The Annual Deliberative Session of Monday, February 06, 2012 was called to order at 7:00 PM at

2 the Londonderry High School Cafeteria, Londonderry, New Hampshire by Moderator Cynthia Rice

3 Conley.

MEMBERS OF THE MEETING PANEL

Panel Members: John FarrellCouncilor Susan Hickey...... Assistant Town Manager – Finance & Administration Margo Lapietro Executive Assistant Budget members: John CurranBudget Member Dan LekasBudget Member Chris Melcher.....Budget Member Tom DaltonBudget Member

OPENING REMARKS

Moderator Conley introduced the head table and the Budget Committee. The Londonderry High School (LHS) Band Colorguard consisting of Danielle Garrand, Carly Anderson, Melanie Lantagne, and Shannor Coburn presented the colors. The Pledge of Allegiance was followed by the singing of the National Anthem by LHS vocalists Cailey Blatchford, Erin Conti, Stephanie Conti and Rachel Hansen. Town Council Chairman Sean O'Keefe introduced the Citizen of the Year, Band Director Andy Soucy, and presented him with a granite state shaped award.

Moderator Conley explained the Moderator makes the rules as they go along. Any ruling of the Moderator may be challenged by a majority vote before the Moderator moves onto the next item of business. She explained the use of voter cards and coupons. All Warrant Articles will be brought

up for discussion and open for amendments. All amendments must be in writing and given to her or Mr. Michels and will be done one at a time. The amendment cannot be added in subject and no Article can be tabled. No more than one amendment will be allowed on the floor at a time. Moving an Article to the ballot does not require a vote at the Deliberative Session. A secret ballot on an Amendment will be taken if five (5) voters request it before we vote. A recount will be taken on a non-secret ballot if seven (7) voters make the request. Moving the previous question requires a 2/3 majority to pass, however, if you are in line at the microphone and wish to speak for the first time it will be accepted as long as the subject has not been discussed for half an hour. A motion to Restrict Reconsideration is permitted after the Article has been placed on the ballot. All non-voters are in their designated area and may not vote. She said the procedure for the Deliberative Session will be reviewed throughout this meeting. If you have questions, please free to ask them.

STATE OF THE TOWN ADDRESS

 Town Manager Caron delivered the "State of the Town" address. He stated that "under our revised budget approval process as adopted by the voters this past March, the Council is responsible for submitting a recommended operating budget, which can be amended at this Deliberative Session. The voters in March would then vote to approve or reject the budget; if rejected, the Town would operate under the Default Budget.

The Council's recommended budget for FY13 is the same amount as the Default Budget, which reflects an expenditure increase of 2.3% over this year's operating budget. There are several initiatives in this year's warrant to begin addressing equipment and staffing needs in the Fire Department, and a continuation of the reserve programs for vehicles, heavy equipment and town building maintenance which promotes tax rate stability.

Although the economy is improving, it is improving at a very slow pace, and we expect that to continue for the foreseeable future; however, staff continues to work on projects that will position the Town to capitalize on growth in the non-residential sector when economic conditions do improve. Last November the State opened the Airport Access Road, and with that milestone comes a greater appreciation by state and federal officials of the strategic location and abundance of commercial/industrial land at Pettengill Road. Town staff continues to receive a growing number of inquiries about the area's development potential while also working with state and federal officials to secure non-local funding for the project which would reflect the Pettengill Road project's anticipated benefits accruing to the region and the entire state.

Again this year I would like to direct your attention to the Town's website; a feature which should be of particular interest to citizens is E-Alert, which allows residents and taxpayers to automatically receive as much information as desired, including emergency alerts, meeting agenda and minutes, road closures and similar pieces of information. We believe E-Alert will help us keep all of you better informed about the activities of your town government.

On behalf of the town staff, we thank you for your support and assistance."

Town Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article 2

ARTICLE NO. 2: [BOND ISSUE FOR HIGHWAY RECONSTRUCTION]

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate FIVE HUNDRED THIRTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$ 537,000) for the reconstruction of roads.

Said sum to be raised by the issuance of serial bonds or notes not to exceed **FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS** (\$500,000) under and in compliance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (NH Revised Statutes Annotated Chapter 33) and to authorize the Town Council to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes, to determine the rate(s) of interest thereon and to take such other actions as may be necessary to effect the issuance, negotiation, sale and delivery of such bonds or notes as shall be in the best interest of the Town of Londonderry, and to authorize the Town Council to accept any funds from the State of New Hampshire, the Federal Government, and private sources, as may become available, and pass any vote relating thereto and **THIRTY SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS** (\$37,000) for the first year's interest payment and bond issuance costs on said bond and to authorize the transfer of the June 30 fund balance in that amount for this purpose. (60% approval required)

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$0 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.00 in FY 13; \$68,750 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.02 in FY 14; and \$66,875 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.02 in FY15, based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

- 112 Councilor Farrell made a **MOTION** to accept Article No. 2 as read for discussion.
- **SECOND** by Councilor Dolan.

Town Manager Caron said the Council recommends support for a \$500,000 bond issue which in conjunction with Article 17 will begin the process to transition funding for road reconstruction activities from long-term bonds to property tax support. The Town has approved road bonds during each of the past five years for a total investment of \$5.7M, and if approved by the voters, the Council plans to continue this transition into FY14. He directed the voters to look at a slide matrix that showed the 10 year transition of bond and debts.

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supports Article 1, 7-0-0.

