

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, November 13, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Chairman James Sullivan, Nancy Comai, Donald Winterton, David Ross, James Levesque, Todd Lizotte, Susan Orr, Adam Jennings, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator), Shawn M. Tanguay, Esquire (Council Attorney), Robert Duhaime (arrived 5:52 pm)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Public: October 23, 2013

***T. Lizotte motioned to approve with edits. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

- b. Non-public: None

AGENDA OVERVIEW

• **Special Agenda Items**

- a. Youth Achievement Award – presentation of certificate and pin

D. Winterton: This is the 2nd monthly Hooksett Youth Achiever award. Last month's achiever was a golfer and student at Manchester Central. This month's achiever is not a golfer, not a student at Central, and not a boy! She is a sophomore at West and is ranked 11th in her class. This year she is taking advanced AP courses and "thriving" to quote her parents. She is in Honors level English, Math, Science, and Music. Her Guidance Counselor says "she really has her stuff together and is a leader in her class." She is a huge part of the math team (½ of the members she recruited!). She excels at music; plays trombone, flute, baritone and euphonium. **Samantha Mussatto** will continue to achieve and we congratulate her!

- b. Deliberations and decision: Personnel issue in accordance with Town Charter 4.6a
Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Town Administrator
Attorney Buckley (Dr. Shankle's Attorney)
Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner
Attorney Douglas (Jo Ann Duffy's Attorney)

J. Sullivan: We had the evidentiary portion at the last meeting for us to consider. Tonight we discuss and deliberate on that issue. Our legal counsel Shawn Tanguay is here to assist us. He provided the Council with instructions on how to proceed.

Chair Sullivan provided the guidelines for discussion/motions and the order in which they are to occur.

D. Ross: My question is the order that it's listed that the discussion precedes the motion being made. That's not the common order of things; I just wanted to mention that. I don't know if that is a concern to Council or not. One other question - this is granted a single question motion, does that prohibit any amendments to the motion?

J. Sullivan: According to the charter 4.6A, that is the only guidance we have. Beyond amendments I'm not sure what you would be looking for.

Atty Tanguay: The only purpose the Council has tonight is to establish whether or not to override the Town Administrator's decision of disciplinary action of Sept. 20 of this year.

D. Ross: I just wanted everyone to be clear on the order in which we should do things.

J. Sullivan: I would concur that before we begin discussion there is a motion. The other items are discussion points (as described in the guidelines provided to Council from Attorney Tanguay). Beyond that I'm not sure how you want to proceed.

D. Ross motioned to proceed in the order on the paper, discuss prior to any motion being made. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan: I will go around the table once and ask each Councilor to speak and then proceed with a motion.

T. Lizotte: I would rather one of us jumps in and keep track of who speaks. I'd be interested in hearing a few people first.

J. Sullivan: Who would like to speak first?

D. Ross: I will. The question before us is not an easy one. We have 2 valuable assets to the town. In my opinion, our prime purpose is to protect the town of Hooksett and my first inclination is to maintain both people as assets to the town. This really began as a failure to communicate clearly and properly. I believe both parties involved had pure intentions and they thought they were doing what was best for the town. Miscommunication comes from the terms that were used. Inappropriate vs. illegal carries different weight as far as the gravity of the concerns. The problem is assertions that someone should have known something they didn't apparently know. Whose duty is it to know these things? As I read through the Personnel Plan I find that the Town Administrator is responsible to be the enforcer for state level regulations and laws. The Town Planner is mostly concerned with land use regulations. To find an error was made (new change to law RSA 91-A) that there is, in my opinion, reasonable presumption it's not an inexcusable offense. It would appear to me that these were improper meetings, but my concern is how big of an offense was it and how appropriate was the response? Teamwork is the most important thing – personal respect for someone and allowing their own self-respect to stay intact. The offense was there but the gravity of it was not communicated clearly. I can see how a second offense could and did occur. The level of response was inappropriate due to the nature of the employee who has been with the town for so long. I can't find anything I would perceive to be an ulterior motive of this employee, Jo Ann. She was in between 2 powerful and assertive authority figures, the Town Administrator and Dick Marshall (who has been part of this town longer than anyone at this table). My presumption is Mr. Marshall is very knowledgeable and very assertive. I don't think it was an offense that rises to the level of discipline that was exerted. Termination is low on the list of possible outcomes, one of the last things – warnings, written warnings, etc. There are other things prior to termination. Insubordination is low on the list as well. It's below other things that did not occur. I think it was a bit heavy handed. I think the education portion is certainly in order but how it was proposed was out of order. We have an education line in the budget. What was proposed was demeaning to someone who has been part of this town for over 20 years. How that came to be a good idea, I don't know and I don't dare to come to an opinion of motive. The motives, as far as I can see, were pure on both sides. One of the things about being a Town Administrator is their knowledge of municipal law. They need to know more than anyone else what the law says. In his own words, he was unsure at the time. If he was unsure, it's hard to hold her at fault for being unsure as well. They are both valuable assets to the town. Everybody now knows what an advisory committee is and everybody knows when it has to be posted as a meeting.

S. Orr: My understanding was that the entire Council had to be present to vote or it would be invalid. I see an empty chair at the table and I don't want to be spinning our wheels if we can't take a legal vote at the end of deliberation.

J. Sullivan: We need a 2/3 vote of the full Council.

Atty Tanguay: At this point we are just deliberating. We can take a break and discuss with Council at a later time.

J. Sullivan: We are here per the charter under 4.6A. No one here doubts the efforts or service provided by both parties of the town and there is no doubt that both parties believed they were acting properly and had the best intention of the town on their mind. Could this hearing have been avoided? Perhaps. But it's the Council's job to weigh the facts and apply them according to the town charter. The situation began when there was a need to review sign ordinances. The planning board took steps to create this process. Once they did it was necessary for them to follow the rules of conduct. Public boards must discuss and do their duty while being transparent and open to public oversight. Some boards demand

