



HUDSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Minutes of the October 23, 2025 Budget Review Meeting

7:00 PM

Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, Town Hall

***Non-Public Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, (a) & (b) beginning at 6:00 p.m.**

Regular meeting will begin immediately after Non-Public Session

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – by Chairman Dumont the meeting of October 23, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen Meeting Room at Town Hall.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Selectman Guessferd.

3. **ATTENDANCE**

Board of Selectmen: Dillon Dumont, Bob Guessferd, Dave Morin, Xen Vurgaropulos and Heidi Jakoby.

Staff/Others: Town Administrator, Roy Sorenson – Finance Director, Laurie May – Town Accountant, Dan Thibeault – Fire Chief, Scott Tice – Deputy Fire Chief, Francis Enos – Deputy Fire Chief, Jim Paquette – Executive Coordinator, Erika LaRiviere – Chief Assessor, Jim Michaud – Town Moderator, Debra Stoddard – Director of Community Media, Mike Johnson – Recreation Director, Chrissy Peterson – Executive Assistant, Lorrie Weissgarber.

Chairman Dumont: And we have our former Town Moderator as well, Mr. Paul Inderbitzen. I think I got everybody.

4. **BUDGET PRESENTATIONS**

Assessing

Chairman Dumont: So, we will roll right on into Assessing first, and I will recognize Jim Michaud, who, believe it or not, this is his 30th presentation in front of the Board of Selectmen.

Jim Michaud: Thank you, Mr. Chair, 30th budget presentation to the Board of Selectmen. Yeah, it's been a while. So, my budget is higher than it was 30 years ago. But I'm not defending that increase, I hope. I could. So, as you'll see on the slide, we have some statistics that talk about the makeup of the assessing budget is mostly labor, mostly inside labor, but we also have external labor through contractors. We have a listing of our Town staff. They're in the department, three full-timers, one part-time that has not been filled in a very long time, and then I guess we call that our vacancy. And then we have our mission statement from before, some SMART goals, objectives, our out-of-budget requests, and more on our considerations. I'm not sure how much work you do on this page. We also have a graph that shows the increase in the tax base and then the decline in the tax rate, right, denominators and numerators, that goes back about four years. So, the inverse can happen as well, right? So, if we have a re-evaluation and our tax base goes down, the rate goes up. We've had that happen. Moving on to page 2, my page 2, that goes through and looks at historical actuals from FY23, 24, 25, what's approved in our current year, FY26, and what the department has proposed as far as suggested increase for FY27. My budget is basically flat outside of assessing IT items, and we saw the 2.5% outside the 100s. We looked at our budget and we determined we really didn't need it, right? So, we looked at what we spent last year, the fiscal year that ended June 30th, and we made a determination that we were okay with going flat. IT part went up a little bit. It was our support contract for our mass appraisal company. Their software support went up. I don't really have too many themes in the assessing budget. From the beginning, salaries make up most of it, and then outside of that it's our line 252, other professional services, and much of that is made up of our contract with Georgie Sansoucy PELLC, and they've done the valuation for our public utilities since 1992, and they've been doing the cell tower communication, telecommunication towers, over the last three to four years, and they're currently under contract through next year, the 2026 tax year. And they also conducted the valuation and are continuing to conduct the valuation for the Target site. And I will welcome any questions of the Board.

Selectman Guessferd: So, I have basically two areas of question, discussion, and they probably are some of the same areas that everyone might be. I don't know. But let's start with that professional services line. You know, we've been budgeting \$107,000, and the last three years it's never gone higher than \$70,000, \$69,275. I'm just struggling with understanding why we need \$107,000 in the budget for that.

Jim Michaud: So, we have a \$26,000 contract with Georgie Sansoucy. That's for the public utilities and cell tower. We have a \$19,900 contract with a value of Target. So, that's committed, right, for the year that we're budgeting for. Beyond that, we also look at are we going to get any appeals that are going to require us to hire an outside appraiser, right? So, EAE, not your house, right? Your house we can handle in-house, but the large properties, commercial, industrial, we would be looking to go to an outside appraiser. That's \$4,000 to \$6,000 just for the appraisal, for one appraisal. Probably closer to six today. There's a dearth of appraisers definitely on the commercial-industrial front. And then that doesn't cover their time if we go to court, and that's just simply the appraisal. So, if you do the math, there's not a lot left over after that. And so, it's a defensive kind of appropriation. We want to have the money in case we do get those, and that's what we've maintained. Now, we don't spend all the money in our budget, right? So, we return quite a bit of money. So, just because it's in the budget doesn't mean we spend it all and say, oh, we're going to go buy a new car or something. So, it's been the policy of the prior Boards of Selectmen that we should have enough ammunition in case we need to go out and get an appraisal done on an appeal. Right now, all we do have is the Eversource appeals, and those have been through Superior Court. So, we're not going to have any more appraisal costs on that old case, but they're suing again for the prior year. And the cost for that defense also needs to come out of here, not the legal part because you guys have that in your budget, a legal defense fund for valuation. But the other costs have to come from the assessing budget. So, I understand what you're saying, and we've been fortunate. And we could go ahead and cut it, but if push comes to shove and we've got to spend the money, then I'm going to go see Roy and say, where do we get the money?

Selectman Guessferd: I'm not saying we bring it down to \$70,000, but I'm thinking that it might make some sense to kind of bring it down a little bit at least in acknowledgment of the fact that we haven't really spent that money. And I certainly understand the concept of having that money there because if it hits, it hits, and it's a cost that we have to expend. But I'm just wondering if maybe, just maybe, we look at that. So, I mean, I don't have to discuss any particular numbers right now, but that was one of my concerns here. I had my second concern, if that's okay, too. I'll open it right now.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, So, the second concern that I have is the assistant or the AT, the appraisal tech that's vacant.

Jim Michaud: Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: So, once again, it's something that, I mean, it's a position. We have the position. It's been vacant. Is there any attempt? Has there been any attempt to hire somebody for that position over the last couple of years?

Jim Michaud: There has not. So, the evolution of that position is we were able to get an actually part-time fire dispatcher position reassigned over to assessing. Thank you, Sean Murray. And we had an employee, and that person, I believe, was part-time personal technician for about two years. In those two years, there was an item in the field. They slipped, they got hurt. They were out for a little bit. And it was fine, right? They recovered. And they went on to another job. And I said at the time, let's go to outside, right, get some outside people to get this work done. And we were doing cyclical data collection at the time with the part-timer. And so, we went out, and we ended up hiring an outside company, and that outside company ended up doing that part-time cyclical work. And we haven't been doing that since the start of COVID. The start of COVID ended the last time we did cyclical project going house to house. And so, we haven't budgeted for it. There's no funding for the part-time appraisal technician, but it still exists as far as the department. So, it's not a fiscal item in terms of it's not even a dollar.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. So, we don't appropriate any money for that.

Jim Michaud: That's correct.

Roy Sorenson: There's no impact.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, So, there's no impact. Okay. I just wanted to make sure it was clear that that was the case. Okay. That's all I got.

Chairman Dumont: Questions or comments from the Board? I will just echo Selectman Guessferd's comments on the professional services. I had the same questions as well. If there's no other questions or comments, we'll go into your outside-the-budget request.

Jim Michaud: So, on the outside-the-budget request, you have the GIS, right?

Roy Sorenson: Yes. Jim, let me jump in. Don't worry about that at all. We've already pushed that somewhere else. So, you don't even need to speak. You can speak to the importance of it, but it won't affect your budget. Yes, speak to the importance of it.

Jim Michaud: All right. So, we won't be adding six?

Roy Sorenson: Correct.

Jim Michaud: Okay. All right. That's great. So, we definitely would be in favor of having a full-time employee GIS specialist here. We'd get far better response time than the current contract we have, which is not a slam on the current contract we have. It's just we don't have a mature contractual relationship, in my opinion. And we definitely would be able to make use of that person and their skill set. You know, people learn differently, right? Some people read by reading words. Others, they can see it visually. And that's what GIS really would bring to us in terms of being able to depict our valuation base, our sales, et cetera, visually using the layers of the onion that compose GIS. And so, it really would be a game changer for our office to be able to have that capacity with that person. So, that person will be stretched, frankly. You know, there will be priorities and then ones that aren't so, prioritized. So, definitely in favor of that. Outside the budget. So, we have really all we have outside the budget is the warrant article, capital reserve for property re-evaluation. We could choose to do that tonight if the board would like, because that is the only article that will be showing up on November 10th for the only Warren article.

Roy Sorenson: So, if I may, Mr. Chair. Go ahead. So, we've talked about a few things at the meeting a couple weeks ago. We talked about the totally and permanently disabled vet tax. We had consensus on \$4,000 there. That's minimal impact if you look at the tax rate. Property re-evaluation capital reserve, I believe we have an RFP out for the one you're going to perform next year. 27.

Jim Michaud: 27, 27 tax year.

Roy Sorenson: And this would build that fund back up for the one after. All right? So, as I mentioned in my opening, if the public's listening, we will do the re-val one way or the other because this did fail last year. It's not going to affect what we're doing this year. We have enough money to do that, but this is important because it starts that process over again.

Jim Michaud: And we've had this capital reserve warrant article established in 2008, and we've had a warrant article every single year for it, and it's passed every single year. It started off, it was like \$10,000, then it became \$15,000, and at \$25,000 last year, it's been passing at \$25,000 the last couple of years. And it's just this prior vote, it didn't pass at \$25,000. So, the question for me is do we want to make up for it not passing? That's \$50,000. That's what I presented. Or do you want to just stay the course and stay at \$25,000, keeping in mind all the other warrant articles that you have and the other cost burdens for the property owners? It sounds like I'm arguing against my \$50,000. I guess what I'm trying to say is it's important to put it on. The amount is important. Like \$25,000 isn't going to do anything. But \$25,000 to me is the de minimis, and \$50,000 is the maximus. I can make an argument for each one. What happens after \$27,000 if the market tanks, right, and we've got to do one in \$29,000? If we don't save enough money, then we're not going to have enough money for that. Then I'm going to go see Roy again and the Board and say, where can we pull money from, because now we have an assessment ratio of 125%, and we'd be like, you know, it wouldn't just happen in Hudson, of course, right? It would happen around the state. So, that's the idea is you want to have enough money. What if you do have to do it more than once every five years? You're the agents to expend. I can't go spend it. So, that's my speech on that.

Roy Sorenson: So, what I would ask the Board tonight, sorry, Mr. Chair, is Jim's here, so, we're covering the warrant articles. I don't want to get away from what we're trying to do. We'll still cover the warrant articles on the 10th. I think the consensus here tonight is that there will be a warrant article for this item. You don't have to figure out what that number might be, but the consensus is that, yes, we are going to push something to the warrant. That's my advice to the Board at this time.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My question is more of a technical question for me. This warrant, this has to get renewed every year? It can't just be added as a line item?

Chairman Dumont: Any additional funds being added into the CRF would have to be through the warrant.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: How does everybody want to handle it? I still think that no matter what, we have our list to go through on the 10th. Personally, I'm in favor of this warrant article. It was last year. It's an item that we're required to do through statute. It's one way or the other we pay for it. I think it's always better to save a little bit of time and get ready for it myself, but it's up to the board how they want to handle it.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: How much does it cost to do the revaluation? I know it was in here, but.

Jim Michaud: So, the last one, total costs, including the two separate contracts, one for the general, one for the public utility, was a roll-up of \$175,000, and that was on contracts agreed to in 2021. So, one would imagine it would be greater than that, and we have approximately \$220,000 in the reserve currently as we sit here tonight. So, even if I expect we'll have some cost increase, we should be able to handle that for 2027.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay, thank you.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, just, you know, to just reiterate and to latch on to Selectman Vurgaropulos, the point here is that what we have currently in the fund will mostly be expended in 2027. And then our next regular assessment is what year? 2032.

Jim Michaud: 2032.

Selectman Jakoby: So, that's our timing, just for the public to know, to rebuild that fund. But if there's something major that happens, because I know this was a conversation last year, something major happens, we could do a reassessment sooner.

Jim Michaud: As long as we find the money either in that account or in Roy's account.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, and that could be to the, you know, we talked about it's just an important thing to have.

Chairman Dumont: And, Jim, to that, to Selectman Jakoby's point, could you explain, So, if there's a crash in evaluation, you used a ratio of 125%. Could you explain to the average taxpayer what that would mean to their bill? So, if we're basing it off of that number?

Jim Michaud: So, no matter if it was at 75 or 125, we're really, when we're moving the values up and down, let's assume the budget remains the same, if we're moving the values down, right, because we're overvalued, then the rate would go up. It's like a balloon, right? You push on the balloon, the other side goes up. And it's more conceptual. Nobody minds being assessed at 75% of value. You assess them anywhere above 100% of value, you are un-American. It doesn't, it really doesn't mean much in terms of the math. We're still going to collect the amount of money. And, you know, if everybody's at 125%, well, then that's equitable, just like if everybody's at 75%. And we have statistics that tell us that, you know, that on average or the dispersion is pretty tight, you know. Most of us are around 75. Most of us are around 125. It really comes down to the perception, A, and B, the markets don't go up and down at the same rate. Commercial industrial markets change at a different rate than residential, at least in my 30 years of experience. And we could have exposure by our overall ratio at 125, but commercial industrial could be at 140. And you guys are going to be signing checks out on abatements all day long. And we want to not have that occur. So, that's really the difference for the taxpayer is that the market doesn't go up and down by the same level.

Chairman Dumont: That, and I think, you know, we talked about this before, was the burden shifts, right? So, over the course of history, the burden shifts back and forth between commercial to residential. And if you're not doing the reevaluation, you may find that the residential could be paying an unfair proportion.

Jim Michaud: That's correct. That's a good way of putting it.

Chairman Dumont: So, I think what is key is even if you stick with his \$25,000 per year for the next six years, you still don't have enough for the next reevaluation after you expend this amount figuring in inflation. So, that's why, for me, I would rather bite a little bit off at a time than try to find \$225,000 at a later date. Go ahead.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I just did the math real quick. So, if we're going to expend the majority of the \$200,000 that we have in the 227, I think it would be appropriate to make sure that we have at least \$200,000 and change \$40,000.

Chairman Dumont: So, what I would say, and I think I would agree with Mr. Sorenson, if we have a consensus that this is something that the board of selectmen would like to at least put forward, we can figure out a number by the 10th, and we can take the vote because we'll be looking at all the other ones and make sure that we're appropriate depending on where we're going to spend, the same way that Jim was saying, but I wouldn't disagree with you.

Jim Michaud: Only other one, if that's a consensus. I don't want to go too quickly here.

Chairman Dumont: How does everybody feel about that? Do we have any other questions or disagreements? Good to go? All right.

Jim Michaud: The only other item is the solar follow-up, right, solar exemption follow-up, are we going to cap it, kill it, leave it alone? That's not an item that goes to the budget committee. So, you can, because it's not an appropriation, it's more than tax credits are. So, you can have that debate when you get done with this really important work, and, you know, you could do that at the last meeting in November, the first meeting in December. I mean, what's the deadline for a warrant article? That's really what we're talking about. We're not talking about we've got to get it to the other side. We don't. So, you wouldn't have, I guess what I'm saying is, you wouldn't have to decide that on the 28th of October or on the 10th of November. You can wait. I do have backup for it. I'm ready for it. You know, I have it ready for the meeting on the 28th. Not right now. I know you probably have it, but I put it in the folder for the BOS folder for the 28th, but Roy and I had a conversation, and we said let's see how tonight goes, right, because it doesn't have to be on the 28th. I just put it in there because I was ready. So, no decision necessary on just explaining why solar isn't necessary to brush through no more than T&D was per se either.

Chairman Dumont: I think I'm fine with waiting a little bit on that one. Would it be good to see how the rest of our night goes before we get ahead of ourselves? All right. Sounds good. No other questions for Jim? I think you are free to go.

Jim Michaud: All right.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you, sir.

Jim Michaud: Thank you very much.

Moderator

Chairman Dumont: Next up will be the Moderator. I will recognize Deb Stoddard.

Roy Sorenson: If I may, Mr. Chair, before the moderator gets started, we do have amended sheets. Thank you. And so, we're going to work off of those, okay? So, we're not going to be in the book. The information you have right is in this packet. We had a little bit of a mix-up with the page, so, we just want to make sure we get things right. So, that's what we're working off of.

Chairman Dumont: Take it away.

Deb Stoddard: First of all, thank you for just being the opportunity to present to you guys this evening as my first session doing this. I appreciate that, grace goes a long way. The 2026 budget is for one election cycle, where the 2027 election budget is for three election cycle, which is why the increase from 2026 fiscal year to 2027. We also are required by the state to have two poll workers at every check-in station, one Republican, one Democrat. So, because of that, we need to increase the staff for our elections. So, that's also why there's an increase in the employee numbers for both election cycles.

Chairman Dumont: All right. I might need to take a peek through, but did anybody have any questions, concerns?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I had a question about the Police details. Go ahead. You're asking for \$4,000. Last year, I don't think that was zero. I'm sure there was a number there. But the last time we had a three-cycle election was 2023, and you're at \$2,800. I know you probably don't have to answer, so, Paul might.

Deb Stoddard: No, because we give overtime pay for all of the Police and DPW workers, because they have a Police presence as well as DPW presence, and extra hours go into that. So, that's why it's added to the budget.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Well, I was just wondering, just on the Police line, because there's a separate overtime line. I saw that. Like, why is that So, much different than the last three cycles? I get it. Years have passed.

Deb Stoddard: Because there's going to be three elections that year for 2027 and only one for 2026.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: 2023 was a three-election cycle, right?

Deb Stoddard: Yes.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: And that was just under \$3,000.

Deb Stoddard: So, I don't know.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. Yeah, it's going to be at page 2. When you pack it, you'll see the detail. Go on to the Police detail line, and you'll see the fluctuation. So, it was 2835 and 23.

Deb Stoddard: Mm-hmm.

Roy Sorenson: I would just add that you have two state elections mixed in with this year, that year.

Deb Stoddard: Yes, you're correct.

Roy Sorenson: So, your numbers are probably going to go up as far as people voting.

Selectman Morin: And remember, we just had a contract, too, So, there are no rates of pay.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Oh, yeah, okay.

Deb Stoddard: Yes, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: You all set Selectman Vurgaropulos?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I'm all set.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you. I did have the same question, and then as I was thinking back through and looking through everything, it would make sense that over the course of the past, you know, four years or so.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I know that's going to be the total increase and stuff like that.

Chairman Dumont: Increased details, cars.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, it just caught my attention.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you. No, it was a good catch. I had a question mark next to it myself. Do we have any other questions or comments? I think that takes care of everything.

Deb Stoddard: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Next up, we have HCTV. I will recognize Mike Johnson.

HCTV

Roy Sorenson: Before Mr. Johnson gets started, I think the Board is aware of this. Typically, HCTV hasn't presented. I think it's important that they present, not just So, he can express his concerns. You know, certainly the public can see that. The other thing to take into consideration here is I think over the next five years, I don't have the exact timetable, there will be some significant impacts with Comcast and cable. So, those impacts are going to come back at the town at some point. So, I think it's important that he starts that process now and kind of explains that.

Chairman Dumont: Take it away.

