

Revised: 12/31/2014

**TOWN COUNCIL AGENDA
Special Meeting
Wednesday, January 7, 2015**

1. 6:30 PM - CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. Public: 12/17/2014
 - b. Non-public: 12/17/2014
6. AGENDA OVERVIEW
7. PUBLIC HEARINGS
8. CONSENT AGENDA
9. TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
10. PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes
11. NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS
12. SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS
13. 15 MINUTE RECESS
14. OLD BUSINESS
 - a. 14 – 101 Review of budgets and warrant articles: Police, Fire, Public Works, others as time permits.
15. NEW BUSINESS
16. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS
17. PUBLIC INPUT
18. NON-PUBLIC SESSION
19. ADJOURNMENT

Anyone requesting auxiliary aids or services is asked to contact
the Administration Department five business days prior to the meeting.

Public Input

1. Two 15-minute Public Input sessions will be allowed during each Council Meeting. Time will be divided equally among those wishing to speak, however, no person will be allowed to speak for more than 5 minutes.
2. No person may address the council more than twice on any issue in any meeting. Comments must be addressed to the Chair and must not be personal or derogatory about any other person.
3. Any questions must be directly related to the topic being discussed and must be addressed to the Chair only, who after consultation with Council and Town Administrator, will determine if the question can be answered at that time. Questions cannot be directed to an individual Councilor and must not be personal in nature. Issues raised during Public Input, which cannot be resolved or answered at that time, or which require additional discussion or research, will be noted by the Town Administrator who will be responsible for researching and responding to the comment directly during normal work hours or by bringing to the Council for discussion at a subsequent meeting. The Chair reserves the right to end questioning if the questions depart from clarification to deliberation.
4. Council members may request a comment be added to New Business at a subsequent meeting.
5. No one may speak during Public Input except the person acknowledged by the Chair. Direct questions or comments from the audience are not permitted during Public Input.

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, December 17, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Donald Winterton, Nancy Comai, Todd Lizotte, James Levesque, Robert Duhaime, Susan Orr, David Ross, Chairman James Sullivan, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)
Missed: Adam Jennings

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Public: December 10, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the public minutes of December 10, 2014 with edits. Seconded by J. Levesque.

Vote 7 in favor; S. Orr abstained due to not receiving a copy in time for review.

b. Non-public: December 10, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the public minutes of December 10 2014. Seconded by J. Levesque.

Vote 6 in favor; S. Orr abstained due to not receiving a copy in time for review, N. Comai abstained due to prior absence.

AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. \$1,400 Gift Cards from American Legion Donation to Family Services
- b. Kathie Northrup, donation of town reports to Heritage Commission
- c. Rob Duhaime brick donation

J. Sullivan: There are 2 additional donations to be added to the consent agenda. We received \$1000 in gift cards donated by Hooksett resident J. Rainville (GameStop, Target and Kohls); \$250 gift card to Walmart donated by the David Cawley cheerleaders; \$125 Cinemagic gift card donated by Hooksett resident Katherine Rice.

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the consent agenda as written and with the additional items added by the Chair. Seconded by S. Orr.

J. Sullivan: And we want to thank everyone for their donations.

Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- Matt Lavoie, building inspector, took his International Code Council test for residential plumbing inspector and passed.
- Council authorized a waiver of \$25 fee for bounced check for auto registration (in non-public last week)
- I contacted NH Municipal Association about the situation with the library and sent a copy of what I received to Mary Farwell to present to the Library Trustees. They had a follow up question for the attorney and it will be put on a future agenda for discussion and will be shared in public at our next meeting.
- Many thanks to the Hooksett Garden Club who brought poinsettias to various departments around town.

PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes

Marc Miville, 42 Main St: I wanted to make you aware that the Community Profile final report is now available on the town website. It can be found on the home page under Boards & Committees/Community Profile. It is a 51-page comprehensive report with the results from our meeting on Nov 7 & 8. It was successful and well received event. We are moving forward with 6 separate action groups who are acting as ad hoc committees. They have asked to consult Dr. Shankle if the Town Council needs to sanction these committees. There is a tentative meeting on Jan. 6 to review what is being done now; there is potentially a conflict with the School Board meeting. We are scheduled for the Town Council agenda on Jan. 13. Secondly, Mary Farwell asked me to mention bell ringing availabilities for the Salvation Army. We only have about 20 slots left, most on Christmas Eve Day and we need to have those slots filled. Register at registertoring.com and put in the zip code to see available time slots. They are about 10% above their normal amount right now in donations.