Open for discussion. Barb Stadtmiller, 14 Crestview Circle questioned if the June 30 Fund Balance covered all warrant articles in the past. The Town Manager explained historically the Council at Town Meeting has supported one time use expenses to be paid out of that fund. B. Stadtmiller asked if all of the Warrant Articles passed this year will be covered. Town Manager Caron responded three are funds available. Mike Brown, 69 Carousel Court pointed out that the tax impact of each Article is noted on the bottom of the each slide presentation. He said the current tax rate for FY11 is \$4.74, this Article has a "0" tax impact but we are already at .21 cents and asked for an explanation. The Town Manager explained the tax rate, first is the veteran's exemption which the Council increases each year which has two components with a maximum of \$500.00. That incremental increase was completed 4-5 years ago and to fund that amount is .15 cents on the tax rate. The second component is .6 cents on any errors in the assessment list and abatement to make up for the lost revenues. Both of those add up to .21 cents for this particular item. Gregory Warner, 10 Pendleton Lane supports the bond because the roads do need repair. Mary Soares 2 Gale Road asked the Town Manager to explain the difference between fund balance and the undesignated fund balance. She asked if the fund balance is money left over from last year's budget. Town Manager Caron explained it adds to that, the overall fund balance is larger. The undesignated fund balances are funds that are available for expense but only a small portion is recommended. It is recommended that we retain a certain amount of the fund balance for cash flow purposes. If we have excess revenues from the undesignated fund balance they go into the fund balance and need approval to spend from the voters at the Deliberative Session. She asked what is the balance in the left over fund balance; he responded we have \$4.25M. Bruce Campbell, 7 Willow Lane asked for all the names of the roads being repaired with this Article. Public Works Director Janusz Czyzowski said we have 14 miles of roads that need repairs and the estimated cost for that is approximately \$19M. \$500K does not give him very much. Sections of Litchfield from Misty Lane to Meadow is the one they will start on. Auburn Rd. and Stokes are top priority roads. Al Baldasaro, 41 Hall Road asked if there is an RSA that identifies the 5% of whatever you are maintaining or is there a policy that comes up with that figure. Town Manager responded to his knowledge there is not a RSA but a policy as recommended by the Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) as established by the tax rate.

152153

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

Moderator Conley stated that Article 2 is moved to the ballot.

154155

- 156 Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 157 **SECOND** by Mary Soares.

158159

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 2 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.

160161162

Town Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article 3

163164

ARTICLE NO. 3: [EXPENDABLE MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND]

165166167

168

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of **TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS** (\$200,000) to be placed in the Town's Maintenance Trust Fund created by the voters at the 2003 Town Meeting for the purpose of repairing and maintaining town facilities and to authorize the use of the June 30 Fund Balance in the amount of \$100,000 towards this appropriation.

- (If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$100,000 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.03 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)
- The Town Council by a vote of 4-1 recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee by a vote of 1-6 recommends a no vote
- 177 Councilor Freda made a **MOTION** to accept Article No. 3 as read for discussion.
- 178 **SECOND** by Councilor Green.

176

184

187

192193

194

197

200

201202

203204205

206

207208

209

210

211212

213

- Town Manager Caron said the Expendable Maintenance Trust Fund is used to maintain town facilities such as repairing HVAC, plumbing and electric systems in various town facilities; purchase of equipment for the Recreation Division, such as bleachers and lighting; replacing the roof on Leach Library; and improvements at the Highway Garage.
- Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated the Budget Committee does not support Article
 3, 1-6.
- Open for discussion. Greg Warner, 10 Pendleton Lane said he does not agree with the Budget Committee. He agrees with spending the money to maintain facilities. Greg Carson, 19 Tokanel Drive asked why the Budget Committee did not support this Article. Chairman of the Budget Committee Todd Joncas said they are trying to save money due to the economic times.
 - Moderator Conley stated that Article No. 3 is moved to the ballot.
- Meg Seymour made a MOTION to restrict reconsideration.
 SECOND by Ann Gaffney.
- 198 VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 3 IS RESTRICTED FROM 199 RECONSIDERATION.
 - Assistant Moderator Michels explained that due to this being the first Deliberative Session the voters have to understand that the budget is a bottom line budget so if you want to eliminate or change something it is from the bottom line. Basically the Council can change where it wants.
 - Assistant Moderator Michels proceeded to read Article No. 4

ARTICLE NO. 4: [FISCAL YEAR 2013 TOWN OPERATING BUDGET]

Shall the Town raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$26,741,721? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$26,741,721, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town or by law; or the

governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.

215216217

214

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$15,638,250 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$4.59 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

218219220

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; The Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

221222223

- Councilor O'Keefe made a **MOTION** to accept Article 4 as read for discussion.
- 224 **SECOND** by Councilor Farrell.

225226

227228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236237

238

239240

241

242

243

244

Town Manager Caron explained that Article 4 funds the operation of town government for the year beginning July 1, 2012, for such departments as Police, Fire, Public Works, Finance & Administration, Recreation, Tax Collection & Administration, Debt Service Payments, General Assistance, Planning, Library, Cable and Economic Development. The Town Councils proposed FY13 Budget is the same amount as the default budget and represents a 2.3% increase in recommended appropriations for the FY12 budget. In order to meet the Councils goal to first fund critical services and staffing responsibilities to the town, resources were re-directed to fully fund new accounts and police and snow removal overtime. The FY13 budget includes more funding for part-time salaries which were previously classified as full-time positions as the town attempts to consolidate and economize all positions wherever possible. With this budget proposal along with the request in Article 9 it will allow the town to continue to provide a level of safe services which the residents have become accustomed to. In order to accomplish this, the Council is recommending a re-allocation to the Library in the amount of \$64K and to the Cable Division in the amount of \$101K. These resources along with operating the cost deductions of other departments contributed to a transfer of \$94K to budget actual fuel usage, \$139K for replacement police coverage, \$50K for emergency snow removal and DPW overtime and \$15K for replacement for the fire departments emergency response vehicle. Employee benefits cost increased \$138, 829.00 overall and debt service has increased \$29,456.00 from the current year. The Council is recommending increases in overtime accounts as it is more cost effective to fill shifts with overtime rather than hire additional employees considering the increasing cost of employee benefits. This system also provides maximum scheduling flexibility to enhance efficiencies.

245246247

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated the Budget Committee supports Article 4 unanimously.