Mike Johnson: Perfect. Well, good evening, everybody. Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to present HCTV's budget this year. As Mr. Sorenson alluded to, this is something that we haven't done in the past, but going forward, we will be doing this annually. So, as we mentioned before, our strategic goals, we're going to be continuing monitoring our underwriting launch next year. We're hoping to raise some revenue for the station through an underwriting program. We're going to be talking about that in a few weeks with this Board once it goes through the policy committee. Our mission statement, produce, teach, and provide quality hyper-local content and information by and for the residents of Hudson. And our main objective is to cover meetings, cover different events around the community, sports, anything that you typically expect to find on community media. As Mr. Sorenson alluded to, our revenue is currently decreasing. HCTV is currently not funded by the taxpayers but is funded by a franchise fee from Comcast. Currently, Comcast's user's bill, 5% of that goes to the town of Hudson. So, that's how we're currently funded. Right now, we're losing about \$2,000 a quarter, and that's how I built this budget. Currently, we split the revenue 80/20 with the town of Hudson, and we're going to be looking to put a Warren article together where we would like to get the full 20% of \$70,800 put back into the HCTV revolving fund. There were a couple of line items I did want to draw to the board's attention tonight. I had some numbers change as I looked over some stuff. Line item 269 should actually be \$6,870.19 rather than the \$7,792. I put our PELMAC security agreement in there twice. That should actually just be under professional services.

Selectman Jakoby: Could you repeat that number again?

Mike Johnson: Yes, So, the actual number there should be \$6,870.19.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you.

Mike Johnson: You're welcome. On that specific line, we have a lot of software that requires licensing at the Access Center, so, we have our Adobe subscriptions. We currently have a Premier subscription and then a full Creative Cloud subscription. I have a staff member who's utilizing DaVinci Resolve because that's what they prefer, so, that's actually saving us some money there. We cancel our Envato Elements subscription, and they're going with a new royalty-free music subscription called Sync Tracks that's saving us approximately \$240 as well next year. We have our agreements with Tighrope, so, they host our video-on-demand system, our Cablecast Screenweave app, and we also pay for RTMP services through them. That allows us when we're at a venue without a fiber drop, we're able to actually stream over a network. So, say this Board had a meeting at Rogers Library, we would actually, if we had an Internet connection, we'd have the capability of streaming that to cable. So, it's a very important service, and it's made our life a lot easier when we're on-site somewhere. I did add an increase on this line this year for the closed captioning. The ADA is going to be requiring government-mandated websites to have closed captioning on live streams of government meetings. Anything we do, we're going to be requiring by the ADA to caption. So, I did budget for that in that line item. I'd be happy to take any questions the Board might have.

Chairman Dumont: That was the line item 269, the software maintenance. So, that's in the \$7,792?

Mike Johnson: Yes. \$5,870. So, that's 68.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, sorry. That's the updated one. Apologize.

Mike Johnson: Okay. And the captioning, I'm anticipating to be bi-yearly. So, the way it works is it's actually incorporated into our cablecast system, and you buy hours. So, we would purchase 1,000 hours. I anticipate that

would last us about two years with the meetings and events that we cover. We actually, if you go on our website and look up the interview with Chief Dionne that we did for his retirement, they gave us some demo minutes, So, if any resident wants to see how it'll work or look, they can see it on that video. That'll be captioned on our app, our website, everything. And to me, I think that's an important accessibility feature. We hear about that from residents. They wish we had live closed captioning on meetings like this. And that for 1,000 hours is \$3,350, and that's actually with a 50% discount we get because we made a test for tightrope. So, there's a savings there.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions or comments on that from the Board? Straightforward. Next up, you have your outside-the-budget requests?

Mike Johnson: Yes, and I did want to speak to that. So, our outside-the-budget requests, a lot of our equipment is approaching 10 years old. Something that really needs to be replaced is our video switcher that we use for a deliberative session. You'll see us on-site with it at the Community Center when we're doing multi-camera events. We've started to see signs of age with that piece of equipment, so, I'd like to purchase another TriCaster that we can use on the go. We also are looking to replace some of our cameras. As I've mentioned in the past, we'd like to get two Canon 605s. They give us the push we need when we're at an event and you're in the back of the room to keep a good quality image. And what we would do is take our existing field cameras and put them into our studio. So, we would also be replacing, I think the cameras in the studio we have are about 12 years old right now. So, we'd kind of start a cycle there. And right now, something I did want to bring up as well, So, at the start of this fiscal year, we actually were able to put about \$15,000 into our revolving fund. So, we started FY25 with \$82,000. We ended with \$97,000 last year. So, we were able to put a little bit of money away. A lot of those purchases specifically kind of depend on how our warrant article goes with the voters this year if we're able to get that allocation put back into our budget.

Roy Sorenson: You may have said this in the beginning and I might have missed it. The underwriting, did you have a value on what that might bring in for revenue?

Mike Johnson: Yes. Right now, it is \$14,000, if we fill every slot. We're looking to do seven slots at approximately \$2,000.

Roy Sorenson: Do you feel confident you can get to that?

Mike Johnson: Hopeful. But we'll do the best we can. That could also pay for that equipment if that's a success.

Selectman Morin: The money for the building, is that just for your section or you take care of the whole building?

Mike Johnson: That's just for our section. We have a few shared expenses. When they come out to service the generator, we split that with the Recreation Department. Pelmac, we also split the bill with them for their security maintenance contract.

Selectman Morin: But that's one building. Why don't we just have one budget for that instead of separating it out for two departments because it's one building?

Chairman Dumont: In theory, I guess you could. In the private sector, if you go by a tenant, you do it by a percentage of ownership of the building and you separate out the charges.

Selectman Morin: We own the building.

Chairman Dumont: I would imagine that one department would say that they wouldn't want to argue for the other one.

Selectman Jakoby: This morning, I had the same conversation with Mr. Sorenson. I think it's a good question. As we look at the buildings and have some more conversations about that, I think we have to look at overall maintenance of our buildings because that's what I said. It's our building. If there's issues in the building, then we need to take care of that. So, I do agree. I just think it's a change in philosophy or a change in paradigm. I don't know.

Chairman Dumont: The only thing that I would say is take basic maintenance, for instance. If you were to pull that building out and just put it under the town buildings envelope that we would maintain, who would be... I

guess would the department still give an update during the budget season as to what their expenses are going to be for that building? And if so, why remove it from their budget?

Selectman Jakoby: I don't have the answers. I just think it's a fair question because he also indicated in his letter that there were some cracks and some other building-type maintenance. So, maybe there's certain maintenance that stays in their budget and other maintenance that goes under building general.

Selectman Morin: Because what are they doing, stopping at the ceiling? You know what I mean?

Chairman Dumont: No, I get the point. I'm just trying to figure out what the solution would be.

Selectman Jakoby: I don't think we have it yet, and I think we're going to see it with other buildings later. So, we just started the same conversation this morning.

Mike Johnson: Okay. And I know in that building, two days into my job, the HVAC unit failed in our IT room and it was beyond repair. So, that's why, if you saw in our professional services line item in FY25, it was \$16,000 to get a new unit there. So, the building did turn 10 years old this year, So, you are going to start seeing some cracks in the wall that might need to be repaired. Last year, we had to get some work done on some of the doors, doing even more work on them this year.

Selectman Jakoby: It's all that drumming that the seniors do upstairs.

Mike Johnson: It is, it is.

Chairman Dumont: A lot of activity, that's for sure.

Selectman Jakoby: Dancing, drumming. They have their drumming circle, yeah.

Mike Johnson: And in the event of a dire emergency, we do have that safety net in our revolving fund if there was ever some, say, like an HVAC unit failed and we had to replace one. We have that there, but the way that our salaries are increasing with union contracts, we have to meet all that demand, and prices are just going up on things like utilities that are a little out of our control. It's a tough situation across the industry right now, community media.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions or comments?

Selectman Guessferd: That just sounds like the main, it's a great point, but probably something we just need to kind of revisit. Yeah, we can definitely do that. Okay.

Chairman Dumont: All right. I think that's it.

Mike Johnson: You didn't have anything else to say?

Selectman Jakoby: Can I ask just one other question? I just thought of it now. So, for how long has it been a 20/80 split? I know it's the warrant article.

Mike Johnson: So, that, the warrant, or the revolving fund, was established in 2015 by a warrant article, so, it's been like that since the original wording.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. The 20/80. Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Nothing else? I think you're good to go. Awesome.

Mike Johnson: Thank you guys very much.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you. We're going to go a little bit out of order and just take care of Recreation before Fire, So, I will recognize the Recreation Director, Chrissy Peterson.

Recreation

Chrissy Peterson: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to present the Recreation Department FY27 budget. I have submitted a budget within the 2.5% increase parameters exclusive of salary and utility costs, and I have one outside budget request to present at the end as well. The 2.5% increase totals to about \$4,500

exclusive of utility and salaries, and those funds have been allocated strategically to meet program and facility needs. If the Board would like, I can go through those four major areas.

Chairman Dumont: Yes.

Chrissy Peterson: Okay. The first one is 5821-232, that's Supervised Play Transportation, and that was a \$600 increase to offset annual bus rate adjustments. 5821-270, a \$1,600 increase to Support Program Operations. 5831-252, that was a \$1,600 increase to cover rising referee fees as well as games. And 5814-224, that's building maintenance for both the Senior Center and the Rec, and that was to address upkeep and safety needs at both buildings and replacement items as well.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions, comments? The equipment repairs, line 205.

Roy Sorenson: What page?

Chairman Dumont: Sorry, I'm just on page three on the overview.

Chrissy Peterson: Is that under admin?

Chairman Dumont: It would be on page six, yeah, Large Equipment Maintenance, I believe.

Roy Sorenson: Page three and six, right?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. So, actuals, looks like it was \$105.30, and then we budgeted \$650 each year thereafter. What do you anticipate for that?

Chrissy Peterson: So, you said it was 205? Yeah, 5810-205. So, that's our Auto Scrubber at the Community Center, and we kind of never know. So, this year we definitely plan to have both of them redone.

Chairman Dumont: And then the Education Reimbursement, which would be 5810-236, can you just, how does that work for your department? Because we've had this question for different departments.

Chrissy Peterson: So, I said 236. Oh, yep, I see it. So, we use that a lot for the CPI certification for our summer staff. I would say that's the majority that we use it. I also use it for some certification stuff for myself as well, some Rec Director and Senior Center kind of certification, but that's where we usually utilize that, those funds.

Roy Sorenson: So, these are necessary for the actual positions? This isn't someone seeking higher education?

Chrissy Peterson: No, definitely necessary. We kind of mandate that our staff is CPI certified, obviously, per se.

Chairman Dumont: That's what I was hoping to hear.

Chrissy Peterson: Absolutely.

Chairman Dumont: Those are the questions that I have for the Board. Any questions or comments? Seeing anybody, we'll jump to you outside the budget request.

Chrissy Peterson: So, I am seeking the Board's consideration to increase the seasonal salaries of the Summer Program counselors and the CITs. I think the adjustment is important. It's a very big job that they have, you know, watching the safety and supervision of the young residents in town, and I feel that, you know, we should really stay competitive with what other programs are offering. Currently our CITs get paid \$10 an hour, and a CIT is a counselor in training, and I'm proposing that be increased to \$13 an hour. And our summer counselors currently get paid up to \$15 an hour, and I'm seeking consideration for up to \$17 an hour. So, the overall increase, including FICA, is \$13,950.

Selectman Morin: Can you give us an idea what other communities are paying?

Chrissy Peterson: I would say on average it's \$16.50.

Selectman Guessferd: For the counselors?

Chrissy Peterson: Yes, for the counselors. CITs are usually right around, like, \$13.00, so, that would be right on target.

Selectman Guessferd: Along those lines, I know we're trying to stay competitive, right? Have we had experience lately with anybody going somewhere else because they were getting paid more? Have you heard any feedback on things like that?

Chrissy Peterson: I think that, you know, it definitely comes up every year. It is something that I try lightly with because I hope it never happens. But this year, looking at this summer, my hope is that we can keep the qualified ones, that we can retain them. Because in that specific program, it's kind of a vicious cycle of every three years we have to reinvent the wheel because the majority of college, you know, kids that work there. So, we have to kind of restart. So, a lot of them have definitely, you know, mentioned that it would be hard to stay when you could go down to Dunkin' Donuts and get paid \$16 an hour, for example. So, it's just a concern.

Selectman Guessferd: So, you're not just looking at other rec departments. You're looking at, you know, other businesses around town. Are we talking mostly high school students? Are we talking about college students?

Chrissy Peterson: College.

Selectman Guessferd: College students. We definitely do have some. Do you have more CITs?

Chrissy Peterson: Yeah, it depends on the age. If they're 17 1/2, then we consider them for a counselor position. But anyone 15, 16 would be counselor-in-training. And it does depend, too, on their experience. Sure, okay.

Selectman Guessferd: Sure, okay. All right, So, there is that concern that we might lose track. We might move to other businesses because of that. And, of course, we've seen that, right, over the last several years.

Chrissy Peterson: I definitely get nervous, too, with, you know, trying to attract new people because it's usually a 50/50 split. We hopefully can keep 50% from the year prior and then we're definitely, you know, looking for half of, you know, the staff again.

Selectman Guessferd: And with the numbers going up, you need more counselors.

Chrissy Peterson: Yes, definitely.

Selectman Guessferd: So, again, it makes it more difficult to try to increase the number of counselors as well. So, I see that that's just another factor, what you're trying to do. Because I think you're trying to continue, as you've said here, to grow the program. And it has been growing every year. And I just want to remind folks out there that when you look at their budget, most of it is essentially offset by their revenues. There's a small difference, comparatively speaking. So, they do bring in a fair amount of revenue for the town, especially the summer program. So, it's something for people to keep in mind.

Roy Sorenson: I think that's a good point. All right, so, if you look at the cover page, you see the overall revenue versus the total budget. And just the programs, I think, where most of the raises are going. Your projection for your revenue, you have at \$42,500 going up. So,...

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you. We spoke before, last time you were here, and you said your program was about maxed out. How many employees do you plan on hiring if you're already maxed out?

Chrissy Peterson: So, probably 19 full-time staff. Well, I should say 18 full-time staff for CITs, and then a couple of those physicians are split. So, even though it's 18 on the books, it would be a few people splitting a 40-hour week.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: So, you're looking for 19 additional?

Chrissy Peterson: No, not additional. No, sorry.

Selectman Guessferd: How many more would you consider?

Chrissy Peterson: How many? It would just be 19. It would be an extra counselor, essentially. I'm just looking for one extra counselor.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay.

Selectman Guessferd: That's another part of this we're going to need to address at some point is the space.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions or comments? No? I think you're good to go.

Chrissy Peterson: Okay, thank you. Have a good night.

Fire

Chairman Dumont: Nice job. All righty. Next up we have Fire, and I will recognize the Fire Chief, Scott Tice, along with the Executive Coordinator, Erika LaRiviere.

Chairman Dumont: I hope I didn't butch that too bad.

Selectman Jakoby: That was like...

Selectman Guessferd: Who does that?

Selectman Morin: The actual boss.

Chief Tice: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good evening, everyone. I'm pleased to be here tonight to present the Fire Department's proposed budget for FY27. I'd like to thank my administrative staff, most of which is here tonight, for their help in preparing this presentation. As we proposed this operating budget, we kept our strategic goals in mind, which are to be a highly professional organization through strong leadership and management, skill development, and practices, to be an operationally excellent all-hazards Fire Department that protects the community against all emergency situations, and to create a supportive environment that fosters health, safety, wellness, and teamwork, which allows all members to reach their full potential. We have stayed within the 2.5% increase as directed by the Board. We reached this 2.5 number. We removed one-time items from the FY26 budget, including the HVAC replacement and floor repairs at Central Station, the funding for fire hose that was added in for this year's budget, and we did pay off one lease payment in FY26. And then, figuring out the 2.5%, we did not include utilities, diesel, gas, and contractual items. This resulted in a \$10,700 increase in those areas, but overall, our FY26 operating budget is lower than our FY27 proposed budget, is lower than FY26.

Chairman Dumont: Just a couple of questions. Newspaper ads going through actuals, and then what's proposed and what you had last year, is kind of all over the place. What do you anticipate for this year for that?

Chief Tice: We anticipate, you know, somewhere between the \$400 and the \$1,100. The ads have gone up, and I can tell you how much here in a second here.

Erika LaRiviere: So, right now, they are around, depending on the size of the ad, between \$250 to \$325. So, each time we have to go off RFP, we have to put an ad in. So, the numbers do vary, because we may have a year that we didn't have to advertise for anything. So, we're just trying to budget to be able to do a few ads if we need to.

Chairman Dumont: And that's kind of what I was wondering. Is that where you see the bulk of it going to an RFP? I didn't know if it was, like, hires or what you were doing in particular.

Erika LaRiviere: Yeah, we're typically not using the newspaper for hiring, but the RFPs were required to put it in the paper.

Chairman Dumont: The other one I had was 5710-232, just admin transportation. That was the other one that was just kind of all over the place, low in the actuals. What do you guys use that for? What is that line?

Chief Tice: So, that would be used for reimbursement if anybody used their personal vehicle to go, say, to a conference or training event.

Chairman Dumont: We typically use department vehicles, which is why you don't see that very high for most users.

Chairman Dumont: All right. That was the only reason why I was asking, because below that 233, you have mileage reimbursement. So, when I saw transportation, I thought it was something separate.

Chief Tice: Yeah, and the same thing with the mileage. I mean, I'm sorry. Yeah, with the mileage, where we use, typically we've been using the department vehicles, and then the fuel for the department vehicles is taken out

of the gasoline lines, So, you don't see much usage there. This would be used if somebody had, again, had to use a personal vehicle to travel to a conference.

Chairman Dumont: I'm sorry.

Chief Tice: This would be used for a personal vehicle. Other forms of transportation would be covered under 232.

Roy Sorenson: I don't know why they're separate, to be honest with you.

Chairman Dumont: We'll fix it next year.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, it seems a lot like that.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. I think, personally, I would just put them together, put the two line items together. They kind of do one of the same, and then obviously you guys figure out how you want to pull out of it.

Selectman Jakoby: 233 and 232?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. At least from the description of what he just gave, they seem to do the exact same thing.

Selectman Guessferd: What's the difference?

Erika LaRiviere: Well, some transportation, if someone was flying, if we were reimbursing for a flight, it's different than mileage. I'm sure.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, for a flight.

Erika LaRiviere: Yeah, if someone was flying out to a conference or something.

Selectman Guessferd: I don't think anybody's been taking any flights for the last few years.

Erika LaRiviere: No, we have. No, of course not.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: Then the other one, just because, and I know it was expanded before, but just because there's a big difference from the actual and 2025, 5710-303 office supplies. So, it was \$844 and 2025, budgeted for \$2,500. You did expend pretty close to that in the previous actual, So, I'm just curious.

Erika LaRiviere: We did, and honestly, I was surprised when I saw that number for FY25, and I double-checked it, and that's what it was. It seemed low, but, yeah, I just, you know, I think.

Chairman Dumont: That's to built-up stock, maybe.

Erika Lariviere: Supplies and then, you know, paper, you know, went on a different line, but I was surprised when I saw that. I said, that can't be right, but we went back and pulled everything, and it was. But typically, that's, we're spending more than that.

Selectman Guessferd: I know it's gone the other direction, medical exams, down to \$18,000.

Chief Tice: Oh, and 5730.

Selectman Guessferd: 244.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, 5710-244. Oh, I'm sorry.

Chief Tice: Okay, yeah, so, in \$87, are you looking at the \$87,000 from last year?

Selectman Guessferd: \$87,000 versus the \$18,000, yeah. I know last year we only approved \$21,000, So, obviously something happened that year. I'm just trying to refresh my memory.

Chief Tice: Yeah, So, this is. So, this is some of the grant funding, the AFG grant.

Selectman Guessferd: Yes, yes, okay.