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

None

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

- a. Economic Development Advisory Committee (Chairman Mo Durakovic and Jo Anne Duffy)

M. Durakovic: We are here to make some changes to our committee – we do not have enough attendance. We are looking for input to see if we can get local businesses (non-residents) to join.

J. Duffy: We have at least 2 people that may not return to the Committee after the end of the year. Frank Kotowski and Leslie Boswak, who was appointed by Council, but has never attended a meeting. We have contacted her for her resignation and she has not responded. If we keep her position, it counts as part of the quorum. Business owners used to be allowed on the board and Council changed it. We are looking into reinstating that policy since their input would be helpful.

D. Winterton: As Council rep, I am in favor of allowing non-residents into this committee; they advise Zoning, Planning and Council. We also are designing some procedures to reduce the size of the committee and naming some people as alternates. We may be able to fulfill our obligations that way. We appreciated Mo taking over as Chairman and sharing his regional and international expertise and his relationship with SNHU.

S. Orr: I agree that it's advantageous to have business owners for their different perspective. I'd suggest you limit the percentage of business owners to residents so it isn't all business owners; that can be discussed when you come up with your rules.

T. Lizotte: When I was on the Budget Committee, the chairman (Marc Miville) worked with Dr. Shankle and came up with the concept that the member from Town Council be excluded from quorum (whoever is appointed in terms of a designated rep to the board). That could also solve the problem as well.

J. Sullivan: You are going to establish procedures and then come back to Council for approval? I'd suggest they come back and we approve it from there. I assume the attendance policy applies to all boards and committees; they should have attendance requirements so every member knows what their obligations are.

Dr. Shankle: This is a committee you put together; not all have that but most do.

D. Ross: Attendance is a great idea that all committees have a requirement just like we do. The situation they brought up shows that it is necessary.

J. Sullivan: Consensus that Dr. Shankle will send a note to the Chairman of the Economic Development Committee to draft an attendance policy for the committee.

N. Comai: The committee needs to present minutes, so this new endeavor in correcting things, you might want to consider having minutes and posting them on the website.

J. Duffy: We do take minutes and they are posted on the website.

T. Lizotte: We designated the Town Administrator as the head of Business Development for the town; would the Town Administrator like to look at the committee's charge and revamp that as well? I don't see a problem with that as long as the Town Administrator is involved in the process.

J. Sullivan: We are looking forward to your suggestions.

M. Durakovic: We are also working on a case study with local businesses; it is a survey of 13 questions including why they chose this area; pros and cons; how did they come to this town.

J. Duffy: Case study for any problems they may have faced and how to address them; it could be PR piece to include some positive quotes on the website. Next step is business visitation and expansion program. We are going to regroup after the holiday and discuss when we are going to start. Andre Garron from UNH Cooperative Extension is assisting.

D. Winterton: I saw Mr. Garron at the UNH football game Friday night, and he was enthusiastic about coming to Hooksett for this program and is overwhelmed with the potential that we have for this kind of project.

J. Duffy: He used to be the Town Planner in Goffstown.

D. Winterton: His brother is the acting dean of the Peter Paul School at the UNH School of Business.

S. Orr: I am curious how you determine which businesses to survey; what is the percentage of rent vs. own, large vs. small?

J. Duffy: In order to get the most recent information, we chose the last 13 projects and they are almost evenly divided between small and large businesses through coincidence.

J. Sullivan: How many currently established positions are on the committee?

J. Duffy: 7 plus Council rep.

J. Sullivan: With the 2 possible absences you mentioned, you would be down to 5 plus Council rep.

T. Lizotte: When did you try to contact Ms. Boswak?

J. Duffy: A couple weeks ago, and I tried a few months ago as well.

T. Lizotte: You have received no response? I think we should take some action on that. It's been over a year since she stepped down from Council.

D. Ross: We can't dis-appoint someone without cause; we should send a letter requesting her resignation.

J. Sullivan: Should it come from the committee or Council?

T. Lizotte: I think it should come from Council.

S. Orr: That applies to official committees; this is a subcommittee of the Council, not an official town committee. Can't we say that since there is no response after repeated tries to contact her, can't we as Council make that decision since it's not an official committee?

J. Sullivan: The Charter states Council has attendance requirements; I'd think if it was a Council committee with no current guidelines, it would revert back to the Charter. Why don't we craft a letter thanking her for her past service and asking her to submit her intention to continue or not since we are reinvigorating the committee.

T. Lizotte: I like Mr. Ross' suggestion but I'd like to add a "response by date" to the letter, such as the second week in January.