248249

250

251252

253

254

255

256

257

258

Open for discussion: Al Baldasaro, 41 Hall Road asked if everything else passes tonight is it all in the budget. Town Manager Caron said a lot of the separate articles carry their own tax rate. This article deals with the operating budget only which addresses town services but is not inclusive of other town services. A. Baldasaro asked if there is any way you can tell the audience what that will happen to their property taxes if everything passes tonight. Town Manager Caron said the slide presented shows the current tax rate for 2011 is \$4.74. The cost of this Article is \$4.59 per thousand. As of this point in the meeting the \$4.83 will be the tax rate for FY12. A. Baldasaro asked if this Article passes tonight what will it cost the taxpayer on a \$300K home. Town Manager Caron responded if all the Articles pass tonight it will be \$4.98 which is a .24 cent increase. The total tax impact on a \$300K house is \$1,495.00. Cindy Eaton, 16 Clark Road said other articles will be adding to the tax rate. She said she would like to move Article 4 to

come after some of the other warrant articles that have tax impacts. Assistant Moderator Michaels said we are in the midst of the discussion of the Article already. If this passes we will have a number and as we progress we can have an idea of the tax rate. We are at \$4.98 if this passes. If we don't pass something we are cutting from that number; if we add things we are adding to that number. At this moment you know where you are. C. Eaton said she might have a motion that will actually reduce the budget, if we have already voted on the budget how can we reduce it. Assist. Moderator Michaels responded once we vote on it we can't change it. Councilor Farrell said since this is a new process what C. Eaton is saying is that there may be people who want to add or take away from the budget depending on what happens with the other articles. They are looking for guidance from the Moderator, should they make their motions now. Assist, Moderator Michaels responded we are discussing the budget at the moment; now is the time if you want to raise or lower the budget. If a motion to restrict reconsideration is made we can't discuss it again. If we discuss it now, and we don't restrict reconsideration later we can bring it up again. If you want to move it off, the time to ask for that was before we started this discussion. Pauline Caron, 369 Mammoth Road said she objected to putting off Article 4 because it has already started. If people had read the Warrant they would have noticed there are different figures for each article and they are not included in Article 4. She said it is up to the taxpayers to read what is before them and understand it before they try to change the process. Gene Jastrem, 19 Horseshoe Lane questioned the ballot process and Assist. Town Manager Michaels explained it to him. Mike Brown, 5 Carousel Court said the budget as presented tonight is increasing 2.3%, he asked the Town Manager to explain how a default budget increases. Town Manager Caron explained that under state law if the voters reject the budget in March it goes to the default budget which is simply the budget under which we are currently operating this year. It is increased due to contractual obligations or decreased by one-time expenses. A. Baldasaro asked if we can move Article 4 to the end and overrule the Moderator. Assist. Moderator Michaels responded you can always overrule the Moderator. A. Baldasaro made a Motion to overrule the Moderator and move Article 4 to the end in the best interest of the taxpayers, second by Anne Gaffney. A. Baldasaro said he wants it at the end so people will have a chance to keep their tax rate down. Councilor Dolan said he objected to the motion because traditionally we have around 300 people at the Town Meeting; tonight we have 133. People at the end of the night leave which results in very little people left in the audience. 90% of the budget will be left in the hands of a very few people, he said he feels this Article should be discussed now when the greatest number of people are in attendance when the greatest amount is going to be discussed. He suggested that the motion be rejected. Budget member Chris Melcher agreed with Councilor Dolan, we should discuss the budget now. Greg Warner, 10 Pendleton Lane, said he is against the motion for the same reason and he said we do have a number to discuss. Dave Ellis, 1 Wilshire Dr. agreed with continuing the discussion. Barb Stadtmiller, 14 Crestview Circle suggested moving this article to after Article #9 because the prior articles have the biggest impact. A. Baldasaro seconded that. Assist. Town Moderator Michaels said we have a Motion on the floor to overrule the Moderator to move the Article to the last item. Councilor Farrell moved the question, second by Steve Young. Vote on the motion to move the question was in the majority. Next was to vote on overruling the Moderator, the motion fails. B Stadtmiller made a Motion to overrule the Moderator and move Article 4 to after Article 9, second by A. Baldasaro. No discussion. Assist. Moderator Michaels called for the vote to overrule the Moderator and move Article 4 to after Article 9, it fails. No further discussion.

301

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266267

268

269

270

271

272

273274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

302 303 Assistant Moderator Michels stated that Article 4 is moved to the ballot.

- Councilor Freda made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 305 **SECOND** by Councilor Green.

Cindy Eaton said she has an amendment to article 12 that will reduce the budget and if Article 4 is restricted she won't be able to do that.

309 310

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 4 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.

311312313

Assistant Moderator Michels proceeded to read Article No. 5.

314315

ARTICLE NO. 5: [APPROPRIATE FUNDS TO CAPITAL RESERVE FUNDS TO REPLACE AMBULANCES, HIGHWAY HEAVY EQUIPMENT, FIRE TRUCKS AND HIGHWAY TRUCKS]

317318319

320

321

316

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sums set forth below to be placed in capital reserve funds already established, and to authorize the use of the June 30 Fund Balance in the amount of \$255,000 towards this appropriation:

322	Ambulances	\$ 75,000
323	Highway Trucks	\$ 100,000
324	Highway Heavy Equipment	\$ 0
325	Fire Trucks	\$ 335,000
326		\$ 510,000

327 328

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$255,000.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.07 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

329 330 331

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

332333334

- Councilor Dolan made a **MOTION** to accept Article 5 as read for discussion.
- 335 **SECOND** by Councilor Freda.

336337

338

339

340

Town Manage Caron explained this appropriation allows the Town to plan for the replacement of its Highway and Fire Equipment without overburdening the tax rate in any one year. It also allows the Town to avoid issuing long-term debt to purchase vehicles. The Town maintains a replacement schedule over an eight year period to forecast future purchases. Generally highway trucks are replaced every seven to ten years, ambulances every three and fire trucks every twelve years.