Chief Tice: Yeah, So, we did the LifeScan physicals and the mental health screenings last year. We'll be doing them again this year.

Selectman Guessferd: That's big.

Chief Tice: Yeah, but that. So, you see that it's, we spent \$87,000, but there was \$76,000 reimbursed to the town.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, that's excellent, okay.

Selectman Morin: 252, only approved last year, \$150.00, and we were at \$18,000, and now we're at \$2,000. Top of the page.

Chief Tice: And that goes, So, under the part-time salaries, 102. I know, but this goes with this. Yeah, this goes with this, because we've been using that. Instead of hiring a part-time person, we've been using some contractual services to do specific projects that have worked out better than being able to try to hire somebody to do everything we would want them to do. So, my recommendation would be to move \$18,000 from 102 into 252, and then cut \$6,809. So, that would, we haven't been using that line, so, that wouldn't hurt us.

Chairman Dumont: I apologize, what line were you pulling the \$18,000 from?

Selectman Jakoby: From 102 part-time salaries.

Chairman Dumont: Oh, part-time salaries.

Chief Tice: And then we would move it to 5710-252, and that would give us a request for FY27 of \$20,000.

Selectman Guessferd: So, yeah, like you said, so, it's \$6,000 less. So, just zero that out, zero out 102.

Chief Tice: Yeah, that would be my recommendation.

Roy Sorenson: Did you get that, Laurie?

Chairman Dumont: All right, any other questions or comments for the administration?

Selectman Guessferd: One other question real quick. Not that it's a bad thing, but there's a little bit more service recognition. So, do you have a lot of folks that you know are getting recognition this year? Is that why that's higher?

Chief Tice: We have had more with promotions, promotions, pinnings, and we have gone to a new venue for our awards night, which is a little bit more costly, but we think the different venues are going to bring in more people and more interest for our membership.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, because a lot of times it's a function of, number one, trying to recognize more people, and number two, if there's service anniversaries, things like 5, 10, 15 years, something like that, if you have more people that are like, this year we got 20 people that are in that category. So, I just wanted to make sure I understood that.

Chairman Dumont: I had one last question. 231 and 5710 meals out of town, So, it's a 200% increase. I know it's not a large dollar amount, but obviously the percentage increase tends to scare people a little bit. Can you just speak to that?

Chief Tice: Yeah, I believe is that when we moved some money from training into there for the national fire economy?

Erika LaRiviere: We did. That was when they went out for that.

Chief Tice: Yeah, So, this is money. We moved money from training under 5730 into this because we were using that money for meal plans when people go to the National Fire Academy. So, it seemed like it was more appropriate to come from the meals line than the training line.

Chairman Dumont: So, you had a reduction, and then this was the increase.

Chief Tice: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Those are all my questions. Do we have any other ones?

Selectman Jakoby: To go along with that, then the admin lodging, what was that switched from? Line 234?

Erika LaRiviere: That wasn't. That's actually always been at \$1,000, but it won't reflect it because it wasn't spent. So, we do try to keep it at... The intent is to be able to send people out to events and conferences, So, we've always just kept that \$1,000 to use.

Chief Tice: Yeah, we've just taken advantage of free training and education, So, this National Fire Academy is free of cost. So, we've just been using things that are free.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: So, to that point, more just on a... I know you guys had spoken to the state not having adequate training in the past or not availability of... Is it the same way with the national? Is that why that hasn't been getting used?

Chief Tice: The National Fire Academy has a much bigger commitment. It requires travel out of state, time away from home. Some of the classes are 6-day classes. Some of the days are 14-day classes, So, you actually leave on a Sunday and you don't get home for a week and a half late Friday night.

Chairman Dumont: So, it's hard to find someone willing to do that.

Chief Tice: Yeah, So, it takes a commitment on the employee's part to go do those classes. Okay.

Selectman Morin: Can you, at the end of the year, if somebody wants to go to a class that isn't spent, use it on that? That way, I mean, if you're going without... It's not being used, why do we have it? But if you're not going to send anybody to the academy, why can't you send them to a class here that's related to the academy?

Chief Tice: And we could do that and use it for lodging. It could also be lodging for, and I know, I think we just used some of that money for lodging, for somebody to go away to a class. So, we will be using it. We just happen to have not had anybody go to a class.

Selectman Morin: So, lodging at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg?

Chief Tice: No, it would be for lodging. Say somebody took a class that was a few hours away and they stayed overnight, or the Fire Chiefs Conference, New England Fire Chiefs Conference, which is down in Connecticut, if we were to go to that and stay overnight.

Selectman Morin: I just can't imagine all the years we fought for money to go to class, and you never use it. That's what kills me.

Chief Tice: Because we'll be trying to take advantage of the free stuff.

Selectman Morin: Speaking of that, they have the \$500. Sorry.

Laurie May: I just had a question on that, taking the \$18,000 off of the support service position. If I do that, it also reduces the payroll tax, So, that would reduce it an additional \$1,300. So, just to let you know, I'm going to reduce that other line by \$19,377. Okay, good.

Chairman Dumont: Look at that. You found us more money you didn't even know.

Chief Tice: Sometimes it's better to be lucky than good.

Chairman Dumont: Are there any other questions on admin?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, we were talking about the reimbursement, educational reimbursement. They've only got \$500 in here. That's for if somebody takes a class and then you guys reimburse them for it?

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, it was more of a comment than anything else in terms of comparison of some of these things.

Chairman Dumont: A lot of that stuff now is figured in contractual with the new contract they got as stipends, I believe now, right?

Chief Tice: Yeah, but this wouldn't be, because this only covers the administration.

Chairman Dumont: Oh, right, okay.

Chief Tice: It doesn't cover suppression.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, okay. All right.

Chairman Dumont: If not, do you want to speak a little bit to the facility? I only had one question for that. I guess instead of going through everything, I was just questioning, I had a question about line 205, so, that would be 5715-205, large equipment repairs on page 9. It looks like a 28% increase. It looks like you moved a couple of things.

Erika LaRiviere: That's where the increase is. That's the line adjustments.

Chairman Dumont: It's about \$1,000 for generator repairs.

Chief Tice: Okay, yes, we're asking to add \$1,000 for generator repairs to cover costs that we didn't have in there before.

Selectman Guessferd: Mr. Chair, the actuals last year were \$16,000, because we had a project that we did, right? Maintenance.

Chief Tice: We did, and did we move some money from this account to other accounts?

Chairman Dumont: It looks like it, yeah, the breakdown.

Chief Tice: Okay, yeah, the sprinkler system. Sprinkler system at Central and the HVAC system at Central.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, okay. All right.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions on that from the Board?

Selectman Guessferd: The other thing was the same thing with building maintenance. We had some expenses last year, but, you know, we're back down \$43,000 this year, which is just a big difference, but I think we know why. There was some things that they had to get done last year.

Chief Tice: Yeah, and the two, yeah, So, that's the floor drains.

Selectman Guessferd: Floor drains, yeah.

Chief Tice: HVAC.

Selectman Guessferd: So, that was a one-time expense.

Chief Tice: Correct, correct. So, that's been removed from the operating budget for FY27.

Roy Sorenson: Those are out of budget, yeah, \$244, I think was the number.

Chairman Dumont: All set with that. I had a question under communications, 5710-212 radio repairs. Again, the actuals are pretty low, but it looks like we're budgeting \$4,000 for it.

Roy Sorenson: Where are you?

Chairman Dumont: 5720, yeah, page 11. 5720-212.

Chief Tice: We've been budgeting \$4,000. We try to keep \$4,000 in there because we don't have a known, it's an unknown amount, what might happen. So, we've been fortunate. We have had very minor radio repair issues, but that would be budgeted.

Chairman Dumont: Are those handhelds or in the truck or what is that?

Chief Tice: It could be handhelds. It could be in the truck or it could be in dispatch.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: The three vacancies you have, what are they?

Chief Tice: The three vacancies?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yes.

Chief Tice: Currently we have two firefighter positions vacant. Oh, in the part-time position, but that position can now be gone. So, we have two firefighter positions vacant.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: So, essentially you're fully staffed.

Chief Tice: Essentially, close.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: So, the two firefighters will negate the part-time. That's double in your overtime budget on 5720-105?

Erika LaRiviere: So, just to kind of talk a little bit about the overtime, with the overtime with dispatch, the majority of the dispatch overtime is actually covered by our firefighters and lieutenants. We only have four dispatchers, and they can't work more than 18 hours without a break. So, each dispatch shift is 12 hours. So, essentially a dispatcher can't work two 12-hour shifts. So, the only other option is the dispatcher that's off duty, and typically they will pick up some of the overtime, but the majority is coming from the firefighters and lieutenants who are paid significantly more than the dispatchers. What we also did this year is we added in overtime for the dispatchers weekly. If they work a 48-hour week, that's part of their schedule. That eight hours is overtime. That wasn't calculated in the budget before. It was calculated in the budget, but not in the overtime line. We had actually had that calculated in some of the salary lines. So, this year we included that in the overtime, as well as their mandatory four hours of community event service that they have to do yearly, and as well as the holiday double time. Those specific holidays, those four holidays throughout the year, that if they do work, they are paid at double time. So, you'll see on one of the pages, you'll see that broken down. So, we're trying to be a little bit more transparent with what is the overtime versus what's the holiday double time versus what is their scheduled overtime, we'll call it.

Roy Sorenson: Page 12.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I know it's important to have those, but I think it's maybe not right now. But we should definitely revisit that because it might be more economical to hire additional dispatchers rather than paying a firefighter lieutenant who gets paid much more to cover that.

Selectman Morin: There was a way, and we talked about this last year, and I understand why, but if you remove the lieutenants from that overtime list, that's a huge savings right there. Because you've got to look at what the lieutenants get paid to sit in dispatch. And, again, I understand. I've been there. They've only got four dispatchers, but we're paying firefighters and lieutenants.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, that's what I was getting at. It might be more economical to balance that.

Selectman Morin: And I'll admit it right now. When I was a captain, I sat in and around overtime.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Oh, I'm not. That's probably great.

Erika LaRiviere: The one concern with that, and I can say that there are a lot of lieutenants that do pick up the dispatcher overtime, if you eliminated that ability, it would definitely result in a lot more mandates.

Selectman Morin: I understand.

Erika LaRiviere: Because the firefighters and lieutenants have the option to be on the dispatcher overtime, but they all could technically be mandated. So, you run the risk of now you're mandating more dispatchers, you're mandating more firefighters because you don't have that pool to take the overtime.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: No, I understand. It's a central service. You can't not have it. I get that. I'm just saying there's probably a better way to approach this rather than paying double time to a lieutenant.

Erika LaRiviere: Well, time and a half.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Well, either way.

Chief Tice: Yeah. Yeah, and if you see the \$148,000 that we propose is in line with the FY24 and FY25, what we use is what we actually spend.

Chairman Dumont: Mr. Sorenson, you had something?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, So, just to be clear, the budget's built off of the four dispatchers you have, which are four dispatchers.

Erika LaRiviere: Yes.

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, that number's true. The overtime, I think, over FY25, a lot of that just came from your vacancies. You were down the two.

Erika LaRiviere: I mean, I don't even want to say it out loud, but we can't seem to go a full year fully staffed. So, unfortunately, that's just been how it is. And there is also, we do have an obligation. They do take earned time, and that's unpredictable. So, you do have to be able to budget to cover for that as well.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, you've had people, dispatchers leave for different reasons. Has it been because they were maybe an illness or injury or different kinds of things?

Chief Tice: We've had that.

Selectman Guessferd: It's not like everybody left because they were going somewhere else.

Selectman Morin: Under communications 5720-325 and 5720-403, communication parts and small equipment, looking at the actuals and what you're putting in there. I understand you bought a whole new radio system in FY24, but then you only spent \$26.99 and \$250.20.

Erika LaRiviere: Those were the actuals, but that's what we've just consistently budgeted in the event that we need it.

Chief Tice: Right, just again because repairs are unpredictable.

Selectman Morin: So, if you did \$1,000 even for 403, would that be any different than 325? Is there a need for the extra \$455 is what I'm asking for.

Chief Tice: What are you saying? Cut the \$445 out of 455?

Selectman Morin: Yeah, I'm asking you is there a reason you need it, though?

Chief Tice: I mean, based on the actuals, if it were maintained that way, we would be okay. We ended up with more repairs. When we ran out of this money, we'd have to find the money somewhere else.

Selectman Morin: So, like anything else, if we go over the budget, we've got to find it somewhere else. Okay, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions on communications? So, suppression, same thing. I just had a question for 5730-157, Education and Certification Incentives. Is that figured in because of a contractual thing, or how does that play in for suppression?

Chief Tice: Yes, that's the Education Incentives approved in the last contract. That is the contract, okay.

Chairman Dumont: Which is why the actuals are zeroed out for FY23 and FY24.

Chief Tice: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: I just wanted to make sure I had some reason for that. The next one was 204, large fleet maintenance. The actuals, again, are relatively low, but we're budgeting pretty close to double for the past FY26 and now FY27.

Chief Tice: So, last year we changed the way we were tracking some of our lines to try to better align all the like expenses together. So, it's broken down now, large fleet and small fleet, and it's broken down into repairs and scheduled maintenance to try to better align that. So, some of the lines are going to seem a little bit out of whack. If you look at the details pages, you can see where some of that money was moved around.

Chairman Dumont: Do you have that page number?

Roy Sorenson: It's 18.

Chairman Dumont: 18. So, the pump repairs that were moved into that line, is that what I'm seeing? No, that's large fleet repairs. Okay. Aerial certification. The aerial ladder certification testing, that's what was moved into that one?

Erika LaRiviere: Yes, that was added in.

Chairman Dumont: Was there anything else? Because that one was only \$2,700.

Erika LaRiviere: Yeah, exactly.

Selectman Jakoby: Major preventative maintenance was 7 units of 225. That's the other big one was \$15,750.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, that was part of the big increase.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Same thing with the oil changes.

Erika LaRiviere: Well, they're consistent. The FY26-FY27, if you look, what we had budgeted for FY26 were based on those line items.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Erika LaRiviere: So, that was what we had budgeted for that, So, we're not really changing that for this year.

Chairman Dumont: Right. No, but all I have to go by is what actually got expended, right? I appreciate the budget. I'm just curious, if we're only spending the \$17,000, where do we envision the other, I don't know, \$13,000 or so, going, \$14,000 change?

Erika LaRiviere: Well, if you're talking about what we expended versus what we're asking, if you look at the breakdown on page 18, it's showing what each of those line items are coming out to. So, for instance, we're anticipating that we're going to have to do two aerial PMs for what comes out to \$5,000, plus we're going to have to do the pump PM service. So, this is what we have in here is what we're anticipating that we're going to have to spend.

Chairman Dumont: And these weren't necessary in FY25?

Erika LaRiviere: They were, but we probably had them budgeted a lot less.

Roy Sorenson: Was some of this offset with, did you say large fleet repairs? Is there a... Because if you go to the next line, your actuals for FY25 was \$63,000, FY26 was \$25,300, and you carried that same line. So, did we move some things around there, maybe?

Chairman Dumont: From fleet repairs in 205 to 204?

Erika LaRiviere: I'd have to go back to FY25 and take a look at...

Chairman Dumont: That's the only thing I can think of.

Erika LaRiviere: Yeah, that's what it looks like.

Chairman Dumont: Because that might make sense. It would certainly make me feel better.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: So, it's in the U? What's the U for?

Roy Sorenson: That's just utilities. So, that one we didn't consider as part of the budgetary...

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: Does anyone have any questions? All right, So, let me look at 20...

Erika LaRiviere: So, in FY25, we had budgeted \$28,125. Oh, no, sorry. In FY25, we had budgeted for... Oh, shoot, I lost this one. In 204... All right, sorry. So, in 204 and FY25, we had budgeted \$33,169. So, that kind of carried over into FY26 with these same line items. So, there really hasn't been...

Roy Sorenson: What did you budget for large fleet repairs, 205?

Erika LaRiviere: 205 and FY25, we had budgeted \$23,181.

Roy Sorenson: There's your differential. So, it appears like that line's getting overexpended every year.

Erika LaRiviere: Yes.

Roy Sorenson: And this line's getting underspent.

Erika LaRiviere: And that's... And Chief will talk later, but that's why we do have a request to increase. So, one of the things that... And I think now kind of with this new administration, we'll have the opportunity to do, is that we used to not be able to move monies. It was... I don't want to say frowned upon, but it wasn't an option to say, if we overspend here, let's physically try and move stuff to offset things. So, that's why you may see some lines are really high, really low. We just didn't have the opportunity to balance things out. It seems like now we do have that opportunity. We do need to make some moves, which we probably will.

Roy Sorenson: I think you're correct. That was part of the objective, was kind of getting back to truth in budgeting, right?

Erika LaRiviere: Exactly.

Roy Sorenson: So, I think that's where the balance is for those two lines.

Erika LaRiviere: And that's what we try to do. When FY25 was already done, we were in FY25, FY26 had already been presented, and then we had looked at the budget and we said, you know what, some of these things need to be moved. So, we did that internally, So, we track it, So, we know, but we weren't able to actually make those changes, if that makes sense.

Selectman Guessferd: At that time.

Erika LaRiviere: So, I think we'll be coming before the Board at some point to ask for some moves of some monies to make things make sense. You know, just trying to be as transparent as possible where it's going and making it make sense for us, because one of the things that was important is we're trying to figure out exactly where are we spending the money and trying to break things down a little bit better. So, you know, you don't just have, well, we're just spending X amount on large fleet maintenance. You know, where are we spending it? Where do we increase? Where do we need to decrease? So, we're just trying to make that sense a little bit more. So, that's why you'll see a lot of those notes, move this, move that, to try to help you with that.

Chairman Dumont: I appreciate that, and that's just why I have the questions. So, I appreciate the explanation, because obviously when you look at the increases or decreases, it kind of throws you off.

Roy Sorenson: I guess my question would be why are we segregating those two anyways?

Erika LaRiviere: Which two?

Roy Sorenson: 204 and 205.

Erika LaRiviere: Because we had wanted to capture what was maintenance, what was required maintenance that we knew we had to do each year versus what were repairs that are unexpected. So, that's the difference between the two. And we do that with both the large fleet and the small fleet.

Selectman Guessferd: And maintenance tends to be more preventative.

Erika LaRiviere: Exactly. Versus if something just breaks. We were trying to see what the difference would be between we know we have to send it out for oil changes, we know we have to do this versus something that was unexpected.

Chairman Dumont: And look where it got you.

Erika LaRiviere: I know. I'm sorry.

Chairman Dumont: I can get that, but I think I would tend to agree with Mr. Sorenson. I mean, personally, it's all required, right? If the truck breaks down, it's got to get fixed. It's got to get back on the road. So, to me, it's all maintenance, whether it's preventative or not. I guess you can get a little bit into the weeds on that one.

Roy Sorenson: Internally, you could do it, right?

Selectman Guessferd: As far as the budget line?

Roy Sorenson: Well, yeah, one large budget line, and then they would just track internally what went to maintenance and what went to major repairs.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, you could granulate that on that line.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. Because the large repairs, I mean, you could get those trucks over there.

Chairman Dumont: So, I would guess you're probably going to get the same question in that budget committee, So, just make sure.

Selectman Morin: It'll probably be a lot worse.

Chairman Dumont: It's 10 versus 5, so, the education, you spoke to that. All right, those are my questions.

Selectman Morin: You've taken all my questions.

Chairman Dumont: Sorry, sorry. I'll stop talking.

Selectman Morin: 5730-325. You got \$8,125, but your actuals last year approved was \$3,000. Your actuals were \$5,300, \$3,000, almost \$4,000. So, how come the big jump?

