

HUDSON, NH BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Minutes of the June 26, 2012 Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - by Chairman Coutu the meeting of June 26, 2012 at 7:48 p.m. in the BOS Meeting Room at Town Hall.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - led by Selectman Nadeau.
3. ATTENDANCE
Board of Selectmen: Roger Coutu, Rick Maddox, Ben Nadeau, Ted Luszey, Nancy Brucker
Staff/Others: Steve Malizia, Town Administrator; Donna Graham, Executive Assistant; Chief Jason Lavoie; Deputy Chief Rob Buxton; Jana McMillan, Animal Control Officer; Kathy Carpentier, Finance Director; Bill Oleksak, Building Inspector; Mike O'Keefe
4. PUBLIC INPUT - NONE
5. NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS
6. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairman Coutu asked if any Board member wish to remove any item for separate consideration.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to approve consent items A, B, C, D and E, as noted or appropriate, carried 5-0.

- A. Assessing Items
 - B. Water/Sewer Items
 - 1) Water Abatement - W-UTL-12-09, w/recommendation to approve
 - C. Licenses & Permits
 - 1) Raffle Permit - Hudson Fish and Game Club, Inc.
 - 2) Petition & License for 1 New Pole on Flagstone Drive
 - D. Acceptance of Minutes
 - 1) Minutes of the June 5, 2012 meeting
 - E. Calendar

06/27	7:00	Planning Board - Buxton CD Meeting Room
06/27	7:00	Benson Park - Landscape Cte - BOS Meeting Room
06/28	7:30	Zoning Board of Adjustment - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/04		4 th of July - TOWN HALL CLOSED
07/05	6:30	Recreation Cte - BOS Meeting Room
07/05	7:00	Benson Park Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/09	7:00	Conservation Commission - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/10	7:00	Board of Selectmen - BOS Meeting Room
07/11	7:00	Planning Board - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/11	7:00	Benson Park - Landscape Cte - BOS Meeting Room
07/12	5:00	Sewer Utility Committee - BOS Meeting Room
07/12	7:30	Zoning Board of Adjustment - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/16	7:00	Energy Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/17	7:00	Cable Utility Cte - BOS Meeting Room
07/18	5:00	Water Utility Cte - BOS Meeting Room
07/18	7:00	Council on Aging - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/19	7:00	Benson Park Cte - BOS Meeting Room
07/19	7:00	Budget Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
07/23	7:00	Recycling Cte - BOS Meeting Room
7. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. Votes taken after Nonpublic Session on June 12, 2012

- 1) *Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to hire Ryann McQuaid as a "Regular Special Shift Employee" HCTV Camera Operator at a rate of \$11.00 per hour, carried 5-0.*
- 2) *Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to authorize Town Attorney Lefevre to disclose any confidential records, including attorney client records, as may be deemed necessary to the New Hampshire Retirement System related to former Assistant Town Administrator Mark Pearson's employment with the Town, carried 4-1. Selectman Nadeau in opposition.*
- 3) *Motion to adjourn at 11:25 p.m. by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, carried 5-0.*

8. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Acceptance of a \$500 donation from Nancy Boyko for training our K-9

Chairman Coutu recognized Chief Jason Lavoie.

Chief Lavoie indicated that recently the Police Department conducted another police academy. One of the participants in that class was Nancy Boyko. During the course of that class, she was impressed with the dog/K-9 presentation that was done by Officer Connor. She felt that she would really appreciate it if the Town would accept her \$500 donation to be put towards continued training with this dog.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to accept the \$500 donation from Nancy Boyko for training our K-9 to put into the donation account with the Board's thanks and appreciation, carried 5-0.

- B. Request a public hearing to amend Town Code, Chapter 205-9 Animal control fees

Chairman Coutu recognized Chief Jason Lavoie and Animal Control Officer Jana McMillan.

Officer McMillan stated that it was determined that one of the fees that's listed in the Code book was incorrect. There's 2 or 3 listings of a fee. They don't coincide with the State law. It's not a fee that we're upping or changing ourselves at the Police Department; it's a fee that just needs to be appropriate with the State law.

Chairman Coutu said that's why in the Code as it exists you want to strike 3, 4, and 5. Ms. McMillan said yes. Chairman Coutu stated that they will be the new 3 and 4.

Chief Lavoie was wondering if the Board would prefer us to word it in the Town Code that current State RSAs will govern the fees for those issues. That way there, we're not constantly coming back to the Board asking for these updates. Selectman Maddox was going to suggest that as it made more sense. Chairman Coutu had no objection to that as long as we're addressing existing RSAs to cover our basis. For the public hearing you would add what and where? Selectman Maddox said it was on the top line. It says, "Animal control fees are set as follows and in accordance with RSA 466". Mr. Malizia said you wouldn't have "as follows" because you wouldn't be articulating any fee. Selectman Luszey said it would stop there. So if a person wanted to see the fees, they'd have to...Selectman Maddox stated "animal control fees will be set in accordance with RSA 466-A". Ms. McMillan said that would only cover the licensing which are the ones that we're discussing tonight. The ones that we just changed a couple of months ago - nuisance, menace, and vicious - those are also set by the State and we had to go through the whole process for that just because the State changed those fees. We didn't change those fees. We were just discussing this today. I haven't had a chance to make something formal. Would I be able to have time to do that and present that?

Mr. Malizia said we have to get it in for the 10th not for a public hearing on the 10th because it has to go in the paper this week. You can come back at the 10th and propose that we can do it at a future meeting from there. To get it in for the 10th, no you cannot. You do not have time because we have to advertise for a hearing. You can come back on the 10th with new language and we could put it for a subsequent meeting in July if you'd like.

Selectman Luszey thought the intent is anything that's governed by a State RSA we should (inaudible) otherwise we have to accept and change the book ever time. Because this was advertised Chairman Coutu asked we can't change anything. Mr. Malizia said we were planning on advertising it this Friday, which means we have to get it in tomorrow morning first thing to get it into the paper. They do not publish after that. So we have to get it in next week for the July 10th hearing. Unless you can write it tonight and get it to Linda tomorrow.

Selectman Maddox said there was no time constraints. If they came back in the second meeting in July and had this reworded to make it work, what's the difference? We don't have to advertise it. It's not critical. Ultimately, Mr. Malizia said you have to advertise a public hearing if you're going to change the fees. What you're saying is you could bring it back at the 10th and have it ready for that meeting. Ms. McMillan said she could try to have something tonight. Mr. Malizia's concern is they wouldn't be able to read it. I think they'd prefer to read what you're changing before they just blanket agree. So if you came back the 10th? Chairman Coutu asked if they could discuss it before the public hearing, have the public hearing because we're amending the fees that would be the second public hearing on the fees. Right now we're going to decide the fees. Right?

Selectman Luszey didn't think they were changing the fees. The State RSA is changing the fees. What we're discussing is taking all of that language out so our 205-9 would just read, "in accordance with RSA 466". Mr. Malizia said this is Town Code fees or licensing. It requires a public hearing. In order to do that, you need to advertise for the public hearing. So if they want to come back on the 10th with the amended language, you can get it approved sending that to a public hearing on the 26th. Selectman Maddox said it was not time sensitive. Selectman Luszey said they weren't changing any fees. Mr. Malizia said there may be other sections you also want to write the same thing on so that way the board sees it all. They know what it is. It will be sent to a public hearing and that's that.

Ms. McMillan thanked the Board and apologized for the confusion.

C. Request to Hire a Building Inspector

Chairman Coutu recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia and Building Inspector William Oleksak.

Mr. Malizia indicated that Mr. Oleksak is here to request the permission to hire a Building Inspector. As you've seen in the correspondence, our Part Time Building Inspector is leaving our employ for full time employment in a community nearby. I believe Mr. Oleksak is here to make a pitch for a Full Time Building Inspector for replacement. Not only does the person serve as a building inspector, they serve as a Code Enforcement Officer so they do both those functions. There's some statistics and some information in this package that Mr. Oleksak will be here to answer any questions. I believe he believes now is the time to make the appropriate hire. We'll be down to a contract person to do electrical inspections and Mr. Oleksak himself will have to be picked up whatever other inspections are going on if we don't do something with this position.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, Mr. Oleksak is here tonight to request that we advertise for a Full Time Building Inspector with electrical background. As I've told you in the past, one of our other inspectors is getting close to retirement. The Town will need somebody with a strong electrical background to fill that void. Similar to the gentleman that we had.

Mr. Malizia said they also took a look at communities in the State and not just in this area. At the very back end of this packet, you will see some statistics that indicate what basically other communities have for employee. The industry norm, our business that we're a municipal government, they have generally speaking a full time inspector for communities that are pretty much above \$5,000 people. You'll see this list is populated with full time building inspector. There are communities that have part time building inspectors that tend to be on the smaller side. I found one community on this list that had a contract building inspector. I found several communities fairly small that have no building inspector. They tend to be up north and they tend to be Sugar Hill, Stark, Sharon - places I don't even know where they are. From our business perspective, it seems that the industry norm is to have a full time building inspector/code enforcement officer. You'll also see that over here. I took the time to call Municipal Resources. Municipal Resources is a firm that provides temporary labor, helps with search firms - they helped out with our Police Chief search. I had an opportunity to speak to Don Jutton who runs Municipal Resources. I said Don we're looking at the situation here, what do you advise? What do you know? His basic answer is you're too big to be small. You're a good size community. We could put somebody there for the interim if you wanted us, somebody in there for a month but we would not put somebody in your community for any longer than a month or two to help you out or if you had a special project. We are too big for that. We will charge you \$56 an hour and that's also to travel here to put somebody in this community. I just did some quick math. If that was 20 hours a week, that's \$58,000; if it's 40 hours a week, that's \$116,000. So it's pricey.

When Selectman Luszey ran through this, that's exactly what I don't see here is the needs analysis. I don't know if we actually have a work load that would dictate the requirement for a full time. That may seem pricey but if only use that person say 20 hours a month, then that's a bargain. Where I'm at with this right now, I'm not ready to support advertising for a full time. We had a part time and we want to go to a full time. What I would like to see is the need analysis with 2 or 3 different alternative approaches other than hiring an employee and see what those costs would look like to help us to make a real informed decision on whether or not this is the right way to go.

Mr. Oleksak said the Town spent a lot of money in training the past person on several different disciplines. When you get a contract person, when that person comes into town, we're going to give him a list and he's going to I guess take a map and go about his business. He's not there to answer any questions, take any phone calls, he's just there to do inspections. That is not a way to conduct business in this town. When somebody calls, they want to talk to somebody especially the person doing the inspections. You're going to have different people giving different information. You want some continuity by having a person here to answer the phones, to answer the questions. It's not just going out and doing an inspection. There are other parts of this business that are done inside. As I said phone calls, there's training - we don't know what we're getting when we ask for a person. I don't know anybody that's come out of MRI with any electrical background.

Mr. Malizia did try to explore some alternatives with Mr. Jutton because I've known him for a while. I can level with him and he can level with me. I said who's your competitor? Who else would I turn to if I didn't turn to say MRI? He said I suppose you can go out and try and hire a contractor on own your which would probably be a retired building inspector from some community, maybe even like we have with the current gentleman that's part time. So you may be looking at that option. You could try and do something with Nashua. Maybe you could get them to send their guys over here and pay them. That's an option. I'm not thinking that they're going to be loyal to us first. I'm assuming they have a work order.

That's Selectman Luszey's point. That's part of the analysis. I don't know what the data would show because we haven't done it. We're asking them to go from a part time to a full time without any backup data or analysis to really support that. Mr. Malizia can tell the Board through the history of this position that it was always a full time position until the last few years when the Board made a conscious decision with the last hire to hire a part time person because the Board felt at the time that the economic slowdown deserved to have a part time person. That's quite simple and that's what they did. That's why they did it. Mr. Oleksak has come in saying based on his, I'm assuming he's saying based on his understanding of the job, also looking into the future, to also realize that maybe Mr. Oleksak is nearing retirement age and maybe some other folks are too that in his opinion needs to start getting somebody trained up. Good, bad or indifferent, you have some continuity of somebody to pass the torch to. I think that's what you're also trying to say if I'm not mistaken. Mr. Oleksak said exactly.

