

**TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2002**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.

PRESENT: Chairman T. Young, D. Pichette-Volk, M. DiBitetto, R. Dion, R. Holley, M. Jolin, P. Ganley, D. Duford, M. Farrell – Town Administrator. P. Rueppel – excused.

MINUTES:

January 2, 2002: Previously approved. On agenda in error.

January 9, 2002: R. Dion moved to approve. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. Motion carried.

January 14, 2002: P. Ganley moved to approve. Motion seconded by M. Jolin. Motion carried.

January 15, 2002: D. Pichette-Volk moved to approve as amended. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. Motion carried.

January 16, 2002: D. Pichette-Volk moved to approve. Motion seconded by R. Dion. Motion carried.

January 22, 2002: R. Holley moved to approve. Motion seconded by M. Jolin. Motion carried.

January 23, 2002: P. Ganley moved to remove from the table. Motion seconded by R. Holley. Motion carried. D. Pichette-Volk moved to approve. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. Motion carried.

January 24, 2002: R. Dion moved to approve as amended. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. Motion carried.

January 29, 2002: D. Pichette-Volk moved to approve. Motion seconded by R. Holley seconded. Motion carried.

February 13, 2002: P. Ganley moved to approve as amended. Motion seconded by R. Holley. Motion carried. R. Dion abstained due to absence.

D. Duford stated that he voted no on the minutes because of the many errors and omissions.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: M. Farrell reported on the following items:

1. The Planning Board has been dealing with a petition warrant article on the growth ordinance to change the previous impact fee waiver agreement with Mt. St. Mary's Apartments at 1701 Hooksett Road. A legal opinion was obtained reminding them of the previous agreement. The Planning Board has decided not to recommend the warrant article.
2. As requested, research was conducted as to when the State had placed Hooksett's Rt 3/Alice Ave and Rt 3/Bypass 28 intersections on their schedule for work. The earliest letter is dated in 1997 indicating that they were placed on the schedule in 1994 and due for work in 1999. DOT will be having a workshop for questions on the projects on June 20, 2002, 6-8pm, Media Room, Safety Center.
3. State Representative Steve L'Heureux has advised that it's not too late to ask that sidewalks be included back into the project but there's only a short timeframe open for the request.

Consensus to have M. Farrell contact Representative L'Heureux to include sidewalks.

4. A bill is on the house floor rescinding last year's amendment to remove the State's tax portion from TIF districts. This bill would put it back to give full use of the tax rate to TIF districts. M. Farrell testified in favor of the amendment. It appears it will pass. The DRA will work on the details of money transfers. This will enable the Town to hopefully pay off the debt service in three years by receiving \$900,000 annually.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Public hearing on special revenue fund for solid waste disposal:

T. Young opened the public hearing at 7:00pm to receive input on adopting a special revenue fund for the purpose of solid waste disposal.

Diane Boyce, Assistant Superintendent at the Transfer Station, explained that all money generated through the facility including Pay-As-You-Through (PAYT) would be for disposal fees only.

Chairman Young asked where excess funds would go.

D. Boyce answered there probably wouldn't be any but if so, they would go to Town Meeting for a vote.

Sid Baines, 59 Farmer Road, stated this has already been done in 1973.

D. Boyce answered this is a different issue.

Chairman Young closed the hearing at 7:04pm.

Public hearing on discontinuance of Capital Improvement Fund:

Chairman Young opened the public hearing at 7:04pm to receive input on rescinding provision RSA 31:95-C to discontinue the Capital Improvement Fund.

D. Boyce explained that currently all revenues generated at the facility go into the Capital Improvement Fund. This article would take all disposal fees out of the tax base and put them into a special revenue fund.

M. DiBietto stated that the Budget Committee has concerns on this and asked the Council to reconsider.

Chairman Young closed the public hearing at 7:08pm.

Public Hearing on \$3.5 million sewer bond for plant expansion and composting:

Chairman Young opened the public hearing at 7:10pm to receive public input on a proposed \$3.5 million sewer bond for sewer plant expansion and a composting program.

Bruce Kudrick, Sewer Department Superintendent, explained they're asking the Council to support the \$3.5 million loan for plant expansion and composting. This loan would be paid back by the sewer users and through system development fees. The equipment needed for plant expansion is currently over 30 years old and needs to be replaced. They're currently land-spreading in Pembroke but the land is being sold. The plan is to create composting at the plant for biosolids, leaves, branches, yard waste, etc. The compost created will be a Class A material that can be used for parks, recreation fields, homeowners gardens, etc.