D. Winterton: Our next meeting is at the end of January so the quorum issue is not time sensitive.

J. Sullivan motioned to direct the Chairman to craft a letter to Ms. Boswak regarding her service on the Economic Development Committee with a requested response by January 7. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan: Thank you and we look forward to your next update.

Dr. Shankle: I'd suggest we move the Budget Overview to the end and move right into the next item.

J. Sullivan: I forgot to mention that New Business agenda item "d" will not be discussed tonight.

OLD BUSINESS

- a. 14 – 066 Lilac (Village) Bridge discussion (Jason Gallant and Britt Audet, CMA Engineering)

J. Gallant: We have passed out 2 new items tonight, the Memorandum and updated presentation. We are here to follow up on our presentation from last week. *Review updated opinion of cost presentation.* We added operations and maintenance costs to 3 out of the 4 alternatives (75-year costs). The removal alternative was \$2.6M and goes up to \$3M. The new superstructure option was \$3.3M and goes to \$3.35M. The gap closes with the 2 least cost alternatives. We vetted assumptions for maintenance of sewer. I asked DOT to explain a cursory inspection and asked them to contact the town to reaffirm their responsibilities for inspecting municipally owned bridges. I'm not sure they have done that but from my understanding, closed bridges are inspected for signage and barricades to keep vehicles off the bridge. I reviewed files from DOT – I have inspection records from 1993 – and it was consistently rated at a 0 (from 1-9) and the substructure is listed as a 5 out of 9. That verifies the opportunity to rehab the substructure (piers and abutments) for long term use. *Review photos of bridge replacement options.*

R. Duhaime: Piers are going to be rejoined? Is there something in that estimate for that?

J. Gallant: Yes, there is a \$300,000 cost for repointing and for providing scour protection around the piers to stabilize them. We've visually inspected them; they should work for deadloads and liveloads. Stone masonry piers are not good for lateral loads and need to be tied together. There will be a nominal upgrade to those piers so they are stable for that 75-year period.

R. Duhaime: You would have to fix both ends of the bridge?

J. Gallant: The abutments and river piers are included in the estimated provided to you.

J. Sullivan: Replacing the superstructure for \$800,000 - would that depend on the type of bridge we want to design? Is it similar to the first picture?

J. Gallant: The cost is based on the photos we have provided. We provide a handful of suppliers that would bid on an installation contract with trusses that come in pieces. In the design criteria, we set the live load and the dead load is something they figure out and then it becomes a price competition based on who can put the lightest structure together. The other cost contributor is width. We propose an 8-10 foot width (similar to the width of a parking space).

Dr. Shankle: My recommendation is the second alternative.

R. Duhaime: The impact fees we have are not dedicated to any other project?

Dr. Shankle: No. After giving this a considerable amount of thought it is obvious to me that rather than thinking about this as two separate issues (the bridge and the sewer) that the Town of Hooksett basically has one emergency situation. If one goes, so does the other. DPW and Sewer are both Town departments. Given that, I am suggesting that we look at the funding as one project and pool available resources. The \$3.35M includes O&M costs; that is why there is a difference. We have that money sitting there for an emergency; that process to move forward is go to the state and get them to concede that eliminating it is a reasonable alternative; get the Budget Committee to agree to spend the fund

balance for this emergency; then go to the Dept of Revenue Administration to agree this is an emergency; then move forward without waiting for any further action.

T. Lizotte motioned to direct the administrative staff to move forward to solve bridge/sewer issue using the following table and authorize them to do what is necessary to get the relevant local, state and federal committees and agencies to authorize both the project and funding sources indicated:

Remove Bridge	\$1,900,000
Utility/Walking Bridge & Sewer	\$1,400,000
Total Uses	\$3,300,000
State Bridge Aid	\$ 600,000
Sewer Department	\$ 500,000
Impact Fees	\$ 600,000
Emergency Fund Balance	\$1,600,000
Total Sources	\$3,300,000

Seconded by D. Ross.

J. Sullivan: With this vote, does this indicate Council is willing to use that emergency fund balance? Is that your intention?

T. Lizotte: To authorize the project and funding sources as indicated; we know this could be an environmental issue so I understand it's an emergency and needs to be done. We know we need to have the sewer line and adding that walking bridge as a benefit and using the impact fees is an indicator of that; the \$1.6M is the fact that we are taking away a hazard.

S. Orr: I think this needs to be done. What percentage of the \$600,000 are we utilizing from fund balance and impact fees?

C. Soucie: \$3.6M is in the fund balance; if you move \$1.6M that leaves \$2M so just about 50%. The zone 2 impact fees goes down to 0. We get impact fees in regularly so the account would start to build back up.

