple of reasons. Number one I am trying to limit the amount of things on the ballot. Number two, the voters voted this down last year. Number three, until we have a better handle on how we're going to manage I guess is the word I want to use these funds, what we're saying here tonight is if you pay the franchise fee, we're all going to automatically going to skim 20 percent off of the town. Good or bad, I think this should be used for cable operations or telecommunications. So until we lock that down, I still think this is not ready for prime time. Thank you Sir.

Chairman Coutu thought that the users pay for a lot of things when they pay their fees to Comcast. The school system is all wired up to receive Comcast. The users are paying for that. We pay for a lot of municipal things. Hudson Community Television Chair feels that he can operate on an 80 percent budget and he would be willing

to allow the town to have the access of 20 percent. We would get 20 percent of the total. He would operate on the 80 percent because there seemed at least to me and to him I'm sure some sort of a desire by the majority of this Board to want to use some of that money to help offset some other expenses. I had shared with Mr. O'Keefe that I couldn't understand having - I can understand having a revolving fund but having the money accumulate if it were to accumulate at the rate that we had in 9 years, he'd have enough to build another building. We don't need for it to have that much money accumulating in there. I think that's a fair compromise. We're going to realize as he said it looks like it would be a minimum the first year of \$71,000 to offset some expenses. That's \$.03 on the tax rate. So I think it could be \$100,000. It could be \$.04 on the tax rate. I've heard from both sides of this table that I sit some desire to want to have some of the cable money used to help offset the budget. I appreciate what Mr. O'Keefe did. I'm going to support the motion. I think it's the right thing to do and I think the town and the taxpayers benefit. So be it a lot of them don't pay into the fees and they're going to benefit - don't pay the \$.04 premium. It's not that they don't have Comcast so we're talking 4 percent of the bill. For some of us, it's \$4 or \$5 but we all benefit as a community. We're going to share in this pool of money so I will be supporting the motion.

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

Warrant Article M - Investment Management Service Alternative. Chairman Coutu asked what is the purpose of this warrant article. I see a lot of pages, a lot of numbers. Steve Malizia said to net the expenses for the investments that the Trustees of the Trust Fund submit. I think that's the simplest way to put it. Right now we have to gross appropriate the expenses. This would allow that we make an investment and we would make a return of the investment. You can take the investment expenses out of the return.

Chairman Coutu asked so it's not going to be just that \$15,000. I thought it was going to be \$15,000. Now it's going to be whatever they guy bills us? Steve Malizia said we're not raising any money here. We're asking for permission from the governing town to be able to take the expense of the investment out of the actual return of the investment. That's all we're doing. Chairman Coutu asked how much is it going to be is it a percentage. Kathy Carpentier said \$75,000 is the estimate for this year because they'll be investing \$15 million with a hopeful return of over \$1 million. Chairman Coutu remarked it's going to cost us \$75,000. I thought we just appropriated \$15,000 to do this.

Len Lathrop indicated you have always for the last 10 years even prior when former Selectman Massey and Mr. Wozniak were Trustees. The Sewer Department has always paid out of their operational budget the amount of roughly - I want to say I don't have notes tonight. I didn't know this would be on the agenda - about \$45,000 out of their operational fees. The Water Department has X amount of money - what we're trying to do overall you won't see a drop in your budget this year. Should this pass the warrant in March, we'll be returning all those operational fees to you because the cost of the wealth management will be taken out of the investment return. In essence, it will cut back on the operation expense but it will also reduce the investment that we return to you proportionately except there's a much cleaner way of doing business. This has just passed under 297 is the new RSA that allowed us to do this and as part of the RSA, you have to have the voters approval and it can't be rescinded by the voters for five years.

Selectman Maddox asked for clarification on it. I know I asked about it says on the backup that you gave us that it doesn't say about that five years on the section 35 which is the town's. It is identical. As far as Len Lathrop can find out and I'm sorry I haven't really done research since the last time I visited you but the advisory that we got from the wealth management people said that it was for the five years and they talked with the Attorney General who controls charitable trusts on a regular basis. When I have a question I go to m wealth managers who we're already paying a lot to. When Steve got that from Buckley, Hodes, one of the guys that was prior to it really passing or becoming effective.