Chairman Young closed the public hearing at 7:12pm.

Public Hearing on warrant articles:

Chairman Young opened the public hearing at 7:12pm for public input on the warrant articles for the 2002 warrant.

D. Duford asked how this differed from the Budget Committee's public hearing.

Chairman Young stated this is the Council's public hearing to take public input and make a recommendation on each article.

Consensus was to take public input on all warrant articles, close the public hearing, and vote on each article. (See Attachment #1 of all warrant articles)

Article #1, #2, #3: Chairman Young explained these are not money articles, therefore no public input.

Article #4: Chairman Young explained this article was heard in a separate public hearing earlier.

Article #5: Chairman Young read the article.

R. Dion moved to waive the reading of all the articles. Motion seconded by M. DiBietto. Motion failed.

Sid Baines, 59 Farmer Road, asked if the amounts listed were increases or total salaries.

T. Young answered increases.

Article #6: Chairman Young stated Article 6 goes along with Article 5.

Article #7: Chairman Young read the article.
R. Dion asked if there would be another increase next year.

Chairman Young answered there would be. It would be double what's currently there.

Article #8: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #9: Chairman Young read the article.
S. Baines asked what this was for.

Chairman Young explained it was for the revaluation of all properties in town. It has to be done to comply with State statute.

Article #10: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #11: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #12: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #13: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #14: Chairman Young read the article.

S. Baines asked why this was being discontinued.

Chairman Young explained that the Town purchased a tractor-trailer last year.

S. Baines asked why wouldn't the Council start saving now for a new tractor-trailer in the future?

D. Boyce answered that the purpose of the article has been completed and the money in this account is excess. A new account will be started in approximately two years.

Article #15: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #16: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #17: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #18: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #19: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #20: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #21: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #22: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #23: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #24: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #25: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #26: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #27: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #28: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #29: Chairman Young read the article.

Charles Watson, Town Planner, stated that sixteen members of the public are on the Master Plan Committee and are currently in a meeting. Members Martin Cannatta, Greg DeMarco, Steve Korzynowski and Mary Ruel wanted their support of this article known for the record.

Article #30: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #31: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #32: Chairman Young read the article.

Steve L'Heureux, 35 Prescott Heights, stated that AED means automated external defibrillator, not automated emergency defibrillator.

Article #33: Chairman Young read the article.

S. Baines asked if the station would be manned 24 hours per day.

Chairman Young answered it would be but this article is only for architectural and engineering fees.

Nancy Winneg, 42 Cross Road, asked if the fire station was part of the development agreement.

M. Farrell answered only the land is part of the development agreement. There's a possibility that some of the site work could be picked up as well. Currently it's only two acres of very expensive land.

Chairman Young further explained that TIF money is for structure only, "bricks and mortar", which can be included in the TIF. Not architectural services, fees or engineering costs.

S. Baines asked why that site was chosen for a fire station.

Chief Michael Howard answered that the particular area was looked at as an area of major future and current growth for building sites. Run response times determine the geographical location which is what determines the locations of needed fire stations.

S. Baines agreed with Chief Howard.

Article #34: Chairman Young read the article. No public input.

Article #35: Chairman Young read the article.

S. Baines asked if this money had been generated by the landfill and if so, why not keep it there instead of returning it to the general fund.

M. Farrell responded that there are only two things that can legally be done. First close the account and the money reverts to the general fund. Second, change the purpose with a 2/3 town meeting vote required.

S. Baines stated it should go to the landfill.

R. Dion stated it would reduce taxes if put into the general fund.

S. Baines responded yes but only short term. If this article passes then tipping fees and garbage bags will have to be appropriated.

D. Duford stated there's also an \$18,000 annual post-closure fee.

D. Pichette-Volk asked what the interest is on \$222,242.

D. Savoie answered \$13,603 per year on \$222,242.

T. Young stated the fund was created for landfill closure not monitoring. The landfill has been closed and the \$16,000 annual monitoring fee is an operating cost.

D. Duford stated the money expended is part of the closure plan as submitted to the D.E.S. and should be used for that purpose.

Article #36: Chairman Young read the article and explained this was heard in a separate public hearing earlier.