341342343

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas said the Budget Committee supported Article 5 by 7-0-0.

344

Open for discussion – No discussion

346 347

Assistant Moderator Michels stated that Article 5 is moved to the ballot.

- Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration. 348
- **SECOND** by Kathy Wagner. 349

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 5 IS RESTRICTED **FROM** 351 RECONSIDERATION. 352

353

Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article No. 6. 354

355 356

ARTICLE NO. 6: [ESTABLISH CAPITAL RESERVE FUND - FIRE DEPARMENT **EOUIPMENT**1

357 358 359

360

361

362

363

To see if the Town will vote to establish a Capital Reserve Fund under the provisions of RSA 35:1 for the purpose of replacing various fire, emergency medical and communications tools and equipment (such as IV Pumps, Ventilators, Rescue Tools, Protective Clothing and Portable Radios) and to raise and appropriate the sum of ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$150,000) to be placed in this fund; to authorize the use of the June 30 Fund Balance in the amount of \$100,000 for this purpose; and to designate the Town Council as Agent to Expend. (Majority vote required).

364 365 366

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$50,000.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.01 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

367 368 369

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

370 371

- Councilor Farrell made a **MOTION** to accept Article 6 as read for discussion. 372
- **SECOND** by Councilor Dolan. 373

374

375 Town Manager Caron explained that this Article recommends the creation of a new fund to plan for the purchase of emergency equipment required by the Fire Department to perform its duties. The 376 goal is similar to other reserve funds, to avoid spikes in the tax rate resulting from the purchase of 377 expensive equipment in any given year. He pointed out a listing of the equipment that was displayed 378 379 on the slide presentation.

380

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supports Article No. 6, 381 7-0-0. 382

- 384 Open for discussion. Mike Brown, 5 Carousel Court asked the Town Manager to explain the new fund and why it was chosen this year. He asked if this fund will be an annual policy decision going 385 forward. Town Manager Caron explained that he expects staff to make recommendations to 386 appropriate funds to this fund on an annual basis. He explained that a lot of these needs have been 387 neglected in past, we have been lucky to get some grants but staff expressed serious concerns about 388 their needs for this equipment. Bruce Campbell, 7 Willow Lane asked how old is the equipment. 389 Londonderry Fire Chief Kevin MacCaffrie explained they are at the end of the life cycle on some of
- 390
- the items; they are mainly concerned about the Life Paks some are at the 10 year end of cycle. He 391

explained they were able to get grants for some of the other equipment and said now is the time to put money away in increments to replace them. Greg Warner, 10 Pendleton Lane recommended the fund be established.

395 396

Moderator Conley stated that Article No. 6 is moved to the ballot.

397

- Meg Seymour made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 399 **SECOND** by Kathy Wagner.

400

401 VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 6 IS RESTRICTED FROM 402 RECONSIDERATION.

403

Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article No. 7.

405 406

ARTICLE NO. 7: [FUND SPECIAL REVENUE ACCOUNT]

407 408

409

410

411

412

413

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **FIVE HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED FORTY FOUR DOLLARS** (\$564,244) from the Police Outside Detail Fund already established. Such appropriation shall be used for the purpose of covering Police Outside Details and shall be funded from users of Police Outside Detail Services. Any surplus in said fund shall not be deemed part of the General Fund accumulated surplus and shall be expended only after a vote by the legislative body to appropriate a specific amount from said fund for a specific purpose related to the purpose of the fund or source of revenue.

414 415 416

(These services are funded through user fees and require no property tax support.)

417 418

419

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

420

- Councilor Green made a **MOTION** to move Article 7 as read for discussion.
- 422 **SECOND** by Councilor Freda.

423

Londonderry Police Chief Bill Hart explained this "is an in and out fund." Vendors hire police officers to handle outside details; the vendors pay all, there is no tax payer support. He explained what is new this year is that they put a premium on the detail which will allow them to fund a portion on the lease for new police interceptor vehicles in 2013.

428

Budget Member Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supports Article No. 7, 7-430 0-0.

- Open for discussion. Pauline Caron, 369 Mammoth Rd asked if there is any surplus where
- would it be put Town Manager Caron responded it stays in the fund. She asked if there was
- any surplus from last year. The Town Manager responded we currently have \$122K from all

435 previous years.

436

437 Moderator Conley stated that Article 7 is moved to the ballot.

438

- Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 440 **SECOND** by Mary Soares.

441

442 VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 7 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.

444

Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article No. 8.

445 446 447

ARTICLE NO. 8: [FUND SEWER FUND]

448 449

450

451

452

453

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **THREE MILLION THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED SIX DOLLARS** (\$3,003,706) for defraying the cost of construction, payment of the interest on any debt incurred, management, maintenance, operation and repair of newly constructed sewer systems. Such fund shall be allowed to accumulate from year to year, shall not be commingled with town tax revenues, and shall not be deemed part of the municipality's general fund accumulated surplus, all in accordance with RSA 149-I.

454 455 456

(These services are funded through user fees and require no property tax support.)

457 458

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

459 460

- Councilor O'Keefe made a **MOTION** to move Article 8 as read for discussion.
- 462 **SECOND** by Councilor Green.

463

Director of Public Works, Janusz Czyzowski explained this is a self funding fund there is no tax payer support. The fund is totally supported by sewer fees and user fees.

466

Budget member Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supports Article No. 8, 7-0-0.

- Open for discussion. Al Baldasaro, 41 Hall Road said last year this fund was combined with other
- things and asked why this year it was separate. Town Manager Caron said that last year it was
- incorrectly classified as a Special Revenue Fund. By state law you have to make sure that those
- funds have to be segregated so we put it out as a separate Warrant Article this year. Pauline Caron,
 369 Mammoth Road asked what the accumulated surplus is. Town Manager Caron said currently it
- is \$4.1M. We have been notified for the past 5-6 years that Manchester will be making some
- significant upgrades to their wastewater treatment facility which is where most of our waste ends up.
- We have been gradually adjusting the rates due to the increases.