As having been the liaison to this department for a number of years, Selectman Maddox thought that they needed to do some sort of needs analysis but I think we need to hire somebody part time, get somebody in here to fill in the position that's now open. I'm not prepared to make it full time. It's a \$40,000 increase going from 32 hours to 40. I think the midpoint Mr. Chairman is at least getting back to where we were. If you look at the numbers, the building permits are down. The revenue is up but we raised the fees so I guess that's kind of a wash. I don't want to leave the department shorthanded with no one. So I think that the part time person is the compromise. I just can't see us jumping on the full time person at this point.

Here's where Selectman Nadeau has a big problem. Continuity is definitely something that we need in Hudson. You have one person go out and inspect everything on this day, and then 3 days later we fixed your problems, and now you're going to ask for somebody to come out and inspect and you get a different person. I've seen that first hand to be a problem. I think we need a person in this position that can take the torch when the other people in the department retire, move on, do what they're going to do. We have to come to a conclusion that if we're not going to fill these other 2 positions when they leave, then we get the right person in once, train them, and know up front that we're going to keep this person. If we're going to go with a part time person and we up the hours to 35 knowing that they have a great electrical background and they have a great building background, and we know that in 6 to 12 months we're going to hire them as our new full time inspector, I guess I can go for that. We know that we're going to have part time work that is going to turn into one full time position. If we decide to go with one full time position and no part timers, we have to make sure we have the right person in position so that when that takes place we have something to fall back on. If our part time person left tomorrow, there's the guy doing it all. Can he do it all? Probably not. Can you do it for 3 weeks? Probably can. It's going to be a very rough 3 weeks. We need to decide where we're going to go as a Board and if we know that we're going to hire this person full time in 6 months to a year, we need to make that pretty clear. If we're going to hire the person part time, then we need to make that pretty clear. I think we need to decide where we're going as a Board. I think in the long run we're going to need a full time person in that department even if it's only one full time person that does building and electrical. I guess if we're going to post the position I'd hope that we post it with a building and electrical background.

Selectman Luszey thought Selectman Nadeau kind of wrapped it up very nicely for me. That is we don't have a strategy. We don't have a plan and yet we're ready or asking the taxpayers to go fund a full time person when we don't have a strategy on what it is we want. All I'm asking for is that we slow it down a little bit and we do the needs analysis to figure out what exactly it is that we want to put there and for how long. Is it a part time person? Is it a full time person? Is it an electro mechanical person? Is it an electrician? All of that. What is the succession planning and when is that going to occur? Is it 3 years out? Is it 5 years out? Is it next year? Is it 6 weeks out? We need to have all of that data in front of us before we can, I think, make a fully informed decision on this request.

Chairman Coutu is going to talk about it from his perspective anyway. I think all of you have heard me in the past express my reluctance to want to go along with bringing in a full time position. I've taken the opportunity to evaluate all of the information that was provided us in this packet as well as to think very carefully about my years of experience on this Board, which are not many. Certainly not as many as Selectman Maddox and Selectman Nadeau but certainly enough to have had an opportunity to understand the effectiveness of most of the people that we have working, especially those within this building and the demands of their jobs as they are defined by this Board to each of the individuals.

Chairman Coutu has a little bit of concern about having to wait to do a complete analysis of the need of the position in light of the expertise from those of us who have served to understand the needs of each of the departments. I would dare say that such an analysis would be very time consuming and just would put that much more pressure on the Building Inspector. In light of my having read all of this and assessed our community size, and its potential for growth, and what is going on now in the field and realizing full well that I suspect that Mr. Oleksak and I'm certainly not going to put him on the spot anymore than I've asked him that I've asked him not to put other people on the spot. I would expect that considering his years of service that he would conceivably leave within the next 5 years, maybe less than 5, but certainly within the next 5. I certainly can appreciate the fact that the part time person that we have now will be soon to leave. I'd hate to find us in a situation where we have 1 or 2 experiences people no longer with us and we're caught with our pants down. Not figuratively speaking but certainly in that situation. I will support the hiring for a full time position for those reasons and others.

Chairman Coutu said that those other reasons are that we have many vacant buildings in this town in the industrial parks. I can see some interest being generated in maybe not the immediate future but certainly in the near future for industries that want to relocate and they're looking for a better bargain. They're looking to put their businesses in an area that is more highway accessible. There's going to be a demand for retrofitting, permits, and inspections on those buildings. I think that in light of one of the things that's going on right now that's being constructed in our town, the success of that and the conversation you and I had Selectman Maddox about the other project that took place in the south end of town and how successful that went in talking about housing. I would think that may generate even more interest to want to come into Hudson and try to find some tracks of land and continue construction. I think the demands are going to be greater. Most significant is the fact that if we don't hire somebody now full time and getting that person in and acclimated, that acclimation is going to take at least 6 months. I can't see it being any less than that. Understanding our Codes, understanding the community, understanding what is expected from them as far as we're concerned and in terms of what we expect from people that work in our Community Development to understand our community, to be able to - we may not be able to hire a certified or licensed electrician or a certified or a licensed plumber, but we may be able to find somebody who has that diversity to be able to do building inspections.

(Chairman Coutu) We may be able to take a building inspector from another community with experience and bring them in here. It depends on what the pool of applicants are. I'm not saying we're going to jump at the first guy that would apply for the job. I think we have to vet them out very, very carefully. To me, this is a very critical position. I think that now is the time, and I think it's the proper time to do it and I think that the demands are going to be greater, and I hate to see us as Selectman Nadeau stated we're going to have somebody in here or we're not going to have somebody in here, and people are getting different information from different people because they don't have one - the only resource that they have is Mr. Oleksak. Mr. Oleksak wears a lot of hats. He's our health inspector. He could get called out and the State may ask him to join him. He can't predict what's going to happen. He's also the Code Enforcement Officer. He manages a clerical person and has to make sure that the communication gets out, and he has to vet all of that, sign it, and approve it, and then he has to be available to us when we need him, and he has to go himself to make sure that he's on top of whatever State and federal changes there are in those codes, he has to be well versed in them. With all of that in mind, I will support this evening if a motion is made to hire a full time position to augment that department properly at this time. Chairman Coutu saw the need and for him the key is to vet and make sure we get the right person. This isn't just some political appointment. I certainly don't have that feeling.

Selectman Brucker's thinking is that now is a good time to hire a full time person. Thinking about how buildings and new construction is picking up. If we want to get someone, I think we have a better pool of people to select from now before any kind of new development gets going or some other for contracts uses these electricians or these qualified people before someone else privately might chose them rather than a public position.

Chairman Coutu said a couple of things that sticks out for Selectman Luszey. One is you made an argument of the necessity and the urgency of this position yet you also then followed up with...I'm not sure if we can get an electrical inspector, maybe a mechanical inspector based on the pool. That in itself tells me we don't know what it is we want. Is it a building inspector? Is it an electrical inspector? Plus the building really hasn't increased. We've got a lot of vacant buildings and we're hoping and wishing that business really does pick up but I don't see that right now. From the builders I talk to and the information I read in local papers indicate that we're going to see a mass flee into Hudson. As a matter of fact, we're seeing the opposite. We're seeing businesses exit Hudson to other places. I'm

hard pressed to support a full time. I am willing to support a part time but not a full time right now. We could use the opportunity of a part time to actually groom and mentor that person into the role that we need when we figure it out. Right now, we don't know what it is we need. That's what I'm hearing right now.

Chairman Coutu certainly didn't want to give Selectman Luszey that opinion. Mr. Oleksak if you will, would you elaborate please. When I was talking about license, I was talking about we may not be able to find a licensed electrician because the last person we had who just left, he was a licensed electrician and we don't need to have a Master Electrician or a Master Plumber to do this job correct? Mr. Oleksak said no. What I would be looking for is a combination building/electrical inspector. The other facets of it, the plumbing is easier to pick up than electrical. Even if we got a journeyman electrician who would have enough knowledge to come on board, therefore be a good candidate to come in. So it's a combination person. Plus that person also will be doing code enforcement with me, Deputy Health Officer - somebody has to know that which is what we did with the previous person and Deputy, and also aspects of septic systems, asbestos which we still have a lot of problems with in town. All those little things all add up into a full person.

Based on you experience at the present time, Chairman Coutu was going to make a statement then you can correct me and you can add to it if you want. I noticed that the previous person as he was riding around the community found an awful lot of things that were done illegally. People didn't apply for licenses. The most outstanding one would have been generators for example. Also I'm noticing, and I could be wrong, but based on what I'm seeing in the community, there's an awful lot of rehabbing going on within a lot of homes. It doesn't mean they're all applying for permits but I know that other communities when they're out riding around they see that and they go look and see if there's construction permits. We don't have somebody doing that right now. I see a lot of that rehabbing going on. What do you see as a wrinkle there?

Mr. Oleksak said that is a function that he and I both did and that only comes with experience going around town. As you see a building (inaudible) nothing records with you. As you pass it several times in the course of your travels around town, you start to make notes. Maybe you take a picture and you come back and you go on line. There's no permit here. There's a new deck. There's something going on in the back. There's a new shed. Those are the things that we were now getting comfortable with that person. As you said about the generators, there were a lot of generators found to be installed with no permits. A lot of generators that were installed not to code. I think we had, if the Fire Department can correct me if they're still here, there was 2 fires this year because of illegal generator installations. Those are some of the little things. We had a program going and a list of generators and we were working with the public to try to get them on line and have everything done correctly. That is suspended as of this moment because there's nobody to do that. That is Mr. Chair an accurate observation of what is done on a daily basis.

Selectman Maddox said if you just look at the numbers. They're not going up dramatically from 2009 to 2010 to 2011. I don't know if you have the latest 2012. It's not in our packet. I think 32 hours gets us somebody to take where we are now and then when we get to budget season we insert a full time because that's doubling the salary from \$39,000 to \$79,000. I guess I'm just sitting here saying if the work order is what it has been all along for the last 3 years and we survived with a part time person with 32 hours, it just isn't there Mr. Chairman to spent \$40,000 more. The generator thing was a snow storm/ice storm drive event. That's going to probably drop off. If we have a full time person and we stay at the 850 inspections. We just spent \$40,000 more than we needed to.

Chairman Coutu wanted to make a correction. I don't like things to be misrepresented and I know you Selectman Maddox, you did not intentionally misrepresent anything. The salary is not doubling from \$39,000 to \$79,000. The salary is going from \$36,000 to \$46,000 because we would be going from a part time position to a full time position; there are additional costs such as taxes, pension, and health insurance plans. Yes the increase would be by \$40,000 but not the salary. I now you didn't mean that but I don't want people to interpret that saying they're giving 8 more hours and they're going to give him \$40,000 more? That's not the case. I appreciate what you're saying Selectman Maddox.

Selectman Nadeau asked if we had a range for this person. Can we advertise it at the low end? Mr. Malizia said they are. This is in the union. We are at the low end. That is the range. That is the low salary range multiplied by the hours. So that is it. We do that. In that particular contract, we go at the low end. That is the low end salary.

Selectman Brucker asked Mr. Oleksak if he's noticed a pick up in the number of building inspections you've had to do would you say. Mr. Oleksak said they have a project on Belknap Road that is starting to pick up. There's 3 homes under construction. There's also 2 more foundations put in which hasn't even been advertised to the public and the developer is getting many calls on that site already. He's already anticipating going to a second phase on his road system come late summer and also another project. There is that potential out there and I don't know. I don't have a Ouija board so I can't tell you. I don't know and I can't predict. Being here 25 years, I've seen a lot of things happen. I'm not trying to slow the Board. I kind of have a feeling that the Board feels I'm asking for something that is not

practical. I'm asking to have somebody in here so that I can train that person and hopefully the person is going to be able to step into my shoes and carry the program forward. The only way to do that is to be with that person and train them and get them all the little idiosyncrasies of this business, of the town. If you take somebody off the street, you have to train them to be an inspector. He's not the same person as the guy that went from wiring or hammering. He looks at it from a different perspective. He has to look at it from the code perspective differently.