Article #37: Chairman Young read the article and explained this was heard in a separate public hearing earlier.

Article #38: Chairman Young read the article.

Dale Hemeon, 62 Hackett Hill Road, stated he was present to answer questions on behalf of HYAA.

S. Baines asked if the lights were just for games or would they be on all the time.

D. Hemeon answered for night games.

Article #39: Chairman Young read the article.

David Paquette, 154 Merrimack Street, stated that the Town needs a community access television channel in order for residents to know what's going on. As an example, out of the 10,000 residents, only a few are here. We will have a more informed voter and this would bring the Town together instead of listening to hearsay.

D. Pichette-Volk asked how the \$25,000 figure was derived.

D. Paquette answered that Manchester has a higher number of subscribers and they have \$25,000 in their budget. Concord has \$20,000. In order to have enough money, \$25,000 was used.

Article #40: Chairman Young read the article.

P. Ganley asked what the current balance was on article 12 because all balances presented indicate they are as of 12/01.

Diane Savoie, Finance Director, answered that she doesn't have a balance. Two accounts were merged together in error. Article 12 separates them.

Chairman Young closed the public hearing at 7:50pm.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT continued:

M. Farrell continued with the following items:

5. The Town has received its annual refund from Primex, the workers compensation provider. The refund is \$24,630 and is based on past performance and success of the pool in investing surplus funds.
6. The proposed middle school bond was approved at the March 12th School District Meeting. 2344 votes were cast, 1606 in favor, 738 opposed. With this approval, the Council will be presented with more paperwork for the final easement approval of the Whitehall Road property.
7. At the April 6th deliberative Town Meeting, the Town will have visitors from the Country of Azerbaijan. This is being sponsored by the Department of Defense and UNH-Manchester through a program called "Democracy 101". The visitors are learning American democracy. They will have translators with them and the warrant will be translated into Russian prior to the 6th. There will possibly be a small coffee and cookie reception after the Town Meeting for the visitors, depending on their schedule.

OLD BUSINESS:

Don Jutton, MRI, re: Assessing Report. D. Jutton gave a brief summary by stating that the Department has not been structured as efficiently and effectively as it should be in order to operate efficiently and effectively. There are several major issues, one of which is the person in charge of the Department who doesn't have the credentials or experience to manage the office. For many years Hooksett was running an operation where the consulting professional was operating under the direction and supervision of an individual who, though well-intentioned and has been in the office for a substantial period of time, did not have the professional experience or credentials to provide the oversight which has resulted in a substantial number of problems and issues that we've encountered. It isn't clear nor is it productive to try to figure out the root cause of the problems but many of the practices and procedures in place in the system are not accepted practices and procedures from an industry standpoint. It's difficult to tell whether it's a function of the assessing approaches, assessing practices, or that the professional assessor was being directed by someone and accepting that direction without question in spite of the fact that some of the direction was not appropriate to the industry. We have made recommendations that essentially suggest you correct that. First and foremost you need to have an assessing professional structuring, managing and overseeing the operation. That's much more critical post-statewide property tax, not pre-statewide property tax. DRA has become and will become more aggressive in ensuring that all municipal assessing operations comply with assessing standards.

M. DiBietto asked if #6 Inclusions which refer to a well-structured and managed GIS system, might reduce the cost of complying with GASB34 by half and what would an estimate be in savings?

D. Jutton answered that by not knowing the entire infrastructure, assuming Hooksett was fully built-out, then at least by half. One issue is identification of infrastructure and then costing it. A GIS system can assist in identifying the field. You could segment the system and obtain the capability of assigning attribute data and formulizing so you could identify different town owned infrastructure.

D. Duford stated the Town had a certified professional assessor directing operations. Was he not qualified to run the department?

D. Jutton answered the assessor had good credentials but was not in charge of the operation. He was operating under the direction of the assessing manager who provided the assessor with direction.

D. Duford disagreed stating the assessor did not answer to the assessing director.

D. Jutton answered that may be the impression but the assessment indicates that was in fact the case and that's how it was operated. As an example, the certified assessor was not allowed to use the computer in the office to enter data. That was the case until MRI started. We indicated to the Administrator that it wasn't an acceptable condition and if we were going to provide services we would have to have access to the system and into the data in the system. From MRI's perspective, understanding, and info provided, the assessing manager provided direction of the certified assessor. That is whom the assessor reported to. That's who established the drumbeat, provided the workload and direction in terms of what would be done, when, and how.