- 478 **Moderator Conley stated that Article 8 will be moved to the ballot.**
- 479
- 480 Ann Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 481 **SECOND** by Kathy Wagner.

- VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE NO. 8 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.
- 485 Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article No. 9

486 487

ARTICLE NO. 9: [FIRE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COSTS AND STAFFING LEVELS]

488 489

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **TWO HUNDRED FORTY THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED FIFTEEN DOLLARS** (\$240,115) for the purpose of maintaining, as much as practicable, the following Fire Department staffing levels:

491 492 493

490

- Additional Overtime Expenditures for 10 personnel per shift \$76,565
- Funding Four Additional Fire Personnel to increase coverage level to 11 per shift \$163,550

\$240,115

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$240,115.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.07 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

497 498 499

495

496

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee by a vote of 3-4-0 recommends a no vote.

500 501

- Councilor Farrell made a **MOTION** to move Article No. 9 as read for discussion.
- 503 **SECOND by** Councilor Dolan.

504 505

506

507

508

509

510

511

Open for discussion. Londonderry Fire Chief Kevin MacCaffrie explained this Article raises the level of safety personnel on duty each day. He explained currently we are at 10 men per shift every day and that sometimes drops down to 9-8 personnel for days off, sick time, training time, injuries, etc. The extra personnel will allow them to have 10 on duty. He explained that according to national standards they are supposed to be at 14 by now. Adding staff will raise their efficiency level by 35% for each person they put on per shift. It takes an average of 16 people to do all the jobs on a fire scene; we are only putting 9-10 to do all those tasks. He asked the taxpayers to give them the opportunity to serve the town in a more effective, efficient and safe manner.

512513

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated the Budget Committee does not support Article No.
 9, 3-4-0.

- Open for discussion. Anne Gaffney, 28 Tokanel Dr. asked why this is separate and not part of the
- operating budget. Councilor Freda responded generally when you are adding personnel it has to be
- voted on at Town Meeting. A. Gaffney then responded why was the Budget Committee divided on
- it. Budget member Rich Dillon said it was a split decision. He said he found a fundamental problem

522

523

524

525

526 527

528529

530

531

532

533

534

535536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

with the way the article was written. The overtime seems to build up year after year and there is no insight here how to change that in the long run. He stated that he is not against more firemen; he would like to see more personnel rather than have more overtime. A. Gaffney asked is he recommending hiring more full time personnel. R. Dillon responded no – not according to this article. A. Gaffney recommended going with safety. Gene Jastrem, 19 Horseshoe said he does not understand why the \$76K for additional overtime for 10 personnel per shift was not put in the operating budget. He said right now they are understaffed. R. Dillon said there is overtime already in the operating budget, almost 20%. This article is asking for another \$76K to add to that which is why he is against that. R. Dillon said there are other ways to address staffing levels. G. Jastrem said that is his question. R. Dillon said you are looking to backfill up to 10 with overtime and then add a staffing level of 11. G. Jastrem asked why wasn't the \$76K put in the operating budget that keeps the goal at 10 on staff. Budget member T. Joncas explained the \$76K is not in the budget because it is associated with this particular article for bringing on the additional personnel. G. Jastrem said isn't it cheaper to pay overtime? T. Joncas replied that is part of the debate. The Budget Committee wanted to reduce overtime and increase coverage. Councilor Dolan stated that the overtime element is complicated. The basic intent of this article is to add four firefighters. The community said throughout the budget process that they wanted a higher degree of public safety and we were teetering on being unsafe and providing services to the community. Originally it was in the amount of \$400K. The Council decided on working out a staggered hiring schedule that staggered the hiring of the four additional firefighters which lowered the cost by \$160K for the first year. Budget member Chris Melcher said the Budget Committee all wanted more "boots on the ground" but the problem was the overtime. He pointed out that overtime is still underfunded even without this article. Budget member Dan Lekas said increasing staffing should decrease overtime, that is the problem he had with the article. Mike Brown, 4 Carousel Court said he is okay with this as a separate article. He agreed with Councilor Dolan and said funding four firefighters is not really \$163K it is \$327K. He asked the Town Manager what the real costs are if approved what it means for the default budget going forward. Town Manager Caron explained it and said the recommendation is to put this in the operating budget this year. Dave Ellis, 1 Wilshire Drive said he is concerned about the overtime which is a regular happening. He questioned if it would be more effective to hire more people and use the overtime as the exception. Councilor Farrell explained the reason we are looking at overtime in our budget is if we are short staffed, if someone is hurt, if they are on vacation. The benefits that we pay for our employees is about 30 cents on the dollar. If we hire additional personnel it costs us \$1.30. We use overtime to keep our costs down. It costs more to hire more people. Budget member John Curran did not vote for this article because he said we voted to keep up with the equipment. He said that should bring down the number of people that are required in the department. The additional people you are asking for is double the amount on an annual basis. Madeline Demeule, 29 Airport Road asked to hear more from the Fire Chief where he mentioned safety is a concern and wants the department staffed at what research says it should be. She said public safety is more important than equipment. Londonderry Fire Department (LFD) Chief MacCaffrie said the NFTA says we should have 16 personnel for a town our size. He said we consider 14 as a minimum base. Councilor Dolan presented a scenario and asked LFD Capt. Rogers what happens with 2 firefighters to a truck when they show up at a house fire. Capt. Jim Rogers, 5 Crosby Lane talked about the fire at Hemlock St., and medical calls and the possibility of putting a