Just one more thing. If Chairman Coutu's math is correct, and I just went over it twice, I come up with \$45,032 and not \$46,030. I just went by what you said. You said it's the hourly wage at the lowest level, step 1, multiplied by 40 hours, multiplied by 52 weeks. I come up with a \$1,000 less.

To Mr. Oleksak, Selectman Luszey said some of the language you use - what happens if you hire this person full time, you put all this money in training and you decide that he's not the right person to fill your shoes? Mr. Oleksak said it was a gamble. Hopefully the process that we did as the last time and found the person that we thought was going to be able to fill in and had made great progress learning the business of inspectional services, code enforcement, health issues is going the same way. I would hope that we would do the same thing with the next person through the interview process as we did with this past one.

Selectman Luszey asked if Mr. Oleksak would mitigate some of the risks by taking on the person part time to get a good feel before you brought him into a full time position. Mr. Oleksak said that's like changing your shoes every 3 weeks. You're going to be changing your socks, shoes or whatever. You want to hire somebody like we do with other people.

Selectman Nadeau wanted to try this. How about if we advertise it as part time to full time? Selectman Luszey said that's what they've been suggesting. Selectman Nadeau said if it's the right person and everything lines up, then we go full time. Selectman Luszey said they'd do that at budget. We'd make that argument to the Budget Committee. Chairman Coutu indicated that the position is approved. Selectman Nadeau was trying to go is if he's going to approve hiring this person tonight or posting this position tonight, can we put part time to possible full time to see what we can attract instead of saying this is a part time position. You might only attract this caliber of people. If you put in part time to full time and you put in that you're looking for building, electrical, plumbing and throw the hook out there and see what you get. Selectman Luszey stated he was okay with that as long as you articulate the skill set and knowledge that we're looking for and that's what you vet out. What I've heard a lot here tonight is if, if, if.

Chairman Coutu's problem with that is that having been in human resources for many years, I find that if you were to advertise a position with a potential to full time, people are not going to read that the way you expect them to read it. They're just looking for somebody. They're just stringing us along. You're not going to get the cream of the crop. You're going to get a lower grade type of applicant on the basis of history advertising positions in that way.

Selectman Maddox disagreed slightly Mr. Chairman. A guy that has an electrical business today doesn't want to give it all up tomorrow, he might like the idea of transition from only working for us part time and continuing to do his business until such time as...Mr. Malizia thought there would be some conflict of interest there with a guy running a business that he's inspecting...Selectman Maddox said not in town. He would not do work in Hudson. Chairman Coutu said why hire somebody to work in Hudson if he can't work in Hudson. We don't inspect Manchester or Merrimack. You're going to tell a guy that has a lucrative business in Hudson he can't work in Hudson. Selectman Maddox said he might live in Pelham; he might not do much in Hudson. He might live in Goffstown and want to get out of running his own business and want to come to work for a government because we're a great place to work but not do it instantly.

Mr. Oleksak said that idea would not lend very well because any competitive electrician who came into town could take the wrath of that person because of loss of an account somewhere else, or a job. Then you have another conflict to pay attention to. People carry grudges and that's one thing we don't want to have in this business.

Chairman Coutu said to Mr. Oleksak that he was counting heads. I don't know where it's going to go. I would suspect that you would be disappointed if it was the wish of this Board not to hire a full time person at this point. Mr. Oleksak said correct. Chairman Coutu indicated that if no one was willing to make a motion, we'll never find out how it's going to go. However if it would go the other way, I would certainly hold other members of this Board to what the intent is which is not necessarily going through all the vetting that you want Selectman Luszey is that if the Board does not wish, and I'm not waiving on my position at all, I do support hiring somebody full time now, take the pool of applicants, not jump on the first one, vet them very carefully. That is my position. If no one makes the motion and I can't vote on that position, I would expect that someone would make an alternate motion to bring somebody in at the 32 hour a week without getting hung up on the pension and be glad that we have that and hopefully try to find somebody. Again, go through the vetting process and find the right person for that job and seriously consider that if you can come back to this Board and say look I've had this guy with me 6 months, the numbers have increased, this guy is doing a fantastic job and you articulate that, then we can convince the Board to go the other way assuming that that's the way

I see it. I see you nodding your head Bill. It's better than nothing. We're going to give you a part timer anyway. I'm going to vote for a full timer if I get a motion to do that.

Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to approve the request to advertise for a full time Building Inspector.

Selectman Brucker is making the motion because I feel that now is a very opportune time to find the right person. I feel that we lost the last person because we did not go to a full time position. He was a valuable employee who had the experience of being a master electrician. I feel that this person will be able to fill the job that Mr. Oleksak needs to learn the idiosyncrasies of the job, the idiosyncrasies of the job, the idiosyncrasies of Hudson and be able to fill his shoes if and when he's ready to retire.

Chairman Coutu said he was definitely going to support the motion. I think now is as good a time as any if not a better time to seek someone with the skill set which we require for the position. It would be clearly defined I'm sure in the advertising. I'm sure that Mr. Oleksak has heard my cry for vetting this person who applies for the job properly so that we get a person with the best skill set for this community. As all employees are when we hire them, I believe they're on a 90 day probationary period. Mr. Malizia said they're on a 6 month probationary period. Chairman Coutu stated we have 6 months at any time without any...we can terminate that person if that is not the right person. To me, that is the safe cap measure that is the proviso in this that lends me to further want to support hiring this position on a full time basis. Any further discussion?

Selectman Nadeau wants to get there, I just don't want to get there this way. I'd feel better putting it in there and writing it up as a part time building inspector with the full time potential or future. You see that in a lot of the ads today that you read. Out of the blue I picked up a couple of papers this weekend just to see what some of the other Boston papers and north country papers said. There were a lot of the ads in there that said part time to full time employment. I think the pool is deep enough right now with the economy the way it is that we could probably find Mr. or Mrs. Right at the part time to full time position. That stop gap measure is in there. The 6 month probationary period we know how that works, not well. Once they're in there trying to get somebody else is like pulling teeth. I want to go with the full time. I'm not getting there the way that I'd like to get there. I'd like to see what's out there for candidates on the pool before I say yup I'm hiring full time. I won't support this motion but if we reword it, I can support going part time with the potential of going full time and vetting the person that way. I think that's worked for us in the past. We've done secretary positions that way in the past. When I was on the Budget Committee that's how we did it. The department head put them in and then as the budgetary process came through...I think the numbers are going to be there to support the full time building inspector. We lost a very big company that took up 3 buildings down in the industrial park. That's 3 empty buildings that need to be subdivided because you know that they're not going to be all one person buying it and outfitting it to their needs. As you can see, all the buildings in the industrial park have been subdivided out into 6 different buildings that used to be one huge business. I think the position will justify a full time person not tomorrow but I think within the next 6 to 8 months it will. I'd rather vet the person this way, find the right person, and then go forward.

Chairman Coutu said he was going to call for a vote because I've got the count. I'm not bitter about it. I don't take this home with me like you do Selectman Luszey. It's not going to bother me. I'm going to lose this one. Six to 8 months I think it's going to take that long for the person to be trained for the position. Then when it all hits the fan and we don't have a person that's properly trained to go on and do it...anyway.

Vote: Motion failed 2-3. Selectman Nadeau, Selectman Luszey, and Selectman Maddox in opposition.

Chairman Coutu asked what is the wish of the Board. Selectman Nadeau knows what he wants to do. I don't know what the...Chairman Coutu told Selectman Nadeau to tell him what he wanted to do and I'll word out a motion for you. Selectman Nadeau wanted to go part time to full time but I want to know what we're looking for. I think this is something that Mr. Oleksak needs to take a week, write it up for us, get it back to us so that we can look at it. I want to post the position as soon as I can. I don't think waiting a week at this point is going to kill us. I want to see what we're looking for our strong points - electrical that we're looking for. If he could write that up for us and get it to us, I think...Chairman Coutu asked if he was not satisfied with the 3-page job summary for the position that we have in our packet. Part time or full time, it's the same job just fewer hours. It's pretty well defined.

Selectman Maddox said that's why he was going to make a motion Mr. Chairman to utilize the Building Inspector job description that we have to hire a person for not to exceed 32 hours.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to utilize the building inspector job description that we have to hire a person not to exceed 32 hours.

Selectman Maddox thought they were almost there but now that just waits 2 more weeks Mr. Chairman. I think that he could come up with something but it's going to be the same thing. It's going to be two weeks later. Selectman Luszey said they needed to put in the provision to go full time within...Selectman Nadeau wanted to see part time to full time. In the advertisement, Mr. Malizia said in the one they did the last time, I would simply put the provision in that says this has the possibility of being a full time position for the right candidate or some verbiage along that line which satisfies what you want but we need to get some motion here to do something. Not to exceed 32 part time is fine. This is the description we use. Sounds good.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to hire a Building Inspector not to exceed 32 hours part time with a potential for full time with the right candidate, carried 5-0.

D. Application for the 2012 Assistance to Firefighter's grant for a new air compressor

Chairman Coutu recognized Deputy Fire Chief Rob Buxton.

Good evening members of the Board. Deputy Chief Buxton was here tonight representing the Fire Department in requesting to apply for the 2012 Assistance to Firefighter's grant. We did an assessment of our current equipment and matched it up against the grant rating system and came up with the air compressor that would support our respiratory protection program at Central Fire Station. We're making a move to a portable unit which would be a tow behind instead of a station mount to give us some more versatility so it could be moved from station to station and actually brought to the emergency scene instead of having people relocate to Central. This grant program has been very good to the Town over the past 3 to 5 years. We've put primal vent systems in each of the 3 stations. We've replaced our protective clothing and last year we did a major upgrade simulcasting at the cost of \$150,000. This is a matched scenario. So the cost of the compressor is between \$70,000 to \$80,000. That would certainly go out to RFP through proper bid process. So our liability financially is approximately \$8,000 depending on where the bid comes in. It would be our intent to comb the FY2013 budget to get those funds for the match.

Selectman Luszey asked if this grant doesn't go through, would you be putting together a request for the FY2014 budget to replace the compressor. Deputy Buxton said they will take a look at that. Unfortunately we may not have those results and that may get put off a year because we wouldn't be able...they have pretty strict supplanting guidelines that would prohibit us from actually putting in a budgetary request that wouldn't match up with the process.

Selectman Luszey was saying if you don't get the grant when we go through the next budget process...Deputy Buxton indicated they're going into 13 now, we'd be budgeting 14. No I'd have to wait until 14 to make sure that...Selectman Luszey asked if you'd put that in. Deputy Buxton said yes. Chairman Coutu asked if they understood what the government looks at is supplanting. If you do it the very next year, it looks like we did supplanting. We'll go for it but if we don't get it, we'll pay for it anyways. Selectman Luszey wasn't necessarily go for it the following year but put a capital plan together that says maybe two years out. Chairman Coutu said it made sense especially if we're not going to get it.

Selectman Nadeau had one thing and then he'd throw something out there. Is this just like the trailer that I want to say Nashua has? Deputy Buxton said it would be very similar to that. They actually have started using theirs as the station compressor at the East Hollis Street station. That's not as available for mutual aide as you might expect. Selectmen Nadeau remembered on a call that we had...Deputy Buxton said specific for the dive team is where that response was.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to authorize the Fire Chief to apply for the 2012 Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program through the Federal Office of Domestic Preparedness in the amount of \$80,000 for the purpose of obtaining funding for a replacement air compressor. There is a 10 percent match from the Town of Hudson on this grant, carried 5-0.

Without objection, Chairman Coutu declared a 10 minute recess. We will come back at approximately 8:57 p.m. The Board resumed at 8:58 p.m.