D. Duford stated he had the opposite impression that pickups were being done which were then brought back to be recorded and filed by the people in the office.

D. Jutton stated the certified NH assessor was doing the fieldwork. But in terms of prescribing priorities, what's being done, establishing the direction, and how data was being filed, alot of duplication and redundancy is going on. Visions Appraisal System, which is one of the industry's leading systems, is not being utilized.

M. DiBietto asked if efficiencies of the operation have suffered as a result as opposed to revenues?

D. Jutton answered the entire system has suffered. Hooksett has lost revenue. The system is not as equitable and fair as it should be. There have been and remain a fair number of challenges that are still in effect in terms of getting the system organized and structured that is acceptable to even the most minimal professional standards. If you're interpreting the report as saying you didn't lose revenue, that's not the case. We were not tasked with going back and auditing past performance. What we understood we were coming in for and what we found when we got here, were dramatically different in numbers in terms of values and properties. There was no prioritization in terms of pickups. In any community we prioritize pickups. We pickup the most valuable as quickly as we can. Ideally you pick it all up and the reason for that is you have an obligation to ensure equity across the board. We ensure that no one taxpayer pays disproportionately as opposed to others. There's some indication that there are properties out there that have been out there for a substantial period of time, which haven't been picked up at all or properly picked up.

M Dibietto stated that Hooksett is about to undertake a full revaluation and asked D. Jutton how long after the reval would his recommendation be that we revise our structure.

D Jutton answered that the Town should revise the structure before the revaluation. A revaluation is a verification of what's in the field, what the physical assets are in the community and the valuation of them. Without the proper system in place, it's going to be a disaster.

D. Duford asked M. Farrell if John, the assessor, ever brought up concerns.

M. Farrell stated that names should not be used. Once the assessor was brought on full-time he reported directly to the Administrator on the inefficiencies and was given read-only computer access. The department head still controlled the flow of work.

Chairman Young thanked D. Jutton and J. Lessard for the presentation.

R. Dion suggested the Council set aside some time and decide what will be done.

Chairman Young asked if the Council wanted to act up on the information presented.

Consensus was to meet, discuss, and take action in the near future.

M. Farrell stated we've already started to move forward by bringing back MRI who's been working in the field and office. The plan has already been designed by the State for the certification process. MRI is working to get us up to the certification level. A longer-term contract is being worked on to bring to the Council for final approval but currently they're filling in on a daily basis and working towards certification.

R. Dion asked to see the exact plan on paper.

P. Ganley stated this seems too general and the Town needs properly trained people who understand the system in order to run it.

M. Farrell answered there is a plan in place which is to bring the current employees up to the proper levels.

Consensus was to discuss this on May 8th with an action plan presented prior to the meeting.

FIRE QUINT TRUCK BID:

Chairman Young briefly reviewed the re-bids presented as followed:

KME Fire Apparatus - \$586,285.00. Five year lease payment - \$132,633.05.

Pierce Fire Apparatus - \$634,630.00. Five year least payment - \$142,214.00.

Ferrara Fire Apparatus - \$617,013.00. Five year lease payment - \$140,141.00.

Central States - \$570,429.00 Five year least payment – \$128,660.14.

The Committee recommends KME.

R. Dion moved to award the bid to KME at \$586,285 as recommended by the committee. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

M. DiBietto asked what the differences were between the two bid requests.

Chief Howard explained there were six items, which were not included on the second bid request. The information is in the packet as presented.

M. DiBietto stated that KME was lower than the prior bid but the interest has increased on the lease payment.

Chief Howard answered that Lascale/Citizen's couldn't compete with KME's interest rate.

D. Pichette-Volk asked if the specs changed on the amp draw report.

Chief Howard answer no.

D. Pichette-Volk asked if the issue of clearing the glass in the cab in conjunction with the air conditioner was still in the bid and where.

Chief Howard answered it's listed under the pros and cons in the back of the packet. KME has provided a larger heater, which corrects the problem.

Roll call vote:	P. Ganley	yes	D. Duford	no	
	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBietto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	yes	T. Young	yes	<u>Roll call vote carried.</u>

PURCHASING AGENT: M. DiBietto addressed a letter that each Councilor had received from Bill DeVoe, Sewer Department Purchasing Agent, asking to be hired as the purchasing agent for the Town.