more support of administrative staff than others. Our administrators must provide assistance and guaranteeing the compliance of the proper rules and etiquette. We expect them to be prepared and well versed in conducting public business. Actions taken by Jo Ann Duffy were not with deception in mind. She believed it was important to provide timely suggestions and guidelines, and it was her understanding she did. In the eyes of the Administrator, she failed. If she had done her duties according to the administration, there would be no need for discipline. Though she and all town agencies were advised of the new RSA's, and was aware of taking efforts to review those, she felt that with only one staff member and one member of the board since it did not represent a quorum, as in the past, there were no inappropriate actions. Those actions were the catalyst that began the communications that eventually led to Dr. Shankle to discipline and thus, tonight's hearing. As a hearing board, it is our role to look at the facts, documents and additional info submitted. That was completed at our first public hearing. It was also indicated that there were 3 others involved in the meetings and sign ordinance research. All 4 did receive actions that Dr. Shankle believed was a violation of RSA 91. In the letter dated 8/29 he indicated he felt that what occurred was inappropriate. He could have been clearer – why it was inappropriate. If he had included that the violation was a result of RSA 91 and all subcommittees needed to adhere to the standards of open floor, this could have been avoided. This should not excuse a department head from taking personal responsibility. Once their boss believes that inappropriate actions had occurred they would go out of their way to find out what their boss thought was inappropriate. Let us accept the premise that Mrs. Duffy believes that she was following the process, and the lack of response from Dr. Shankle to her first email confirmed in her mind that she was following the right procedure. After a second email was sent, I would make sure I was taking the proper steps to find out why what they were doing was wrong. Perhaps an act of contrition for her missteps would have ended the need for further discipline. The statements made by Mrs. Duffy that no official sign committee was formed, contradicts the many documents submitted from the boards and staff that referred to such meetings as a sign committee meeting. Clearly the lack of communication, understanding and effort to find out what was appropriate on both sides led to this need to discipline. If Dr. Shankle had singled her out, I would be concerned this is a sign of discrimination; however others received discipline. Though the forms of discipline varied, Dr. Shankle provided ample reason for such variation. At the end of the year she will, if this continues, have gained more knowledge and will increase her professional development. In the scheme of things, the discipline which was accepted prior to her appealing will benefit her career. All actions we take rule out in consequences – sometimes positive and sometimes negative. I have adoration for the efforts Mrs. Duffy has provided this town for 20 years. The vote I take should not deter my faith in all the good deeds she has done in the past 20 years. Her efforts have made a positive impact on this town and this one misstep should not overshadow that. The discipline received will benefit her as well as the town. As a guardian to the charter, it is our duty to be the last defense in seeing our charter is followed and adhered to. It's paramount that we take due diligence to make sure we do the right thing and adhere to the rules. If we choose to apply rules to only a few then the need to have rules does not need to occur. We, as the guardians, must ensure full compliance in matters such as this.

T. Lizotte: After hearing testimony, I just looked at the facts from a standpoint of management. This isn't a hierarchy where the Town Administrator has centralized power. The department heads are responsible for their specific department. From that perspective I tried to look at how I would think about it. I have always struggled with what is the key element that makes a productive environment. How do I get the most out of my employees? I came up with trust. What happens when trust is broken? How do you rectify that? You have to trust that the professionals will make the right decisions and are given the latitude to make those decisions. We don't want to have micromanagers. We want them to take responsibility for any mistakes they make. We rely on that structure to make sure professionals will adhere to policies in the long run and trust the employee will act in solidarity of the organization. That goes to concept of insubordination. One of those things – execution of duties – has to be in the interest of the organization and can't be influenced by external influences and must adhere to the hierarchy of the organization. As soon as you miss that the whole organization becomes inefficient. I did a timeline analysis from both sides, as they provided the same facts. The town body understood there was a problem with 91-A last December. We discussed this and made a unanimous decision to say all boards need to be told there were changes, and we sent letters to all the boards. That was the first point I see that everyone was placed on notice that 91-A was serious. Next is the concept of the meeting. When you look at the timeline, the sign committee was going to meet on the 28th. They did meet (p. 22 in the exhibits from the Town Administrator). I trust my people and my team. There is no reason that Dr. Shankle didn't trust Jo Ann. I think it's inappropriate that "*I thought, I was under the impression that this was a meeting with staff only.*" First off, there was no posting. There was no communication to Dr.

Shankle of a meeting. He says the first thing you should do is notify me of the first meeting. I believe it was you made a mistake and I have acknowledged it. The first thing is to report an infraction at the first meeting. I don't read anything other than that in the first email. I think it would be more inappropriate to jump up and accuse them of having an illegal meeting. The response to it lays it all out (p. 21) – the committee was formed as a subcommittee of the Planning Board. The board agreed to have an organizational meeting. That was an acknowledgement that it was a meeting and the board was formed by the planning board as a subcommittee and a draft was taken. I think it was an acknowledgement it was a meeting and he was hoping this department head would understand that. The next thing is who has the burden to keep all parties apprised of the situation going forward? My belief is that it's not the Town Administrator; that responsibility is still within the planning department. That first email, it's not up to the Town Administrator to know there would be an extra meeting. I think it's a professional email but I still think the burden is on the Planning department to notify him of the second meeting. There is a key element we are missing – meeting notification goes out, and Dr. Shankle is not cc'd on that. An email from DPW director sent early morning the day of meeting and that peer within the hierarchy, of equal footing, clearly states 2 things: *"make sure Dr. Shankle knows about it, at least invite him."* That is an opportunity. We are talking about semantics of an email that should be more substantial. The second piece of info was from DPW director stating his concerns that their *"manager needs to know about this meeting."* "At least" – that's where I have a problem. We are dealing with a professional organization and you rely on the trust of those managers to make the right decision. I think the email from DPW director indicated he understood the gravity and was communicating that gravity to the planning department, allowing them a chance to respond to it. It goes into the context and whether it breaches employer trust of employee. I think it goes to trust. The question becomes what do you do to correct this action? My belief is training is the only thing you can offer. The Town Administrator understands the value of the employee but we are talking about the Town Administrator trying to build back the trust. Micromanaging is not the key. Training is the key. Discipline level – training on town time in which the Town Administrator is willing to put himself forward to conduct that training. It's a shared responsibility. I think that is one of the best solutions – shared interest in success. Also provides a chance to increase the bond in communication. We need to really look at the timeline. The issue here is the first offense would have been the end of it if planning understood their role and took a cue from a peer to make sure Dr. Shankle knew about this meeting. That indicates that for whatever reason there was a point where solidarity fell apart in regards to the organization and for whatever reason the planning department felt they didn't owe that professional courtesy to the Town Administrator. That to me is insubordination. It's significant in terms of the manager/employee bond and trust to say go forward and do your work autonomously and professionally. In order for Dr. Shankle to have that feeling, he needs to make sure they have sufficient training in order to carry that out. I think the training request is warranted and it also serves as a vehicle for professional growth. I don't think it's a distraction. In our history, we have lost people for various reasons because of a lack of action to make a course correction. I concur with the Chair that we have an obligation to say this was a clear violation of 91-A. It could have been a simple, corrected thing but a second violation took place. That would not have happened if planning communicated better through the chain of command like they should and they should have listened to their peers when it was clearly stated by DPW director. Neither of those things happened. When he attends the meeting and asks if Dr. Shankle was notified, the answer he was given was no. Once again, I think that goes to insubordination and I think that can be corrected with training.