E. Hudson Dog Park Agreement

Chairman Coutu recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

To start the discussion as you are all well aware, Mr. Malizia said this has been an item that's been kicking around for a while. The folks from the Hudson Dog Park Committee have come in with a proposal to put a dog park at Benson Park for the benefit of the citizens of Hudson and whoever wants to avail themselves of that park. There's been some discussion here at the Board level on numerous occasions as to what exactly we are doing, what we are accepting, what's going on. An Agreement was provided to my office almost 2 months ago. Subsequently I forwarded that

Agreement to the Town Attorney for his review and vetting of the Agreement. He made some points that basically said when I, the Town Attorney, look at the minutes it's confusing to me as to who's going to ultimately own this, who's going to have the liability for it, and what not. He prepared an agreement in response or in counter point to the Agreement that was provided to me. Unbeknownst to me, the Agreement that was originally provided was not really from the Dog Park Committee. It was from a former member of the Dog Park Committee. As a courtesy to the Dog Park folks, I forwarded them the Agreement that the Attorney prepared. They reviewed it and had some corrections or from their point of view what they wanted to do and what they are representing that they are willing to do. Bottom line, it appears that from what I can tell, the Dog Park Committee wants to donate the dog park to the Town of Hudson and will provide maintenance to that dog park. It's as simple as providing bags, making sure there's somebody there to monitor it, and whatever. We the Town will own the dog park. It's on our property. It will be under our insurance and that's basically it. Under your control.

Selectman Luszey said it is on our property not would be. Mr. Malizia said you are correct. It is on our property. Selectman Luszey said there is a pen on our property. Mr. Malizia said right now there is nothing. There is a fence on your property. To that affect, I thought it would be prudent to have the dog park folks here so that we could all have a discussion. You could determine exactly who's doing what so you go into this with your eyes wide open as do the dog park people. They know exactly what is expected of them.

As you know, Chairman Coutu and Dave had had extensive talks and discussions and in fairness to all of the other members of the Board of Selectmen, I'll bring them up to date if they haven't already been brought up to date. The confusion originated as you remember as a result of the Town Administrator receiving from an unknown third party a potential agreement to be vetted by attorneys. When I had discussions with the Town Administrator I said when I think dog park, I think Dave Briand because you're the first one who came to this Board and originated an idea of wanting to do something. Selectman Nadeau was on board and knew you prior to my getting to know you and working with you with this venture. That thus began the confusion. So I've had extensive discussions with the Administrator over this and as well as with you. In all that was presented by the Administrator and I also found out that because of our insurance the coverage that we have is not going to increase our cost whatsoever. It's going to be an umbrella under us anyway. It would be a duplication if we get a second insurance policy; it's not going to matter.

In light of that, Chairman Coutu said we would expect some reciprocity from you in terms of maintenance. You don't have to enter into a formal agreement but we just want you to lay out what you think that we would expect you to do if we agree to accept the donation of the dog park. You will just maintain it and if the day should come that you and your committee should walk away from it and nobody is willing to take it over, we own the land and we can do whatever we see fit. I think that's what you're looking for. I'm certainly ready to go in that direction and I'll turn the floor over to you.

Basically Dave Briand said what we want to do which I thought we were working on from the beginning was we wanted to add a dog park to the more or less the master plan of Benson's. So it would actually be Benson Park and dog park would be part of it. We were offering to as a subcommittee of the Benson Committee, we were offering to raise the funds for the construction for the Town so it wouldn't cost you any money; we were offering to add upgrades as funds come in to keep it clean to a reasonable level, keep it maintained. If a tree fell on top of a section of fence, we would be on top of that for you to more or less oversee it for the Town free of charge as a volunteer group. To do all this, we had to start a 501 (c) 3 nonprofit charity organization. We've pretty much got that done. We're down to hopefully the last fence payment and then we can start outfitting it. We're more or less just looking to see what direction the Board would like to go.

Chairman Coutu said he pretty much laid it out unless you have something more you want to offer.

Jessica Barker wanted to clarify. I'm not sure I sent the list of our maintenance responsibilities but we assumed...Mr. Malizia indicated that the Board has it. Ms. Barker said basically we provide the poop bags and waste receptacles. We would purchase the signs and display them prominently at the entrance with all the rules that were also attached. Then we'd be responsible for routinely inspecting any equipment, seating, storage, and the fence to make sure there's no hazards or repairs to cut down any of the liability concerns. I think it was an update to the rules that we added on the bottom of contacts e-mail so that if anybody saw something at the park that needed maintenance in between the time we were scheduled to look at the park, they could contact us so that we could get that fixed as soon as possible.

One of the things Chairman Coutu suggested to the Town Administrator, I just asked him, in light of the fact that we don't need to go into a formal agreement like we were talking about, would it be necessary for us to get into some sort of agreement about the maintenance? It's in the minutes. It's on record. We own the property and if we felt that you weren't holding your end of the bargain, like any good landlord to a tenant, we would advise you that we would except that you hold up your part of the bargain subject to an eviction notice. I don't see us going there because I know you have good intentions.

Selectman Luszey asked if the dog park was a subcommittee of the Benson Park Committee. Mr. Briand responded yes. Selectman Luszey asked if the Benson Committee be the governing committee of what they do and don't do. Just like everything else there...Chairman Coutu said they have to get authorization to go ahead with this. Even if they were to go away, Selectman Luszey said the Benson Committee the way I'm processing it is they would then pick up the responsibility of the dog park. Chairman Coutu said at first the Board would have an opportunity to decide whether or not we wished to continue the dog park. We still have final say on all of anything that goes on in Benson, a discussion we'll have later this evening about things that might be going on that shouldn't be going on. That was Selectman Luszey's question. Is the dog park part of the Benson Committee's master plan?

Chairman Coutu said that kind of frightens him. We don't have a master plan at Benson. We have...Selectman Nadeau indicated that we do. Chairman Coutu said if somebody comes in and adopts an area, it's not really on the master plan. Yes go ahead if it's a good plan. If the dog park is in what there is in some sort of a master plan, you would know better than I. You serve on the committee now. I guess we would give them the opportunity. I think the Board would say at that point if the Committee came to us and said we're not can't collect any more money. We've lost interest. We're going to dissolve the nonprofit and you can do what you want with it but we're not going to be able to put anybody there to take care of it. We would instruct whoever the liaison person is at that time and see if the Benson Committee wants to take it over and keep running it as a dog park. If not, we'll shudder it until we decide what to do with that piece of land.

Selectman Luszey asked if he could rephrase the question. The playground. Is the Benson Committee responsible for maintaining that going forward? Chairman Coutu said that was part of the recreation plan. The Board of Selectmen wanted to put...that was part of our plan originally. One of the things we definitely wanted at Benson's was a recreation facility so that we could attract people of all ages. There was nothing much to do for the kids. So we put that in. It was funded with recreation monies from the donation account. As part of the agreement what we do is when the Highway Department is available, they go in and fix up if something needs to be fixed, and they kind of take care of the bases on the ground now...the mulch and things like that. That came out of the recreation donation account. It was funded by recreation money. Selectman Maddox said by builders. Chairman Coutu said by builders in this town who donated to the recreation account.

Selectman Nadeau asked if Selectman Luszey if the slide breaks tomorrow who's going to pay for that. Selectman Luszey said exactly. Selectman Nadeau said the Recreation Department. Selectman Luszey said that the Town is responsible for that. I guess my logic is if we use that model and the Benson Committee has a plan that says the dog park is part of that master plan, once we accept the donation, we become the owner and manager regardless whether they form a 501.3 (c) to do this. What I'm also thinking right now in my mind is the precedence that we may be establishing here that could be used to support or not support the senior center and the relationship between the 501.3 (c) and the town senior center. Chairman Coutu said they're donating it to us.

What Selectman Luszey heard it wasn't that clean. Yes they're donating to us but at that point if they go away and there is no maintenance money to do it, we may tear chose to tear it down or not tear it down. There's no long range plan for it. That's what I'm trying to make sure that we have an accord here, and understanding that if the Board of Selectmen has already agreed that the dog park is part of the Benson plan, then yeah they make a donation, thank you, and all that. There is no criteria for them to do anything after that point. It is the Town property and it will be maintained by the Town. Chairman Coutu said assuming we want to maintain a dog park.

That's where Selectman Maddox said he was slightly confused. I thought this was going to be similar to Freedom Field, to Zach Field. From the minutes of the 9/13/2010 the motion by Selectman Jasper, seconded by Selectman Nadeau to approve the dog park committee's proposal and the location subject to review of the Town Council and the Local Government Center, the Town's insurance carrier, and a formal agreement with the Dog Park Committee similar to the agreement that the Town has for Freedom Field. That carried 5-0. I was always under the impression that they were going to operate this just like Freedom Field; they're doing whatever is being done out there during the term of the 15 year lease.

Mr. Malizia thought for Freedom Field it was 15. Again, Selectman Maddox is just a little off from...Chairman Coutu said we're not into a lease agreement with them. If you read the 10/26 minutes, Mr. Malizia said the same Selectman also says it's our dog park and not theirs. It's been back and forth and that's the point I think. Selectman Maddox was trying to say that's where he was coming from as the motion that was made that said that this was going to be like Freedom Fields. I understand both sides but I'm just trying to figure out where we're going. Do we want to operate a dog park? Chairman Coutu said not necessarily. Selectman Maddox said they're going to operate it...Chairman Coutu said they want to and the day comes that they want to abandon it, that Board will have to decide what they want to do with that parcel of land. They either want to keep it gated and shut or they're going to find another nonprofit that might want to open it up, or they may want to take the fence down. It may be in disrepair by them. Who knows? You would hope not but it appears to me that they're committing for the long term. That's always been my impression. You have how many members that actively...for the board itself, Mr. Briand said there's 5 members but

we have actively 8 or 9 solid volunteers that are at every meeting, help with every fund raiser, and then we have another list of 30 or 40 that come out for cleanups, and things of that nature.

Chairman Coutu asked Mr. Briand what has he received in terms of interest in the dog park. In terms of correspondence back and forth and e-mails? Mr. Briand said there's been a lot of interest.

Going to the park a lot and seeing what goes on there, Selectman Nadeau said there's a lot of interest with people that want to be if you want to call them dog park police or people that will go there on a certain time frame to tell people the rules, and that type of thing, and explain to them this is the little dog area, this is the big dog area. I think there's a lot of willingness out there. They're in it for the long term. I don't think we'll get to the point where in 20 years dog parks are a thing of the past. We might get to that point because nobody might have dogs in 20 years. I don't think that will happen. I think they're in it for the long haul and we're in it for the long haul. I think that the way we're going is just the way I want to keep it.

Just so maybe I can be real clear about the way I'm thinking about this right now, Selectman Luszey agreed we want to be in it for the long haul. If they want to set up a 501 to raise funds to help offset the costs of this, great. I don't want us to set a precedent where the future of the dog park is based on a 501.3 (c) because that sets up some difficulties and me when it comes to talking...Chairman Coutu finally got the message. It took a while to sink in. I think they're in it for the long haul. I hear you loud and clear. I understand the complexities of how this is being done. I think we're getting there.

Just a question. It looked to Selectman Brucker that there's quite a bit of monitoring required. Are there going to be people there volunteers there all the time? Mr. Briand said not all the time. Between what we have as a committee, there will be people on and off, in and out. We can't say for sure we're going to be there Tuesday at 5 a.m. With our different schedules as a committee, there's going to be people on and off, day in and day out.

Chairman Coutu has received assurances and I know Selectman Brucker has spoken it and I think you have too Ben that our dog officer is going to be patrolling infrequently in there. One of the histories about dog parks, and Selectman Nadeau I know you've done some of this research, you'd be surprised how quickly these people begin to self police when they see that their dog has a nice recreation area and then other people are coming in and they're disrespecting the area, and they're not picking up after themselves, and they're being abusive with the toys, and they're not respecting the little dog area versus the large dog area. I found that the few dog parks that we have in this State have become self policing and those that are in Massachusetts I'm hearing that they're policing themselves. It becomes a community effort after that. Just like Benson Park, there's a lot of people that don't respect the area but there are other people now that are making it known to them that they don't like the fact that they're trashing Benson Park.

Selectman Brucker was curious if they were going to lock the gates when nobody was there. It's always going to be open and accessible. Mr. Briand said it was going to be unlocked. Like I said, our hours coincide with the park hours so there shouldn't be a problem with cars in the parking lot when there shouldn't be any cars in the parking lot with the main park as well. As far as the gates being locked, no.