M. DiBietto moved to employ Bill DeVoe as the purchasing agent at 20 hours per week. Motion seconded by R. Dion.

M. Farrell addressed the motion stating the Charter mandates the Town Administrator as the only one that hires employees. There is a hiring policy in place, which would have to be followed for posting, etc. There is no money in the budget for the position. The position itself has not been created.

P. Ganley stated he hasn't seen any evidence and statistics as of yet showing that the position is needed and the savings gained. This would be an unfunded mandate. We're not in a position to hire people.

D. Duford stated that the information received thus far is not thorough. People are currently doing the purchasing now. The time being used right now by many people could be used by one person saving time and money.

R. Dion stated the Council had discussed this position during the budget process and decided against hiring a purchasing agent.

M. DiBietto withdrew his motion in order to make a new motion. R. Dion withdrew his second.

M. DiBietto moved to request the Administrative Code Subcommittee look to see if the Town needs this position. Motion seconded by D. Duford.

T. Young stated the Council as a whole would decide if the position is warranted or not instead of a subcommittee. Once the position is created, you've essentially stated it's needed.

M. DiBietto withdrew his motion in order to word it differently. D. Duford withdrew his second.

R. Dion stated the Council just approved a budget for next year, which doesn't include money for a purchasing agent. It was discussed and voted down.

R. Holley stated there are many ways of purchasing items such as an in-house agent for big items and an outside company for office supplies.

T. Young stated his company has one purchasing agent who purchases \$24 million annually. A purchasing agent generally specializes in the field. For a Town, you have to be a jack-of-all-trades.

M. Farrell stated all I've heard thus far is statements of we "think" we can save money. Until it's definitively proven no funds should be spent. In order to prove the savings, someone would have to sit down, look at every invoice paid through the finance office for the last year and see what discounts we already received. Also, determine if there could be more discounts that could be obtained; can a service provide it better; would it justify the position, etc. Quite frankly, we don't purchase enough to warrant the position.

M. DiBietto moved that the Council request the Administrative Code Subcommittee to make a determination on whether a slot is needed for the part-time computer person and the part-time purchasing agent. Motion seconded by D. Duford.

Roll call vote:	D. Duford	yes	M. DiBietto	yes	
	R. Holley	no	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. Jolin	yes	
	T. Young	no	R. Dion	yes	<u>Roll call vote carried.</u>

OLD BUSINESS: Recommendations on Warrant Articles:

Article #4: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by M. DiBietto.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #5: M. DiBietto moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #6: Chairman Young explained that Article 6 goes with Article 5.

Article #7: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.

Roll call vote:	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Duford	no	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	
	M. DiBietto	no	T. Young	no	<u>Motion failed.</u>

Article #8: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote:	R. Holley	yes	M. Jolin	yes	
	P. Ganley	yes	R. Dion	yes	
	D. Duford	no	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	

M. DiBietto yes T. Young yes Motion carried.

Article #9: M. Jolin moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #10: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote: P. Ganley no D. Duford no
 D. Pichette-Volk no M. Jolin yes
 M. DiBietto no R. Dion yes
 R. Holley yes T. Young yes Tie Vote – dead issue.

D. Duford stated that the CIF should be for the Transfer Station which generates the money and the master plan and GIS fund and asked if this Article #10 fund could be changed.

Chairman Young answered no.

R. Dion stated that the Council directed the Administrator to put these in the appropriate location which has been done.

Chairman Young explained that D. Duford's statement was explaining that the master plan or GIS fund would be better under the capitol reserve fund instead of the archiving reserve fund.

M. DiBietto moved to not recommend. Motion seconded by D. Duford

Roll call vote: D. Duford yes D. Pichette-Volk no
 M. DiBietto no R. Dion no
 R. Holley no M. Jolin no
 P. Ganley yes T. Young yes Motion failed.

T. Young moved to recommend. Motion seconded by D. Pichette-Volk.

Roll call vote: D. Pichette-Volk yes M. DiBietto yes
 R. Dion yes R. Holley yes
 M. Jolin yes P. Ganley no
 D. Duford no T. Young yes Motion carried.

Article #11: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote: M. DiBietto yes R. Dion yes
 R. Holley yes M. Jolin yes
 P. Ganley yes D. Duford yes
 D. Pichette-Volk yes T. Young yes Motion carried.