Chief Tice: \$6,405 was moved from other and asking for another \$1,000 for power equipment, small engine repairs.

Selectman Guessferd: So, 33 of that \$100 was moved, yeah.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, that's the big one, 203.

Erika LaRiviere: So, even though it was an increase, it really wasn't because we pulled it from another area. That was part of our reallocation project.

Chairman Dumont: Operations equipment replacement, right underneath that, 340, is that the same thing for the 75% increase? I know it looks like there's three different lines that have moved. Yeah, \$3,300 bucks, \$800, and \$200.

Chief Tice: And while we're looking at that line, I have another recommendation based on discussions we've had about what we can use the target funds for. So, I would recommend removing the hydraulic rescue equipment and cutting that \$1,500.

Roy Sorenson: \$1,500?

Chief Tice: \$1,500, correct.

Roy Sorenson: 340, okay.

Selectman Jakoby: So, decreasing 340 by \$1,500.

Chairman Dumont: All right.

Selectman Guessferd: You got that?

Laurie May: Are you going to vote on it, though?

Selectman Guessferd: Do we need to vote on that?

Selectman Jakoby: It's a correction that the Chief is making.

Laurie May: Okay.

Selectman Jakoby: Just like the last one.

Laurie May: Okay, gotcha.

Selectman Jakoby: That's the only distinction I could figure out.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, there you go.

Chairman Dumont: If he wants to take it out of his budget, let him keep pulling.

Selectman Jakoby: Anything he says, you can just take out. Anything we take out, we have to vote.

Selectman Guessferd: So, we would incur it. Never mind. Decrease to \$1,500. Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that was captured.

Chairman Dumont: Is everybody all set with that? Move on to Inspectional Services. I'll ask anybody else if they have questions before I go through mine this time. Let everybody get there, but page 22 is what it starts on.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, there's one that kind of sticks right out, the professional services.

Chairman Dumont: Take it away.

Selectman Guessferd: But that's the mosquito control program. I saw that. I actually have it circled. So, that's new, and that's why that's \$40,000.

Erika LaRiviere: Yes. And that started FY26. So, we do have that warrant article in FY26, and we're moving it forward to FY27.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Line 252.

Chairman Dumont: I don't know about you guys, but the mosquitoes in my backyard didn't get any better.

Selectman Guessferd: Mine didn't either, except for the spraying that was done.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, I'm just thankful that the awful ones weren't found in Hudson.

Chief Tice: No, very minor, very minor what they found this year.

Selectman Jakoby: The awful ones were found south of us, right?

Chief tice: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Where they do all the control.

Selectman Jakoby: They're moving north.

Chairman Dumont: It's kind of ironic how that works. They spend all kinds of money on it, and they're still down there.

Selectman Jakoby: That's what's really weird. I thought that was odd, yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Tells me it's a waste.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, I'd rather know.

Chairman Dumont: It's inspection services training. Can you just speak to that a little bit, So, right above that, 237?

Chief Tice: Yeah, So, we moved \$750 from 236 just to combine the lines, and then increased by another \$300 due to additional training that's been going on with a new inspector who's been taking a lot of training, trying to get up to speed and get ready for. We know we have an opening coming. We're expecting an opening coming. So, that's going to require more training as well in that area.

Chairman Dumont: I do want to commend, obviously, the division up there. The guys are very intelligent. I know they've been taking a lot of courses to try to make sure that they're up on their stuff. So, I was curious. I just figured I'd ask the question. That was all that I had for that. Are there any other questions?

Selectman Guessferd: Public Education Materials. It's not a lot of money. It's just community events. You're buying more stuff.

Chief Tice: Yeah. Buying more stuff, doing more community events.

Selectman Guessferd: Well, you've had the open house the last couple of years, So, yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Everybody loves the red helmets.

Selectman Jakoby: They do.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: They ran out of them at Old Home Days.

Chairman Dumont: My boys always make sure to grab them. Yeah. All right. Next would be Emergency Management. That one seemed relatively straightforward. Decrease. A slight increase, I apologize.

Chief Tice: There is an increase under the professional services, and that goes with the maintenance contract for the radio system.

Chairman Dumont: The only question I had was the IT software maintenance. I can just speak to that one, same thing. I'm assuming that has to do with the contract. But it was up last year to \$113,000. I'm assuming it's a decrease this year. Actuals were less. That's 269, 5777.

Chief Tice: Yeah, we can speak to that. I know IT will be presenting this budget, is my understanding, or did they already?

Selectman Guessferd: They already did.

Chief Tice: They already did.

Chairman Dumont: I didn't notice that until I was flipping through yours. 269.

Roy Sorenson: Any particular line, though? It's broken out. It's page 29.

Selectman Guessferd: The actuals aren't broken out, though.

Chairman Dumont: No, quite frankly, what jumped out at me was the 80% increase.

Erika LaRiviere: Oh, So, that, yeah, the CAD system.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, that's going to be the annual agreement for the new CAD system.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. That's the \$39,872, yeah. If you do the math, it makes sense.

Selectman Morin: Before we get into budget, I do have two things I want to discuss. I figured they'd take a little longer. That's why I waited. First one is the Fire Alarm Revolving Fund. What does that fund?

Chief Tice: That refunds salaries, parts, equipment, any repairs, any contractual services for repairs on the fire alarm system, the municipal fire alarm system.

Selectman Morin: Any maintenance whatsoever of the fire alarm system, and that fund is enough to take care of it where the town doesn't have to put any money into it?

Chief Tice: Correct. That's the intent. That should generate enough money that we'll be able to take care of that.

Selectman Morin: Okay. So, recently we removed all the street boxes. If we have the money that's not taxing our taxpayers because we have the revolving fund, and, yes, they don't get used much, but the way technology is today and 911 systems go down regularly, why did we remove the street boxes where the public could go pull an alarm if we've got the money and it's not going to cost us anything? I just want to understand what we saved with that So, I understand it in the revolving fund.

Chief Tice: They were removed, my understanding was, because, you know, the lines on 911, they're not being used and they were in disrepair, So, they were removed.

Selectman Morin: So, how much did we save?

Chief Tice: I would have to get back to you on that. I do not know.

Selectman Morin: I just, again, it was just a piece of safety equipment for our residents, just in case. As we talked about the rope rescue team, doesn't happen much, but we may need one. So, I'm just, okay. So, I'd like to know what the saving was and if it was really worth taking them all out when we're not paying for them anyway but

they're there just in case. And the second thing was you want to go from Souhegan Valley to the new Hazmat or the new organization over there. What is the total cost to go from this side of the river to this side of the river?

Roy Sorenson: You want to segue into out of budget?

Selectman Guessferd: Segue out of budget.

Chairman Dumont: Is that what you're getting?

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. Are we moving to out of budget request?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, we finished everything else anyways. So, we can go into that. It's the second one on his list.

Selectman Jakoby: So, we're at the second one, the \$7,400?

Selectman Morin: I did see it in dues. That's why I brought it up when I did because it was in dues, so, it was part of that.

Selectman Jakoby: So, the dues?

Selectman Morin: It was in dues also, just So, everybody knows.

Selectman Jakoby: And what line? So, the dues under?

Selectman Morin: Yeah, it was in the first part.

Roy Sorenson: Why don't we, if we go to the cover sheet, you'll see the out of budget requests. I think what you see in the budget book is actual, the cost financial, I believe, right?

Chief Tice: Yes, that's what we budgeted for.

Roy Sorenson: So, now you go back to Selectman Morin's question. You're asking for \$74.99 on top of that?

Chief Tice: \$74.99, which is the difference between the SMART team and the Southeastern New Hampshire team. What's that?

Chairman Dumont: Was it 13 and change?

Chief Tice: We're trying to increase our capabilities to the public.

Selectman Morin: What was the total cost? I'm sorry, I missed that.

Chief Tice: \$7,499 is the difference currently.

Selectman Morin: That's the difference between them and that?

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Morin: So, an additional \$7,000 on top of what we were paying. Okay.

Chief Tice: Yes. And what we're trying to do is increase the capabilities that we have and increase the capabilities we have to provide services to the community. It would allow us to work with our regional partners to try to develop the rescue capabilities that we've talked about. It would be an organization that we would have representation on the governing board. They have a board of directors, which is made up of an elected official or appointed official from each community, and then they have an operations committee, which is the chief from each department. They would give us hazmat capabilities, such as we're getting now from the SMART team. In addition, we'd also get compliance-based rescue, which they have the capability of, and they're just invested in updating their compliance-based equipment. They've purchased a lot of rope rescue equipment, and they're taking that on as a project to be able to do the technical rope rescue. We would also be able to get rehab services. They have a rehab truck that can come out, provide drinks, provide snacks, provide warming or cooling shelters. They also have the ability to come fill Cascade bottles. They have drones. They have gators for off-road stuff, and they have a mobile command unit. So, we would have some enhanced capabilities, regardless of whether we did with technical rescue. But we've talked a lot about the technical rescue stuff and trying to work regionally and spread the cost out, spread the burden out. This team has a structure, the way they handle hazmat now, that

they can do the same with the technical rescue disciplines, and that's what they're looking to do. And I think that's why I want to go to their team. We get the same services, we get some additional services, and then we could work with them to try to advance the technical rescue capabilities that would be available to our town without us trying to do it ourselves and spending all that money trying to do it ourselves.

Selectman Jakoby: So, if that difference is \$7,499, and that's what you as Chief believe you should do, why wasn't that just included in your budget? Because then it would have been still a negative.

Roy Sorenson: No, it's combined.

Selectman Guessferd: It's in addition to what's in the budget.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, I understand that. But his overall budget came in under, at a negative, at a negative 2.5%. So, why not, if it's that important, just put it in your budget and you would have just been around zero.

Chief Tice: Because by the guidelines that we were supposed to follow to calculate our budget, it's down because it was those large one-time expenses that were in the budget that we pulled out. So, trying to factor in that, it wasn't right to factor that into our 2.5%. So, pulling those out, pulling the lease payment out that we paid off this year.

Selectman Jakoby: So, you just wanted to make sure that we were clear on where that money was coming from. Okay, just looking at the chart.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I don't think that's a negative 2.5%. I think that's a dash.

Chairman Dumont: No, no. It's a negative of a less.

Selectman Jakoby: It is a negative.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, to the Chief's point, that \$10,700 that's less than does not include the Souhegan dues.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: Right, so, that's why you're bringing it to our attention.

Chief Tice: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: In theory, we would have never known otherwise had you just thrown it in there.

Chief Tice: Correct, but I don't know that that would have been fully transparent.

Chairman Dumont: No, no, that's right.

Selectman Jakoby: No, no, that's fine. I appreciate that. And I'm just pointing out that I just want to point out that difference is within your leeway.

Selectman Morin: Do we have any hazmat techs that could participate in the team?

Chief Tice: I would need a little bit of time to research that because it's a manual going through the files right now to find out who has those certificates. I know we have at least a couple that I'm aware of, or at least one. There's no requirement for us to have anybody join the team. And where we haven't been part of a hazmat team, there hasn't been a whole lot of reason for somebody to go out and get those certifications, so, it's hard to gauge what the true interest would be without being a part of that.

Selectman Morin: My last question. I understand they reimburse the department. Do they reimburse the department for the training and the overtime for the team, correct?

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Morin: So, do they reimburse for the person covering that person that's taking the training and responding as a team, or does the town have to pick that up?

Chief Tice: No, they cover either the overtime or the backfill. So, if we had to ...

Selectman Morin: Cover both?

Chief Tice: Well, it wouldn't be backfill if the person responding goes on ...

Selectman Morin: So, you have somebody that gets on the team?

Chief Tice: Yeah.

Selectman Morin: A tech?

Chief Tice: Yeah.

Selectman Morin: They have mandatory training, with the team?

Chief Tice: Yeah.

Selectman Morin: They're on duty that day. You send them over.

Chief Tice: Their backfill would be covered.

Selectman Morin: So, both would be covered.

Chief Tice: Well, they're on duty, So, they're going, and their backfill would be covered.

Selectman Morin: So, that would even count if they went on a class and they were off duty?

Chief Tice: That's my understanding, yes.

Selectman Morin: Could you get that?

Chief Tice: I will find out for sure. Because we were part of this team at one time, and we dropped out because of overtime. That was the one issue. The team has everything he says, but that was the issue because we belonged to this team, and the overtime was very high. That's why I want clarification.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I would appreciate that, too. And I did have a conversation with the Chief about that one, and that was the understanding the overtime and the backfill was covered, which to me obviously was a no-brainer because they're going to cover it.

Selectman Morin: If they got covered.

Chairman Dumont: I mean, obviously we're paying the dues, So, don't get me wrong. There's still a charge there, but overall that organization pays the difference.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. Not specifically to this. I just want to clarify your requests here. So, as we look at the outside the budget requests here as we're going through them, do these represent your priorities in order? So, one is your highest priority and two is so far? I just want to make sure. I just wanted to confirm that. Let's start with the first one then, chief, if you want to walk through that.

Chief Tice: Yeah, I'll have Brian come up. If you don't mind, I'll have the Deputies come up, whichever ones work on these projects specifically in case they have. Second one.

Selectman Morin: As long as we get an answer about the overtime, I would agree with Selectman Jakoby, why doesn't this just go put in the budget?

Chairman Dumont: Do we have that authority here tonight?

Selectman Jakoby: And just to piggyback on that, if I add the \$1,500 to that total, we're at like \$1,200, \$12,000 under budget.

Chairman Dumont: Right, \$1,500 under budget.

Selectman Jakoby: Just for kicks and giggles.

Chairman Dumont: Yep, yep, yep. I would have used a different word by now, best not on air.

Chief Tice: Okay. I know the lines are confusing, but we have been overspending and anticipate having higher maintenance costs, repair costs, the cost of supplies are going up, the cost of labor is going up, the cost of parts are going up. I recognize we're asking for \$62,689. I understand that's a big pill to swallow. I think we have an

option, whether we split this between an increase or capital reserve fund or complete capital reserve fund, that would help fund or ensure we had the funding for repairs and maintenance, and it would lessen the hit to the taxpayer if we were to use the capital reserve fund for some or all of this. I think the way that we could approach that, if the Board is not comfortable adding to this line item, then when we got to the point where we overspent the line item, then we would request to go to the capital reserve fund to cover it so it's not a hit to the taxpayer. The capital reserve fund has a large amount of money in it.

Chairman Dumont: The \$492,457?

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: It's \$642,457.

Chairman Dumont: I apologize, I was looking at the market balance of June. Do you envision the \$62,000 being reoccurring, or is that because of what you see coming up for that year alone?

Chief Tice: You want to go ahead?

Deputy Chief Enos: Sure. Good evening. I believe I've met all of you. Currently, a fleet falls under me, and as the Chief and Erika were alluding to earlier, the past two years we tried to realign and be more transparent on exactly where we're spending money. So, we can get a better handle on how to prepare the budget in the future. One of the things that tied the hands of the organization and everybody in the town was the town went four years without any increases, two defaults and two zeros. During that time, though, the CPI on that stuff went up. Some stuff went up as much as 15%, 18%. So, our numbers are false. It was everybody was scrambling just to try and make sure we could get the trucks out the door. To be transparent, this is what I prepared. The Chief now has to sell it to you guys, fund it. But this is the honest-to-God truth of what it takes to run the Fire Department and to run our apparatus. To give you a current example, I went to a current fire truck vendor. They're called Fleet Masters. When another Fire Department calls them and asks, what does it cost each year to maintain for their budget, they say an average number is \$25,000 for an engine, \$35,000 for a ladder truck. That's for maintenance fees to keep this truck up and running. We're much lower than that. This is extremely scrutinized, but we're also on top of this now. So, when we prepared this, you'll see I did try and go through, and we sat line by line by line, where can we make adjustments. The numbers are very hard to follow at first because you can't do the three-year average because we've been trying to correct that. And Erika promised us all that after this three years, this is going to make a lot more sense. But it's going to be a lot more transparent for all of you to understand and anybody in the town to understand where the money goes. So, when you look over at 5730-304, large fleet maintenance, I tried to mark out specifically when I presented this to the Chief, you're going to see an increase that we didn't factor in before. A large PM, PM refers to preventative maintenance. That has to be done on every fire truck at least once a year. That's \$3,376 per truck, per fire engine. For a ladder truck, all right, a ladder truck is more, and I don't have that number written right here. But I will tell you that \$3,376 times three engines, times a 5% CPI. 5% is being reasonable. I'm sure you've all seen on the news and stuff how the cost of fire trucks has gone through the roof and then some. So, their parts go through the roof.

Roy Sorenson: Real quick, Fran, you're working off of the stuff that's in the addendum, is that correct?

Chairman Dumont: Yes, at page 7 of the addendum.

Roy Sorenson: So, if the Board looks at page 7 of the addendum.

Deputy Chief Enos: Excuse me. Sorry about that. So, this is where I tried to really scrutinize what I was asking for. Our pump testing required we have to test every fire truck that can pump water once a year. We have to test the ladder truck. The aerial itself has to be tested. That's a separate test once a year. We can't avoid these things. When we looked at some stuff, we saw oil changes. We're tracking when oil changes occur and stuff like that much differently now. We're going off the manufacturer's recommendations using new software. So, instead of randomly throwing at it, we send it exactly when it's required. That's cutting down on some of our costs. You can see that where we're going to have a hit, next year we'll be receiving a second ladder truck. That ladder truck will have another test required. That ladder truck also will carry ground ladders. Those also have to be tested every year. I had to factor that in. Batteries for apparatus. To give you an idea, we were budgeting \$500 for batteries. A battery can start at \$175, and you don't know when they're going to go. I believe I'm already at like \$2,000 so

far into this year's budget on batteries. That's where you can start to see breakdowns. Parts. We never increased over four years' time. We never increased the cost of parts, but the cost of steel has gone up at least 5% every year. These are my actuals. Paint and body repairs. We reduced that down because that's not the type of stuff we're seeing now. Because our fleet is in much better shape. So, we're truly scrutinizing every single line. Small fleet repairs. 5% increase because the actual we spent was \$18,469. The administration has done their best to make it through with what was presented from the taxpayers. But if we want true numbers to present to you, then that's what it does cost. And I understand that she has the much tougher job of explaining this and spending and budgeting and supporting this. But to your point, Mr. Dumont, Chairman Dumont, the truck's got to go out the door, and that's the way we do it. We have been extremely transparent. And I don't want to say cheap, but we've changed some vendors to get better rates, hourly rates and stuff like that because we were spending a lot before. We've changed it. And our service has been excellent. We have a couple firefighters that have been handling some stuff internally, small stuff. Changing the light bulb. If I have to send that truck out to a vendor, it's \$350 just for them to look at it. But if I can buy the part on Amazon for \$75 and have someone change it, I was changing some of them for a while, trying to keep up. So, we've made a lot of cuts where we can. But that \$62,000, that's the result of four years of you guys not seeing actuals.

Chairman Dumont: So, with that \$62,000, you're still going to be going out there working on the trucks, though, right?

Deputy Chief Enos: I do every day.

Roy Sorenson: I would commend them for what they're doing. They're doing preventative maintenance now. I don't know what was going on before. And that's not to say it wasn't going on. Tires. Are you covering your tires in this?

Deputy Chief Enos: Tires are in there. And tires are like batteries. We have a very good relationship with our tire vendor, Maynard and Lesieur. I can't tell you how many times he has helped us out and taken a look at our trucks, no cost. But we've built that relationship, you know, very strongly over the past two years to the first name basis. There is nothing we can do about certain tires. Right now, I have not recommended to increase the tires by much, a little, but not by much. And that's because right now we're able to, with our system, track the mileage. We know it's coming. What's killing us is when somebody inadvertently runs over something. And you've got to, you know, if you lose a front tire, that's two tires.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Deputy Chief Enos: Because if we don't replace both of them, I'm going to need an alignment.