J. Levesque: Jo Ann Duffy was torn between 2 people – Dr. Shankle and Mr. Marshall, who can be very forceful. That doesn't relieve that her boss told her he didn't think it was appropriate to have this first meeting. I don't think it was his position to clarify, I think it was her position to go down to him. This could have been settled with a face to face meeting. The other thing is Mr. Marshall didn't make himself available in her defense at the last meeting; he sent a statement. Regarding it being inappropriate, the DPW director took that well and understood the severity of it. His request to her about having Dr. Shankle at the next meeting was very important. She didn't comply with the request from her peer which was a simple email to Dr. Shankle notifying him of the meeting and asking him to attend. I don't know if that was insubordination, but I don't see it as being a team of people keeping communication open. Comment was made that *"we've always done it this way."* We have rules, a charter, development regulations, and zoning ordinances – let's stick to the rules. We write them and should abide by them. When DPW director asked her directly and she responded *"no,"* that is total disregard for your supervisor for not advising them of what was going on.

D. Winterton: The reason the letter was sent out in December was because of me. I was violated by the Planning Board under 91-A. They met about me illegally. When I brought that up to the employees of Hooksett, the line I got was *"when we get a letter from the lawyer we go into non-public and we always do it that way,"* clearly a violation of 91-A. One of the pledges I made to myself is that no one should be treated that way by the town. The issue is clear – I'm the only one with my name in the minutes tonight because I am a member of the Planning Board. No one should come before the Planning Board and be treated the way I was treated by this town, so I became a member of the Planning Board and now I'm a member of the Town Council and I'm here to do the right thing. I was part of and one of the catalysts for creating the sign committee and purposely did not offer to be a member. I was at the Planning Board meeting when we discussed having preliminary meetings so the following meetings would go further. I did not think the preliminary meeting would be a violation of 91-A but clearly it is. The key steps are when the planning department was informed that something was inappropriate, something should have been done. When the DPW director notified the planning director that Dr. Shankle should be notified or invited, something should have been done. In the world of email, it is so easy to cc your boss. There is a paper trail. I can understand there is a need for discipline. The question is, is it appropriate? I am in agreement, and I am proud of this board for not talking about this for the last 3 weeks, but the training is a light form of discipline. The ability to be trained by a PhD on work time does not seem like heavy discipline to me.

N. Comai: Councilor Lizotte made many of my points but I'd like to add that we as a board asked everyone in the town to read 91-A because of the importance. In Mrs. Duffy's testimony she said she did not read it. It's disturbing to know that someone who has put in 20 years and is a valued employee that should know those rules and someone I have gone to many times for town issues and I've learned from it. Training is an additional investment and a solution on many levels. We have to nip it in the bud, at the end of the day we will all feel accomplished and like we are making a difference as a board. All of the misunderstandings are understandable as things are read different ways but black and white – these minutes will be interpreted clearly. When we asked about these things it was subject to interpretation. But the facts remain – there is a timeline and some infractions were made. We need to correct them and we will all be better for it later on.

A. Jennings: I'm proud of NH for strengthening 91-A, regarding transparency in all levels of government. One of the reasons I left the army was micromanaging and I feel the email Dr. Shankle sent saying it was inappropriate was because of trust not micromanaging. The employee contract for the town planner says 8-4:30 work hours. I think the guidelines of discipline are appropriate in making the town planner an effective manager. I feel it is a benefit to the town and not a detriment to Ms. Duffy's career as a town planner. This action will make Hooksett a better place rather than terminate an employee and trying to find someone to fill her shoes.

S. Orr: This is a difficult position to be put in. I don't take people's lives and future lightly. The end result of what we do is going to seriously impact 2 people I respect and I think do an excellent job. 91-A is very important but I don't believe that is what this is about. This is about management process and communication. In hindsight I have come to realize those meetings probably were not appropriate. My concern was the process in which it was addressed and handled. We don't want to be micromanaged however the right to know law is very important and if it is so important as to be grounds to dismiss an employee of 20 years, the communication should have been stronger. We hired the Town Administrator because of his knowledge of the laws. If this was important enough to dismiss someone, it would have been important enough to use stronger language or walk into a meeting and stop it. I don't think it was stated firmly enough or with conviction. In everything I see here I don't see insubordination, disrespect, or total disregard for the law. I see someone who took the steps to call the municipal association to consult with attorneys to support that what she was doing was correct or not. She got advice that was incorrect but I don't think she was acting without regard to regulations and rules. I'm concerned about the discipline process that was taken. The guidelines say there are 4 types of discipline: documented verbal warning, written warning, suspension, and dismissal. I believe the first 3 steps were jumped and went right to dismissal. I think training is very useful. We should all be continually striving to be better at our jobs and take proactive action to do that on our own. My concern is this training does not appear to me to be geared toward making her a better town planner. It feels very punitive to me. Maybe there needs to be punitive action but this goes above and beyond simply training an employee to do better at his/her job. My issue here isn't necessarily just was 91-A violated? I believe it was the process of communication, how it was communicated – this is a swift and overly strict disciplinary action of an employee who has

been here for a long time. I'm also uncomfortable because according to the letter written to Ms. Duffy *"this training will take place every work day beginning at 8:15 in the Town Hall or any other appropriate location I may assign."* I believe that is too open. That is too vague, where can that be? I am not comfortable with the wording of that disciplinary action. If the training would be to have to go to the LGC and take one training a month, or so many hours per year, some of which could be provided by the Town Administrator, I would support that. The way it has been presented does not sit well with me.

R. Duhaime: When Charles Watson left the planning department I had been on the planning board for a few years and I highly recommended Jo Ann to be promoted from within. I was glad to recommend her. She took charge and is sailing that ship but it's the admiral's navy, and I'm going to back my admiral. She took the job, pay and everything that comes with it.