That was the word Selectman Nadeau was looking for "self policing". There's a lot of people that are there at different hours, seniors are there early, the older people like myself are there later. So I think it will be just fine.

Chairman Coutu asked for some advice to the Town Administrator. What is the proper forum for us to take now? Mr. Malizia said wait until they make a donation and then you'll have a public hearing for that donation. Chairman Coutu said we have everything recorded in the minutes. I think there's a general understanding. Mr. Briand would ask is if we are going to accept this as a town park through that process is there any way we put a set of rules in your packet. Can we get that accepted tonight so we can put a motion on the table to accept those rules so we can get in touch with the State Prison and get those signs made up as soon as possible? Mr. Malizia wanted to make one codicil. I spoke to the insurance people as late as today. They're going to send me some of their recommended rules. I'd like you to at least take a look at that so that just in case we missed anything, and again we're all not perfect, just in case you see something that they recommend, we might incorporate that. I would ask that you defer until we get that. I will e-mail it to both of you and you can determine if it fits, if it doesn't fit.

Chairman Coutu said that was a discussion. We are not the experts on rules. Provided you have his input in terms of making sure that these rules coincide. We are at least as inclusive of what insurance companies are recommending. I would suggest that at that point until such time as you're willing to make the donation to us for us to be able to accept it. As far as signs Selectman Nadeau and things of that nature, you can take it up with the Benson Committee and whatever is appropriate, have them do, and whatever is appropriate have them do and they'll work with you. You're on the Committee, so there's one vote; there's two votes. We'll get those signs up. I don't think we need to get into that minutia. The next thing we expect to hear from you is the donation of the park and our accepting that donation is taking ownership of the park. As a volunteer group, you can stay there as long as you want for the

upkeep, fundraising, and doing whatever you want to do over there as long as it's within the parameters of what is legal.

F. Request to Transfer Cable Committee Funds to Capital Reserve Account

Chairman Coutu recognized Mike O'Keefe, Chairman Cable Utility Committee.

Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. I'm coming before you tonight to request approval to transfer the remaining Fiscal Year 2012 funds from the Cable Committee budget to the HCTV Access Center Capital Reserve Account. We've been doing this now a couple of years running. Rather than have the remaining funds just fall into the General Fund, we've asked that they be put in the Capital Reserve Account so that we can build that account for use in creating our own access center, which as you all know there are plans well under way moving towards that direction. The final amount won't be known until the fiscal year closes. It's going to be approximately \$70,000.

Chairman Coutu asked Ms. Carpentier if she had at her fingertips and if not and approximate amount that we have in the HCTV Capital Reserve. Ms. Carpentier indicated that she gave Mike that amount. Mr. O'Keefe said it was \$671,482. Mr. Malizia indicated before this year. Chairman Coutu asked if that was before we put in the 70, so we could conceivably have \$740,000 at the end of this. Mr. O'Keefe said there was potential when the FY13 kicks in. There will be more money that could go in that budget.

Just as another point of reference, Mr. O'Keefe said this is based on our budget and our budget of course is funded through franchise fees received from Comcast. The total received in this current fiscal year was approximately \$226,000. That's about \$26,000 more than we budgeted. That \$26,000 will end up in the general fund. We're only asking for the transfer of a difference of what we've spent and what we budgeted. Chairman Coutu said they could conceivably be \$96,000 going in? Mr. O'Keefe said no.

Selectman Luszey said he was confused. Why wouldn't that additional \$26,000 because its unanticipated revenues that are...Chairman Coutu said the mechanism is altogether different. The budget is whatever is unexpended goes back into the general fund. Selectman Maddox said no, the unanticipated revenue. Mr. Malizia said it was different than say a grant. For example you have more ambulance revenue. Because you have more revenue, it doesn't mean you get to spend more on ambulance or any other purpose because you have an appropriation budget. All they're really able to do is approve the appropriation budget. We don't have a revolving cable fund or a revolving recreation fund like some other communities do. That money is great that it came in, it goes to the general fund surplus. I suppose you could appropriate it out of there somehow in the next budget cycle and move it if you wanted to but you don't have an appropriation to do anything with it. Just like the ambulance revenue that's greater than expected. A car revenue that's greater than expected, and interest revenue that's greater than expected. You've budgeted those items. You might have a greater number than you budgeted but it's not an anticipated revenue like a grant is which basically is paying for a police project or a fire project for example.

Selectman Luszey understood on the ambulance because that's all within the town. Mr. Malizia said he has no separate fund. Selectman Luszey said where they come from is not the same as...Mr. Malizia said (inaudible) from the users. They don't come from the taxpayers either. It's only the revenue from the people that use the service. You or I don't pay for it if we don't call them. Selectman Luszey said exactly but the difference is the cable utility users are funding that which is different than an ambulance call. We appropriate funds to support the Fire Department and all of its services. We do not raise taxes...Mr. Malizia said but you appropriate funds for this purpose whether they're taxes...you are appropriating it in the general fund budget. You do not have a separate budget like the water utility is a separate utility; the sewer utility is a separate utility. If there were no users and everybody cancels cable, Selectman Luszey said we would still appropriate tax dollars to this? Mr. Malizia said that's your choice through the budget process. I can't say if you would or wouldn't. I wouldn't if it were me but you all might. Selectman Luszey said you're using the same word. That's where I'm getting a little confused. You're saying appropriate. We're not appropriating any tax dollars for cable. These are user fees that are being collected off of a utility bill. Mr. Malizia said it was part of your general appropriation. When you raise the money even though it has an offsetting revenue, you're still raising. There's still the \$26 million line item you see on the warrant. You have an offsetting revenue which we never identify on the warrant. We tell the townspeople we want to raise \$26 million. That's the warrant article of which we have 3 basic funds in that: the water utility, the sewer utility, and the general fund because we don't have a separate cable fund or we don't have a separate ambulance fund. They're part of the general fund. So you've raised that appropriation. You also have a corresponding...

Selectman Luszey got that. What I'm saying is the cable users are getting hosed on this. If there are excess funds like this, it goes into the general fund and it sounds like there's no way we can get that money that the cable user paid to the appropriate place, i.e. this capital reserve. Mr. Malizia indicated you could do it in the next year by appropriating money out of the general fund surplus where this money goes for example. This extra \$26,000 would

theoretically flow down to the bottom line to the surplus. If you wanted to make that appropriation out of that surplus, you would do it through the cable budget line saying I'm going to take that money which flow to the surplus we move it. That's one way you could accomplish that in a subsequent fiscal year. I can't tell you what the numbers exactly are going to be because I don't know what he's going to get. Selectman Luszey indicated that we could set up another...in theory, Mr. Malizia said we could. We've been adverse to doing that in the past. That's been discussed for recreation. It's been discussed I know for Rec. I don't know whether it's ever been discussed for cable. There's been an aversion to do that. That aversion may change. Selectman Luszey thanked Mr. Malizia.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to transfer the balance (approximately \$70,000) of the remaining fiscal year 2012 cable funds to the Cable Television Access Center Capital Reserve Account, carried 5-0.

G. Extended Hours Request - Finance Department - Water

Chairman Coutu recognized Finance Director Kathy Carpentier.

Good evening. Thank you. Ms. Carpentier is before the Board this evening to ask for your permission to extend hours in your department similar to the Town Clerk/Tax Collector's Office working on a late Thursday having the office open until 7 p.m. adjusting the hours on Friday. So it would be a no cost item. We would have 2 people manning the office for those additional hours. We do not have any security issues because we are behind a locked, closed bullet resistant glass door because this used to be the Police Department. The purpose of doing this I'm hoping is maybe we get some additional people in who can't get here the normal 8 to 4:30 hours or who are adverse to doing on line banking.

Selectman Nadeau really like extending the hours. The only thing that scares me is people coming down here on Thursday nights. Yeah there is meetings and stuff and there would be people down here. Is it possible to have the person that's down here just sit upstairs with the Town Clerks? Yeah if they were down here they could be doing their work type thing. It would probably be a little nicer to have them downstairs in their office. Is it possible that they be upstairs with the Town Clerk for that extended 2 hour window? Can they do their stuff from up there?

Ms. Carpentier said probably not as efficiently and effectively as they can down here. They can do filing, go through their desk, answer messages. The phones ringing down here it's not ringing upstairs. Is it possible? Yes. Is it effective? No, I don't believe it is. I don't know that there are too many Thursday night meetings in here. I know there's some. That's kind of nice too because there's more people in the building instead of strangers walking around. Selectman Nadeau had a problem with people coming downstairs I guess. They could wander but with the new security system going in, I think we should be just fine. Selectman Luszey asked where they were going to wander to. Ms. Carpentier said usually the meetings are public so anybody could be wandering in. I don't recommend that.

Chairman Coutu asked when they were going to get cameras in the hallway. Selectman Nadeau said that wasn't part of our proposal. It should have been.

Selectman Maddox asked if Ms. Carpentier was going to keep some sort of report as to what kind of numbers you're getting. I know this is a trial. Do you really think that you're going to have 10 people, 50 people, 2? It was Ms. Carpentier intention - I like numbers as you know - so I would like to know how many people are coming in, how many dollars are coming in, and we can revisit it. It's something nice to offer to people. If we get an extra dollar in the door, it's an extra dollar in the door. Yes, I would hope that some time before I come back and ask again if this was a successful program, then I would have the stats to back up my request.

Follow up question Mr. Chairman. Selectman Maddox knows that the Town Clerk/Tax Collector said that she would be willing to collect the water fees. I'm just wondering why we need to have two of your people downstairs when if I want to come pay my water bill, I can pay it at the Town Clerk's Office without having any of your staff here. They could just hand the check and get a receipt from the Town Clerk. Ms. Carpentier said 98 percent of the people as myself just pay my bill. I can drop it off upstairs and there's a gray box out in front of sewer; I could just drop it in there; I can hand it to anybody at Town Hall. It's the people that we have the Wednesday shutoffs once a month, can make arrangements to come in and sign a payment plan, and that type of thing. It's more the people who need a little hand holding and trying to get themselves out of holes that they've dug themselves into by not paying their bills. Selectman Maddox said that number has gone down dramatically with the list that we're seeing. I guess I don't have a problem doing the pilot program. I just don't see a great amount of use. As long as they're utilizing what they're doing, what they would have been doing on Friday, I guess so be it.

Selectman Nadeau guessed the only thing that scares me is the people that are coming in down here are going to be the ones that are irate. They're here because their water is being shut off on Wednesday and they're here on Thursday trying to get a payment plan. I guess I always look at the negative type things like that even though they are

behind bullet proof glass, they do walk out of here at 7:31 or 7:29 or whatever it is that they're going to be leaving. I like this plan. I was one of the ones that was into making sure that the Town Clerk got their new hours. I think that was a great idea. I've seen increased traffic from that. I think you'll see in the winter less people coming in because we're not doing shutoffs in the winter. I think there's stuff that they can be doing. Ms. Carpentier indicated that was her next agenda item. That's why I specifically said right now for the shutoff season. We'll have to define what the shutoff season is next.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to authorize the Finance Department to extend their office hours by staying open until 7:00 p.m. on Thursday nights beginning in July and continuing through November, carried 5-0.

H. Changes to Water Policies and Procedures

Chairman Coutu recognized Finance Director Kathy Carpentier.

Ms. Carpentier indicated that some of things in here are housekeeping but primarily two of things that we wanted to do is change for - we start sending shutoff notices after 45 days versus 90 days and also to put in some verbiage that the shutoff season is from April 1st to November 30th but also say "but may also take place in additional months weather permitting access to curb box". This was a very light winter. We really could have started before April. The other problem we've run into is that some people are playing - they know the policy. So they're only 2 months late in August and September they didn't pay and then they don't pay all the way until April when we get back to them. They're like 9, 10, 11 months out. It might only be \$200, but they're 9 months past due and we're chasing \$200. The Water Utility Committee agrees with this. I think it's time to ramp it up those 2 items.