third ambulance in place rather than calling for mutual aid which takes 16 minutes. He urged the voters to vote for the article. A. Baldasaro, 41 Hall Road asked if the fire safety codes and standards for NH are the same for NY, MA, etc.; he responded yes. A. Baldasaro asked about mutual aid and response time. He asked if there were any other major issues the past few years that required 4 firefighters. He said the national standards are for big cities. The Chief replied the figures are data driven, it is not determined by the population of the town, and it is what it takes to do the job that is why it is called national standards. A. Baldasaro suggested bringing out the call firefighters if there is a large fire. Pauline Caron, 369 Mammoth Road said she objects to this article because of the construction of the article. The overtime should not be in with the hiring of 4 firefighters. The overtime will be a continuing thing if you add 4 firemen you will have higher overtime. If we approve this article your taxes are up \$4.78 and recommended that the taxpayers keep that in mind with the upcoming articles. Town Manager Caron clarified that the reason there is overtime in this article is that it is a policy decision of the Council to see whether we should increase the preferred minimum staff level per shift to 11 for the Fire Department. From his perspective it didn't make much sense for the Council to assume that policy decision if we didn't budget adequately for overtime to ensure as much as possible of getting to the level of 10 because without the additional overtime if the voters didn't approve the additional personnel there would be many times we could have 11 per shift we would have 10. To go from 10–11 you have to go to 10 first and that is what is represented in the additional overtime expenditures. Reed Paige Clark, 79 Stonehenge Road said safety is important, vote for the article. Barb Stadtmiller thanked the Council and Budget Members. She said we are only talking about \$40 more tax dollars on a house, it is a good idea. Ann Gaffney talked about the national safety issues – the Chief needs 14 and we are only talking about 11. She made a motion to move the question. Moderator Conley asked for a vote, the article passed.

586587588

564

565

566

567

568

569570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578579

580

581

582

583

584

585

Moderator Conley stated that Article 9 will be moved to the ballot.

589 590

Mary Soares made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.

591 **SECOND** by Anne Gaffney.

592593

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE No. 9 is restricted from reconsideration.

594595596

Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article No. 10

597598

<u>ARTICLE NO. 10:</u> [APPROPRIATION OF LAND USE CHANGE TAXES TO THE CONSERVATION FUND AND THE GENERAL FUND]

599600

601

602

603

604

To see if the Town will vote pursuant to the provisions of RSA 79-A:25 IV, to place annually One-Hundred percent (100%) up to One-Hundred Thousand (\$100,000); then Forty (40%) percent of revenues received in excess of One-Hundred Thousand (\$100,000) from the Land Use Change Tax in the Conservation Fund; currently, one hundred percent (100%) of the revenues received from the Land Use Change Tax are placed in the Conservation Fund. (By Citizens' Petition)

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$0.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.00 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

609 610

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee by a vote of 6-1 recommends a yes vote.

611612613

Councilor Farrell made a **MOTION** to move Article No. 10 as read for discussion.

SECOND by Councilor Freda.

614 615 616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

Petitioner Jay Hooley, 25 Yellowstone Drive said this year the Londonderry taxpayers have an opportunity to re-direct a portion of the Land Use Change Tax (LUC) to the General Fund for use to pay town operating costs. The Conservation Fund currently has \$1.1M in their account and those funds currently in their account will not be impacted by this article. It will be impacted moving forward only. On average the LUC has increased that fund by \$180K per year since the 1996 vote to move it into the operating fund. The breakdown for \$180K would be \$132K to the Conservation Fund and \$48K to the General Fund. Anytime that the LUC is at a level of \$100K or less it goes only to the Conservation Fund. Over the past ten years, revenues from this source have totaled \$1.88M, from a low of \$0 in FY03 to a high of \$699K in FY07. It is reasonable to re-direct a portion of the LUC so that it might be used for police, fire, highway and the other items before us tonight.

625 626

Budget Chairman Todd Joncas stated the Budget Committee supported Article 10, 7-0-0.

627 628 629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638 639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

Open for discussion. Mike Speltz, 18 Sugarplum Lane recommended a no vote on the article. He had a PowerPoint slide that displayed a diagram that showed the LUC receipts by fiscal year averaging about \$180K per year. He said that this fluctuates year from year. He proceeded to provide the history of the tax. The income from that tax has gone to the Conservation Fund since 1989 to protect Open Space in town. He stated that we have made great progress, but are not finished. The question to the taxpayer is do you want to continue Open Space which is protected forever. He said the amount you would save in an average year is about \$3-\$4 on a \$300K house it could make a big difference over the long term and allow investments in Open Space. Mike Brown, 4 Carousel Court disagreed with M. Speltz. He said this article is a reasonable compromise, the Town will also receive a portion, and it strikes a reasonable balance between the Town and Open Space. Greg Warner, 10 Pendleton opposes it because it sets a precedent for using special taxes to fund general revenue. He wants the money to be kept in the Conservation fund. He does not want to have special fund revenue shared with the rest of the town budget. Martin Srugis, 17 Wimbledon Drive said he was on the Open Space Taskforce and according to the report we are close to having the 39% that was the Open Space goal, we currently have 33%. This is a good idea and would like to see a stewardship trust fund established. Deb Lievens, 105 Gilcreast Rd. shared the history and philosophy of the LUC. She said it was the only money they got for Open Space. They have given \$50K to the General Fund to go against debt service. She said the funds from the LUC should be put back into the Conservation Commission to make up for the land lost to development. Greg Carson, 19 Tokanel Road talked about the LUC coming in from the Woodmont revenues. This is money back in our pockets and should be supported. A. Baldasaro agreed with Brown and Carson. He stated that the landowners reap the benefits and said that this is a great article. Barb Stadtmiller asked for clarification of the article. J. Hooley explained the first \$100K each year that comes in from the LUC will continue to go to the Conservation Commission. Anything in excess of \$100K; 40% goes to the Conservation Commission and 60% goes to the town. Barb said she cannot support 40%. Pauline Caron, 369 Mammoth Road said she supports the article; they get the first \$100K and 40% after. She said that M. Speltz stated at another meeting that he estimated over \$700K would come in from Woodmont alone. The Conservation Commission is not getting short changed. Councilor Freda said they took the numbers from 1977 to 2011 and if you applied J. Hooley's formula the town would get 32% of the LUC and the Conservation Commission would get 68%. Paul DiMarco, 38 Holstein said he supports the article. If the petitioners were selfish they would take all of it. Town Manager Caron clarified that Woodmont is not in current land use, the vacant property near the airport is not in current land use they are currently paying taxes on the fair market value. Anne Chiampa, 28 Wedgewood Drive said she heard the figure of \$700K is that for a particular part. Councilor Farrell said the assessor has not yet put a value on that land; it will come out in pieces. As individual site plans come in and when it comes out of current use that is when it will happen. It depends on that and how they develop it. A. Chiampa asked is this the last time this article can come up. Town Manager Caron said if the formula is changed it becomes effective the following year. Town Counsel Bart Mayer explained there are different rules depending on what type of development you are dealing with. Trying to explain how Woodmont Commons comes out of current use is way too complicated. Town Assessor, Karen Marchant explained when the property comes out of current use it is determined what the market value is at that time. Woodmont is not going to be developed at the same time. It will come out either lot by lot or section by section and that penalty will be determined at that time. They paid \$7M for the Woodmont property. Barb Stadtmiller amended the Article from 40% to 80%. Second by Anne Gaffney. B. Stadtmiller said it can be revisited in the future. Dave Ellis, 1 Wilshire Drive said he opposes the amendment. Greg Carson, 19 Tokanel explained the original idea came up to reduce the amount of taxes that we would pay on property taxes. It would reduce the number of homes on open space so homes wouldn't be built, so no more kids would be in school. We have a revenue generator and if we change it we will miss the opportunity. He recommended voting against the amendment, leave it at 40% and re-visit it next year. Mike Brown, 4 Carousel Court favors the original article for the same reasons given by G. Carson, he is against the amendment. He said we have a reasonable compromise in the article. Jay Hooley, 25 Yellowstone said he opposes the amendment. Any money going to the general fund can be used for the Conservation Commission or other purposes determined by voters. Councilor O'Keefe moved the question, second by Bruce Campbell. Moderator Conley called for the vote on the amendment, the amendment fails. Moderator Conley called for a vote to move the question, the question is moved.