J. Sullivan: Will Council will offer a motion? Mr. Tanguay has provided the correct wording.

N. Comai motioned that the Hooksett Town Council vote to override the decision of the Town Administrator's decision for disciplinary action associated with the Town Planner's actions as prescribed in the Notice of Disciplinary Action dated September 20, 2013 in accordance with the town charter section 4.6A under disciplinary action. Seconded by S. Orr.

N. Comai: We typically, as a board, submit a motion in the positive, second it, discuss, and then vote. Tonight is different in that the motion was stated to override the decision of the Town Administrator. *"The Council by a vote of 2/3 of full Council may override the Town Administrator's decision."* That is why the motion is written the way it is.

J. Sullivan: The vote in favor would override the decision of the Town Administrator; yes would override and no would not override. 2/3 would be 6 out of 9.

S. Orr: I don't believe this series of meetings and events are not grounds for some sort of attention, disciplinary action, focus, training, but I am opposed to the manner in which it was done and the proposal of disciplinary action as it sits on the table. I feel we have been given a list of warrants to pass as one warrant article when there are multiple items to choose from. Though I support some of the Town Administrator's actions, I don't support it fully and I'm not comfortable agreeing to this disciplinary action as it stands.

D. Ross: Pertaining to amendments – hindsight is 20/20 and there are many suggestions that come to mind, but this isn't the venue to support that. My definition of insubordination is deliberate disobedience. I don't think that occurred here. There was a call made seeking advice, which was found to be incorrect, but the effort was made. The warnings did not rise to the level of what was about to happen. It should have been a far stronger warning. Everybody makes mistakes and we should have forgiveness. It's not a black and white question that we are being asked. Good people are hard to find. I consider them both good. I'm hopeful this works well for all involved. The next normal step prior to this hearing would have been an HR department but that position is gone and that is how it got fast-tracked here. Perhaps we should look at that again. As far as being a team player, I believe that was what was perceived to be occurring. Everyone was trying to help out the town. I don't see that any damages occurred; I don't know that anyone has threatened to sue the town over these illegal meetings. The avenue chosen for discipline would be inappropriate because according to the documents of the town, education is not in the Town Administrator's job description. That is not his job here. These rules to 91-A were new changes. The damages done don't amount to anything. I don't think this rose to the level of dismissal or this form of re-training. I consider it to be borderline cruel and unusual, and I can't support the decision that was made.

J. Sullivan: Roll call vote on this motion please.

N. Comai: For clarity, if the motion fails to receive the necessary number of votes, the disciplinary action remains in effect. If you vote yes, the disciplinary action is overridden and if you vote no the disciplinary action stands.

Roll Call

T. Lizotte – No
S. Orr – Yes
A. Jennings – No
N. Comai – No
R. Duhaime – No
D. Winterton – No
D. Ross – Yes
J. Levesque – No
J. Sullivan – No

Motion fails 7-2.

J. Sullivan: The motion to override the decision of the Town Administrator has not been overruled and the action remains in effect. That concludes this hearing on the matter of town charter 4.6A. I'd like to thank Shawn Tanguay for his assistance in this matter.

5 MINUTE RECESS

Reconvene at 6:32 pm.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. 13 – 113 SNHU: Release landscaping bond in the amount of \$112,301.
- b. 13 – 114 McDonalds: Release landscaping bond in the amount of \$22,500.
- c. 13 – 115 Mega X: Release landscaping bond in the amount of \$13,475.
- d. 13 – 116 Bond Auto Parts: Release treasurer check in the amount of \$17,843.40.

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the Consent Agenda. Seconded by A. Jennings. Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- I have been working with department heads on budgets
- I would like to remind Council that Mr. Marple has sent in letters that you will be given copies of, and we will continue to give them to you as they come in. He is welcome to come in and speak to the Council any time.
- We have promoted from within – DPW had a job opening because we lost our crew chief who handles buildings and grounds and he promoted John Soulia to building and maintenance crew chief. He has been with the department since June 2000.

S. Orr: Is there an opening that needs to be filled?

Dr. Shankle: A laborer position. He is hiring laborers and truck drivers prior to the snow falling.

- Community profile and visioning from UNH cooperative extension - I contacted them and spoke to Molly Donovan. She is more than happy to come to the December 11 meeting. She said a lot of what they do is in preparation for master plans or general community vision.
- Boston Post Cane ceremony for Eva Chouinard will be held this Friday at 11:30am in the common room at Holly Berry. Please feel free to attend, and it will be posted as a meeting.

J. Sullivan: The district Councilor for Mrs. Chouinard is District 1 but everyone is welcome. We would like to thank Councilor Orr for suggesting UNH Cooperative Extension come in and help with the community vision. We received a note from Heather Rainier and the library staff thanking Council for organizing staff appreciation day. I asked the Town Administrator to pen a certificate of appreciation to the library staff.

T. Lizotte: I was there and I thought that in theory we are supposed to get approval for those things, but we talked about giving the Chair latitude for last minute events that come up between meetings.

J. Sullivan: We can get wording together and have it on the next meeting schedule.

Dr. Shankle: This is the only meeting in November and the only meeting next month is on December 11, unless you decide to have a special meeting.

J. Sullivan: When do you present the budget for use to start looking through? Our next meeting is December 11; will we receive documentation before that? Will you begin with an overview or go through particular department heads over a period of 2-3 meetings?

C. Soucie: You will get book and at the first meeting in December the Town Administrator will be giving an overview and presenting smaller departments. The real meat of the budget is handled at the end of January.

T. Lizotte: I have a special project. I am hoping to address it when we get to new business under fire, if I can bring it forward. I want to form a subcommittee.

J. Sullivan: Let's get there and then we can address it.

PUBLIC INPUT

None

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

None

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

None

OLD BUSINESS

a. 13 – 104 Alarm Monitoring

J. Sullivan: This motion was tabled at the last meeting.

D. Ross recused himself from the discussion.

***T. Lizotte motioned to bring this item off the table. Seconded by S. Orr.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

S. Orr: This was tabled based on a concern I had, so I'd like to start. I did a search on the web of policies of towns in New England regarding someone on a board/staff providing paid services to that town or city. The wording on all of them (variation of wording) – *“as long as it is disclosed and the Council and selectmen know about it and everyone is in approval and the person recuses themselves during any conversation about cost, terms, etc. then it's ok.”* I believe we have abided by those ground rules as written in other town's regulations, and I am now comfortable with contracting with David Ross to continue to do this work.