Chairman Coutu asked if Ms. Carpentier was eliminating #10 here the disconnection fee. Ms. Carpenter was not only because it's regurgitation. In #9, you can see it's right up there "outstanding balance and the \$125 disconnection charge". It's a repeat. Mr. Malizia thought it was pretty explicit there. It says that they have to pay it prior to the reconnection. I'm not sure it says the exact same thing as in #9. Ms. Carpentier recited: "The Utility shall endeavor to restore service during business hours. When the customer requests that the service be restored at any other regular hours, the Utility shall attempt to make the reconnection if the customer has called the Utility by 2:30 p.m. The Utility shall be under no obligation to reconnect until the next day." Mr. Malizia said if you read the next one, "...must be paid at the Hudson Water utility prior to the reconnection of service". It doesn't quite explicitly say that in the one before it. Ms. Carpentier read it as a duplication. I do not have heartburn if you leave it there. I thought it was a duplication of what was already said in item 9. Mr. Malizia would say its unambivalent when you leave it. They definitely know that they're going to pay it. Selectman Luszey said he would leave it in or add the rest of that sentence after the \$125 if you want to eliminate #10. Number 10 is very explicit. Ms. Carpentier was good with that. So I'm putting 10 back in. Selectman Luszey said yes please.

Selectman Maddox asked if it was the policy, he didn't see it when he read it, that you have to pay in cash or bank check. Ms. Carpentier said yes. That's in your shut off notice. You have until the Monday before of the actual shut off. Selectman Maddox said it wasn't in here. It's just in the notice itself? Ms. Carpentier said in the notice. A month before you're going to get shut off if you give us a check, we have time for that to clear. Friday afternoon you can't give us a check because we don't have 3 days to make sure your check is going to clear.

Motion by Selectman Brucker and Selectman Maddox, to accept changes to water policy as amended for section III Q Financial Operations as recommended by the Water Utility Committee and Finance Director, carried 5-0.

I. Re-adoption of the Investment Policy

Chairman Coutu recognized Finance Director Kathy Carpentier.

Ms. Carpentier recommended the proposed Investment Policy be readopted by the Board as required by RSA 41-9. There are not changes to the Policy that was adopted at this time last year. Mr. Malizia indicated that the law requires the annual adoption by the Board of Selectmen. While it's repetitive, it's also a requirement. Seeing we're not making any money, it's not a real big deal.

The only question Chairman Coutu had with regard to our Investment Policy, have we been actively talking to banks about better opportunities for us to invest our money? Ms. Carpentier indicated that would be the Treasurer's responsibility. Because we have a new Treasurer, he's learning how to do the books at this point. No we haven't at this point. That was my intention. That will be my plan. No we're not at this point. However, we have a very conservative...we don't have a lot of options on the town side. The Trustees of the Trust Fund have a lot more latitude and investment strategies that they can use. Chairman Coutu said they have more long term money than we have to deal with. Mr. Malizia stated that State Law is very conservative with the town's funds thereby they put you in quite

the box where you don't really have a lot of options. So when you look at them, you can bank shop and whatever. As Ms. Carpentier said, the new Treasurer is still learning the ropes. At some point in time, that would be hopefully something that he would step up because it is under his purview to do so. Ms. Carpentier didn't mean it was just with him.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to readopt the Investment Policy as proposed by the Treasurer and the Finance Director, carried 5-0.

J. Employee's Earned Time Fund

Chairman Coutu recognized Finance Director Kathy Carpentier.

Over the course of the year, Ms. Carpentier indicated we've had 89 accrued time payouts. Five employees have left employment; ten have hit a max, and we automatically pay them out anything over the max, and then the remaining people have bought out time. All the contracts offer that twice a year in June and December. \$89,000 was just currently done in June. Those numbers are incorporated in the actual versus budgets. We have \$337,000 in the Capital Reserve Fund. At this point, we have one more payroll to book before this year ends. It appears we'll be able to cover these costs within the total budget. There definitely will be some departments that are over. Two come to mind - Fire and IT in their bottom line. The General Fund will be able to cover the expenses.

If you chose not to move this money, Mr. Malizia indicated Chairman Coutu didn't need to make any motion.

At this time, Chairman Coutu recognized Selectman Brucker if you're going to move on your action. Now would be the proper time.

Selectman Brucker said she would like to reconsider the vote. Do I have to make a motion for that?

Chairman Coutu said you're moving to reconsider the motion made by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to expend \$193,440 from the surplus from FY2012 towards combined dispatch, carried 3-2. Selectman Luszey and Selectman Coutu in opposition.

Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to reconsider the Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to expend \$193,440 from the surplus from FY2012 towards combined dispatch, carried 3-2. Selectman Luszey and Selectman Coutu in opposition.

Selectman Brucker indicated after that meeting, I met with Police and Fire. We went over the whole proposal. The different phases of it, and there really are maybe even four phases to this whole combined dispatch project. The combined dispatch is really close to the end of the whole process. It seemed wise to take some time to do all of this. It would have been a rushed job with doing all of the purchase orders and that it wasn't really going to be properly done the way that it had been proposed. So I'm reconsidering my vote to say that I would not support the motion.

Chairman Coutu asked if Selectman Brucker would support the Motion to Reconsider I would guess. Selectman Brucker said she would support the motion to reconsider.

Selectman Luszey was at the same meeting and maybe to elaborate a little bit on what we saw and what we found out. The amount of monies that we voted on last time really spoke to the purchase and installation of microwave antennas to allow communication between the Fire Department, Central Station, and the Police Department. When all said and done, there was a lot of talk about redundancy. We have redundancy today between the Fire Station and the Police Station. We have copper and fiber. What we're really talking about is an upgrade in the communication infrastructure to really provide a level of communication between those two facilities that would be closer to being fault tolerant. It really has less to do with combining the dispatch than to having a strategy and a plan that talks to upgrading the communication infrastructure within the town - two emergency departments.

Selectman Luszey said the second item that was missing and that really needs to be talked about is the Motorola infrastructure in the Fire Department. That is going obsolete. Again, that really has nothing to do with combined dispatch but it has everything to do with our ability to begin putting into place a plan about upgrading that equipment to equipment that will be supported three years on out. When you get down to it, the spending that we approved at our last meeting really did not do a whole lot in enabling this thing that we call combined dispatch. What combined dispatch really gets down to is an organizational discussion and change on how you bring two different organizations together to act as one, which hasn't been done yet. That's why I would support this motion. We should reconsider it and we should not fund the microwave installation at this point until we have a full backed plan that speaks to the

entire infrastructure and organizational change that needs to take place. Each one of them can stand alone independently and they should be brought forward as independent projects.

Selectman Nadeau said he must have missed the meeting that everybody is talking about. For all these years we've been looking forward and going forward with this combined dispatch and all of a sudden microwaves, the new latest and greatest thing, and now we have to have that and we can't do combined dispatch. Three years ago, microwaves were never talked about, never brought up. What other towns are using microwaves? Why do we have to be on the latest and greatest cutting edge of this type of thing? We can combine dispatch just the way we're doing it today. Because a couple department heads decided that they didn't want to do it in their time frame and their speed, now we have to go through and back peddle and change this motion because I'll say one department head, maybe even two. If I told them tomorrow to go out and cut a purchase order to buy a new fire truck with that money, the dam thing would have been bought and sitting in the driveway by now. Now because he doesn't want combined dispatch because we're not doing it his way...

Chairman Coutu gaveled Selectman Nadeau. Selectman Nadeau said, "No I want to finish." Chairman Coutu told Selectman Nadeau he was out of order. Selectman Nadeau said, "I am not out of order." Chairman Coutu again told Selectman Nadeau he was out of order. Selectman Nadeau said, "Because I am explaining something my way..." Chairman Coutu said you are bringing to task an employee without any just cause to do so. You do not know for a fact that he might ask for a purchase order for a fire truck...Selectman Nadeau said, "I said IF WE told him to go out..." Chairman Coutu said he was pointing the finger to a single individual department in this town. Selectman Nadeau replied, "I SAID TWO! I DIDN'T SAY ONE; I SAID THERE COULD BE TWO." Chairman Coutu said the other one is sitting here. If he wants to stand up and defend himself. Selectman Nadeau replied, "I'M NOT REFERRING TO HIM!" Chairman Coutu didn't know what other department head you're talking about that is involved with combined dispatch. Selectman Nadeau replied, "DO YOU WANT ME TO TELL YOU?" Chairman Coutu said he was trying to get away from personality over something of this nature. We don't need to go start attacking our employees here over Mrs. Brucker's motion. Selectman Nadeau replied, "ITS NOT THAT SIMPLE! I guess all these years that we've been talking about combining dispatch, we finally can do this project for a reasonable amount of money and because one person doesn't want to go forward with it, a department head, now we're going to put the brakes on this? You know where the votes are. So go the way you want to go."

Selectman Maddox was confused on two fronts. You keep on saying microwave. Well that was not part of the \$193,000. We took that out. Selectman Luszey said the towers were part of that. Selectman Maddox said one tower but that was to raise the police antennae to a level that was more useful. It really has to be there for the antennas whether there's a microwave on it or not. So the microwave I think is really not part of the \$193,000. Selectman Nadeau said it wasn't. Selectman Maddox's question to Selectman Brucker is what information did you receive that the rest of the Board is not privy to. I think that maybe Selectman Nadeau's frustration. You obviously have been told something that the rest of us don't have in front of us. I know you told the Budget Committee that this was now going to go through and go to the warrant. I'm just wondering what information that you had received that I guess we didn't.

Selectman Brucker's understanding was that you two, or you three, or I don't know - that the rest of you already understood how the system would work. I did not understand the microwave part of it which my understanding is that that is a key part of the whole project and it would be the first phase that this would secure the communication that we have, that we need, and that we lost during a few storms in the past 4 years. There were 3 times that we did not have full communication. The microwave system would allow us to continue to communicate - police and fire - even if fiber went down, copper was interrupted and that that would be the first step. I'm sorry that you didn't know this because I thought you were all very well aware of it. You proposed it.

Just a follow up question. Again, Selectman Maddox said they were always combining dispatch as one separate entity and then doing this. I agree this is really backing up to the nth degree. When I asked the Police Chief and John Beike how many days the Police Department has been down in the last 10 years, they said 2 days. So I don't know what the microwave is going to get for \$200,000. That's not part of combined dispatch. I think that that's probably our confusion is that somehow or another has become part of combined dispatch Mr. Chairman. Whatever we used to back up whether it's microwave, or copper, or satellites, or whatever was never part of combined dispatch. I think that's some of the frustration. Again, you have information that you presented to the Budget Committee that some of us just don't have. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Selectman Luszey before I recognize you to speak, Chairman Coutu would like to him a question because you got involved with having meetings with some of the department heads. Unless Selectman Nadeau has information that I'm not aware of, and Selectman Maddox and I serve on the Ad Hoc Committee, I would suspect that you don't have the same information that he has either because you've never offered it to me. Have you had any reluctance or any statements made to you by any of the people involved in the departments that will combine dispatch? I've indicated to you that they're not in support of doing this at all. Selectman Luszey said no. Chairman Coutu said the statement was made that there are one or two department heads that don't want this done. I wanted to make sure you didn't

hear...I guess he's the only one that got the information. That's the only way I can see it. I see everybody on board just not rushing into it.

Selectman Luszey said the meeting that we had, and it was an education for Selectman Brucker and I to get up to speed on the work that has been done by the Chairman and Selectman Maddox. There is a proposal that talks of combined dispatch. The spending that we authorize is for a digitizer, and alarm monitor, a Police Department tower, maybe I shouldn't have used microwave, security cameras, radio relocation, telephone lines to Litchfield, and phone expansion. For us to do combined dispatch if we chose to go forward with it, really the only thing we would absolutely have to do is the Litchfield and the phone system. Everything else is in place. So all this other spending that was put forward as needed to do combined dispatching is not needed and we shouldn't be encumbering dollars out of the surplus to do it now. The plan is not fully pegged. That's all I'm saying. If we want to combine dispatch tomorrow, again, it's an organizational discussion that we need to have on how that would occur. There is no plan that has been really vetted out here on how that would occur. I haven't seen that piece yet. There's been a lot of talk about communications and equipment that gets us to a fault tolerant ability to communicate if another disaster like October snow storm hits where we lost phone lines and communication lines between the Police Department and the Fire Department because there is equipment that will stay at Central Fire Department that combined dispatch will be dependent on. So if you take the two times the communication between the two facilities were lost in the last 10 years, statistically that is insignificant and the risks of combining the organization is very low. If we want to go forward, then we should be working on an organizational design on how we combine dispatch. We shouldn't be spending money on all this hardware under the umbrella of combined dispatch. That's where I'm at.