Selectman Jakoby: That's all of us.

Deputy Chief Enos: Yeah. And unfortunately for a fire truck, you know.

Selectman Jakoby: It's a lot more.

Deputy Chief Enos: Yeah. It can turn into \$7,000 pretty quickly.

Selectman Guessferd: Like a little sedan. Page 7 is 204, not 304.

Deputy Chief Enos: So, to your point, Mr. Town Administrator, in two years or three years' time, since the trucks begin to age and stuff like that, absolutely. The cost of tires, though, will go up. One tire is \$625 right now. And if I buy cheaper tires, we're just going to replace them that much faster. I had a long talk, again, with Maynard and Lesieur, and they laid it all out. You know, we're getting state bid prices for our tires, but we are getting a quality tire. It's a safety issue, first of all. But second of all, we don't want to buy tires every other year.

Roy Sorenson: As long as you're covered in here, because they are expensive.

Deputy Chief Enos: Extremely expensive. To replace the ladder truck, which has the most tires, just tires alone would cost me \$12,000.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, because you guys aren't doing it. You're sending them to the shop.

Deputy Chief Enos: Correct. We don't have an internal mechanic.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: If you would like to fund one.

Deputy Chief Enos: No, if you would like to fund one, I would love to have a Fire Department mechanic. I get nauseated at the hourly rates they charge. But, like I said, we've just made strong partnerships with a few of the vendors we are using, and it's paying us dividends. Like I said, some of these firefighters that are actually stepping up and doing this, I can't compensate them. I don't have anything extra, but it does. It's literally \$350 to send a truck out So, they can tell me, oh, yeah, the light bulb's broken.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: It's like going to the doctor, right? I can't make it because I'm sick. How much are you going to save?

Chairman Dumont: Are there any other questions on that? We'll do the same thing that we've done with the other ones. We'll have them run through these, and then we'll have a discussion on the Board. So, are there any questions about that? You spoke to the Southeastern New Hampshire Hazardous Materials.

Chief Tice: Hold on a second. Do you mind if we skip to number five, fleet replacement?

Chairman Dumont: No. Go right ahead.

Chief Tice: All right. So, we're asking for – and there's two different figures here. \$27,988 represents an annual lease payment for five years. Is it five? Five or four? Four years. Okay. Or that makes more sense. Or the \$96,030 represents a lump sum payment, which would be overall a reduced cost because we wouldn't have to pay for their – for finance charges. What we're asking to do is replace the 2001 F-250. It's – we've had some rust issues with it, and we've had mechanical issues due to rot. It is a 25-year-old truck. What we would do is we would use the current shift commander's vehicle. We would rotate that to the utility spot, and the new spot would become the shift commander's vehicle. So, the response vehicle would be the new vehicle. It would be an F-250. It would have the ability also in the future to then be rotated out to either a forestry position or a utility position. It would be heavy-duty enough. It could plow if it needed to plow. It would help us rotate that 2001 truck either if somebody else in town needed it, wanted it, not quite sure what – you know, how much more use they would get out of it, but it would allow us to move that vehicle along.

Deputy Chief Enos: No, it's going to – the current – this is the same pickup truck that we requested last year, the replacement last year, and some decisions had to be made and it just couldn't happen. Right now, that truck needs steering work, engine work, glow plug work, charging work, and that doesn't include any of the body work. So, you know, I'm trying to be – I've got to pick my battles and keep them front-line pieces out. So, this was my – excuse me – recommendation to the Chief last year. The purpose of rotating that down is to try and extend the life of our vehicles. The Fire Department's always, you know, had that practice of trying to rotate it down. By rotating that vehicle out now, we're kind of ahead of the curve, and hopefully that will get us, you know, 24 years out of the existing silver pickup truck that we were rotating to the utility spot because that wouldn't be used as heavy duty. The current shift commander's car, that runs quite a bit. So, this will hopefully buy us some time and, you know, be fiscally responsible down the road.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions on that one? All right. Thank you. I don't think there was – what I was going to say about the other one, Southeastern New Hampshire Hazardous Materials, you already spoke to it. Did you have anything you want to add to it, though?

Chief Tice: No, I believe we covered that, unless anybody has any more questions.

Chairman Dumont: So, next up would be the physicals, cancer screenings, and mental health. Right here.

Chief Tice: We're asking for \$38,912, and this is a difference between what we would have – what we have budgeted and what it would take to do the same physicals we've been doing. So, we budgeted in the budget to do physicals as we did them before. So, that was utilizing St. Joe's. If you're under 40, you would go every other year for a full physical, and the off year you would just get a very quick physical and a PFT. If you were over 40, you would get a full physical every year. The physicals we're doing through LifeScan.

Chairman Dumont: Sorry, is that – just what I'm looking at, is that page 9 too in your packet here, the LifeScan Wellness Center?

Chief Tice: Yeah, it's probably – yeah, 9, page 9, page 10, 11, and 12.

Chairman Dumont: Sorry, I just wanted to make sure everybody was looking at the right spot.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Chief Tice: So, these physicals through LifeScans are a lot more in-depth, a lot more thorough. They include cancer screening. They include a physical fitness element, neither of which we get through the St. Joe's physical. This would also fund the mental wellness program that we started last year and we're doing again this year, both years under the same grant. That allows for a one-hour session for every firefighter, or this would account every employee, that would be able to go see a mental health clinician once a year for one hour. We use the same clinician that the PD uses. She is trained, vetted, culturally competent, so, she understands the trauma and what's associated with fire, Police, emergency services. I feel this is important because if you look across the workforce, stress is a huge, huge issue, and the illness, the lost productivity, the low morale, low retention, high turnover, all those things that go with it just from the stress of everyday life, and then you add in the type of work that our people are doing and it just compounds it. So, they have the opportunity to discuss anything that they would like. It's all private, personal, so, we don't know, but whether they have questions on their own mental health, they need some guidance, they need contact. She won't see any of our people as a continuing clinician because there's a conflict there, but she can put them in contact with somebody who can see them, who is an appropriate person because not every clinician has the right mindset and background to deal with some of the stuff that they would have to deal with. So, that is what we're asking for, is basically a continuation of what we've been doing under the grant.

Chairman Dumont: Questions, comments? So, just to touch on a comment that Selectman Morin brought up previous about the mental health part of it, if we could figure out something town-wide, I don't know if it's something we do this season or this year around, but it would be a good thing to look at, I think, as a whole.

Chief Tice: I'd also like to just mention Pastor Hobble at New Life Christian Church who has been very instrumental in helping us do this. We've done our physicals there. They have a facility that's appropriate to be able to conduct the physicals. There's also a nice facility away from the fire station that we're able to send people to do these because we don't want somebody sitting in the firehouse in one of the side rooms talking to a mental health clinician. We want them to go away and have some privacy. So, he's been very instrumental in helping us do that. So, I just wanted to give him some thanks.

Chairman Dumont: Fantastic. All right. I don't see any questions or comments. We'll go to convert four firefighters to lieutenants.

Chief Tice: So, currently we operate. We have a lieutenant and two firefighters at the Robertson Road station, the Lowell Road station. They're a working supervisor, working closely with their crew day to day and on emergency scenes, making sure that they're operating safely. The central station, we have five firefighters and the captain. The captains are tasked with the overall supervision of the whole shift, and on emergency scenes, they're the incident commander. They're running the entire incident. They're back, big picture, overseeing the whole incident. They're not working close with their people, whether it's day to day or whether it's on the emergency scene. That means we have, operating out of central station, five firefighters that are essentially unsupervised. What we would like to do is convert four firefighter positions to lieutenants positions. So, these would not be additional positions in the Fire Department. It would be taking four firefighter positions, making them four lieutenants' positions. So, the money that you see that we asked for, the \$52,161, represents the difference in salaries and benefits for those four positions. And you can see it's all broken down into the salaries. You'll figure out the difference in overtime, insurance, holiday double time, all the associated costs as well.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Can you explain what the groups are? Because I hear lieutenants, and I'm thinking all the lieutenants with the same base pay or whatever pay, and I see there's varying pay scales here. So, I don't know if that's probably due to the group on the breakdown?

Chief Tice: On the breakdown, yes. There are going to be a different step.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: That's because of the adjustment of the steps?

Chief Tice: Yes. On the wage scale, there's two different scales. There's lieutenant AEMPs and lieutenant paramedics.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Okay.

Chief Tice: So, they get different pay to begin with, and then for years of service, they get steps.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Okay. Thank you.

Erika LaRiviere: I also just, too, want to clarify on that. So, part of the difference, too, is depending on what group they're in, they do work different holidays. So, that's why there's kind of a significant difference because some of the groups don't work any of the double time holidays. Some of the groups don't work as many holidays. So, there is a pay difference whether you work a holiday or you don't. So, that's why I had it broken up into the four groups So, I could track exactly what their schedule was, what they were working to have it more accurate instead of just doing an average.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I appreciate that because that's what I was wondering. Thank you.

Erika LaRiviere: You're welcome.

Selectman Guessferd: A couple questions with regard to the soft part of this a little bit. So, you're going to be taking four existing firefighters. I'm assuming that you're going to have a competitive process to go through with the whole thing. Do we anticipate any sort of morale issue associated with this? In other words, are the firefighters pretty much ready for this? You said they're unsupervised right now, some of them. So, they feel as well, the work and follow feels that there's a need for this as well. How are we going to make sure that this turns out to be a program that everybody is in support of?

Chief Tice: Well, I think they all recognize the need to have supervision. We're running Engine 2 currently out of Central Station, which is actually what we went to with the 12th person. We were able to staff a fire engine around the clock, and that's the engine that doesn't have a supervisor on it currently. I think all of our people would appreciate having that position there. It's very hard for a firefighter to oversee other firefighters, even as an informal leader, where designating somebody as the formal leader gives them that direction, it gives them the person to look to, and it gives that person the authority to be able to carry out their responsibilities.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. It may seem like an obvious answer to some of us, but I just want to make sure we've discussed it.

Selectman Morin: In the way they're running it now, correct me if I'm wrong, you're rotating every day a different person riding in the command seat, and we've got to be careful with the contract because if they're in that seat a certain amount of days, they're rotating.

Chief Tice: Yes. We can't just designate a trusted person to be in that position and be in charge because they're not in that position. They don't hold that rank.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. Got it.

Deputy Chief Paquette: On Sunday, the fire that you guys got the email about, that was the first time since July 1st that that engine was first due at a building fire without an officer on the truck. So, that crew of three, not that they didn't know what they were doing, but there wasn't one person in charge that was calling the shots for that specific crew. And we ran into an instance at that incident where multiple people are trying to run the show versus giving direction and just going with it. It gives us the ability to hold them, that one person, accountable instead of trying to hold three people accountable.

Chairman Dumont: So, Chief, you mentioned the one engine right now that doesn't have the supervision. Can you do one lieutenant instead of four, or does it have to be four?

Chief Tice: The problem is there's four shifts. So, one per shift would give that engine a lieutenant 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Is it going to result in four or five fire openings that you're going to have to backfill?

Chief Tice: It won't result in any openings because there's no net increase to the number of heads. It's just reclassifying four firefighter positions or four lieutenant positions.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I just don't know how the operation works when you're a lieutenant.

Chief Tice: No, that's a logical question or a logical thought that might happen, but this is not to add additional staff. It's just to reclassify four positions.

Chairman Dumont: Okay, thank you. Any other questions on that? All right, we'll move on down to the next one, which will be Robinson Road Station Facility. Sorry, Station Facility Study.

Chief Tice: As we discussed last year, Robinson Road is a station that was built in the 1970s. It's aging. We've done minor repairs to it in the last couple of years. We've been doing some stuff to try to make it a better, more livable station. There were some electrical issues we addressed. We replaced the windows. We've done some painting. But we don't know what structurally the systems, the HVAC, the septic, plumbing, electrical, any of that, what might need to be done with that building to preserve it and make sure it lasts in good shape into the future. So, we're just asking if the town thinks it's a good idea to do a study to find out where we are with that building and what might need to happen with that building in the future.

Selectman Guessferd: I know we've talked about it a little bit.

Chairman Dumont: Yes, we have. Yes, we have. Questions on that? No. Down to the last one. Key access.

Chief Tice: So, we have several locks. We have code locks on our doors. They're starting to break. So, as we look at, you know, anticipating the need that we're going to need to replace more of these as they break, if we looked at going to a new system, replace them all, and instead of doing a combination lock, do something like PD, I believe, has, Public Works might also have it, I'm not sure, where it's a card access. So, you can set different levels of security, different parts of the building. You can lock out one card, So, as employees leave, you can either grab their card, you lock the card out, whereas now it's a code that everybody has the combination to. And we just see this as we know we're going to be replacing these, So, we can replace them one by one, but is this the time to go and replace them all with a brand-new system that's going to provide more security for the building? And this includes key locks for all the living areas. So, if the apparatus doors were open and somebody got into the apparatus floor, they still would not be able to get into the living spaces. Now in the stations, if you can get into the apparatus floor, you can get into the whole station.

Selectman Guessferd: Is this merely a flasher card, door opens, or is there a, like I know where I work, you put your card on and then you put in a four-digit code.

Deputy Chief Paquette: It's a basic RFID system, key card or fob can be tied to your ID, can be any of that, but really we're trying to eliminate the public from getting into private spaces in the station. And this is a, each one of those locks that the chief was talking about, we replaced Robinson Road and some of the ones at Central Station with a residential grade lock because that's all we could afford. The locks on the Low Road Station, we replaced one this year, it was \$1,400, one lock, and so, the life expectancy of that station with six doors hasn't made six years. And this is a system-wide, this is a change to us, it's all IT-based, we've already talked to the IT department, this is something I believe they're talking about for here.

Roy Sorenson: Potentially.

Deputy Chief Paquette: Potentially down the road, so, it's an entire system, it will tie into PD, it will tie into fire, and it's almost a town-wide initiative.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions on that? I think that takes care of all your outside-of-the-budget requests because we removed the GIS specialist. Any other questions for the Chief or anybody else here?

Chief Tice: When are the warrant articles?

Chairman Dumont: Warrant articles will be going over on the 10th.

Roy Sorenson: Are you, what's your plan for out-of-budget requests for tonight?

Chairman Dumont: I'd like to try to see if we can get through as much of what we heard tonight as possible, if everybody's comfortable with it, because I'd like to finish everything by Tuesday.

Roy Sorenson: All right, I would ask this then. Why don't you, before you leave, can you talk to us about the \$90,000 warrant article for use of fire apparatus, CRF?

Chief Tice: Yes. Sure.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you.

Selectman Jakoby:

What number warrant is that?

Chairman Dumont: I believe that's the second warrant article, 10.

Selectman Guessferd: Number 10.

Selectman Jakoby: Right?

Chairman Dumont: Number 10. Yeah. Page 5.

Chief Tice: So, we currently run three engines. That's one engine out of each station, and then we have the tank, which is also a pumping apparatus, but it is not. The way it's set up, the amount of hose, the hose configurations, the height of the hose bed in the rear doesn't lend itself as a great engine. But what we've been doing, when an engine goes out of service, we move the tanker into its spot, and it runs as an engine. We've been doing it at Central Station, and then moving Engine 2 out to a substation is how we were doing it. It kind of masked this one issue that we didn't recognize until we experienced it. Now, whatever engine it replaces, you've got to run two pieces with that engine company because the tanker is a two-person cab, and you've got a three-person crew. Also, if we go down two pumps, two pumping apparatus, which thankfully has only happened a couple times for very short periods of time, we have a station without a pumping apparatus in it. This happened at one point along the way, and I wasn't involved, so, I can't give you a lot of detail, but we got rid of two engines and got one. So, we dropped to three. I've been waiting to get some of our other lease purchases. We have somewhere, I forget, \$350,000 in lease purchase agreements in our operating budget. Those are coming due FY28, we pay off Engine 1. FY29, we pay off Engine 4 and Ladder 2. I was trying to get to the point where we paid those off before we took on another lease payment, try to keep that balance, you know, somewhat flat. But we're finding more and more that this is happening. So, we're trying to think of an economical way to bridge the gap until we can get a new engine. And really this is kind of like going back to where we would have been had we not gotten rid of both the engines we got rid of. If we had kept one of the older engines, we would have the three newer engines, we'd have an older engine in reserve that would just be there, you know, in case we needed that reserve engine. This is not an ideal situation. I can't believe I would actually be bringing this forward, but we have a need that we approach with kind of an out-of-the-box idea of why don't we take a look at this because you can, out there looking around, you can come across a decent used engine that would bridge the gap. This would not be a long-term thing, but it would bridge the gap in the short term until we were at a point that we could buy a newer engine. Obviously, and I'll let the deputy speak to it, we would have to be very selective on the engine because we don't want to buy somebody else's problems. And I know that's a concern for mine. I've got to imagine it's a concern for you as you sit here and think about it. But I think if you go out and find something that would, again, we're talking three to six years, hopefully closer to three.

Deputy Chief Enos: So, that's why the Chief brought me up here because if someone needs to be brought out back, that will be me with this idea, and I'm quite all right with it. So, a quick background, a Fire Department our size with our size fleet, most departments, even in the neighboring area here, will have two reserve engines, and those are engines usually that are 20 years plus that are not run on a daily basis. So, what happens is if we need to do just preventative maintenance, like on the ladder truck or a fire engine, because we don't have a mechanic, that fire truck has to be driven either to Derry or Lawrence, and then that truck is down for a day or two or longer, depending upon if we're waiting for parts on order or something like that. In the meantime, because the car volume is increasing and we have the staff in, we need to keep trucks on the road. So, we started using the tanker

truck, which primarily just carries a lot of water, much more top-heavy and puts more wear and tear on it. Now it's being run more like an everyday Class 1 fire truck. As a result, we're burning through tires. We're getting air leaks on the truck. We're chasing all new problems. It's not that the truck's bad. We're just using it a lot more. And as a result, we're not using it for what it truly was designed. So, we need a gap because if we order a fire truck, it's three to four years away, and then that's a million or \$2 million. So, what I'm proposing to do is to do what we may have been doing anyways, and that would have been or what the community used to do was we held on to a truck that was older. We have a lot of good neighbors, and we also, one of the companies that services our fire pumps, the actual pump that pumps the water, that company, their name is Perkins. They're very well known in the New England area. He probably has put hands on every fire truck in the state besides Boston. It's unreal how many trucks he's touched. He could tell us. He'd do it for free. He would come with us and tell us right off the bat, stay away from that truck, don't do that truck. He knows what we're looking for. This is to go in once a month, once every other month, So, we don't have to go down and not have a fire truck in that area. And we just can't foresee. Even if you were to approve and say, you know what, just buy a new fire truck, that would take care of it. It's four years away. In the meantime, we're going to run that tanker truck right into the ground and be back here asking for another tanker truck sooner rather than later. So, my proposal would be is to have a mechanic and have the fire pump guy, Perkins, they would do the actual inspection of a truck. So, we would start looking and see if something meets our needs, something that has lower mileage, lower hours, lower corrosion. There are departments in the state of New Hampshire that only do maybe 1,000 calls a year. The fire truck rolls maybe 400 times a year. The truck's 20, 25 years old. That could be an opportunity for us to look at that. There is no guarantee. We could buy it and the engine can blow up. I can't predict that. That's just being unreasonable. But what I'm trying to tell you is we could do our due diligence beforehand. This wouldn't be a decision made by me or any other firefighter. We would get a professional diesel mechanic to go through that truck. We would get a professional fire pump expert to go through that truck, and then we would make a decision. That I can guarantee. There's too many Fire Chiefs out there that think, oh, we can just, no, we would do these steps. That's the proposal that I'm looking to try and sell here. It also goes hand-in-hand with the fact that we need to be looking at getting ready to ask for the purchase of a new fire truck because we're going to need one, but it's going to take four years to get. If we don't get in the queue, it just takes longer and longer and longer. So, we have to be foreshadowing what's coming, we have to prepare you. We have to be honest and prepare you that these things are coming. But if we don't get ahead of it, then our mechanical repairs, you'll see me back here asking for a lot more money. Speak of the devil.