Selectman Brucker asked Selectman Maddox were asking about the five year stipulation. Selectman Maddox said yes on page two of your package. On the first page, Selectman Brucker noted it says "no vote by the town to rescind such authority shall occur within five years of the original adoption of this." Selectman Maddox said yes that's what is worded. I'm asking on the second page...Mr. Lathrop said KC and I wrote that first page. Their legal opinion that Steve got from Hodes is slightly different because the law is different for cities and towns. 297 has a separate section for cities and towns. On the city side, you have to report the cost of these investments on your MS10. Our town doesn't even file an MS9, we file a MS10. The paraphernalia that you got with it said that you have to take your expenses on an MS10. We don't even file one of those. So what they make cities do and what they make towns do are completely different. Selectman Maddox said but it says the city you cannot rescind it for five years yet it doesn't on the copy that we...Mr. Lathrop indicated I know. Selectman Maddox said before we put that to the warrant, we need to find that that is in fact true.

Len Lathrop said when we were here last time, I think Mr. Malizia alluded that when it goes to the attorney, he's sure that that would be vetted. That's why I didn't do anything. I was going to let the attorney vet it. Steve Malizia stated they've got all of our articles. That's the DRA.

Selectman Maddox indicated it may be nothing but again I don't want it to fail because we have the cities wording in there and not the towns. It just whether that one sentence is going to be on there.

Chairman Coutu questioned it by saying we're going to change the language. I'm going to vote on something I don't know whether or not the language is going to be changed. I can't vote for something the language might be changed. That doesn't make sense. That's like having a lawyer say sign the contract I might change the language. You change the language then I'll sign the contract.

To move things along, Selectman Maddox said you're right. We can wait until that gets answered.

Len Lathrop indicated you didn't take a vote. Is the vote to defer or is the vote to wait? We don't have an opinion. You didn't take a vote.

Chairman Coutu asked the opinion of the Board. Selectman Maddox indicated you wanted to wait so we said we'd wait. Chairman Coutu said I'm just one person. Nobody was saying anything. I'm trying to move things along.

Selectman Nadeau said I would forward it to the warrant knowing that our attorney...Chairman Coutu said then make a motion. Nobody was saying anything. Everybody is talking about we're changing the language and I don't see how you can vote on something that you're changing the language later on that could change the language but you want to make the motion to pass it along...Selectman Nadeau indicated you could change it a Town Meeting.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Nichols, to forward Warrant Article M to the warrant.

Chairman Coutu said it doesn't make sense to vote on something that you don't know the language of. Common sense.

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

Chairman Coutu said I'm not controlled by the puppet master.

Article N - Wage and Benefit Increases for Non-Union Full Time Library Employees. Kathy Carpentier stated the Library Trustees handed this out to you on their night they presented. The total cost - \$15,397.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to forward Warrant Article N to the warrant, carried 5-0.

Article O - Police and Fire Dispatch Console Replacements \$164,343.

Selectman Maddox had a couple of questions of the Police Chief. Chief the other night, and it was late and my hearing isn't what it used to be, but I believe you said that you had some coverage issues and you kind of tied that into this warrant article but that's not the case. It's really the tower is going to drive the coverage issues? Chief Lavoie said no. I was trying to separate the two that night. The coverage issues are completely separate from the infrastructure that deals with the initial calls going out or coming in to headquarters. Again, Selectman Maddox read that thing and it looks like there's 5 separate pieces. There's 5 separate consoles. Is that the case? As I understand it by the time we took that number down Mr. Chairman and did the discounts that we think we're going to get, it was about \$350,000 which is \$70,000 a unit. Humor the selectmen. If we replaced the two at the fire station for \$150,000, we would have two spare set ups for the Police Department. What I'm getting at Mr. Chairman we don't have to do this all at once or do we?

Chairman Coutu didn't know. Whatever the Fire Department wants. I guess we give them all new stuff and the hell with the Police Department. Whatever you want to do. Make a motion.

Selectman Maddox wanted to have more information. Do we have to spend \$350,000 all at once?