L. Lessard: I recommended the Ross bid.

A. Jennings: The administrative code section 552 states, *“Anything over \$2,000 needs 3 competitive bids but can be overruled by the Council.”* Did that happen before I was on the Council?

T. Lizotte: Before we tabled it I requested that we receive an itemized list but we need a motion to waive the rules. I like to have it laid out side by side for a good comparison. The DPW director provided what I had requested and I'm OK with moving forward.

R. Duhaime: The commercial fire inspection – do we need that or is it a separate contract?

L. Lessard: The inspection is done by a different company through the state. That is an add-on if we were to take it over. The person I had working as building maintenance crew chief was searching for everyone to do it all. Mr. Ross would have to do additional work if we did it and so would Total Security.

R. Duhaime: Is it something we can live without?

S. Orr: I'm still confused. We don't do commercial fire inspections right now?

L. Lessard: No we don't.

S. Orr: Is there a reason why another security company included in that in the bid?

L. Lessard: The prior crew chief was trying to get it all organized under one contractor. Fire alarm systems are done through a state contractor.

S. Orr: Who inspects commercial buildings for fire safety?

L. Lessard: David Ross but the fire department has someone contracted by the state.

S. Orr: The \$800 item is free when done by the state?

L. Lessard: I believe it is covered under a fire marshal thing.

S. Orr: Who does commercial fire inspections, the state fire marshal or our fire department?

L. Lessard: I will have to get back to you on that. He was going to have to revamp all the systems at the fire department; \$400 of that is labor.

R. Duhaime motioned to waive the requirements to have 3 bids. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

S. Orr: I heartily agree that we definitely include David Ross in this bid. We are talking about a circumstance where a Councilor provides a service and I'm wondering again about appearance and transparency. Now we are waiving the requirement and end up awarding the job to the Councilor. How does everyone else feel about that? I'm not 100% comfortable.

L. Lessard: We tried to get 3 bids in August but we only got 2. We talked to another firm but they were not interested in it.

S. Orr: You did approach 3 people and 1 was not interested?

L. Lessard: Yes, correct.

S. Orr: Can I ask that it be in the staff report so that it shows we are doing our due process. I don't think this motion is needed then.

J. Sullivan: I know there is something that allows us to waive the rules if we do not receive 3 bids.

A. Jennings: In the Town Charter – p. 16 under purchasing procedure.

N. Comai: Back to the \$800. If it is not provided by Mr. Ross does it need to be provided by Total Security?

L. Lessard: Only if we put everything under one umbrella, but we don't have to do it. I'm not going to have that done.

N. Comai: Looking at the installment agreement from Total Security – \$3,779 is the subtotal but on the front of the summary it is \$3,600. The 2 numbers don't match. Are we deducting the \$800 because they are not providing that service? So now you're at \$2,800.

S. Orr: We need to vote on a motion before we go off course.

Roll Call

J. Levesque – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes
N. Comai – No
R. Duhaime – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
D. Ross – Recused
J. Sullivan - Yes

Vote in favor 7-1.

L. Lessard: On the Total Security page marked additions, those are extras. That comes up to \$2,640.

N. Comai: We are also taking out \$800; I'm just trying to clarify the facts.

J. Sullivan: With the items removed, the Total Security bid would be?

L. Lessard: Total security is \$2,640; David Ross is \$2,670 without all of the additions.

R. Duhaime: The Heads School is not monitored on the other bid?

L. Lessard: Yes, David Ross provides it and Total Security does not.

J. Sullivan: When you compare things to be equal, there is a \$30 difference.

A. Jennings: On the letter from David Ross the total is \$2,870. Does that include \$390 for the fire alarm communicator? If it is included then his bid price is \$2,480.

L. Lessard: I would say no but I would have to wait and ask David Ross on that.

J. Sullivan: On the first information provided to us I believe it said \$2,640 and \$2,670; that is the \$30 difference I mentioned.

N. Comai: Of the two, and in your experience, who are you recommending?

L. Lessard: David Ross.

J. Levesque motioned to accept the bid submitted by David Ross. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Roll Call

D. Ross – Recused
J. Levesque – Yes
T. Lizotte – Yes
S. Orr – Yes
A. Jennings – Yes
N. Comai – Yes
R. Duhaime – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
J. Sullivan – No

Vote in favor 7-1.

J. Sullivan: Article 7b states that no employee of the town should be eligible to serve on the Town Council; I'm just playing it safe.

S. Orr: Can I ask Mr. Lessard to provide us with a corrected side by side comparison of numbers. I'm still confused.

T. Lizotte: Since there are reservations on the Council, I pull my second.

J. Sullivan: Once Mr. Lessard provides additional information, at our next meeting, we can do a reconsideration. You cannot recall your second once we have concluded the vote. If there is still a question, someone can make a motion to reconsider at the next meeting.

N. Comai: When we voted to waive the rules, it was to waive the rules on the number of bids received?

J. Sullivan: Yes.

L. Lessard: With this approval, can I put his PO through? He has been waiting since July for the money.

J. Sullivan: Once the motion has been approved, you can follow Standard Operating Procedures.

T. Lizotte: If we are going to consider a reconsideration, if it's in anybody's mind, we should address that now. Is reconsideration actually going to happen?

J. Sullivan: We are not prohibiting a Councilor to motion to reconsider but we still need a majority. If we vote to reconsider and we vote no it creates an accounting problem.

J. Levesque: I don't see why we need to reconsider. Leo Lessard said they asked for 3 bids and got 2 so I think we fulfilled our need for bids. We voted for David Ross and I don't see the need to reconsider.

N. Comai: If we reconsider under article 7, it returns us to 1 bid and that could skyrocket. We are always going to have these same 2 bids.

S. Orr: My concern is not with the number of bids but that I don't clearly understand the numbers on both sides of these columns. I'm just asking Mr. Lessard to put on record a copy of the correct numbers. I don't think I would ask to rescind. I trust Mr. Lessard's process and all I'm asking for is a corrected version of this so we have a correct bid on record.

J. Sullivan: Let us proceed according to the vote that the bid has been approved. If something comes up we will deal with it at that point.

T. Lizotte: I share Ms. Orr's concern. My dilemma is the motion doesn't have a dollar figure in it. If that comes back and there is a miscalculation, does this board have a concern with that?

R. Duhaime: If it was \$26,000 instead of \$2,600 we were discussing I would think we would spend more time in debate. I'll give the difference to the taxpayers and be done with it.