685 686 687

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

Moderator Conley stated that Article 10 will be on the ballot.

688 689

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE NO. 10 PASSES.

- 691 Councilor O'Keefe made a **MOTION** to restrict from reconsideration.
- 692 **SECOND** by Councilor Tom Freda.

693 VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE NO. 10 IS RESTRICTED FROM 694 RECONSIDERATION.

Mary Soares made a motion to speak to Article 12 before Article 11, second Barb Stadtmiller.
Moderator Conley called for a vote and the motion fails; 53 opposed 49 for.

Moderator Michaels proceeded to read Article No. 11.

ARTICLE NO. 11: [ESTABLISH A CAPITAL RESERVE FUND FOR CABLE DIVISION EQUIPMENT]

To see if the Town will vote to establish, pursuant to RSA 35:1, a Capital Reserve Fund for future equipment replacement at the Cable Access Center, to raise and appropriate **TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS** (\$200,000) for said purpose, to authorize the use of the June 30 Fund Balance for this purpose, and to designate the Town Council as Agents to Expend. If Article #12 passes, this article will be null and void.

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$0.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.00 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee by a vote of 2-5-0 recommends a no vote.

- Councilor Dolan made a **MOTION** to move Article 11as read for discussion.
- **SECOND** by Councilor Freda.

Town Manager Caron explained that the Town recently discovered that voters never legally established the Special Revenue Fund for Cable Revenues, therefore Cable revenues, expenses and fund balance have been moved to the general fund. The Council recommends that cable expenses should remain in the general fund and be subject to the same funding justification and prioritization for public funds as all other Town needs such as police and fire protection. The Council does recommend that a portion of the fund balance generated by past cable revenues be transferred to this new Capital Reserve Fund to plan for future equipment replacement at the Cable Access Center.

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas stated the Budget Committee does not support Article No. 11, 2-5-0.

Open for discussion. Mary Soares, 2 Gail Road urged people to vote against this article because the taxpayers have voted for the past several years to establish a cable revenue and now know it was an illegal vote. That fund was specifically for cable funds. It allowed us to pay salaries and buy equipment. This article only pays for equipment it does not have anything to do with salaries and is a zero impact to our town. She urged the taxpayers to maintain it the way it was and the way it has been voted on for many years. Tom Provencher, 75 South Road said it needs to be done as in years

738

739

740

741742

743

744

745

746 747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768 769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777778