Chief Lavoie said I would certainly invite the Fire Chief to speak on in regards to his equipment. The concern here that we have is what we've talked about before in that the components are no longer being made. The availability of spare parts isn't out there. I would kind of use as an analogy where a couple of years ago the Board of Selectmen took a major infrastructure component and said we should put this out to a warrant article to the taxpayers. That was \$500,000 in road paving. It was a major thing. Little outside of the normal operations that the Board of Selectmen govern. That went out to the public to get a consensus from them as to whether or not they felt that that was an important piece of the community that they felt should be maintained and this is similar to that. We're concerned is if this breaks down if the public needs us, we're going to have difficulty getting the information out there.

Selectman Maddox asked to help me out. You have three consoles at the Police Department and the way I'm reading this, and again I read that handout that we received the other night Mr. Chairman that said there's five different ones. If one of your units goes down, then you still have two. Does the whole thing go down? I guess the Fire Chief knows.

Chief Buxton asked to step in for just one second. The consoles need to function as a unit. Currently today the Police Department if they needed to evacuate their facility could come down and do fire dispatch and control their radio equipment. With the new consoles, they don't communicate on the same way. They don't have that ability to bridge over to control their equipment. They would be on an upgraded core which is a brain or the need we talked about during combined dispatch meetings and the other dispatch center would be on a different platform and they wouldn't talk appropriately. We would have controlling issues for me to provide him backup and for him to provide us backup.

Selectman Maddox's question is do we have to replace it all or nothing. Chief Buxton said we have an issue where we're looking at updating our technology. Selectman Maddox indicated that's what I was looking for Mr. Chairman. I was hoping that we were able to put two somewhere. I don't care where they go and have our own spare parts bank. If you're telling me that it's all or nothing but it would be all or nothing by site or you're saying even if we put new ones at your station, we'd still have problems...Chief Buxton said we'd have problems controlling his equipment.

Chairman Coutu commented the cost isn't \$450,000. That's not what we should be moving to the warrant article, right because we're going to get discounts?

Again, Selectman Maddox said there's a whole bunch of questions Mr. Chairman that I just didn't have answers to. So again the Police Chief time to give us what we need.

Selectman Brucker asked what would be the figure that we would move \$300 something. Chairman Coutu didn't know what the discount is exactly. Can we get that number? Selectman Brucker asked do we have to use this figure.

Chief Buxton believed if you talked to Motorola, they're going to tell you that that's the budgetary number they suggest you use. Because you're forecasting out 18 months. They can talk about the discounts and they can talk about the rebates but from conversations that the Chief and I had, and correct me if I'm wrong, there was no guarantee that those would be there at that point in time.

Chairman Coutu said that puts a whole new complexity on this thing.

Chief Lavoie indicated there are two discounts. One was the South Westin something. Steve Malizia noted State's Alliance something purchasing. Chief Lavoie believed that figure was in one of the pieces of paper that we had sent...Chief Buxton said roughly a \$56,000 discount. So it brought it down to \$350,000. Chief Lavoie said Motorola puts out secondary discounts at various times and that can be a range.

Chairman Coutu didn't understand that we're talking about a half a million dollar piece of equipment and we can't get anybody to come in with a number. I'm not talking about you. I'm talking about the company. If you want to sell us a half a million, they say hey that's what you should put in the budget because I can't guarantee the discounts. Well you'll put something in writing before we make a decision. The voters need to know what they're going to spend. If we're going to ask them to raise an appropriate \$464,000 and they say yes and we only need \$225,000, they're paying for it that following year because we appropriated the 464. It's not fair to the voters. If Motorola can't provide us with solid information, my question is should we be doing business with Motorola? They're not a fly by night company. They're the largest communications company and manufacturer in this country. They should have answers. They should know. Their sales people should know. I know you can't forecast out but they're already making these things.

Chief Buxton thought you're voicing our frustration for the last week and a half.