What gets Selectman Nadeau so upset about this whole thing is microwaves. You just said that we don't need to spend all this money to combined dispatch. Every time we've talked about combining dispatch, the price tag goes up. There's latest and greatest things on the wish list that we need to have in order to combine this dispatch. What you just said is we can do it for less money and we don't need to have all the latest and greatest things.

Selectman Luszey said conditionally because Motorola is unsupported. We will need to do that and we need to put a plan in place and vet that through the budgeting process. That has nothing to do with combined dispatch. Should we go with a combined dispatch, there is a risk factor of doing that should be lose communication between Central Fire Station and the Police Station and do we want to take that risk without updating the communication capability between those two facilities which then involves the entire town. So we need to make those decisions and that's what drives that cost figure. We have not vetted that out through the process. That's what I'm getting to.

One of the things that Chairman Coutu was concerned with Selectman Nadeau because I had worked with Selectman Maddox on it. I think that even though Selectman Maddox joined with you and supported the moving forward for spending the funds to combine the dispatch, the elephant in the room is the manpower and whether or not we're ever going to be able to get that accomplished. Then there's going to be the problem of who oversees what and those things were still barely discussed. We didn't sit down and that is a discussion that the Board has to be involved with the department heads because ultimately we run the Town. The department heads work for us and we want to make sure that its well managed and I wanted to make sure that the Fire Chief and the Police Chief are both on board with the management mechanism that we're going to set in place to make this thing work properly. I appreciate everybody's concern. Mine was in looking at it at the last minute. I had a piece of paper where I thought we'd have a little more detail. It just said this in April; this in 2013; this in 2012. It wasn't really outlined the way I would have liked to have it outlined so that I could vote on it intelligently. That's why I withdrew my support for the plan. I certainly didn't feel that any department head was against doing it. That's not the impression I got from anybody. The decision I arrived at was not influenced by anybody. No one approached me. It was just a decision I made on the basis of availability of funds. This is something that we can still do. We can vet it through the proper process. We can work out all the details, and we can start putting things in motion even though it will come in the next budget cycle. If we get that grant, we'll have money available to us this year that we can be able to start things.

Selectman Nadeau asked about the grant. Chairman Coutu he applied for \$100,000 and it can be used for...Selectman Maddox thought it was for the infamous microwave. Chairman Coutu said it could be for the microwave. That would be \$100,000 that we wouldn't have to spend if we even get the grant. I understand your frustration. I didn't want characters assailed here for no reason.

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

Chairman Coutu asked what the wish of the Board.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to rescind the Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to reconsider the Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to expend \$193,440 from the surplus from FY2012 towards combined dispatch.

Selectman Maddox asked what the plan is. Selectman Brucker is our representative to the Budget Committee said that there was already a plan in place. I would just like to hear what that plan is Mr. Chairman. Selectman Brucker said the plan is to go forward with the phases and the first phase being the microwave towers to put that in the budget. Selectman Maddox asked if she was going to put a \$200,000 line item for FY2014 for microwave and then combined dispatch to follow.

Chairman Coutu said Selectman Brucker is not going to be putting anything in the budget. It's up to the Board of Selectmen whether or not we're going to put anything into the budget. I don't want it to get way out of context that I know what you meant. She's not going to be putting anything into the budget. I think that there's a process Selectman Maddox and you're going to be part of that process. This is not a surprise to you. I am removing myself from the Ad Hoc Committee and I told you why today. I don't understand this stuff. You know ten times as much as I do. I wish I had your knowledge and I certainly wish I had Selectman Luszey's knowledge because I certainly respect that he's been in the industry. I expect the process to proceed with you and Selectman Luszey fully involved in the process and I expect that each of you will respect each other's observations and you'll have a private discussion about what you observe and which is the right way to go. I would like to see a plan delineated. Selectman Brucker may or may not have misspoke to the Budget Committee but it is as she understood based on information that was provided her. It may not be that we're going to go with the microwaves first maybe it is. I don't know. In the end, we have to approve whatever is brought before us and we're going to respect the fact that you and Selectman Luszey are going to be serving on that Ad Hoc Committee and representing our interests.

Selectman Maddox's question is why don't we just kill it altogether. You basically summed up that we don't have the personnel issue solved. It's always going to get more expensive. This is going to be a \$500,000 project at the rate the bells and whistles, why don't we just say we tried. It was a nice attempt and move on. I just don't want to spend a lot of time another year and getting nowhere.

Chairman Coutu asked if Selectman Maddox agreed with him that we don't have the personnel issue solved. I'm not pulling that out of thin air. Selectman Maddox said he wasn't disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that this balloon is getting...Selectman Luszey thought that was part of our work is pop the balloons. People are trying to roll things into combined dispatch that isn't necessarily needed to do a combined dispatch. My belief is that there's 3 possibly 4 distinct projects that should stand alone. One of them is the communication infrastructure. The other one is the software and IT requirements needed to support the radio Motorola stuff. For me the third thing is it really talks to combining dispatch which is an organizational discussion. The manpower. How are you going to bring two distinct different groups together into one, less the governing, how is that all going to be done? To me, that's the work of the combined dispatch that hasn't been done. So we can still go forward in bringing together a combined dispatch.

Chairman Coutu recognized too that with your expertise and working with Selectman Maddox that the reverse may be true. We may find that some of the costs that have been associated with this that you and I have been looking at may be unnecessary and we may be able to further trim the costs. If after properly vetting and talking to people about the microwaves we find that they're not necessary, we do know and you and I both agree that the additional tower at the police station will go a long way to opening up avenues where they had been losing some transmission. So I'm certainly receptive to that idea and will not back down from that. I wanted to see a better plan.

Selectman Nadeau said here's where we're going to run into a little problem. We finally have the money to do the project or at least start it. We're going to put \$200,000 into the budget which we know that we're already going to have to trim out 10 percent because the voters aren't going to vote for a town-wide budget because it's too big. We're adding in all these Cadillacs when could be getting Escorts. Then we're going to have to trim manpower because if we're going to put these microwaves in, they're nice to have but we don't need them. We have all these things that we want to put in on our wish list to fulfill these projects that we have coming down the road. We have the opportunity today to have little to no impact to the taxpayers by putting in this first phase of combining the dispatch which we've talked about for the last 15 to 20 years. Now we're going to put it off and now we're going to put it in the 2014 budget, 2015 and 2016 budgets when we have the opportunity to solve a problem now by putting a tower on to the police station and getting our infrastructure ready to combine dispatch. We know that Selectman Luszey said it's not going to cost us that much and it's just a personnel thing. I think taking this \$190,000 and starting our first plan was the right way to go but because certain people weren't on board with doing it, we're not going to it. Now we're just going to pass it on to the taxpayers down the road again and now we're going to go for the Rolls Royce instead of the Cadillac. I will not be supporting combining dispatch from here on out.

If combined dispatch was a good idea, which it seems to Selectman Brucker that most of the people seem to think it was a good idea, I don't understand why you're not willing to go through the appropriate phases of getting to combined dispatch. The people who are going to have to be involved with it we're not ready. Things are not planned out well enough. At this point, I don't see any point to rushing it. I don't know if the Board will decide to go ahead and enter some of this into budgets or not. I just think we have an opportunity to do that and if we do a good job of educating the community about what's involved, I think we have a better chance of getting it. It just seemed like it was

too much to ask at the end of the year for everybody to go ahead with this. Not enough people understood it. I know from my own point of view, I didn't fully understand the full blown plan. I don't know what people have against the microwave system but it seems to me that it solves a lot of problems.

Selectman Luszey had a couple points. I am taking personal responsibility for my vote on this. It has nothing to do with what any other individual thinks. I saw some data. I saw some costs and I didn't think it was a good idea. You say this is a good idea. It has not been shown to really be a good idea yet because a good idea usually says you can save some money. No one has been able to show me any significant savings by combining the two dispatches. Again I will say it again, all of the hardware spending and software spending stands by itself and we should make it stand by itself. Combining dispatch is an organizational discussion that involves two different unions at least that we need to work all those issues through. That's what hasn't been done and we don't know if it's going to save us any money. If it doesn't, maybe we don't combine dispatch but that doesn't mean we won't upgrade the communication capability of the town and that doesn't mean we're going to upgrade the radios. We're going to have to because that stuff is becoming unsupported. That's why they should stand all by themselves.

Selectman Maddox had to say that I keep on hearing that people aren't ready. We've been talking about a date of July 1, 2013 for 6 months and we never heard "can't be done" and we never said that was an absolute drop dead date. So to now hear that people can't make it happen tells me that I guess they didn't speak up. I just don't understand Mr. Chairman how we got into the predicament that we're now in. I can see how the votes are going. We move on. I think that...Selectman Luszey wanted to ask a question of Selectman Maddox. When you say people aren't ready, who's not ready? We're not ready. We, this Board of Selectmen, are not ready. It has nothing to do with any...Selectman Maddox said that's what Selectman Brucker said that there weren't people that weren't ready.

Here's the issue. Selectman Luszey said where is the plan that shows how you bring 2 different organizations together, and the impact on the unions, and what all that means? Where is that plan Selectman Maddox? Selectman Maddox said the plan that you asked for in February that the Fire Chief said he would provide you. I don't know. That was in the minutes that he would get it to you. Selectman Luszey said that you're part of that team to bring that information back here. So don't put it on the Fire Chief, don't put it on the Police Chief take responsibility. We are the ones responsible for creating that plan and we haven't done it. Selectman Maddox stated, "Only when it serves your purposes Sir". Selectman Luszey said, "Bull".

Chairman Coutu thought we weren't going to push the buttons and we're beginning to push some of the buttons. With all respect to you both, I would like to call a vote on the motion to rescind.

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

K. Fiscal Year 2012 Encumbrances

Chairman Coutu recognized Finance Director Kathy Carpentier.

Before you is a Memo. At the last meeting of the Board of Selectmen, Ms. Carpentier said is to encumber any funds for legal obligations that have been committed and not yet completed. The memo includes warrant articles that have not lapsed. In particular, the design reconstruction and repair to Pelham Road Bridge and the Senior Center/HCTV facility that was previously voted on by the voters.

Ms. Carpentier indicated that the next section is POs that were written and have not been processed for payment yet because the service is not complete or the invoices have not been clear. The sewer fund, water fund, library fund, donations, I would like to take the liberty of changing the amount of the encumbrance by adding \$500 that was previously this evening accepted for a donation. I will be increasing the number by \$500. I believe that the middle section here for the digitizer, tower, camera, radio, Litchfield phone expansion by taking that out, the new encumbrance would be \$1,038,044.25. I increased by \$500 and took out approximately \$170,000 which was that middle section there.

Selectman Luszey had a question on the encumbrances. Are these the amounts of monies that will be needed to fulfill obligations that are created in this fiscal year but the invoice won't show up until next fiscal year? Ms. Carpentier said that was correct. If it does, I take it off this list. If some of this gets processed in the next week or two as long as it was purchased or liability was created in FY2012. Selectman Luszey's question is in library. What is the liability for the sale of the town property? Is that the liability of the town to give that money to the library? Is that how that one works? Ms. Carpentier said no. That one is a warrant article. I don't have it in front of me but they got the proceeds from the sale of the homes...Selectman Luszey said even though there's no PO or...Ms. Carpentier said that was correct because they had to raise and appropriate those funds. I think in FY2014 is the last...Selectman Luszey said it was the warrant article that's causing that one. Ms. Carpentier said correct. It's similar to our top which don't necessarily have POs attached to them.