Article #12: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #13: R. Holley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.

Roll call vote: R. Holley yes M. Jolin no
 P. Ganley yes D. Duford yes
 D. Pichette-Volk yes M. DiBietto yes
 R. Dion yes T. Young yes Motion carried.

Article #14: M. DiBietto moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #15: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #16: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #17: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #18: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #19: R. Holley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #20: P. Ganley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #21: P. Ganley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #22: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #23: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #24: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.
D. Duford stated he doesn't approve of this because the approval of a quint truck last year should be enough for awhile.

M. DiBitetto stated the Budget Committee does not recommend this.

R. Dion stated with a quint truck, we're getting more uses than buying separate use trucks. This is cost effective in the long run.

Chairman Young stated that in 1999 the Fire Chief presented a very aggressive plan to update the aged fleet. The plan called for one truck per year for many years.

P. Ganley agreed with Chairman Young stating the idea is to eliminate the old equipment to multi-use new equipment and reminded the Council on the Fire Chief's presentation which explained the sad state of equipment. There is no logic in not recommending this article. The Fire Chief had no idea of the growth that was coming.

M. Farrell stated that last year and this year the CIP, Council and Budget Committee were informed of purchasing six fire trucks. No one can say they didn't know of this plan.

R. Dion moved the question.

Roll call vote:	D. Duford	no	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	
	M. DiBitetto	no	R. Dion	yes	
	R. Holley	yes	M. Jolin	no	
	P. Ganley	yes	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #25: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #26: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.
Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #27: R. Holley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #28: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	no	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #29: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

D. Pichette-Volk stated she'd prefer to see CIF used for this article.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

D. Duford moved to extend for 15 minutes. Motion seconded by M. DiBitetto.

R. Dion moved to amend to finish the warrant articles. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote on amendment:

	D. Pichette-Volk	no	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried on amendment.</u>

Roll call vote on original motion as amended:

	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried on original motion as amended.</u>

Article #30: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #31: R. Holley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	yes	T. Young	no	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #32: D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #33: D. Duford moved to not recommend. Motion seconded by M. Jolin.

D. Duford explained that any fire station is a cookie cutter building and be done by design build.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	no	R. Holley	no	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Duford	yes	T. Young	no	<u>Tie vote. Dead issue.</u>

P. Ganley moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	no	M. DiBitetto	no	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	no	<u>Motion failed.</u>

M. Jolin moved to not recommend. Motion seconded by T. Young.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBitetto	yes	
	R. Dion	no	R. Holley	no	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Duford	yes	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #34: M. DiBietto moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBietto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #35: M. DiBietto moved to not recommend. Motion seconded by D. Duford.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBietto	yes	
	R. Dion	no	R. Holley	no	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	no	
	D. Duford	yes	T. Young	no	<u>Tie vote. Dead issue.</u>

M. DiBietto expressed reluctance to take the money out after hearing testimony this evening.

D. Duford stated the Solid Waste Committee recommends the money be left in the account for post closure fees and in case there's a problem. It's not tax dollars. It's earned revenue.

D. Pichette-Volk moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Dion.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBietto	no	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #38: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	no	M. DiBietto	no	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	yes	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

Article #39: P. Ganley moved to not recommend. Motion seconded by T. Young.

P. Ganley stated this warrant article is premature.

M. DiBietto stated that a "no" vote doesn't mean the Council is not in favor of public access TV. The Town Administrator is a capable negotiator to deal with this. Larger cities contract with the vendor rather than make the voters pay.

M. Farrell stated this article is possibly in violation of the SB2 law because it goes beyond just the monetary aspect.

Roll call vote carried unanimously.

Article #40: R. Dion moved to recommend. Motion seconded by R. Holley.

Roll call vote:	D. Pichette-Volk	yes	M. DiBietto	yes	
	R. Dion	yes	R. Holley	yes	
	M. Jolin	no	P. Ganley	yes	
	D. Duford	no	T. Young	yes	<u>Motion carried.</u>

M. Farrell stated he would check with legal counsel to see if the "recommendation" goes on the budget article and if not, it won't.

Chairman Young closed the meeting at 10:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth D. Dinwoodie
Assistant Town Administrator

Michel N. Jolin
Council Secretary