J. Sullivan: We will proceed, as the bid has been approved.

S. Orr: Can we make the approval pending final numbers?

J. Sullivan: We could have but we already voted to approve. We need a vote to reconsider.

S. Orr motioned to reconsider vote. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

J. Sullivan: Is it 2/3 for reconsideration or just majority? I believe majority.

Motion to reconsider fails.

J. Sullivan: The bid at this point has been awarded to David Ross, and everyone may proceed accordingly.

S. Orr: And we will be provided with the correct numbers?

J. Sullivan: At the next meeting, in your Town Administrator report, can you clarify any of the bid process requirements we may need to address based on this discussion? We may be able to put this on the agenda if we need to revisit.

NEW BUSINESS

a. 13 – 89 Revaluation Report

Lee Ann Moynihan, Town Appraiser

L. Moynihan: I am here to provide a brief overview with the revaluation. This has been finalized in the last few days. Vision submitted the final report on Friday. They were reviewed and we met yesterday to address any concerns. The first few pages are the scope of work by Vision Appraisal for commercial and residential revaluation. He will come by to sign it this week. The next part is the email we received from Steve Hamilton – administrator at DRA. His cursory review falls in the guidelines provided by the DRA and a summary of values. The Board of Assessors met tonight and accepted these values. It has been signed by the board and will be submitted to the DRA so we can set the tax rate. They still have to provide new pictures of all properties. They are struggling with that but we are putting pressure on them to get that part of the contract completed. The DRA are our monitors and will provide a final written report once they see the final product. We won't see that until January or February. When we get that we will come back and let you know how that turns out.

J. Sullivan: On the last page it shows the value of Hooksett proper has gone down \$90M. All other aspects have gone down – residential, vacant land, mobile homes, but the value of commercial properties has increased.

L. Moynihan: These numbers were provided on 10/23 and there have been minor tweaks since then but nothing major. The percentages haven't changed.

R. Duhaime: That is why the difference between the 4/1/2013 number and the final number?

L. Moynihan: That was a total number – 1691 on p. 9 matches the 1691 final value on the summary page. The last page is correct.

D. Winterton: On page assessor's classification report, can you send us an email telling us what the property codes are?

L. Moynihan: Yes, we can get you that information

N. Comai: As a member of the Board of Assessors, at tonight's meeting when we voted to approve the values, the 2008 values were at 92.8% and the 2012 values are 112.8% so the needle moved 20%.

L. Moynihan: Those are the equalization values – revaluation resets that clock. 2012 we were at 112.8 – value of your property, we were 112.8% high to the market. Reassessed every year based on sales but this resets that.

N. Comai: We are moving in the right direction. Even though we are down \$90M we are still moving in the right direction.

L. Moynihan: We were over assessed by 12.8% last year so you had to expect values to decrease when we looked at the market. 20% is when the DRA will say you need to adjust your values.

T. Lizotte: When we finally get a tax rate, we will need some clarity. Our budget stays the same and the values go up and down. We are going to need education on that. Once it comes in I think it's going to go up.

b. 13 – 111 Technology Services Bid

C. Soucie: We received 6 bids from different companies. The fire department, police department, finance and Town Administrator reviewed the bids. I have recommended a 1-yr contract with Mainstay who is our current provider. The lowest bid was ruled out due to high cost during off-peak hours. We are in the process of a few conversions – police are working with IMC, fire is working their software, and finance is also finishing up. Mainstay can help us finish up these projects.

S. Orr motioned to award the technical services contract to Mainstay in the amount of \$37,800 for a one-year contract. Seconded by N. Comai.

R. Duhaime: The current budget is \$35,000 so you are going over budget.

J. Sullivan: Where is the difference coming from?

C. Soucie: It will come out of the administration department which houses computer line items. This contract starts in December and crosses over 2 fiscal years. We won't see the full impact of the additional \$2,800 this year, only \$1,400.

T. Lizotte: Going forward, the contract has an allotment of time shared amongst the departments. Is there any way that certain departments don't get the short end or is it project based?

Dr. Shankle: We are doing it differently this year. We have unlimited hours within the context of what it covers. All maintenance is covered. The only issue will be special projects and those will end up in the department that needs them. We are addressing the issues we had last year.

D. Ross: Is there a way, for ease of budgeting, that these contracts, for future reference, can be aligned to the fiscal year of the town?

Dr. Shankle: We can look at that. I'm not sure why it's December 1. Maybe we do a 9-month contract to be aligned with the fiscal year.

A. Jennings: Dr. Shankle, does the Mainstay quote include price for off-hour service?

Dr. Shankle: They do not increase the cost. I think the others went from \$125/hour to \$240/hour.

C. Soucie: And they have a 2-hour minimum. Mainstay does have an off-hours rate of \$75/hour which is not included in the unlimited hours.

Roll Call

D. Winterton – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

R. Duhaime – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

c. 13 – 106 Emergency Operations Plan Chief Michael Williams, Hooksett Fire Department

Dr. Shankle: In case you were wondering, you only got the table of contents; under the right to know law emergency plans are exempt from publication. If Council wants to see that you can come to my office or the fire department for review.

Chief Williams: As an emergency manager, I review it annually. This was developed in 2011. Make sure ESF's are adequately working. We had a table top exercise at the safety center and all the functions seemed fine. This is a housekeeping item of getting signatures from new Councilors that were not on the 2011 plan and letting them know there is a plan out there and that it's in effect. This needs to be signed by the Town Administrator, Chair, myself and the rest of the Council.

J. Sullivan: We need to accept the amendment to the EOP.

N. Comai motioned to accept the amendment. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

S. Orr: The only changes are name changes? Are we talking about the signature page or within the document itself?

Chief Williams: It's just 3 signature pages. It had the specific name of the Town Council chair but I took the person's name off and left it generic so the players can sign off but it doesn't affect any of the ESF's.

S. Orr: Other than that, there is no change since the last Town Council review?

Chief Williams: Absolutely not. That's why we had the table top review. This plan can be viewed by the Council. All the depts. are broken down and it covers fire, police, highway, finance, planning, and logistics if there is a major event. We need to acquire new signatures to make sure they know there is a plan in place. No changes were brought up at our table top.

D. Winterton: You are required to update the EOP. Required by whom? State law? Town charter?

Chief Williams: I don't know. I know you should have a table top but I believe as a maintenance thing I should advise you as the elected officials so you know that there is a plan in place and that it's being updated.