D. Winterton: I agree with the funding sources. I'd think about bonding the bridge since it's a long-term project. This Council has been able to build up the fund balance and it's cheaper to think of it as borrowing from ourselves; if we continue to be prudent with our dollars we will build up our fund balance again.

D. Ross: These are estimates at this point; we still have to go through the bid process. There is a chance they could be higher. At the last meeting we discussed how these amounts were broken up; didn't they allow \$700,000 for the cost of the sewer portion?

J. Gallant: Our estimate is to replace the sewer in kind for \$300,000; to pump it around the Main St. Bridge (no bridge alternative where the Litac Bridge is now) is the \$700,000 relocate sewer cost.

Dr. Shankle: Even though their (sewer) portion to put it across is \$300,000 they are willing to put in \$500,000 toward this project.

N. Comai: Thank you, Bruce, for coming up with \$500,000. There was a depletion of your funds due to the disk problem. Do you have funds to cover this?

B. Kudrick: Yes that is the best we can do knowing we still have legalities with the disk issues ongoing. We are willing to give \$500,000 even if it comes in less.

J. Sullivan: You still have to move things around temporarily.

B. Kudrick: The pipe on the bridge now will be replaced; there will be a bypass period of time while the bridge is being taken down and the new one is being put up.

J. Sullivan: That cost includes the \$500,000?

B. Kudrick: The \$500,000 is for the bridge, that part hasn't been worked out yet, but you will get \$500,000.

T. Lizotte: Mr. Winterton brought up a good point about bonding; can we add a caveat to end – if things go above the estimated cost, maybe designate some creative financing options.

Dr. Shankle: If the numbers change, we will bring it back.

D. Winterton: This will become part of the trail and I'd expect the Town Administrator and staff will continue to look at other funding options available to limit the money coming out of our fund balance.

J. Sullivan: How comfortable are you with the estimate?

J. Gallant: We are providing the cost on concept designs. We have tried to factor in contingencies within engineering judgment so you can make reasonable decisions. For budgetary purposes we feel these estimates are appropriate but we haven't worked out details in full. We have allowed for changes up or down so that on balance this is what you'll be looking at in the end.

T. Lizotte: Is there any chance the state provides us 0% interest financing or some type of payment plan out of our fund balance?

Dr. Shankle: I haven't heard of that but we'll continue to look into all possible sources of additional funding.

R. Duhaime: We try to hang onto things too long and there are so many issues now; it shows the millions of dollars that it will cost to maintain. The walking bridge is something we can all enjoy.

J. Sullivan: This is a necessity; from a historical point of view it's unfortunate that we realize things too late. We need to maintain structures otherwise historical buildings will fall apart. Hooksett is proactive in historical preservation but sometimes we wait too long. Maybe this can be a model for future historical buildings so that problems are addressed before it is too late. This will be the last 3-span Storrs bridge in the state of NH. I think it would be nice to maintain a portion of the old bridge for historical purposes. It seems to be the most economical solution.

Roll Call

R. Duhaime – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

J. Levesque – yes

N. Comai – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross: I presume the next item would be to solicit bids for demo work?

Dr. Shankle: As soon as we know the state is on board with our direction. I will continue to update you as needed.

NEW BUSINESS

a. 14 – 102 DPW Environmental Snow Melt

L. Lessard: Matthew Scott is with me again. He was here last year to discuss the additive to the salt. We used almost \$40,000 worth. It worked well but we stopped it to save money as we were close to going over budget. Keene has used it for 8 or 10 years. They like it; it saves time, fuel and money on salt. I'm hoping at some point to get GPS units on the trucks but I can't do it this year, hopefully next year.

T. Lizotte motioned to approve a purchase order for \$40,000 to NH Ice Melt to use to treat incoming salt for DPW for winter road treatment. Seconded by S. Orr.

S. Orr: What is the cost of salt?

L. Lessard: This year it's \$39.13/ton. Last year the mix was \$19/ton and has dropped to \$18 this year.

J. Sullivan: What is the average tonnage you use, just salt?

L. Lessard: Last year 3,200 tons. Hopefully with this additive, we will have at least a 20% savings.

M. Scott: I've worked with Keene for 11 or so years and they have had GPS units since then to know how much they are putting down and the rate they are putting it down. I have seen GPS and flow control and it is a huge benefit.

R. Duhaime: Are all the trucks calibrated now?

L. Lessard: They are calibrated the old way; sometimes the drivers do a blast and that skews the results. The GPS will regulate that. We saved tonnage using this last year but I lost a lot due to the rains we had.