Chairman Coutu asked how do you explain this to the Budget Committee. How do you explain this to the voters especially the Budget Committee? Well we're asking for 464 but we might not need it. Why are you asking for it? Because we don't know what we need because Motorola won't tell use the actual number. Why don't they stop playing games? Did they mail you any coupons that we can cash in if we buy these things? You know you buy two you get \$20 off. We get 5, we get \$1,000 off. What kind of a company operates this way? Chief Buxton didn't have that answer. Chairman Coutu asked is there anybody else we can do business with. They're the only ones in the world that make equipment for our radios? Chief Lavoie said there are other companies Mr. Chairman however to switch over to that would be even more costly because now we have to replace radios, etc.

Selectman Maddox thought all the new radios we bought were section 25 or there's something that supposedly...Chief Buxton indicate B25. Selectman Maddox said that says that the radios have to be able to talk

to each other. So we could look at other vendors Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure if that's the way the bus we want to get on but I do believe there is now the availability because that is an issue. I mean if you only have one vendor across the country - I think Uniden and there's a couple of others. Yes there are other vendors Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Coutu stated right now worse case scenario I don't care whether its police or fire dispatch center, one of the consoles malfunctions and this company comes in. We have a service contract right? They come in and they say we can't buy anything for that. That part is not available and we can't get it. Of course they may have a million parts. We have no way of knowing. We have to trust that they're telling is the truth. Yeah sure they're salesmen. We lose a radio. What we're in serious trouble? We're one down and it leaves us with how many functional do we have left after that one is down? Chief Buxton said we each have a backup. Chief Lavoie believed Springfield, MA, was down for 3 months when they had a failure.

Chairman Coutu said you operate on 24 hours on two. How many consoles do you have right now? Chief Lavoie said three. Chairman Coutu asked how many do you operate on? Chief Lavoie said sometimes three. Chairman Coutu asked do you have a backup. Chief Lavoie said no. Chairman Coutu commented you just have those three. You have how many consoles? Chief Buxton said two. Chairman Coutu asked do you have a backup. Chief Buxton said yes. We have one dispatcher on 24 hours a day. They have two dispatchers on. Chairman Coutu noted you have two consoles. You have a backup console. Chief Buxton said that is the backup - yes we have two full consoles in fire dispatch.

Chairman Coutu said you don't have a backup except that you only use one so the other one is the backup. All four of the other consoles are all the same. So we have one with spare parts. If we were to use it as spare parts, you would lose your backup but we'd still be functional and operational. I have a difficult time - I was under the impression that we were going to get these discounts. I have a difficult time supporting a half a million warrant article although I understand where you're coming from Chief. On things of this magnitude, I think that the voters need to make the decision. They made the decision on hot topping though most of the people told me I thought it was only one year but it passed. It's in the budget and they're paying for that every year from here to infinity unless one of us takes the money out. Kevin is doing a good job paving the roads. This is significant. I think it's significant the impacts operations both fire and police. It gets us in a direction that you and I Selectman Maddox at least because we were delegated to do it and not just like the other three Selectmen, we were to report to them no action has taken place so the other three Selectmen are in the same position we are. We don't know where we're going. We're trying to get in the direction of combined dispatch and this gets us there and I think that the voters need to make the decision. What scares me is that I thought we were going to have some discount numbers so that we could say the cost is going to be \$312,232 not \$464,000 or maybe it was going to be just \$200,000.

Selectman Maddox had a couple of things. First I think my drive is more your tower. I think that's going to do more to protect our offices today then whether we gamble right or wrong on these consoles. I would hope that we would get a budget not a default budget so we would have hopefully some money to be able to get a tower up at your station sooner rather than later to fix the coverage issues. Second - I'm scanning here because I thought we had a capital reserve fund so KC jump in please for communications. Kathy Carpentier said we do - \$10,000 and \$10,000 is being added. Selectman Maddox told the Chairman we have a capital reserve fund. I would rather the warrant article say to put \$200,000 into that warrant to that capital reserve fund as the Board of Selectmen are the agents to expend. Kathy Carpentier said yes. Selectman Maddox noted that way there we have money if and when we get to where we need to be but we're not committing to spend \$450,000. This gives us some cash that we can quickly make a decision if something does go down but doesn't commit us today to buying equipment that I'm not sure what we're buying.