Chairman Dumont: Questions or comments on that?

Selectman Guessferd: All right, So, obviously, again, an obvious question, but we'll be able to get a serviceable enough truck, you think? I mean, the \$90,000, you've looked at it and said, you know, that's about what it's going to cost us.

Deputy Chief Enos: Right now, they actually have, just like the old car trader magazines and their websites now, they have fire truck magazines like that. For what we need, we should be able to secure something for under \$90,000. Right now, I'm very sure of it, I know that there's a couple out there, and I haven't even cast a really big net to look. And then, honestly, it comes down to, like, buying a used car. There'll be negotiations, and they'll be trying to get it lower and lower.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, and outfitting it?

Deputy Chief Enos: Outfitting it, what we would do is quite literally look around to what we have, because, again, if we have some spare stuff, we'll put it on. But worst-case scenario, Engine 1 needs to go for a PM. We take all the equipment off Engine 1 at 8 o'clock in the morning and put it on the reserve truck. So, we're not, you know, we have a few axes, spare and stuff like that. We'd put that stuff on. And you've seen in the budget, we're trying to build up our hose, so, that would be there. But the overhead would be little because we would just swap it over.

Selectman Guessferd: And then we'll have to add maintenance costs to our budgets in the next couple of years if we get this truck after that.

Deputy Chief Enos: Yep. The only bonus is that the truck, I would like to buy an older truck So, it won't have the Def, so, I won't have to worry about that.

Selectman Guessferd: Good call.

Deputy Chief Enos: For the Def systems, that's the EPA guidelines and stuff like that, if we lose a chip sensor and that causes problems down the road, that averages to \$6,000.

Selectman Guessferd: \$6,000, yeah.

Deputy Chief Enos: Just for parts. That doesn't include labor. This would eliminate a lot of that. And that's what we're – you get a code, and then the next thing.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. No, I know. Okay. We're good.

Chairman Dumont: You may have said it, so, I apologize, but how long do you expect to get out of the used apparatus? How many – life of this truck?

Deputy Chief Enos: Being realistic, one to four years. But what I would hope for is when we order our next truck, if we can cycle this correctly and plot this out, we have a graph that plots this out, that we would – engine one would become the next reserve truck, that truck would go out to pasture, or we would trade it in. Because it's taking four years to make fire trucks, used fire trucks now suddenly have a worth. So, we could get a trade-in value on it that before it was scrap metal, but now suddenly we're getting offers. Same thing with ambulances. We would get maybe \$500 for a trade-in ambulance. They're giving \$20,000 now because it's such a delay.

Roy Sorenson: So, engine one needs to be replaced at some point.

Deputy Chief Enos: In 2015, So, that's ...

Chief Tice: Well, my intent would be when we get these other trucks paid off after the next couple years, we would replace that as a front-line truck and move that to the reserve truck.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. So, four or five years out?

Chief Tice: If we wait to order it until we're in the year that we're paid off, we pay off engine four and ladder two in 2028.

Roy Sorenson: Do you know what that value would be, the debt on that?

Chief Tice: It's about – Oh, actually, hold on. Give me a minute.

Roy Sorenson: And then the question for that, Fran, would be what would that cost be for a new fire engine, the equivalent of what you're trying to get?

Deputy Chief Enos: For a brand-new fire engine, for what we own right now, it would be just shy of \$1 million today, unfortunately. And that's because there's another community that bought the identical truck that we were running three months ago, and that's what they paid. No frills, no nothing, just it's sickening.

Chief Tice: All right. So, engine one's payment is \$57,706. We pay that off in FY28. So, in FY29, we would pay off engine four and ladder two, and that's \$173,000 roughly.

Roy Sorenson: So, about \$200,000 available in the budget. And what's the lease on that engine one? How many years?

Chief Tice: Ten years. They're all ten-year leases.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. Any other questions on that? All right. If there's no other questions on that, what I'm going to do right now is give us a brief five-minute recess at 9:29 p.m. I'll just round it off. We'll reconvene at 9:35 p.m.

Out-of-Budget Requests

Department of Public Works

Chairman Dumont: All right, we are back at 9:39 p.m. We'll be starting off with the DPW outside the budget request. So, the first one would be the overtime request that the director put in for \$40,000. How does everybody feel about that? Any questions, comments?

Selectman Jakoby: Wait. What page are we on?

Chairman Dumont: Page three of the executive summary.

Selectman Jakoby: Page three? So, I have a couple of questions. So, we're estimating overtime at \$40,000 for fiscal year 27. So, the overtime that's currently in the budget, the estimate is that it's short by \$40,000?

Chairman Dumont: His explanation was this would make it hold to his estimate.

Selectman Jakoby: To his assessment.

Selectman Jakoby: I don't know. It's a big jump. So, I'm kind of on the fence about it. And because I think – where are we? Do we know where we are now with our tax rate?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah. That's a good question. All right. So, the adjustments that we previously or the Board voted on have been made. Laurie, correct me if I'm wrong, but the health insurance in here is correct.

Laurie May: Yep.

Roy Sorenson: So, there was a savings there on the health insurance. So, right now this is general fund only. Don't worry about sewer and water, and only the out-of-budget requests that you already endorsed. Our tax rate is \$5.70. As an example, if the Board's curious, the municipal property tax for FY24, which is currently what you're paying, this is municipal only, this is not town-wide, it's \$4.97. Our projection for FY25, which we should have maybe next week or the week after, right, is \$5.162. Okay. The FY26 projection, based off of the budget we're in now, was at \$5.62. Now those include your outside budget requests. Those include your warrant articles. Those are whole. Right now, we're not whole, and we are at, what did I say, \$5.705 right here. Okay. I don't know what the appetite of the Board is, what this magic number is, if at all. But as we go, we can certainly plug and play here and see what that number does.

Selectman Jakoby: So, that's my concern. You know, we're already at \$5.7. What are we thinking? I mean, what are we hoping? Because like Mr. Sorenson said, we can do this both ways. We can add what we want, and then we can say, oh, that's too much.

Chairman Dumont: That's kind of what I was thinking, is you plug it in along the way and we'll have to revisit it every time we make an addition. I had a conversation with Mr. Sorenson about this one, and I think we share some of the concerns you bring up, so, I think the overtime is a big ask. We're trying to balance a lot of other items, but I think a fair number would be around \$20,000. It's a need. I think that it's a problem that's occurring. We can't solve everything all at once but, I think that that would be a good starting point.

Selectman Morin: Do we know for a fact that if the warrant article for the extreme weather capital reserve fund goes through, this money, if it doesn't get spent, can get transferred into that?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah. So, I think what Director Twardosky is doing here is this is actually for just regular operations.

Selectman Morin: No, no, I understand that. But in the long run, if we could take if there's any left and throw it into this account, then we don't have to do this every year if we see there's enough money always in that extreme weather fund.

Roy Sorenson: That'll go back and forth. It'll always be in the operating budget. So, like I said, even if you had – you didn't have that bad of a winter because it's a bottom line, and say he had, I don't know, \$70,000 in his operations, it would take that up. And then vice versa, you have – So, if you approve the extreme weather and the CRF gets approved at the end of FY27, if there's \$110,000 left over, you have the ability to throw that in that fund and or reuse it for the upcoming year.

Selectman Morin: That's what I'm saying. That's why I was asking if we could take this – if any was left and throw it into that. Transfer it over.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: The one thing that I didn't really enjoy these numbers was he was basing this off the FY17 budget to try to make it whole against that, which I don't know if that's the most relevant number of what we should be using. I'm just trying to find out what page it was on.

Chairman Dumont: So, he says in the executive summary, so, FY17 budget assumed \$44.85 for hours at \$150,000, and the FY27 assumed \$32.95, is that what you're talking about, \$200,000?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, those two numbers. I'm trying to find it in the big book, but I had it marked out because it was one of my questions. I agree. I see what he's saying, but at the same time, we're using data from 17 to make what we're doing now. We should be using more relevant data.

Selectman Morin: Just before we go too far, we had several occasions tonight where we almost had duplicate lines. You know what I mean? If we could start with, do we want to remove? We asked some questions about why \$450 is nothing. Don't get me wrong. But if you got away with under \$1,000 all these years, then why do you need the extra \$450? And that happened in several departments. You know what I mean? It's small money, but it does add up in the end if there was anything we want to knock those off first.

Chairman Dumont: We could. I have a couple that I was going to look at. I'm just trying to keep things in order. So, that way I wasn't going to lose track of everything, to be honest. But if the Board would, choose to bounce around, then we could. It's up to you guys. I've already made my spiel for what I think the overtime should be.

Selectman Guessferd: I would concur with you on that. That's \$20,000 for that, no more than that. Okay. On the overtime. Right?

Selectman Jakoby: So, are you looking for a motion to add \$20,000?

Chairman Dumont: If you're comfortable with making a motion, I will hear one.

Selectman Jakoby: I am ready. So, it did say in the executive summary that this increase would be split between 5552 and 5557.

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I would then put \$10,000 into each in my motion? Okay. All right. I move that we place \$10,000 into the DPW account 5552. Oops, sorry. An additional \$10,000 into account 5557 in order to cover the overtime out-of-budget request.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to appropriate an additional \\$10,000 to each of the following Department of Public Works accounts: 01-4312-5552-105-000 \(Streets Salaries Overtime\) and 01-4312-5557-105-000 \(Extreme Weather Overtime\), to cover overtime expenses in the out-of-budget request. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: And just a question to Mr. Sorenson. Are you good with the way the motion was to cover the outside of the budget? I believe that would be streets and one of his other requirements.

Roy Sorenson: So, the total number is now \$20,000, correct?

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: But he had it requested that it be split. \$10,000 to \$10,000.

Chairman Dumont: So, yeah, extreme weather and for streets. All right. All in favor? Motion carries 5-0. We'll take care of that one.

Selectman Jakoby: Laurie has a question.

Laurie May: So, were it's wages, the associated taxes would also come off of that. So, and each plus tax?

Selectman Jakoby: So, then we're moving to town-wide paving?

Chairman Dumont: Next one would be town-wide paving.

Selectman Morin: If we add this \$100,000, they've got some money to take from it.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Like they always do.

Chairman Dumont: I'll give just a quick one about this. We did this last year. I'd be fine with holding off on this one for this year.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you. I thought we had done it as well. Yeah, I don't.

Selectman Guessferd: What is the state of paving right now?

Chairman Dumont: We always have more roads to pave.

Selectman Guessferd: I know that.

Chairman Dumont: Mr. Sorenson, do you have any information for that?

Roy Sorenson: As far as the paving program this year I think he'll use his full allocation this year, which is 1.1%, versus carrying some into the spring and having some of that money in there for purposes other than maybe roads or the intention of it.

Selectman Guessferd: Because they always pull from that. I'm okay with holding off.

Roy Sorenson: I think in general maybe we look at the program in a different way, not this year, maybe next, or, of course, at some point during next year as we build towards the budget season.

Selectman Jakoby: Do we need a motion?

Chairman Dumont: If we have a consensus, I don't believe we need a motion.

Selectman Guessferd: No, I don't think so.

Chairman Dumont: All right.

Selectman Jakoby: We're not touching.

Chairman Dumont: Is everybody okay with that?

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: All right. The next one is Police.

Police

Selectman Guessferd: Before we get into any more of these, did we want to do any of that combining stuff or do you want to just go right down to Police?

Chairman Dumont: Well, it's up to you. My preference would be Police, but if you guys want to go to a different department ...

Selectman Geussferd: We can figure out those things by department.

Selectman Morin: Yes, and if we figure these out and see how much we actually did, then we can take it from there.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, and I just think in general that the point is well made in terms of combining and ask for next year's budget as they get combined into next year's budget so we can look at them differently next year. And if we make adjustments this year, great.

Chairman Dumont: And the hope would be if we can, and I get that there's some other cuts people have brought up, if we can make our way through the book with doing the add-ins and these cuts now knowing everything, we can take a look at the number. We can always bounce back and say, hey, maybe we need to make some adjustments.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: At least that way we'll have a starting point. Yep.

Selectman Jakoby: We're on to Police.

Chairman Dumont: We are on to Police. So, we already had a motion made last time that passed for the Neo-Gov, so that was already added in. The yearly wellness consultations, while I'm in favor of that, I would almost like to try to take Selectman Morin up on his comment and Selectman Jakoby were talking about doing a town-wide initiative. I don't know if it would hurt to wait until next year to try to put something together as a town for a Police, Fire and the municipal side or the administration over here, but that was kind of what I was thinking.

Selectman Guessferd: It would take a little bit to re-record that at this point this year, but definitely need to do it, I think, for next year.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I don't want to put it off. I'm just wondering if we could almost kind of expand it to cover everybody.

Selectman Guessferd: Yes. I think it's a great initiative. So, I'd say I'm in favor of it, so I'll make a motion if we want to do that.

Chairman Dumont: Do you want to add that in or do you want to make it a town initiative for next year?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, for next, for FY27?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. Well, it would be fiscal year of 28, but yeah, it would be done in FY27.

Roy Sorenson: You'd be foregoing this?

Selectman Guessferd: We'd be foregoing it for this year.

Roy Sorenson: Okay.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I have a question after the motion. So, the main, just to remind everyone, the main push for this was so that there would be yearly meetings for each yearly wellness consultations for each of the employees to receive an annual wellness consultation with a qualified mental health professional. This would also include four emergency consults. So, they currently have mental health support, but it's not yearly.

Selectman Morin: Correct and it makes you listen to why they want to do a whole different, they want to do the same thing, but it's a different group and the money is different.

Selectman Guessferd: As long as they're getting the help they need during this year.

Selectman Jakoby: And that's why I want to make the public clear that we have things in place for them to get the help they need. Right now, no one is getting a required annual, and we're looking at trying to look at the mental health of both Fire, Police, and the town all together and see if we can come out with a more cost-effective way of doing this. So, in that case, we're looking at putting this off for a year.

Selectman Guessferd: Well said.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: I like it. All right. How does everybody feel about that?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, as long as they're getting the help they need.

Selectman Morin: Yeah, they've already got contracts, and Officer Downey is the wellness officer for the Police. We know they've got a wellness officer. So, if something goes down, they have someone to go to, and Fire has Dr., can't think of her name off the top of my head. But they have a contract with them.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, and they're very happy with them. So, I just wanted the public to know.

Chairman Dumont: And I do want to stress that I don't think anybody on this Board takes this lightly, but I just think that we as a whole believe that we can make this a better program than what we have in front of us.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: The next one would be CentralSquare Pro Suite. It's a big-ticket item. I think it's a good thing. I don't think it's bad. I'm not sure if out of all my big-ticket items that we've got from all the departments if that would be my number one. I tend to lean more towards the one for finance as far as the software goes. But how does everybody feel about this one?

Selectman Jakoby: I almost want to hold off on this one because I want to look at the others. I do have others as a priority, and I'm thinking we can't do all of them. So, I guess I just would like to hold this one.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, let's revisit it at the end of this whole thing.

Selectman Jakoby: That's what I'd like to do.

Chairman Dumont: Right now, we'll take no action on that outside of the budget request. We will move on. All right. Next up I think would be we already went through engineering. We added in \$5,000 and so we're done with those outside the budget request, I believe, correct? All right. So, next would be we did tax collector. We already went through that as one. I think the next biggest one was IT.

IT

Chairman Dumont: I know that you had asked to hold off on that, Selectman Jakoby, are you still waiting to hold off on that?

Selectman Jakoby: Nope, I'm good.

Chairman Dumont: All right, So, we'll hop to IT. You said you had some questions, So, I'll turn it over to you.

Selectman Jakoby: I actually met with Mr. Sorenson this morning and just really spoke to him about the importance of the storage array and also the service for it. I know there was a proposed invoice within our packet. I wanted to affirm that if we do go forward with this, there would be a full RFP, that we would need to go through our usual way of getting various quotes, that this is not necessarily the exact cost of it, and I just also recommended that we look at a service contract. My question was is if we don't get this, because if we end up in a default budget, So, we can put this in.

Chairman Dumont: Right now, we're talking about the outside of the budget request for the Dell storage array.

Selectman Jakoby: That's what I'm talking about. Because part of me is if we end up on the default budget and we don't get this, then we're still concerned about servicing it. Just that after some research, service contracts can be separated from hardware contracts and just ask that that be looked at as we move forward. Like I said, I got my questions answered. I'm still on the fence on getting two. I realize that it's for redundancy, but it's needed. My real question was might we be able to put this off for a year to look at? Doug's goal was to look at the infrastructure and upgrading the overall system, and we don't really have a plan for what he's looking at five years, ten years, for what that might look like because technology has changed so much. So, I was just looking at whether this can be put off. And apparently, it's so old that it may not be able to.

Selectman Guessferd: Well, it says they're not supporting it after the end of FY26, and this is FY27.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, but there are other service companies that may be able to support it from my research. But I don't know. That's not my expertise.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Well, if I remember correctly, what he said was, yeah, he'd be able to service it, but the hard drives still might not be available.

Selectman Jakoby: But they might be.

Selectman Guessferd: The parts.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: The parts. So, though, we might be able to get that. It's still kind of in the same position.

Selectman Jakoby: And, like I said, through my research, we might be able to still get the old parts.

Selectman Morin: Can we get that information before our Tuesday meeting So, we can make a decision? We know for a fact that it's available?

Selectman Jakoby: I can make a call. I mean, I had a couple of friends give me a couple of places to call.

Selectman Morin: Can we give that to Doug to make the call and make sure it's accurate?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, Doug.

Roy Sorenson: I think Doug should certainly weigh in on it.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, absolutely.

Roy Sorenson: You could hold the item for now until Tuesday if you want.

Selectman Jakoby: I'll write a memo with what my research found and let him let us know.

Chairman Dumont; That's fine.

Selectman Guessferd: Now, the two storage arrays, to your point of one versus two, they each would do the same thing. In other words, it's not like one would be dedicated to Police and one would be dedicated to ..., but they would both service all town departments, correct?

Selectman Jakoby: It's the redundancy, is my understanding.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, one would be the primary, one would be the redundancy.

Selectman Morin: Yeah, if something happened here, we still got the other one.

Selectman Guessferd: Right. I mean, I think the chances of two drives failing are maybe relatively low, so maybe one is, when we do that, when we revisit it, maybe that's considered one.

Chairman Dumont: That was my question. Could you get away with one for this year and then try to do something on the following year?

Roy Sorenson: I mean, I think if you let Selectman Jakoby do some of her research, I'd really be more comfortable with Doug weighing in too.

Selectman Jakoby: Me too.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, I want Doug, yeah, definitely.

Selectman Jakoby: I'll try and reach out tomorrow.

Selectman Guessferd: No disrespect, but yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: No, I agree. I admit it's not my expertise. I just did research.

Roy Sorenson: I mean, if it comes down to cost, that's where we are. We do have CRFs that could take up some of this.