Roll Call

N. Comai – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

R. Duhaime – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

b. 14 – 103 Police Department new guns (Chief Bartlett, Sargent Bradley)

Chief Bartlett: We are asking Council for approval to purchase new side arms. Currently we carry a Glock that is 12-15 years old. That is a typical life span. I wanted to capitalize on the trade in value of the current weapons. Sig Sauer is a quality weapon that I'm familiar with. The P320 has a unique attribute in that the working component of the weapon is the metal insert that fits inside the handle of the gun. You can take the serial number insert and move from a full size barrel to a compact barrel. Instead of buying smaller weapons for detectives vs. larger for patrol, we can buy component pieces for \$29. I liked the versatility of this weapon. We tried to do this last year with local gun shops but they couldn't do the trade and purchase through one vendor. This company will do both (with a 50% trade-in value), magazine and leather gear for the equipment that goes with the gun. It provides our officers with 3 additional rounds than we carry now. If we went with a new Glock, they are a bit more expensive so this is a cost savings as well. If we can use the money from the drug forfeiture fund, there would be no fiscal impact.

D. Ross: The current firearms are how old?

Chief Bartlett: 12-15 years old.

R. Duhaime: Atlantic is your agent?

Chief Bartlett: Atlantic Tactical will take our trade, give us a credit and sell us the new equipment.

R. Duhaime: How big is the new weapon?

Sgt Bradley: It's about 1/2" larger and lighter. Officer transition for training is minimal to get used to the new firearms.

S. Orr: Drug forfeiture account is set up for what and what have you used it for in the past?

Chief Bartlett: It is any seized money taken during an investigation. We seized \$18,000 at an address in Hooksett for a drugs and weapons seizure. You have to work with DEA to get the money sent back to the community and it needs to be spent on police equipment. The current balance is \$25,000. We have purchased other types of equipment in the past, but I don't know specifically what.

D. Winterton: We can't put that money in the general fund?

Chief Bartlett: No. That money comes back from the DEA and they take a piece as well as any other agencies involved take a piece and we get back the rest of the funds; you try to get back as much as you can.

J. Sullivan: Can you expand on your training as a firearms expert? Will this require additional training? You mentioned it won't require as many rounds.

Sgt Bradley: It operates the same way as what we currently have now. Transition is like shooting guns we are used to. These are balanced better and lighter. Our department qualification is in the summer so when we do qualify with these firearms, that it would be like a normally scheduled training.

Chief Bartlett: Mandatory training is dictated by the state annually, to qualify with any weapons we have, to maintain our certification. Occasionally we do additional training; recently we did some training around shooting with low light. We try to train when we have time and resources in different atmospheres and circumstances.

J. Sullivan: When a gun is discharged, there is a required review?

Chief Bartlett: That is correct; there is always a review of circumstances surrounding the discharge. We also have use of force reports where if an officer deploys his weapon in a manner to protect himself but doesn't actually fire it there is a paperwork process that is reviewed through the chain of command to make sure that use of force level was appropriate for circumstances dictated in that event.

J. Levesque: The Glocks you have now are alloy frames?

Sgt Bradley: The new one, the sled is nitron and the shell is polymer.

J. Levesque: Will they hold up as long?

Sgt Bradley: They are corrosion resistant so they are built to last. They are built to take countless numbers of rounds and are designed for law enforcement and military.

T. Lizotte motioned to allow Chief Bartlett to purchase new Sig Sauer P320 weapons and the necessary equipment at a total cost of \$7,456.50 to be expended from the department's drug forfeiture account thus having a zero fiscal impact on the town. Seconded by D. Winterton.

Roll Call

J. Levesque – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

R. Duhaime – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

c. 14 – 104 Suggested Charter Changes regarding annual audit

Dr. Shankle: Refer to section 10.8 of Charter for provision on how the Charter is changed. This is just asking you to get the process started.

J. Sullivan: The section where the audit is mentioned is 5.9.

C. Soucie: I'd like you to consider changing the last 2 sentences. My understanding is we can only have an auditing firm for 4 years; best practices recommend having a firm for 5 years because there are a lot of upfront costs to the auditors. It takes them a certain number of years to recover those costs. Changing every 4 years could lead to a missed audit. It doesn't detect fraud but looks at financial statements to see if our practices are sound. The auditors need to re-learn our system with each change.

J. Sullivan: In July 2011 there was a change. Do you know what that was?

C. Soucie: It was 7 years and we changed it to 5 years.

J. Sullivan: This section has to go on the ballot with the original verbiage struck out and the new verbiage added.

D. Ross motioned to direct the Town Administrator to compose a warrant article to reflect the intended change to have a new auditor every 5 years (section 5.9). Seconded by T. Lizotte.