The library situation, Selectman Brucker asked if this was the amount that we talked about that the library would receive out of the sale of the houses, the \$200,000. Selectman Luszey indicated yes. Selectman Brucker thought we got a portion of it. Mr. Malizia said the language in the warrant article that was approved by the voters articulates that up to I think \$450,000 of the sale of the two properties, 47 and 49, would go to the library. We realized less than \$450,000 so therefore we deducted our expenses and we would remit the remainder to them. Ms. Carpentier indicated that this year we only sent them \$70,000 but they had previously received the proceeds of the first home.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to encumber the not to exceed amount of \$1,038,044.25 for Fiscal Year 2012 as recommended by the Finance Director, carried 3-2. Selectman Maddox and Selectman Nadeau in opposition.

9. OTHER BUSINESS/REMARKS BY THE SELECTMEN

Selectman Nadeau - I have nothing this evening.

Selectman Luszey - I only have one additional after the joint dispatch. It's the senior center. I had the distinct pleasure of attending the senior center Council on Aging meeting last Wednesday. I think we need to have the Chairman of that 501.3 (c) come in and talk to us and get a clear set of expectations as to what their expectations are in the return of a financial transaction as he put it. My personal feelings at that meeting or observations, I'm not sure the correct language I should be using right now, is they're opposed to us setting up the Hudson Senior Affairs Committee that would begin to put together the operational plans for that center. I felt that they were opposed to that committee managing the affairs and operations of that building and I think the 501.3 (c) organization has some very explicit expectations as to what they'll be getting for their money. I think we need to get that vetted out sooner than later.

Chairman Coutu said he happened to watch the meeting. My observations were no different than what yours were. I think it's time that we clear the air. When it's appropriate, please work between the Town Administrator and our Administrative Aide a time to put that on the agenda. It's a necessary evil at this point.

Selectman Maddox - I'd like to talk a little trash. You and I had a discussion about plastic bags today. I stopped by and saw Mr. Burns the Road Agent. I thought he was going to call you but since you didn't do it, I'll wing it here. The problem with plastic bags in the recycling is that it gets into the equipment. That's why they don't want plastic bags in the waste stream for recycling. Also, there will be a correction in the Hudson/Litchfield News this week of some of the stuff that was in the article last week. There was a number of confusing statements in regard to you could still get a barrel for \$75 for 5 years. All that hopefully is going to be cleared up because we are going to the new plan July 1st. At my house, we're not going to have recycling because they're only done every 2 weeks isn't going to be until I think the 11th of July. At this point when you get your barrel, there is a description of what the plan is attached to it. Again, there will be something. I believe there's an insert this week in the Hudson/Litchfield News. Again, I know that there's going to be some confusion. There's going to be some angst. The real drive here is this Board is trying to keep taxes as low as possible. By going to single stream recycling, hoping to get the recycling numbers from the 25 to 28 percent to a hopefully 50 percent range, there will be a savings of tax dollars to pick up. There's no charge for the recycling being thrown away. It's only the trash. Again, hopefully everybody will read those and we can make this transition as smooth as possible.

Chairman Coutu added that he hoped this is a trial. Really after my wife spoke to somebody at the Highway Department, she didn't identify herself, she was asking as a citizen concerned about what she can and can't recycle. A lot of stuff that we could recycle we can no longer recycle. It's not just these plastic bags. There are other things. She asked about it. For example, I would think that if you have an iron and you want to throw it away, it's all metal, you'd put that in recycling. No that goes in the rubbish. She asked if she had a table lamp if it has ceramic or a plate you can't put that in recycling. Okay so I can't throw that away. What if I had this? No you can't do that. She said we have nothing left to recycle. It looks like they have these the wrong way. The trash barrel should be the big one. The recycling should be the little one. I said honey we have to try it and see what happens. The lovely lady and I are going to be married 49 years Friday. I don't want to upset her. So we'll try. She gave me orders to day that I am to find enough recycling material in the house to fill that barrel by Monday because we get the first collection on Monday. We'll see how it goes.

Selectman Maddox said the fun part about being in government is you get to make change. The bad part is you get to be there while it's being done. I'll just leave it at that Mr. Chairman.

While you're talking about trash, Selectman Nadeau wanted to mention that this Saturday if you bring your coupon and go to the landfill, it's the last Saturday of the month. I made the mistake last week of going down because I thought it was the last Saturday of the month. You can bring down your grass clippings every week right now on Saturdays, and your cardboard, and your scrap metal to put in the bin. If you have scrap metal and your wife can't get rid of it, you can bring it down. Just thought I'd let you know about that option. Chairman Coutu said his wife doesn't want me throwing grass clippings in the back of the car.

Selectman Brucker - The Conservation Commission will be having a workshop next Monday and there will be many things that will be looked at at that workshop.

The Water Utility Committee - as we've seen the shut offs are getting fewer and fewer. This new system of 45 days rather than 90 days seems to be working and helping people be more prompt with their payments.

Selectman Coutu - One of the items I want to discuss if I might, Selectman Nadeau on the basis of your motion with the Recreation Department when we were encumbering funds, they purchased 8 tables and 153 chairs. Based on the information that was provided me, 75 old chairs were removed. Now I'm being told that some of them it's only because of a lack of a rubber coupling under the leg. I had asked them to store them at Robinson until I discussed with the Board what they wanted to do with these chairs. Apparently somebody wants these chairs and you had made a request that somebody get these chairs - a nonprofit, or Benson Park. I didn't get the full story.

With that being said, Selectman Nadeau said if the person that was going through the chairs knew that it only needed a stopper and we could have saved buying all of these new chairs, I think they should have been smart enough to go out and get the rubber stoppers for those chairs. The Benson Park Committee does need probably a dozen chairs for the office building that they were willing to repair some of the old chairs, weld them, do what they needed to do that we wouldn't do to save some of these chairs. Welding a chair is not cost prohibitive. They were willing to weld the chairs and make them usable in the barn for what they needed for their meetings. If these chairs that are held at Robinson Road or wherever are just lacking rubber stoppers, I would hope that the department had authorized those to be thrown out or disposed of would get the proper parts to fix them.

Chairman Coutu said they weren't thrown out Selectman Nadeau. They were put in storage because they didn't want them scraping on the floor if they didn't have the rubber stopper. They don't want the chairs scraping on the floor. I agree with you. Selectman Maddox and I had the discussion that we could have bought a bag of stoppers if that's all that's wrong with the chair. Selectman Nadeau would hope that's not what's wrong with them. Chairman Coutu agreed with him. I've been there. You said you've been to several functions and there were some of the tables that were...actually we needed more tables for the functions because we were turning people away. Some of the chairs were in pretty bad shape. Selectman Nadeau said yes the chairs were in disrepair but the ones that needed to be welded, it's not cost prohibitive for us to send them out to be welded. Those need to be thrown out. If the Benson Park Committee wants to have their volunteers weld them and...

Chairman Coutu wanted to get to that subject next. You mentioned office building and welding all in the same sentence. I would be very concerned...Selectman Nadeau indicated they wouldn't be welding them there. Chairman Coutu said you did mention office building and welding all at the same breath. Selectman Nadeau said the chairs are needed for the office building. Chairman Coutu asked for what purpose. Selectman Nadeau said when they do the lunches for the volunteers and stuff, they open up the office building because that's where they don't have the elephant barn anymore. They only have the office building. Chairman Coutu asked if it had an occupancy permit. Selectman Nadeau said the elephant barn doesn't have an occupancy permit and they've been using that all along. Chairman Coutu said somebody has gone down inside the building and run illegal wiring from the office building to the barn. I've asked our Code Enforcement Officer to go over there to find out 1) who installed the wiring, what license does that person have, who's permission did they get, who's paying for the electricity - the taxpayers? Another thing is who authorized them to go out and do a bid process on removing asbestos. Why isn't this Board vetting something that probably needed to go out to bid? I'm a little concerned. It's not your fault I know that. Selectman Nadeau said it's our building but they're responsible for doing that type of stuff if they wish to. Mr. Malizia said with your approval. Chairman Coutu said those kinds of things need to be approved by us and we didn't approve that. Selectman Nadeau said that's something that has nothing to do with the Benson Park Committee. That's the Friends of Benson's. Chairman Coutu understood that. It has nothing to do with you. I'm just bringing that up.

The other thing is, Chairman Coutu asked do we not still require people who volunteer at Benson Park to sign a release form when they go and volunteer and do volunteer work. Mr. Malizia said on most cleanup days. I'm not sure if they do or don't. Do you know if they do? Selectman Nadeau said he hasn't been to a cleanup in probably 6 or 8 months. Chairman Coutu said we have one guy that has been working...there's a question as to who is running the Friends of Benson's right now. It's like the dog park. I thought when we were talking dog park it was Dave Briand. Then we got somebody else trying to override that and take full control of that. Now we're having the same problem going on with the Friends of Benson's. I really don't know who has control over there whatsoever. Selectman Nadeau said the Friends of Benson's has nothing to do with...I don't know what's going on with them nor do I have an interest. Mr. Malizia indicated Chairman Coutu sent a letter that you signed didn't you. Did you not send that letter? There was a letter that was prepared for your signature to go to the Friends of Benson's to tell them that they needed to go through this process or that process. You have sent a letter. Chairman Coutu said they sent a letter to that effect but then there's a problem with who's in the leadership. I don't know who's going to get the letter. I would hope the right person would get the letter. I associate as representing the Friends of Benson. Apparently there's coos going on all over the place. I guess that's it. I have nothing more. Mr. Malizia indicated that you did address a letter though to the President of the Friends of Benson to say that any modifications require permission by the Board.

Selectman Maddox said asbestos abatement is not something that we want to treat lightly. Chairman Coutu agreed. They had people in there trying to remove the asbestos before I sent the Code Department out there to put a stop to it. They were just removing it. It was flying around the air. They were doing it on their own. Selectman Maddox thought they needed to have a discussion about any future construction in there. Chairman Coutu said that's why he brought it out in the open. Selectman Maddox knows that they have the best of intention but if something goes wrong, everybody is going to be pointing to the 5 of us. We can get in enough trouble just with ourselves. Chairman Coutu said the problem is is that there's a

problem with who is running it right now. That's the problem. Selectman Nadeau said that wasn't our problem. Chairman Coutu said you tell one person and they say yup and they say well the other person says we don't have to do that. When you have somebody who is approached several times...Selectman Nadeau said we have enough of our own problems. We don't need theirs. Can we move on? Chairman Coutu said there was one person for example that was several times given the thing you need to sign a release and was pretty much told what to do with the release. He's not signing it and no one was going to throw him off the property.

10. NONPUBLIC SESSION

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to enter Nonpublic Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3 II (a) The dismissal, promotion, or compensation of any public employee or the disciplining of such employee, or the investigation of any charges against him or her, unless the employee affected (1) has a right to a meeting and (2) requests that the meeting be open, in which case the request shall be granted; (b) The hiring of any person as a public employee; and RSA 91-A:2 (a) Strategy or negotiations with respect to collective bargaining, carried 5-0 by roll call.

Chairman Coutu stated that Nonpublic Session is being entered at 10:38 p.m., thus ending the televised portion of the meeting. Any votes taken upon entering open session will be listed on the Board's next agenda. The public is asked to leave the room.

Open session is being entered at 11:02 p.m.

Motion by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to award Dorothy Carey a \$500 merit award; Captain William Avery a \$250 merit award; and Captain Robert Tousignant a \$250 merit award per the Town of Hudson Professional Management Association Contract, carried 5-0.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to hire Shayla Bergeron, Maggie Blinn, and Emily LaPlant as Counselors for the 2012 Summer Staff at an hourly rate of \$9.50 per hour, effective June 27, 2012, carried 5-0.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 11:03 p.m. by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, carried 5-0.

Recorded by HGTV and transcribed by Donna Graham, Recorder.

HUDSON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Roger E. Coutu, Chairman

Benjamin Nadeau, Vice Chairman

Richard J. Maddox, Selectman

Ted Luszey, Selectman

Nancy Brucker, Selectman