Selectman Jakoby: That was my other question, yeah. Okay. And if we have the CRF, do we not do it? And if push comes to shove and we have to do it, we have the CRF to do it. If it fails, we have the CRF to cover it, and we don't have to put it in the budget. And we can encourage Doug to come up with his longer-range plan.

Selectman Guessferd: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Just mark these down so we don't lose them.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay, so we're deferring Police and IT.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, So, the software for Police and the storage array for IT will hold on.

Town Buildings

Chairman Dumont: All right. Town buildings, you would ask to hold on that. Are you comfortable with looking at that tonight?

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, I'm comfortable looking at that tonight.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, again, since you had asked to hold, I'll give the floor to you.

Selectman Jakoby: What page is that?

Chairman Dumont: I'm not there yet. Town buildings, 5510 to 5120. Okay.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, So, the town buildings was really more a question that's similar to what we talked about with HCTV, is just moving forward, looking at how we're going to more closely monitor and look at all of our buildings and maintenance moving forward. I did take an extra look at it. I think we raised the question about the gas at Oakwood. You know, I don't think there's any action to be taken here other than, you know, in the future, I think we need to look more closely at all the buildings and maintenance and how we better manage that as we've asked our departments to better manage their items. And I don't think there was there an out-of-budget request for that?

Selectman Guessferd: No. It's just something we were looking at.

Selectman Jakoby: So, that's where I ended up. So, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: As far as the natural gas, how long do you think it would take to get an answer on that? So, I have the answer. Okay.

Roy Sorenson: Go ahead. There is a bathroom there. We have a hot water heater, apparently it's in the attic. We would have to basically, just like you have a camp up north, you'd have to drain everything, shut it down. It's an old building, so the gas is on. We do keep it at a minimal temperature, obviously, but, you know, it's an old building. So, anyone who owns an old house knows where most of the heat is going.

Chairman Dumont: And is that the concerns around the water in that building?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, I think.

Chairman Dumont: Does it get shut off during the winter time?

Roy Sorenson: No. No, that's my point. It's not because there's a hot water heater.

Chairman Dumont: I don't know why they put it up in the attic.

Chairman Dumont: Is there any chance to shut it off?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, I think we'd have to look at just shutting it down for the winter.

Chairman Dumont: Or you could do one of those insulated booths, right, where it comes in?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, and doesn't it need to be at least temperature controlled for what's stored there?

Roy Sorenson: As far as the files and stuff?

Selectman Jakoby: The files and stuff. I'm asking a question.

Roy Sorenson: I don't know.

Selectman Jakoby: And for fires, is there a fire suppression there or no? No. Just asking the water questions.

Roy Sorenson: I don't know. I mean, I think what I would do is at this point, you know, I mean, you can adjust the budget line if you want. Either way, we'll have to look at how we handle it operationally, right?

Chairman Dumont: What page is that on?

Roy Sorenson: This is going to be, so, we're in the Selectmen's area, page 8, 01-4194-5115, Facilities Oakwood. So, you see the \$800, which is fine, but that doesn't tell the story. I mean, you can see what we've spent here. That's why I made it true, which is \$2,600. It doesn't solve the problem. Just let you pay the bill and not.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: If there's no restrictions to temp control and it's only for storage, no other function, then there's an opportunity to just mothball it, switch the water lines, turn the gas off.

Chairman Dumont: I would say what we could do is leave it in the budget, look for a solution for this coming year. There's no reason why we can't still do that. Then you have some extra money left over that would flow back into the general fund.

Selectman Guessferd: That's fair.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. So, everybody's good with town buildings?

Selectman Guessferd: Yes.

Assessing

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, that brings us to tonight to Assessing, if I'm not mistaken. Did you have anything else from Tuesday, Mr. Sorenson?

Roy Sorenson: No.

Selectman Guessferd: CRF?

Roy Sorenson: Yes. Assessing is just the CRF. I think you have a consensus on it.

Chairman Dumont: Yes. I just didn't know if I missed anything from town building. Sierra.

Selectman Guessferd: The only thing else about assessment that I still feel strongly that the number in there for the professional services is too large.

Chairman Dumont: So, I know you said you didn't want to bring it down to \$70,000, but I'm going to be honest, the first thing that came into my mind was why can't we cut that to \$75,000?

Selectman Guessferd: No, I'm fine with that. I mean, I'm fine with that.

Chairman Dumont: The way that I would look at it is almost, you know, if something did happen, he would have to come to us, and we've done it before, whether we look at a contingency or another line item, and I'm not saying that I'm always in favor of that, but that's, you know, a good chunk right there, \$32,000.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, yeah, no.

Selectman Guessferd: That just stuck out to me like a sore thumb, you know?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I'll make a motion if you want.

Chairman Dumont: Go right ahead.

[Selectman Vurgaropulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to reduce Assessing account: 01-4152-5410-252-000 \(Professional Services\), from \\$107,000 to \\$75,000. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: At least we made up some of the add-ins. Was there anything else in there in Assessing just the plain budget? Because we didn't make any changes to his budget while he was talking.

Selectman Jakoby: No.

Chairman Dumont: I didn't have any other issues. That was really the only one that raised the question to me. So, we'll go into the warrant article. So, never mind. So, the only thing that I would say is just definitely really

consider by November 10th when we get to that "a" dollar amount. However, you feel about it, I'm strongly in favor of it. It's going to happen.

Selectman Guessferd: We have to be prepared.

Chairman Dumont: No matter how you put it, it's going to be a big hit, even if we can make it all the way to 2032. Next up would be Moderator. Do we have any changes there?

Selectman Guessferd: No, I don't think so, I think the numbers speak for themselves.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I appreciate them always identifying how many elections are in that fiscal year.

Chairman Dumont: I was going to say FY27 is going to be a lot.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, and that fluctuation is made clear in the presentation, so I'm good.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. We're good with that one. The next would be HCTV. Questions? Comments?

HCTV

Selectman Jakoby: So, I have a question.

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: So, do they have a reserve fund, too?

Roy Sorenson: Well, they're a revolving fund.

Selectman Jakoby: And that's different?

Chairman Dumont: It's different, yeah.

Roy Sorenson: Right.

Selectman Jakoby: So, their revolving fund is the contributions from the money that they get from Comcast.

Selectman Guessferd: Comcast, yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: And that's a revolving fund. Okay. That was my question. I wanted to make sure I understood.

Chairman Dumont: So, I didn't have any problems with his budget the way he's presented tonight. We're going to have to figure something out going in the future, obviously, as those funds continue to go down.

Selectman Guessferd: Well, I'm hoping that, quite frankly, I'm hoping the citizens approve taking the 20% and putting it back in his budget.

Chairman Dumont: Right.

Selectman Guessferd: I think it makes all the sense in the world. I mean, either way, it's coming into us.

Chairman Dumont: Well, I think the value that HCTV gives us is worth it, right? I mean, what they're able to do, whether you enjoy the sports at Auburn or you like watching us talk about a budget, it's very valuable.

Selectman Guessferd: Or there's other programming they do, you know, the different shows and things people put on. Yeah. Gives people an opportunity to.

Chairman Dumont: Well, I think that those are a lot of luxuries, but, you know, the government meetings that get covered, I think, allows everybody to understand what's going on in town, which is very important.

Selectman Guessferd: There's so many towns that don't do it. Right? I mean, you know, so, I mean, we have the luxury for our citizens that a lot of towns just don't.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah.

Selectman Guessferd: I'm in favor of, actually, the TriCaster. That's, you know, those are switching between the cameras, the different camera angles when people are, if those things aren't going on, the usefulness of the meeting kind of goes down a bit. So, I'm in favor of that one for sure.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I'm just trying to think. So, that would go into a new line item, or that would, how would that be incorporated? Because this isn't in there.

Roy Sorenson: The two out-of-budget requests?

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, no, that would just be added into his budget, and then his revenues would come in and would offset it.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, okay.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yep. Yeah, I'm thinking I like the TriCaster. I think that's important, and I'm thinking maybe we could push the cameras until next year.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, yeah. I mean, it's just, it's not going to be quite as robust.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, it won't be as detrimental to push the cameras.

Selectman Guessferd: Come back to us next year with that one, and we'll see how that. We'll also know at that point whether or not we'll have the revenue. They'll have the revenue, right? Because that's going to be a warrant article.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to point out, I think that \$9,000 is for two cameras?

Selectman Guessferd: Yes. Yeah, it looks like it, yep.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes. So, you could do \$4,500 for one, but we cannot do it. I just wanted to point that out.

Selectman Guessferd: All right.

[Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by selectman Guessferd, to increase HCTV account: 45-4199-5045-329-000 \(Audio/Visual Equipment\) for a Vizrt Tricaster 410 Plus in the amount of \\$10,495. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: Are we going to hold on the other one for right now, or do you want to feel strongly about one camera?

Selectman Guessferd: I feel like we should hold.

Selectman Jakoby: I want to hold on the other one.

Chairman Dumont: Hold on the other one, okay.

Selectman Guessferd: I know it's not a lot of money, but, you know.

Roy Sorenson: It'll have a tax impact, though, because that comes out of the general.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, that's what I was saying. These come out of our general.

Roy Sorenson: No, that would come directly out, because what happens is we take that 20 percent, and we keep it on the general fund side.

Selectman Jakoby: Removing. Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: So, yeah. So, the HCTV, now, looking at the numbers. I ran the numbers. So, if we get, just say we keep the same amount, it's going to go down, whatever. But right now, the difference between the budget he presented and the amount of revenues they're projecting is \$70,618. So, that's \$70,000. What is it? Let me get my glasses on here. It was \$283,000. So, the revenue versus the projected expenses are actually \$64,383. If we put the 20 percent back in, then that adds up to \$353,618. Kind of basically covers it plus like \$7,000. Now, that revenue may go down anyway, just because more and more people are streaming.

Roy Sorenson: I think it's going to continue to go down, yeah.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. So, you know, I think it's worth. It's certainly going to fall within that. There's like a \$6,000 - \$7,000 difference right now.

Roy Sorenson: I think at some point. So, the effect here. So, back to your question first. The \$70,800, it just affects the other departments, right? That money is going to just come from somewhere else. If we don't get any revenue from Comcast, what's his overall budget? I don't have the sheet in front of me.

Chairman Dumont: \$353,618.

Roy Sorenson: That's the cost if we want to maintain on our own. It's a community cable.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I also think we can pass on the cameras. I know they're working on, I just remembered this, they're working on some other funding options through sponsorships and things. So, I would agree we can hold off on that.

Selectman Guessferd: See if they can be creative, maybe get some money for those.

Selectman Jakoby: And they're also working more with the school that has a lot of up-to-date equipment and things. So, who knows what creative partnerships can be formed this year.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, Mike does a good job. I think he can, I think if he gets the TriCasters.

Selectman Jakoby: He'll figure out the rest. So, I'm good.

Finance

Chairman Dumont: So, everyone's good with HCTV? So, I apologize, I did jump over Finance's out of the budget, even though I mentioned it earlier.

Laurie May: I was just going to go home.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Didn't you say we would go in order so you wouldn't get lost?

Chairman Dumont: I did, yeah.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Too many check marks and notes.

Chairman Dumont: So, this is one, I understand it's a big-ticket item, but I truly believe it's probably necessary. Everybody feels, and we don't have to make a decision here on it tonight if nobody's comfortable, because I understand we're holding on Police as well. But I wouldn't want to hold on too many items and then get deadlocked.

Selectman Morin: The software, like I said, we've gone through three finance directors, and it's got to be 10 years. And, you know, if we put it in now, it will give us some better direction where we're going later on.

Selectman Guessferd: It will also support audit.

Selectman Jakoby: Right, and everything else. I was ready to make a motion on this one. There's no question in my mind.

Selectman Morin: Yeah, because this will help every department.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I'm like, this one was no question for me.

Chairman Dumont: All right, well, take it away.

Selectman Jakoby: So, where am I adding it to, though? There's no account number.

Roy Sorenson: Oh, it's going to go under. Is there an IT section of Finance? Let's do that.

Selectman Jakoby: I have to make the motion to the right place.

Chairman Dumont: That would be a software firm.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: It would be 5377-215, page 9.

Chairman Dumont: Page is at 9.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep, I can put it there.

Chairman Dumont: Finance, IT, and subscriptions. Yep, right there.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Morin, to add \\$175,000 to account number 01-4150-5377-215-000 \(IT – Finance & IT Subscriptions\) to replace existing Finance accounting software. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Selectman Guessferd: Wow, that's from \$420 to \$175,000.

Chairman Dumont: You can explain that one next year.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. All right, do we have any discussion? Motion carries.

Selectman Jakoby: See, that was the easiest one.

Chairman Dumont: So, and just, I guess, for full transparency, the way I looked at it, we had a couple in there that was over \$100,000. For me, that was that you take care of that one. I'm not open to the other ones purely because of that. That's just me, though. Let me add that to my list here. \$175,000.

Selectman Jakoby: So, are we in an awful place now?

Roy Sorenson: No, I mean, we, no. I think, and remember, this number down here, so, there's your general fund, which we talked about. Well, actually, that'll have to get added in, so, that general fund number will change, but this is with all the warrant articles still in there.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, okay.

Roy Sorenson: \$6.255.

Selectman Jakoby: That's with all the warrants, okay.

Roy Sorenson: Okay, you're out of budget requests, but you're up here. You were at \$1.2 million. You're at \$853,939 right now, so.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. Where to next?

Recreation

Chairman Dumont: We will go to recreation. That was the next one after HGTV that we heard. Comments, questions, anything outside of the budget requests?

Selectman Guessferd: Seasonal staff, yeah. No comments at all on her budget. I'm in favor of what she's trying to do with the counselors and CITs. \$13,951, right?

Selectman Morin: Yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, which would be, does she have an account there? So, she includes the account in the executive summary?

Roy Sorenson: So, \$13,951.

Selectman Guessferd: All right. So, if you want.

Chairman Dumont: I have no comments, So, motions, wait?

Selectman Guessferd: Okay.

Selectman Jakoby: I'm going to ask one question.

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I know that Recreation, again, for the public, this is for the counselors for the summer program. The revenue from the summer program comes back into the general fund, just So, that everyone in the public knows. But in order to increase salaries, we have to put it into the budget at the increased rate. And with that increased rate, will the revenues for that program cover that increased rate?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: Because the Director's goal is always to break even or create revenue. So, I'm just reiterating that for the public. And sometimes sharing what's in my head is helpful.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. And I think we could take a look at the history of the last several years on the program since COVID. And it's increased more than that every year.

Selectman Jakoby: Every year it has continued to increase. So, I just wanted to let the public know that it has to go into the budget and then the revenues come back. And that's how it is done.

Chairman Dumont: It's offset.

Roy Sorenson: So, if you look at the overall revenue, this includes seniors, which is a big part of it, right? You can see the revenue just climbing. Okay. Now if we go to where this money would go, you can see a projection is almost \$43,000 more in revenue due to the success of the programs.

Selectman Jakoby: Which covers this easily. So, I support your motion, Selectman Guessferd.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. That's the one I'm going to make.

Selectman Jakoby: The one you're going to make. I support it. But I thought it was important for the public.

Selectman Guessferd: No, no.

Selectman Jakoby: It took a lot to understand that before.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by selectman Jakoby, to increase Recreation Department account number 01-4520-5821-104-000 \(Supervised Play, Salaries Seasonal\) by \\$13,951. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: Do we have any discussion? Motion carries five to zero. That was the only one for recreation.

Fire

Chairman Dumont: Now we have a long list here with Fire. Who wants to go first?

Selectman Jakoby: So, are we, or did we, or are we going to put the 7499 in? We didn't, right? We just talked about it.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, we didn't put anything in.

Selectman Jakoby: That's fine.

Chairman Dumont: For me, the fleet maintenance program of the \$62,689, I'd like to see the CRF used for that.

Selectman Jakoby: I was wondering that.

Chairman Dumont: I don't think that's, you know, I understand it's reoccurring costs, but I'm hoping that with every year you have your ups and your downs, the following year, if they continue on getting their budget straightened out like they've been doing under the direction of finance and Mr. Sorenson, we might be able to figure a way to get that in, but we have the money in the CRF.

Selectman Jakoby: Which CRF would that be?

Roy Sorenson: It's going to be apparatus refurbish and repair. I think that's the large one.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, that's the one with the 642 in it.

Chairman Dumont: Correct. And we have the authority to expend that at any time.

Selectman Jakoby: Do we need, so we can just eliminate it from here and say that's what we're doing?

Roy Sorenson: Zero it out.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep. I'm good with that.

Chairman Dumont: We will do a motion to expend probably at a future date.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. Okay. So, that's consensus. I'm good.

Selectman Guessferd: Which one was that?

Chairman Dumont: So, that's the fleet maintenance program. Number one, \$62,000, 689.

Selectman Jakoby: Absolutely. Yep.

Chairman Dumont: Dave, are you good with that?

Selectman Morin: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: So, the next is the move to Southeastern New Hampshire Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid District.

Selectman Jakoby: And we had held off on that.

Selectman Morin: Right.

Selectman Jakoby: Because you wanted to affirm that the ...

Selectman Morin: I just want to make, we were part of this at one time. It was just the overtime cost.

Selectman Jakoby: So, until we get that affirmed, we don't want to do anything with this.

Chairman Dumont: And I would agree because I had a conversation with the chief about that. And that was the belief. And if that was the case, then I would be a yes on that. Because to me, it was almost like a no-brainer, right? We were going to get a significant benefit where right now, and Selectman Morin can speak to what we have, is about half that cost.

Selectman Morin: Yeah, and all we get is a HAZMAT team.

Chairman Dumont: Right.

Selectman Morin: The only difference between these, we get a lot more, don't get me wrong. The HAZMAT team we get from over there comes with a full team right away. We're going to have to wait for everybody to come from all these towns to get here and then formulate a plan. So, there will be a delay. But other than that, we get a lot of stuff from this.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: So, we'll hold on that one for right now. Yep. The next is the physicals, cancer screenings, and mental health, which if we're sticking with everything else, we're going to hold.

Selectman Jakoby: We're going to hold off.

Chairman Dumont: We'll try to do a town-wide initiative.

Selectman Jakoby: Agreed.

Chairman Dumont: Convert the four firefighters to lieutenants.

Selectman Morin: I think this is a safety issue. As the deputies talked about, that one engine company had no one in command because they were all at the same rank and nobody made any directions.

Selectman Guessferd: Was this at the recent fire?

Selectman Morin: I'm sorry?

Selectman Guessferd: Was this at the recent fire?

Selectman Morin: No, they did their job, don't get me wrong.

Selectman Jakoby: And they got there quickly.

Selectman Morin: But there was nobody, and that could be a problem.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Too many cuts.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, absolutely.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I support this just for the sheer effect. That's why I said that.

Chairman Dumont: So, I've got to be honest with you, I was on the fence with this one, and I still am. We added four new positions at the previous one. There's a lot for people to bite off. I don't know, just on the fence to see what I guess.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, we can hold off.

Chairman Dumont: No, no, I don't want to make the list any larger, and I'm not going to let myself hold you guys back if you're certain of it. I'm only one vote anyways.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, we can just make it four to one vote.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. Well, we've done that many times.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I think this is critical, just coming from a military background. I'm sure Bob can agree. If you have too many cooks in the kitchen, you're going to get that. Nobody wants that. So, from a sheer safety standpoint, I think that's a necessity.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, when he explained it, to me it was kind of clear.

Chairman Dumont: I kind of asked the question with doing one. He said the job got done at this most recent one, which, I mean, from everything that I saw and read, they did a fantastic job. What are we really looking at if this wasn't approved here tonight? You're creating four new positions. It only gets more expensive in a year.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, they're not four new positions.