N. Comai: Why did it go from 7 years to 5 years in 2011?

C. Soucie: 7 years is too long. We changed it from 7 years to 5 years but the way the sentence was written is unclear.

N. Comai: It seems like there was a misstep between what was written in the charter and what was voted on. If it was already voted on to be 5 years then it seems like a moot point and we just have to fix the verbiage and we won't have to go through all this. I'd say we check that before we go any further.

J. Sullivan: I was on a committee that did an extensive review of the Charter and there were many changes. Our intention was to change it from 7 years to 5 years so maybe it was a clerical error. We will check that before we continue.

D. Ross: If it was adopted you probably will have to go through that anyway.

J. Sullivan: We will have legal review. We have a while before we get to warrant articles.

Vote unanimously in favor.

C. Soucie: The next thing is the last sentence in same paragraph. I think they are talking about the prior year audit but it's odd to me that it is in this paragraph and that it says "town business." I think section 9.1 (town report requirements) would be a better place for this sentence. 9.1 came in several years after the original charter. Moving it seems to be more appropriate and understandable.

N. Comai: I don't have that document in my packet, but my first thought would be that we need to find out the intention of the sentence. It seems like a timing/dating issue as to when the audit is done and available for review.

C. Soucie: We put it on the website when it's available but the words "town business" seem odd to me.

N. Comai: What would it say?

Dr. Shankle: That is in the section of independent audit, not town business. The assumption is it's talking about the town audit. It should say "the annual audit shall be made available no later than 60 days after the close of the fiscal year."

D. Ross: You can just change that word "business" to "audit."

J. Sullivan: I think that suggestion will make sense.

Dr. Shankle: If you're going to make a change, why not change in both places?

D. Winterton motioned to direct the Town Administrator to prepare a warrant article to change the Charter section 5.9 wording from "business" to "audit" and add to section 9.1 the wording "and audit." Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan: Are there any additional changes to section 9.1?

C. Soucie: Under the CIP section it talks about putting the Capital Improvement Program in the town report. That got missed because it wasn't in this section.

J. Sullivan: We can check to see if we need to add something on that.

5 MINUTE RECESS

~~d. 14 – 105 AFSCME (Public Works and Recycle & Transfer) Union Contract Signing~~

OLD BUSINESS (continued)

~~a. 14 – 101 Budget Overview; CIP Discussion and Review of Various Budgets
Jo Anne Duffy, Community Development (FY 2015-2016 Budget Book, Tab 4)~~

T. Lizotte: I'd like to hear a synopsis in regards to the difference between this year and last year and reduction/overage.

Dr. Shankle: \$14,844,426 is the recommended operating budget excluding the sewer request. This is a decrease of \$48,562 or 0.33% from current year. There are no new employees or raises included. *Refer to the General Information Budget Overview Sheet for Personnel and Benefits overview.*

T. Lizotte: Our request of our Town Administrator was to maintain a flat budget to maintain services; it seems like he provided that with some caveats so can each department give us what the previous vs. current budget is and speak to what is affecting the change? I'd like to know that right off the top.

J. Sullivan: Specifically reference items increased or decreased is the main point.

Dr. Shankle: Department overview is included in the General Info sheet.

J. Sullivan: It was \$475,000 last year, and this year it's \$483,000 so around an \$8,000 increase.

J. Duffy: We have an increase of \$8,179 (.01%). The Town Administrator reduced my request by \$5,620. Part time employee added additional hours for the minute taker due to additional meetings. OT line reduced because the Administrative Assistant is only taking minutes for one committee. Training and dues increased from \$1,160 to \$3,500; we have 3 new employees and encourage additional training. Printing increased by \$250 based on increased costs incurred. Office supplies are combining Code Enforcement Officer and Community Development into one line bringing it to \$3,000. Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission dues are based on a formula and population. That increased by \$300.

N. Comai: In the OT line it appears that in previous year's activity you only applied \$983 to a \$3,500 budget. It's only at \$45 now and we are at 42% of our year. You've only used \$50 of a \$4,000 budget. I see where you brought it down to \$2,000 but isn't that still high?

J. Duffy: I'd agree that it could probably be adjusted.

J. Sullivan: Are we making suggested cuts now or at the final review?

T. Lizotte: I think we should do it while we remember.

J. Sullivan: Mrs. Comai do you have a suggestion of what it should be?

N. Comai: What do you think it could be Jo Anne?

J. Duffy: Maybe \$1,000.

N. Comai motioned to reduce Community Development OT line from \$2,000 to \$1,000. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross: I had a question on how they came about with last year's budget. The approved budget I show is \$468,900 and there was a transfer of \$6,549 that brought it up to \$475,000.