For clarification Selectman Maddox, Kathy Carpentier said there's \$10,000 as of last June. We're adding 10 in FY15 and you've budgeted to add another 10, so there would be \$30,000 at the end of this budget. Selectman Maddox said in another 27 years we'd be able to buy this thing. I'm saying that we need to fix the problem but I'm just not ready to commit \$450,000 to a project we don't know what it entails Sir.

Chairman Coutu indicated if our budget says that the 2016 budget appropriation is for \$10,000. You want to make it \$200,000? Selectman Maddox said no. I want to leave it just like it is. I want to put a warrant article on there that the Chief can sell to appropriate \$200,000 into that existing...Steve Malizia clarified into the existing fund. He wants to give the voters a say on that. Chairman Coutu said if it passes, there would be \$210,000. Going in there's already 20 in. We're going to put 10 in the 2016 budget and if we add a new warrant article, it would be 200. So it would be 210 going in in 2016, add it to the 20, gives us 230. I think that's a sensible approach. I can support that and we're making a commitment to - we know one thing. If something happens and we're in a disaster we call Motorola and say look get your discounts because we've got \$230,000. Figure it out. I'm sure they'll find five consoles for \$230,000. The coupons will start flying.

Steve Malizia was going to say I believe in warrant articles you can always put more in if you need to. You can't take it out and move it to somewhere else but if some reason...

Selectman Maddox thought this is committing that we need to do this. This is a big jump towards that. We don't have all the facts and figures to be able to give the Budget Committee, the citizens a dollar value on what it's going to cover. I'm saying that this addresses the Chief's concern as best we can with what we have to work with. Chairman Coutu stated why don't we just put it in the budget and put it in...Mr. Malizia said because if your budget fails, then you get nowhere. At least if this article stands alone, it doesn't...Chairman Coutu indicated you said we're committed. If you're committed...Selectman Maddox indicated we're committed or we are committable.

Selectman Brucker said it's the second time tonight I was thinking exactly the same thing as Selectman Maddox. The only thing is I was thinking \$300,000 as opposed to \$200,000 because I think it would get us closer. You're going to have half the money.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to put \$200,000 into the communications infrastructure capital reserve fund.

Kathy Carpentier indicated this would be with the 200 and the 30; it would be half of the 464 that was originally asked. I'm just mentioning that she wanted half.

Selectman Maddox stated this is a step Mr. Chairman. Again I can't just say give you \$450,000, I'll tell you what you're buying later. I know enough members of the Budget Committee to know where that's going.

Chairman Coutu wasn't faulting the Fire Chief, or the Police Chief, or this. This is the company. They're very slow in responding. It's not their fault. They're trying to get...Selectman Maddox said if you have the money in the bank, there's going to be a lot more coupons coming. Chairman Coutu agreed. That's what I say. Put a little something there and dangle the carrot and see what they say. I agree. I think we're going in the right direction. It shows a commitment and it's important to our infrastructure.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Just for clarification, Kathy Carpentier asked you are forwarding a warrant article that would put \$200,000 into the communications infrastructure capital reserve and not forwarding the one that was presented.

Chairman Coutu asked we don't need to make a motion because that was just a piece of paper presented to us. There was no action ever taken on forwarding it or should we vote...Mr. Malizia indicated you just forwarded an alternative to that.

Kathy Carpentier asked if you are done, the final motion that the Board needs to make...if you're done, somebody needs to make a motion to forward the general operating budget.

Motion by Selectman Nichols, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to forward the General Fund Operating Budget in the amount of \$24,411,456, the Sewer Fund Operating Budget in the amount of \$1,581,206, and the Water Fund Operating Budget in the amount of \$3,647,180 to the warrant.

Briefly, Chairman Coutu thought we did a good job. Thank you.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Coutu thanked the Town Administrator, the Finance Director, and all of the department heads for their work this year. Now it's onto the Budget Committee. Good luck Selectman Nichols.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 11:11 p.m. by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, carried 5-0.

Recorded by HCTV and transcribed by Donna Graham, Recorder.

HUDSON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Roger E. Coutu, Chairman

Benjamin J. Nadeau, Selectman

Richard J. Maddox, Selectman

Nancy Brucker, Selectman

Pat Nichols, Selectman