Dr. Shankle: It used to be a FEMA requirement. If you run into a situation where you need money, you need to show you have a plan in place.

Chief Williams: Our rep from homeland security visits us at least monthly and knows about the plan. It's overseen by the state. Once it has been re-signed a copy will go to homeland security.

D. Winterton: It is compiled by LMK. Do we have an annual contract or was this a one-time fee?

Chief Williams: It was a one-time fee and we do the maintenance. If we need to make large changes, we can send it back to him and have him make the changes. We could have done it by ourselves – this is a good plan that was put in place in 2011 and it's important to have and keep it in place.

T. Lizotte: I don't see anything about schools. Are they part of the plan?

Chief Williams: Yes, they are. Dr. Littlefield was part of the distribution list invited to the table top.

T. Lizotte: In terms of drills and rehearsals, do you plan to have any to test various aspects of it?

Chief Williams: We did a table top 2-3 months ago. There has been a discussion of drills – as this location is set up as a shelter. One of our plans is to set this up as a shelter which falls in place with our plan. We can do shelter drills. We need to figure out when we want to do that.

R. Duhaime: Who is the new emergency manager?

Chief Williams: Dan Pike was but he stepped down a couple years ago and I took over.

R. Duhaime: The code enforcement officer is part of the emergency plan and we have gone through a few.

Chief Williams: It's difficult if you have a lot of turnover in these positions. I did the table top when Chief Bartlett came on since all the key players should know about it. We set up a desk at EOC with ESF's to go over with new employees. It should be a seamless transition. We are trying to simplify since there has been some turnover of some the key players.

R. Duhaime: Fall safes are in there too?

Chief Williams: We have had vacancies so by having each function in a separate binder it's simplified. This procedure manual is pretty new – 3 or 4 months old.

J. Sullivan: They can view the full document and if there are any questions they can contact you. I suggest if you want to look at the full report, see Dr. Shankle and contact the chief directly with questions.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Dr. Shankle: We can put it on the next agenda to be signed.

D. Fitzpatrick: It was in the full packet sent to Council on November 6 as a pdf.

J. Levesque: Should we not have pdf files floating around for security purposes? I think we should have hard copies.

Chief Williams: Do not forward it.

J. Sullivan: Going forward maybe we should have hard copies of things that do not follow the right to know law.

D. Ross: We can use the Council reading room, that's what it's there for. Internet security is an oxymoron. I think proper procedure is to use that room and get hard copies.

J. Sullivan: Please read this prior to our next meeting and ask the chief any questions. I will sign at the next meeting.

d. 13 – 107 Update to Fire-Rescue Fee Schedule

Chief Williams: This only applies to the fire detail rate. According to the finance director, an increase is due to offset the NH retirement increases we have incurred over the last 2-3 years. We have put in here that to set a lower rate we took out the rate for HYAA events. If they require EMT's we took administrative fees out of those.

J. Sullivan: What were the detail rates previously?

Chief Williams: I don't have it in front of me but I think it's about an \$11/hour difference. It was a substantial difference. Fire apparatus did not get changed. Just detail rate (there is a 4 hour minimum.)

J. Sullivan: If the firefighter is there, so is the apparatus?

Chief Williams: Not necessarily. Some don't require apparatus, sometimes it's just an EMT.

R. Duhaime motioned to accept the update to the Fire-Rescue fee schedule. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Ross: This appears to be a low charge for detail, also known as private use of, fire apparatus. I can see discounting it for town events but if this is the generic detail rate for private use, it seems low. Are there comparisons to any other towns?

Chief Williams: We did not look at that but we can. Every fire department has a detail rate and that affects apparatus. We need to make sure we collect enough money for details.

J. Sullivan: If you want him to look at that before we approve, we can table or we can update this in the future if the cost is too low.

Chief Williams: Ritchie Bros. is having auctions so we need to at least get this part done and I can come back if I need to.

D. Winterton: On the \$74/hour, can you break that down to what it was and what the former retirement contribution was as opposed to what it is now?

Chief Williams: Per Christine's email, based on the base rate, it was per the union contract: \$45/hour, 4-hour min, FICA, unemployment, workers' comp and retirement. \$61.54 was the actual but we rounded to

\$62.00. Of the \$61.54, minus the \$45 rate, the rest is the administration fee. \$12.00-\$13.00 per hour rate was for retirement. I can get the info for you from Christine. \$12.48 for retirement, \$3.04 workman's comp, \$0.36 for unemployment, \$0.65 for FICA, plus the \$45 comes up to the \$62.00

D. Winterton: Are firefighters on Social Security?

Chief Williams: No we don't pay into that.

D. Winterton: What is the FICA for?

Chief Williams: It's a different portion of FICA (1.45%). I can have Christine break all this down.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan: Who signs, the Administrator or Chair?

Dr. Shankle: I would normally sign.

J. Sullivan: Dr. Shankle will sign as in past practice.

e. 13 – 108 Fire-Rescue Personal Protective Equipment

Chief Williams: The voters approved the 2nd year of CIP PPE – jacket, suspenders, pants, and boots. NPA revised standards and put a 10-year lifespan on gear. We are replacing a lot of our gear. We have revised our specs and taken a good approach to how we protect our gear. We received only one bid back after we set it out from Bergeron which is made here in NH. They are one of the largest makers in the world. I'm recommending we accept this bid for 10 sets at \$2,394.16 per set.

J. Sullivan: Why could you not get more bids?

Chief Williams: Our specs are very specific. We added more thermal layers to the shoulders. We wrote it around a Globe vendor and it met all the standards for bid but we only received one.

J. Sullivan: The specifics of the bid limit the number of prospects?

Chief Williams: It makes it harder to meet as to how it's designed and built.

J. Sullivan: We need to waive the rules again on the bid process.

T. Lizotte: Because this is a specific clothing bid, I think it's justified to have a sole source, as it's based on their specs from past experience.

***T. Lizotte motioned to waive the rules of the bid. Seconded by N. Comai.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

N. Comai motioned to approve the purchase of \$23,941.60 in PPE per the recommendation of the Town Administrator. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Winterton: On the last page there is a 30% overcharge for large sizes.

Chief Williams: Nobody in this group is that size. We should be all set with that.

R. Duhaime: On the shoulders, did that add cost?

Chief Williams: Yes, we added an extra thermal layer. It was probably a couple hundred dollars.