J. Duffy: Carolyn is taking some Conservation Commission duties and those monies have been moved.

J. Sullivan: Tab 16 (Conservation Commission) shows that reduction.

R. Duhaime: The town engineer is all budgeted in here – insurance, retirement, etc.?

J. Duffy: Yes, correct.

J. Sullivan: Any Planning Board highlights?

J. Duffy: That all remains the same.

J. Sullivan: Code enforcement?

J. Duffy: Training and dues went from \$1,500 to \$3,000 due to having a new Code Enforcement Officer and we are encouraging additional training.

J. Sullivan: Explanation further in that tab you can refer to.

J. Duffy: Vehicle maintenance went from \$1,000 to \$4,000. The first 5 months this year we spent \$1,109. Our vehicle is a 2002 Ford Ranger pickup with 80,000 miles. We have put in a request for a new vehicle through CIP for 2016-2017.

Dr. Shankle: I believe I took it out of the CIP.

J. Sullivan: At some point it will need to be replaced. What is your thought?

Dr. Shankle: Leo thought we could keep it one more year. The vehicle they wanted, I thought, was too much of a vehicle for what they will use it for. Leo thought the current vehicle could last and if something happened to it he has one they can use until next year.

D. Winterton: If we increase the line to \$4,000 and we replace it next year for \$27,000 does it make sense to buy it earlier and save the \$4,000 in maintenance costs?

Dr. Shankle: Leo said he could keep it going.

J. Sullivan: Can we get clarification on maybe getting the \$4,000 pared down?

D. Ross: I think it should be. That seems like a lot of money.

J. Sullivan: We should ask Leo to modify that number.

J. Levesque: Do we pay labor on the repairs through Leo's department?

J. Duffy: Just parts.

J. Sullivan: The Town Administrator will ask Leo on that.

T. Lizotte: Can we repurpose any other vehicles that we can give them to use?

Dr. Shankle: Leo said he has a vehicle for the Code Enforcement Officer to use until next year when we purchase one.

J. Sullivan: When we do have to replace it, it needs to be a pick up.

J. Duffy: It needs to be a 4WD since some places he inspects there aren't roads done yet.

J. Sullivan: We will put that on hold until we hear from Leo.

R. Duhaime: There is no vehicle planned for town engineer?

J. Duffy: We have 2 vehicles out there under administration.

Dr. Shankle: We have 2 and we could be getting another hand-me-down police vehicle.

J. Sullivan: Public health?

J. Duffy: Printing increased by \$200; postage decreased due to usage. Most certified mail is reimbursed by the applicants and we never know how much that will be. (Abutters need to be notified by certified mail.)

N. Comai: Under fuel for Code Enforcement Officer, \$1,500 is bare bones minimum because of previous year's usage. Why not put \$1,500 in the default as well? I'd think fuel is an obligated use. We've been skimping on what we put in the default but \$1,464 was used in the previous year. I'd ask that the default go up to \$1,500.

J. Sullivan: Why is that figure not the same? Can you explain how you came up with \$1,000 in the default?

C. Soucie: The Charter has specific wording on default (*read from section 5*). The RSA says default is taking last year's budget, removing one-time items and increasing for contractual obligations. We don't have a contract for fuel so we don't increase it. You are responsible for the default so if you want to increase or decrease that is your call.

N. Comai: Didn't we have a board in front of us this year asking us to increase fuel cost? Default needs to cover our obligated expenses.

J. Sullivan: We don't know the cost of gas. I don't know how to handle that.

N. Comai: The previous year was \$1,464 and budget was \$1,300 so you overspent. Your budget should be what you need to spend. Default should be at least what you are obligated to spend.

J. Levesque: \$1,464 was spent prior year; we are 42% into the current year and you have only used 34% of the budgeted fuel.

J. Duffy: I just approved an invoice yesterday for \$700 for fuel.

N. Comai: You are adding a full time person and a vehicle. It's my opinion you're going to spend close to \$1,500 next year.

D. Winterton: This is just Code Enforcement Officer's budget.

J. Duffy: We only have one fuel line in Code Enforcement.

J. Levesque: I think \$1,500 is fine.

R. Duhaime: If you use your personal car do you get reimbursed mileage?

J. Duffy: No I don't get reimbursed.

T. Lizotte: The previous budget is \$1,300; I don't think we should set a precedent of adjusting things not approved previously. I'd agree we should go to \$1,300 instead of \$1,500.

J. Sullivan: That is going back 2 years not last year. That was from 2013-2014; it should be \$1,000. I don't think it should go up.