Chairman Dumont: Not four new positions, but you're increasing their rank.

Selectman Morin: What's happening right now is there's no standard control, for one, because nobody has the authority to move forward. You've still got the captain who has to take care of all his duties, plus he's got to supervise them now, a full crew, plus run the fire. This day you've got John, next day you've got Joe, and then you've got Harry. You know what I mean? So, it's always a constant. There's no command and control for that engine company. Don't get me wrong. They did what they were supposed to do the other day, but their firefighters, they're still thinking that way because that's their rank.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: This is purely for safety and continuity. If you don't have that continuity, it's just like anybody here. If you're in charge of something, everybody's coming to you. If it's you and a whole team and everybody's asking a different person something, you're going to get a different result.

Selectman Morin: And the other thing, too, speaking of that, if you've got firefighter A and firefighter B and we don't agree, I'm not going to listen to you today because you're just a firefighter.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: And technically they're in the rank because that's their rank.

Selectman Jakoby: And I understand all that. I guess the thing that bothers me, and, you know, I'll support this, but when we were adding the four firefighters, this wasn't discussed.

Chairman Dumont: That's my problem.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, I figured that was it. I was trying to say a good way of stating it.

Selectman Morin: You're correct. But when we added this firefighter, it was discussed about asking him when he was going to make a lieutenant because this was going to have to happen. When we added the four firefighters for this injured company, okay, the discussion on a lieutenant was talked about because he didn't have the overtime and stuff and he was worried about how much money he was short this year. That's why it didn't get done. Remember? Because he was in that deficit and we had to make it up.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, he was going to promote one, though, not four.

Selectman Morin: No, he has to do four.

Roy Sorenson: Four groups.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I didn't understand that that conversation related to this.

Selectman Morin: Yes, it did.

Selectman Jakoby: Because I'm right where you are.

Chairman Dumont: You're not the only one.

Selectman Morin: Because lieutenants were discussed in our meeting when you're going to promote a lieutenant to be in charge of this company So, the captains could do their job.

Selectman Jakoby: Right. And I did not have the understanding of three men on an engine and you need a leader. There, I said it nicely.

Chairman Dumont: Motions?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'll make a motion.

Chairman Dumont: All right, go right ahead.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I make a motion to fund, I don't know what account.

Roy Sorenson: Let's go to the addendums.

Chairman Dumont: He's got more than the \$52,000 in that one.

Roy Sorenson: Page?

Chairman Dumont: Page two of the addendum and he goes on to page three. A lot of different accounts.

Selectman Guessferd: Well, those are the fleets. Salaries, the overtime, you have the FICA and everything like that.

Chairman Dumont: So, do you want to make a motion? Because, I mean, to be honest with you, I don't think we need to list every account.

Roy Sorenson: You don't.

Chairman Dumont: I think you make the motion to add the \$52,000 into his budget based on the addendum we received here tonight.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, that's a good way of doing it.

Chairman Dumont: Because there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven accounts.

Roy Sorenson: I would say to the 5730.

Selectman Guessferd: 101?

Selectman Jakoby: No.

Chairman Dumont: No, 5730 would be the department.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, yeah, right, okay.

Selectman Jakoby: Just according to the addendum that we received from the Chief.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Okay, So, let's try to make a motion to fund, fund, convert, and qualify a party position to a lieutenant position with a cost of \$52,161 to the accounts listed in the attached addendum.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Morin, for \$52,161 to be allocated to the following Fire Suppression salary lines: \$35,141 F/T Salaries (5730-101); \$95 Overtime (5730-101); \$522 FICA (5730-108); \$95 Insurance Benefits (5730-122); \$10,492 Fire Retirement (5730-114); \$757 Holiday Double Time (5730-118); \$5,059 Uniforms (5730-319). Motion carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Motion carries five to zero. So, the next step is the fleet replacement program. And so, I appreciate Mr. Sorenson having him talk about funding the fire apparatus for the \$90,000 because, to me, I would use that CRF for this new vehicle. I wouldn't do the lease payment. I would buy it outright at the \$96,000, and I would use the CRF for that. Looking at how long they got for that vehicle, 20 to 25 years, makes me feel a hell of a lot more comfortable about using that \$90,000 versus one that we may get for one to four years. And I would think that we need to figure out a plan for that other engine. I appreciate what he's trying to do. That's his job, and I think that that's a good idea. But I think the money is better spent using the \$96,000 for that CRF, personally.

Selectman Guessferd: I do like this, but I also think the engine is really important, that we ought to really consider.

Chairman Dumont: So, there's a couple different ways to do it, and I think Mr. Sorenson can probably speak to it better than I can. But I definitely think that there's options in the future to get that done. If you want to add anything to that?

Roy Sorenson: So, I asked him about the payment schedule, because what's in the budget on the other vehicles, when those payments come off, you know, that money, you use the money and you stay steady where you are. Can that allocation make up a new payment for your next vehicle, which would be a new – correct me if I'm wrong, select me more. I think it's engine – is it engine one?

Selectman Morin: Engine one.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Now, the only concern that I had in myself, I think, and the chairman talking to the chief – and this is no disrespect to Deputy Chief Enos, because I think he's very intelligent and knows what he's doing. If you can find it for \$90,000, fine, but he said it himself that it's just maybe he gets four years out of it. So, do we take that four years to properly plan for the new vehicle and start getting monies into the budget moving forward and they can actually order the truck? It's going to take, what, two, three years to build, I would imagine.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, yeah, I agree.

Roy Sorenson: And then if you – you know, and don't forget, if they use that fund for this truck too, that goes to vote. The Board doesn't have authority to expend that. But you have that vehicle replaced immediately.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, yeah, with the four and the two.

Chairman Dumont: With the \$96,000 for the utility.

Selectman Guessferd: I mean, you could put forward the lease.

Chairman Dumont: We could put forward the lease or the buyout rate.

Selectman Guessferd: No, I think we'd buy it out if we're going to use the CRF.

Chairman Dumont: It's roughly a \$16,000 savings.

Roy Sorenson: So, that account, you know, right now has \$155,000 in it, roughly.

Selectman Jakoby: I agree. We'd buy it outright from that fund.

Chairman Dumont: And, you know, again, based on the way that that truck is utilized, I think that you get the longevity out of it and you get the most bang for your buck today. With inflation, I think it's a better use than having that money sit there and try to build better.

Selectman Jakoby: Absolutely.

Chairman Dumont: You're not making much on it while it's sitting in the bank, So, we'll fix the problem today. Selectman Morin, what are you thinking about over there?

Selectman Morin: I'm just, they're replacing the command car with this, okay? And what did he say they were going to use the old command car, command truck for?

Chairman Dumont: So, it's for a 2026 F-250, obviously.

Selectman Morin: No, no, that's the new one. But the one they got now is what they're going to.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: It says to trade in, offer it to other town departments, or sold at auction.

Selectman Morin: That other one's ...

Chairman Dumont: The 2001 F-250 is what they're replacing.

Selectman Morin: Right. Yeah, right. But what they're going to do is take this new truck and give it to the captain's, and the captain's truck is fairly new, the silver one.

Chairman Dumont: Which is the 2022 F-150 that they're going to cycle down.

Selectman Morin: 2002?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, 2022.

Selectman Morin: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: That was my understanding that they would cycle it down.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, repurpose that one.

Selectman Morin: Right, they're going to keep that, but Utility 2, which is a 2001, is the one they're getting rid of.

Chairman Dumont: That's the one they're getting rid of.

Selectman Morin: That's what I'm, okay. So, I don't know if that's big enough, because that right in the other F-250 is a plow truck. I don't know if this F-150 is going to be enough to do that. That's my question.

Chairman Dumont: So, my understanding was that the F-250, if needed, the way he said it, could do the plowing, the new one, the 2026. The F-150, you can plow with it. I mean, what do they use for that plow right now?

Selectman Morin: They have the F-250, the one they're trying to get rid of.

Chairman Dumont: No, I know, but what do they plow?

Selectman Morin: All the stations. All the stations. Yeah, because Public Works used to do it, but because they're So, busy and they don't have enough crews, we do our own stations So, they stay open.

Roy Sorenson: It is a F-250, though.

Selectman Guessferd: It is a F-250, right.

Chairman Dumont: The new one, but what are you saying?

Selectman Morin: No, no, I understand it. I'm just wondering what they're doing with the one they got right now, because it's only a F-150, but they need a plow. That's what I'm saying.

Chairman Dumont: The F-150 gets the plow. You could do the station with the F-150, I think.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, the 2021 is a F-150? I've plowed bigger parking lots with a F-150.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I think he talked about cycling it out, anybody who wanted it in town, or forestry, stuff like that, that's what he was talking about.

Selectman Jakoby: So, what I understand, what we're talking about right now, is that the Fire Department plows their own driveway So, that they can stay open and the DPW can keep our roads safe. So, currently they're using the 2001 F-250 to plow.

Selectman Morin: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: That one would be the one that would go away, and then they have a 2022 F-150, and the question is, and Selectman, do you mind, you said a F-150 should be able to plow?

Chairman Dumont: It definitely can. That's not going to move it as quickly, but I would do it.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Selectman Morin: I'm good with that, because I can't see the captain responding to an emergency with a plow on the front of the truck. That's my concern.

Selectman Jakoby: And the concern being that the new truck, the new F-250, would not have a plow because, as Selectman Morin just said, we don't want him responding with a plow on the front.

Chairman Dumont: And I apologize. I also look at that as his day-to-day operations. If he's proposing this, he better know how he's going to be able to keep this place open.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I was just going to say, to caveat on yours, the F-150 will do it. It will be slower, but we're also not plowing the streets. We're plowing very small areas in comparison.

Selectman Morin: Have you ever seen firefighters plow?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I'm sure I will. But I'm just saying, it's not like you're plowing massive areas. So, it might be slower. I think it's doable.

Selectman Jakoby: Doesn't it also go out more often? That's what my husband says. You plow when it's this much, and then you plow.

Selectman Morin: That takes a guy off shift, though.

Selectman Jakoby: I'm just teasing. But I would think that the chief has planned that for this matter.

Selectman Morin: I don't want to see us having to come back for another truck, because we beat the crap out of this silver truck that we think is going to last for 24 years, because it's a F-150 and doing that extra duty.

Chairman Dumont: To your point, because we don't have the authority to expend this one anyways, if everybody is good with putting it forward to the CRF, we have until November 10th to make that decision. We can ask the Chief and say, hey, this is what we're thinking. You're going to be able to take care of the parking lots with the F-150 or not? I firmly believe you can, but that's my opinion.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I say we go with CRF right now, revisit with the Chief to verify. I'm good with buying the truck.

Selectman Morin: I just want to make sure that we can still do what we've got to do.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Of course.

Selectman Jakoby: It's very important.

Chairman Dumont: The other part of that, though, is now we would be eliminating the use of the fire apparatus for the used engine as well, because there's not enough money in there to do both of them.

Selectman Morin: See, and I understand what the Town Administrator was saying, but we will get into a situation with these trucks getting older that we're going to be down to nothing, and it's happened several times already that they have to take the tanker, and then we're running the tanker and an ambulance or a tanker and a forestry, so, we're running double trucks when we don't need to. The wear on the tanker is absolutely right, and if we lose two engines and we're down on one engine, we're in a bad spot, and we have no backup.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: It does concern me about the wear and tear on the tanker.

Chairman Dumont: So, I don't disagree with that at all. I firmly believe that there is money that we could make available over the next couple of years to make that. If the priority from the Fire Department is we need that

engine, if you look at the out-of-budget requests that they provided us here tonight, it's enough for a payment on one of them. So, I think that it's possible. I think the voters would understand the necessity behind it. The money, I can't see the \$90,000 going towards a used engine.

Selectman Morin: No, not if it's going to last for four years. I agree. Because when you said that, I'm like.

Chairman Dumont: So, yes, we need a plan, but as far as these two asks go, I think the money is better off going over here, which is why I'm fine with eliminating that one article.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: Everybody good with that?

Selectman Jakoby: Yep, and we'll make a plan. Sounds good.

Chairman Dumont: So, the next one is the Robinson Road Station Facility Study. I'm going to be honest with you. With the other two asks that we gave, I'm a no on this one.

Selectman Morin: The station is not exactly what you would want, but you know what? We refurbished it not too long ago. It's not that old with the refurb that they had.

Chairman Dumont: No, I think we're making due. Realistically, if all this goes through, there's four asks there that got satisfied. I'm not trying to look at it. There's a lot there that we're getting done.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, and I think we've.

Selectman Guessferd: Specializing.

Selectman Jakoby: Trying to be fair here.

Chairman Dumont: I'll tell you why, because my reasoning is totally different. My reasoning is that as we've looked at the town hall and we've pulled and started talking about all of our properties, I think this is part of talking about our properties, along with Central Station and everything else. There are other things. I think if we need a study, I don't think it's this study. So, I would like to eliminate this, because I think there's a bigger strategic plan and a larger vision and discussion about Fire overall and the buildings of this town. So, that's why I would like to eliminate it.

Selectman Vurgarouplos: I agree with that.

Chairman Dumont: That's fair.

Selectman Guessferd: I'll go along.

Chairman Dumont: Everybody okay with that? So, the next one is the key access entry locks. I believe, again, I think that this should be more of a town-wide thing. It's a big ask. We've already satisfied the financing. So, for those reasons, for me, that one's out.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, I'm kind of on the same page. As soon as he started talking about the fact that the Police already have something here and that, you know, if we're going to be doing this with all the buildings in town, why not try to see if we can either piggyback on the Police, put an RFP out for a larger amount for the entire town. It's certainly going to enhance operations here and security here and here at the fire stations. I just think we're going to be able to get more bang for the buck with a town-wide sort of RFP for this. That's my thought.

Selectman Jakoby: I agree.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Same.

Chairman Dumont: So, everyone's good with that? That handles the outside of the budget requests. How do we look?

Roy Sorenson: Let's take a look. \$6.184 right now.

Chairman Dumont: That still includes the warrant articles.

Roy Sorenson: This has all the warrant articles in it, yep.

Chairman Dumont: Is there any way to get a rough idea without the warrant articles, the damage that we just did?

Roy Sorenson: Let's just see what we've got here.

Selectman Guessferd: You're making him work, you know.

Chairman Dumont: Well, he shouldn't be so good at the spreadsheets.

Roy Sorenson: There we go. We deduct that. Actually, you know what? I'm going to do it. I'm going to do it the easy way.

Selectman Jakoby: Laurie has it.

Roy Sorenson: Do you have it?

Laurie May: So, if I take the outside of the budget requests and subtract out, like, the municipal software, the things we've already put into the budget, those can come off of that sheet, right? I think it's going to update your sheet if I do that.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Give it a whirl.

Roy Sorenson: Are you in the same sheet right now?

Laurie May: Yep.

Roy Sorenson: Well, let me just do this real quick. Let me just zero those out.

Laurie May: I think yours is probably different, right? I think you're working on a different one.

Roy Sorenson: You take your warrant articles out, you're at \$5.70. I mean, it's – Actually, I've got to put back in the – I just eliminated the – what's that number? Copy. Roughly \$5.80. You put the outside of the budget requests, which you approved, back in.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Roy Sorenson: Which is a little under \$500,000.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Roy Sorenson: You're at \$5.80. So, you have it, Laurie?

Laurie May: Roughly. I'm still working on it.

Chairman Dumont: Did you – What did you drop there?

Roy Sorenson: \$5.80.

Chairman Dumont: You were at, what, \$5.70 before without anything?

Roy Sorenson: With your out-of-budget requests, yeah. So, this is where you were before. And plus, the stuff you already approved, \$5.70.

Chairman Dumont: What was the total number of approved and added additional I came up with?

Roy Sorenson: I don't – that would be inside this sheet.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Roy Sorenson: I just happen to want you to ...

Chairman Dumont: You can do that later. I came up with about \$240,000 of add-ins after the cuts.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, but you would have saved on health insurance and all that.

Chairman Dumont: That's what I did on there. Okay. Yeah.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: You need her for that.

Chairman Dumont: Just trying to see if I can still somewhat do math with just a regular calculator.

Selectman Jakoby: All right.

Roy Sorenson: So, what we'll do is we'll give you a baseline tonight. We'll do a baseline tonight. And then I think, you know, you can – That was even with some of these in there. You can come back with your warrant articles, see what the number looks like, and then if you want to go back and add a budget request, you can do that. What do you have?

Laurie May: \$5.70.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, that's just for the general, all right.

Laurie May: Okay.

Roy Sorenson: But you got to add in the out-of-budget request from tonight, which total a little bit under 5. Brings it to \$5.79.

Laurie May: Out-of-budget.

Chairman Dumont: Go back over to the out-of-budget real quick.

Roy Sorenson: That's still with this in here?

Chairman Dumont: Oh, that's – oh, with the – that's what. Okay. I was going to say, how am I so far off of your \$4.80?

Roy Sorenson: I didn't see that number yet.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. And you have the IT in there.

Roy Sorenson: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: If you take those two out, yeah, you're only about 200.

Selectman Jakoby: No, because you put in the actuals.

Chairman Dumont: You're only about \$5.75 right now.

Selectman Jakoby: No, I think she's working on actuals.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, but I left in – did you leave in the CentralSquare Pro Suite and the Dell Storage Array? I did, I did on mine.

Selectman Guessferd: You left them in.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah.

Laurie May: Dell Storage Array. Yep, Dell's in. And what was the other one?

Roy Sorenson: The CentralSquare Pro Suite, \$126,220.

Laurie May: Yeah, I left that in.

Roy Sorenson: So, what's your total tonight? \$480,539?

Laurie May: I have .08¢ cents on the outside-of-budget request.

Roy Sorenson: Yep, that's about right. We're close. Add eight to that, 785, 797.

Chairman Dumont: To me, we haven't made a decision on the other one, So, we're actually lower than that.

Selectman Jakoby: Right, because we – right, that's what I was thinking.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, you can look at it both ways.

Chairman Dumont: My calculator was still right.

Selectman Jakoby: Which is important because we still haven't addressed the warrants too. Right. Yeah.

Selectman Guessferd: Right.

Chairman Dumont: All right, So, that gets us through our out-of-budget. We've made it through each department. Do you have anything else to add?

Roy Sorenson: I don't think so, good work tonight.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions, comments, motions?

Selectman Jakoby: I think my only comment is to Selectman Morin's thought that if there are any, you know, places that we see little pieces that might add up to more, it would be for us to look at that before Tuesday and bring it with us.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: That's what you would like so that we can be done with that?

Chairman Dumont: Or we'll be done with this, besides warrant articles, Tuesday night.

Selectman Jakoby: That's the plan? That's the plan. Okay, so anything else we're thinking we might want to consider cutting, bring it there.

Selectman Guessferd: Yep, that's our time.

Roy Sorenson: But for Tuesday night, with that in mind, a quick look at the warrant articles and what the impact might be, right?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. So, that way we can make a formal decision on the 10th, correct? Yes. And we do have some normal business to take care of on Tuesday as well.

Selectman Jakoby: And we're starting at 6:00 p.m.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I don't remember what normal business looks like.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Everybody's favorite motion?

5. ADJOURNMENT

[Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby to adjourn at 10:48 p.m. Motion carried, 5-0.](#)

Recorded by HCTV and transcribed by Lorrie Weissgarber, Executive Assistant.

Dillon Dumont, Chairman

Bob Guessferd, Vice-Chairman

Xen Vurgaropulos, Selectman

Heidi Jakoby, Selectman

Dave Morin, Selectman