R. Duhaime: Other companies don't stock the specific suit you are looking for?

Chief Williams: Everything we did through our investigation we learned from Globe gear. They did an analysis of our gear and why this gear saved our firefighter's life. We learned a lot about how we should

maintain our gear from that report. It has Globe's analysis of the gear and why he survived. We will do the rest through the operating budget. We are trying to stagger it so we get a couple sets per year.

D. Winterton: If we lose a firefighter to retirement, resignation, etc. are these suits transferable?

Chief Williams: They do have standard sizes and we try to size them as close as possible so we can reuse them.

D. Winterton: If we customize our suits and Globe thinks it's a good idea, are they marketing "Hooksett suits?"

Chief Williams: Every department has different specs for their requirements. It depends on where you are geographically and what type of gear you require. Our gear policies and specs were changed based on our experience.

Roll Call

R. Duhaime – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
D. Ross – Yes
J. Levesque – Yes
T. Lizotte – Yes
S. Orr – Yes
A. Jennings – Yes
N. Comai – Yes
J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

Chief Williams: As part of our collection policy for ambulance reimbursement fees, one of the questions I had that we can add to collection policy is regarding some of the people that have bad addresses. If we send bills out and they don't have an address it gets returned. It's a small list but I need guidance on where to go with this.

Dr. Shankle: The collection agency will send them back as not received. We are keeping numbers on the books that we can't collect. We don't know where the people are. If you are willing, we can change the policy to write off those things that come back undeliverable.

J. Sullivan: If Dr. Shankle and the chief could come up with the appropriate wording, we can schedule an agenda item to approve that change.

N. Comai: Can you put what the current steps are not to get to that point?

Chief Williams: I can forward the current collection policy that was approved by Council.

J. Sullivan: We can schedule for the next meeting or the meeting after.

T. Lizotte: I talked about my special project that has to do with fire.

J. Sullivan: Can we add as an agenda item?

T. Lizotte: I'd like to form a subcommittee to look at forestry issues to be comprised of staff and conservation commission to come up with a town forestry plan and dovetailing it into working with MR. Ross in regards to the conservation. I wanted to reach out to Harold Murray. He knows everything about dealing with forestry issues and fire. I'm looking for support for that. I'd like to put it on the agenda for next meeting.

S. Orr: Could you in your proposal put in examples of specific issues that this subcommittee can address? That would be great.

R. Duhaime: Chief Williams, can you show us estimates on what we write off each year as bad debt?

Chief Williams: Sure.

f. 13 - 112 2014 Holiday Schedule

D. Fitzpatrick: Holidays were approved by prior Council; this is informational only.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Jennings: Parks & Rec has not met yet.

R. Duhaime: I did not make the sewer meeting. SNHPC got a new computer system that they are phasing in over the next 10 years. Numbers will get worked into one software program. Dr. of Meteorology at UNH will be at PSNH in Manchester on November 25 at 3pm. He will be talking about the climatology of NH. His last presentation was incredible, and I encourage you to attend.

S. Orr: Nothing to report.

N. Comai: Nothing to report.

J. Sullivan: Nothing to report.

D. Winterton: I missed the last Planning Board meeting. The subcommittee meeting of Hooksett Youth Achiever of the Month will meet again prior to our December 11 meeting.

S. Orr: Who is on that committee?

D. Winterton: Robert Duhaime, Todd Lizotte and myself.

S. Orr: When are the meetings?

D. Winterton: At 6:00 before the last monthly Town Council meeting.

T. Lizotte: It happens to be that I volunteered and between myself and Councilor Duhaime, if one of us can't make it, Susan, if you want to attend I don't mind tag-teaming.

D. Ross: Conservation Commission: Some more mitigation money is coming our way to allow us to be part of the purchase of some more property around the Clay Pond area. This will increase the continuous land mass over there. The preliminary estimate is less than \$400/acre; currently valued at \$1,000-\$1,200/acre through the Conservation Commission trust fund. This could be another chunk of town that is rightfully conserved and preserved. The Riverfront project is moving along to preserve the town's rights to the public's use of town properties. All issues were ironed out. Final agreement will be presented at the next meeting.

J. Levesque: Board of Assessors met tonight and voted on the valuation summary. ZBA met last night and there were 3 items:

- The wetlands crossing for Sterling Homes site walk is set for Saturday at 10 am.
- The former Staples is now going to be a Petco. The sign exceeds the size approved by zoning but is smaller than the Staples sign. They will only be using the front right hand side.
- Manchester Water Works came in for Kimball Drive. They want to install a well to pump 6M gallons of water/day. Neighbors are concerned, but they claim nothing will happen. Filter changing went from bi-monthly to monthly. MWW needs to put them on their system. They said they will if anything changed. Site walk scheduled for December 16 – I will confirm that date if you want to know.

T. Lizotte: We had a budget meeting to go over the presentation by Dr. Littlefield and Dr. Shankle. Dr. Littlefield was clear that the transition period for high school is going to be expensive. On that I'd like to bring forward the idea for education to the public that we consider purchasing ½ page ads in the *Banner* to discuss budget issues. When it comes to our turn, as much as Dr. Shankle cuts things where he can, I think we need to consider more educational methods by leveraging the *Banner* and tasking the Town Administrator to articulate with info graphics what the budget aspects for the town are.

Dr. Shankle: I would like to mention that we are moving forward on police union negotiations.

PUBLIC INPUT

Marc Miville, 42 Main St.

I was not here earlier, so this may have been already covered. There was a terrific, positive meeting at the library this week. They were approved as library of the year for the state. The event was well attended and a source of positive pride for the town. No press was present but thought I would put that on the record for others to read. State reps and several Town Councilors attended.

Secondly, very important this time of year is the Salvation Army bell ringing to gather donations for good causes for citizens of town. They are looking for bell ringers starting the day after Thanksgiving through Christmas Eve. Mary Farwell is looking for volunteers. You can sign up on the Salvation Army website.

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.

J. Sullivan motioned to enter non-public session (a) at 8:20pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Roll call

N. Comai - Yes
R. Duhaime – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
D. Ross – Yes
J. Levesque – Yes
T. Lizotte – Yes
S. Orr – Yes
A. Jennings – Yes
J. Sullivan - Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

***R. Duhaime motioned to exit non-public at 9:10pm. Seconded by A. Jennings.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Winterton motioned to seal the non-public minutes of 11/13/13. Seconded by T. Lizotte.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***J. Levesque motioned to adjourn at 9:10pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Verney
Recording Clerk