N. Comai: I agree but my point is we need to be sure when we have a default budget we have money to run the town the way it needs to be run. I'd like to get a budget that runs smoothly.

T. Lizotte: If we had a policy stating that a default is only the items that hinder the operation, but we don't have such a policy. I don't want to set a precedent of doing that kind of thing. When voters don't vote for our budget, we need to dig deep and make cuts elsewhere.

J. Levesque: If you just approved a \$700 invoice we are up to \$1,000 already.

J. Sullivan: Let's go through the current budget and think of our approach since we are the governing body and we set the default. Let's make those changes when we get to the default and we will come back to that.

N. Comai: ZBA budget is \$1,000 but default is \$1,300; it always should be at least as much as the default because that is what you are obligated to use.

C. Soucie: There are a certain number of zoning board members that get a stipend. \$1,300 is if they all take it; history has shown that sometimes they don't take it.

N. Comai: Then we are obligated to have that money in there in case they all take it.

J. Sullivan: We are obligated to provide that stipend for \$1,300 but not obligated to pay for gas.

N. Comai: This is contractually obligated.

J. Duffy: I requested \$1,300 but it was reduced to \$1,000.

J. Sullivan: We need to approve a default budget, but let's work on this.

N. Comai motioned to increase the stipend line for ZBA members from \$1,000 to \$1,300. Seconded by J. Levesque.

J. Levesque: 5 full time members get \$200 each and 2 alternates get \$100 each.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Winterton: We just increased the Town Administrator's budget by \$300.

J. Sullivan: You are presenting the Town Administrator's budget and we just brought it back to \$1,300. The budget we are talking about is the Town Administrator's budget.

S. Orr: Town Administrator line for office supplies is 0. I assume that you are going to use paper, etc.

D. Winterton: It moved from Code Enforcement.

J. Duffy: It seems confusing because it was 2 separate budgets and now it's one. By law, Code Enforcement has to have some separation that's why there are 2 lines for some things.

D. Winterton motioned to changed ZBA FICA taxes line to \$99 from \$77. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan: When we come back to this we will have the updated numbers. Thank you Jo Anne.

Dr. Shankle: We should end soon since we have non-public.

J. Sullivan: Can we do Budget Committee (Tab 13)? There should be a change due to the motion to include stipends.

M. Miville: Part time employee salary went down due to the projected number of meetings; everything else is standard. Training is for a potential new member. September often has budget workshops and we typically offer that opportunity to new members, so it's budgeted for that.

D. Winterton: Are we being fiscally responsible by not contracting Tiffany to do this role as opposed to someone we have to pay NH retirement for?

M. Miville: The previous Town Administrator developed a blended rate and the opinion of the Budget Committee is to keep the current secretary since she has been there for years and it's more conducive to the flow of the Budget Committee process to have someone who has done it for years and years.

J. Sullivan: When that person decides not to do it anymore, would we look for someone at that blended rate?

Dr. Shankle: By using a full time employee of the town in another function and creating the blended rate is a way to not pay OT. Budget Committee has used the same secretary for a number of years and they'd like to continue to use that person.

M. Miville: She gets paid for the longer hours she is there. We don't have more than a 3-hour meeting.

J. Sullivan: Thanks Marc. We are going to hold off on further review.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nothing to report.

PUBLIC INPUT

None

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

- **NH RSA 91-A:3 II (a)** The dismissal, promotion, or compensation of any public employee or the disciplining of such employee, or the investigation of any charges against him or her.
- **NH RSA 91-A:3 II (c)** Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of the public body itself.

J. Sullivan motioned to enter non-public session at 9:15pm. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Roll Call

T. Lizotte – yes

D. Ross – yes

R. Duhaime – yes

J. Levesque – yes

D. Winterton – yes

S. Orr – yes

N. Comai – yes

J. Sullivan - yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting from 9:30pm to 9:40pm. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting from 9:40pm to 9:45pm. Seconded by T. Lizotte.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting from 9:45pm to 10:05pm. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting from 10:05pm to 10:40pm. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting from 10:40pm to 11:00pm. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Winterton motioned to exit non-public at 10:55pm. Seconded by S. Orr.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***S. Orr motioned to seal the non-public minutes of 12/17/14. Seconded by T. Lizotte.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***J. Sullivan motioned to adjourn at 10:55pm. Seconded by S. Orr.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

NOTE: The Town website www.hooksett.org may have attachments to these Town Council minutes for documents referred to in the minutes, reading file material, and/or ancillary documents that the Town Council Chair has signed as agent to expend as a result of the Council's prior approval of the documents.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney
Recording Clerk