past. Greg Warner, 10 Pendleton Lane said he is opposed to the Council putting their hands on money he paid through his cable fees. It should go to cable only and not decrease cable service. Budget member Chris Melcher said the cable money allows Comcast to put wires throughout town. Even if we don't have a cable studio they will still have to pay the fund in their cable bills. Most of the Budget Committee would like to see it as a general fund item. Gene Jastrem, 19 Horseshoe said the operating budget has the cable salaries in it already. What are we doing tonight, why are we spending all this time because the voters will decide in March on all these articles. He said he does not understand this whole process. Cindy Eaton, 16 Clark Rd. said she has an amendment to Article 12. Mary Soares made a motion to amend Article 12 to "0", second by Cindy Eaton. Moderator Conley read the amended Article and opened it up to discussion on the amendment. Councilor Farrell explained that a citizen came during the budget process and said we were not treating the funds properly. At the direction of the Council the Town Manager went to our town attorney and he advised us that the citizen was correct. There was \$535K in that fund. That money was immediately moved to the general fund. This Article is saying that we are now funding the cable group out of the general budget. Comcast does pay a fee to use the Right-of-Way to bring that service to your home. This article is saying that we are taking \$200K of that \$535K and putting it back in to continue operating the cable group and continue to buy more equipment. We were told what we had to do to comply with the RSA's of the state. Chairman of the Budget Committee T. Joncas said he would hate for us to take away the opportunity for the voters to vote on this article. He said don't change the article put it before the voters. Budget member John Curran asked if we can legally create a situation by petition to put the \$200K back into that fund. Attorney Bart Mayer said what is being said is that there was a certain amount of money and now the question is the disposition of those funds. The proposal is saying whether to establish a capital reserve fund to handle some of the funds that have been freed up – there is nothing illegal with doing that. Marie Newman, 26 Otterson Road said the current amendment is to zero out the article and if Article 12 does not pass in March then there will be no funds for equipment. She cautioned the voters to not put the amendment through as it is worded. Cindy Eaton said the \$200K is for equipment only, usually the line item is less than \$30K. This is not the same revenue fund that they had in place. Greg Carson, 19 Tokanel said if this article is amended to zero the RSA says no dollars can be appropriated. The next article comes up and asks for money for a Capital Reserve Fund for the Cable Department how can that be done. Attorney Bart Mayer said the content of the article that he is debating would be applicable. We have a Capital Reserve question where they are trying to establish the funding. There is also funding in the budget for cable services. This article is to set aside money you have available right now for future purchase of equipment. Those two do not cancel each other out nor does he think establishing a revenue fund would be inconsistent with establishing or not establishing a capital reserve fund or funding cable services in the budget. There are three different things going on, there is nothing legally inconsistent. Councilor Dolan said there are a couple of ways to zero this fund out; support the amendment to zero it out, if the voters vote for article 12 it will also zero it out because it is null and void. The money was moved to the general fund when it was found to be illegal and will find its way to the undesignated fund balance at the end of the year. That money is gone. This is our only opportunity to create a capital reserve fund to put money aside for equipment. A. Baldasaro asked what is the difference between capital reserve and a special revenue fund. Town Manager Caron explained a special revenue fund is a process where you take ongoing revenues to pay for a specified expense. Capital Reserve Fund is either a onetime or the voters can add to it in subsequent years and put money away in a bank account to pay for specific equipment replacement. A. Baldasaro stated that the Cable Revenue Fund in Article 12 takes the authorization from the legislative body to spend it. Town Manager Caron explained in the FY13 budget that is explained in Article 4 there was a new line item called the "Cable Division" so the annual revenues from the franchise fees are the operating budget for the Cable Division. He explained the funds have to be spent for the purpose of the article. It has to be spent on equipment. Paul DiMarco, 30 Holstein called the question on the amendment, second Greg Warner. Moderator Conley called for the vote on the question and it passed. Moderator Conley then called for the vote on the amendment and the amendment failed. Greg Carson made a motion to move the question, second by Councilor O'Keefe.

Moderator Conley stated that Article 11 is moved to the ballot.

- Councilor O'Keefe made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- **SECOND** by Councilor Green.

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE NO. 11 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.

Assistant Moderator Michaels proceeded to read Article No. 12.

<u>ARTICLE NO. 12:</u> [ESTABLISH A SPECIAL REVENUE FUND FOR CABLE DEPARTMENT]

To see if the Town of Londonderry will vote to adopt the provisions of RSA 31: 95-c to restrict all the franchise fees and any other revenues from the Cable provider to expenditures for the purpose of all Cable Department and PEG Access purposes. Such revenues and expenditures shall be accounted for in a Special Revenue Fund to be known as the Cable Special Revenue Fund, separate from the general fund accumulated surplus and shall be expended only after a vote by the legislative body to appropriate a specific amount from said fund for a specific purpose related to the purpose of the fund or source of revenue. (By Citizens' Petition)

(If passed, this article will prevent the Town from utilizing \$105,000 in franchise free revenues to help defray General Fund Operating expenses, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.03 in FY 14 based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a no vote; The Budget Committee unanimously recommends a no vote (0-6).

- Councilor Green made a **MOTION** to move Article No. 12 as read for discussion.
- **SECOND** by Councilor O'Keefe.

Open for discussion. Petitioner Cindy Eaton said for the past 9-10 years the taxpayers have 821 supported the Cable Special Revenue Article for the Access Center. It supported the entire 822 department. When it was found out that the funds were not legally established all the monies that 823 were collected from the franchise fees were put into the Undesignated Fund Balance. The 824 Council did not present this article so she did. She stated that 85% of the town uses cable and 825 they have a franchise fee tax that went to a special cable revenue fund. Until a few years ago all 826 827 5% was to self fund the Access Center. They moved the money and there is nothing to fund the Access Center except they did put it in the budget. She said they are raising taxes to fund it; 828 829 there was no tax before with the revenues that came in.

830 831

Budget Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee does not support Article No. 12, 0-6-0.

832833834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

Open for discussion. Martin Srugis clarified that the fee is the fee from Comcast for the privilege to run lines in the town. Town Manager Caron stated that is correct. M. Srugis asked if this article were to pass it would fund the whole Cable Department, if all their costs are met where do the extra funds go and can they be used for anything else. Town Manager Caron responded the extra monies stay in the Special Revenue Fund and according to the language in the article the funds would have to be used for that particular purpose. M. Srugis asked if there is a limit to how much money can accumulate in that fund. Town Manager Caron responded not that he is aware off. M. Srugis then asked if we pass this article what kind of empire is the cable studio going to build because they have all this money. He said he is against the article; the cable studio should be part of the general fund. Town Manager Caron clarified that he understood C. Eaton say that currently in the general fund taxes pay for the cable studio. Due to the Special Revenue Fund both the revenues and the expense will move to the General Fund so there is still no tax impact. David Ellis, 1 Wilshire Dr. asked for clarification of the revenue fund and the legal ramifications. Attorney Bart Mayer explained the history of how the fund was established. D. Ellis stated that this article is unnecessary and he would like to propose an amendment to it. Moderator Conley stated we already have an amendment that she was given, D. Ellis said he would wait to hear that amendment first. Budget member T. Joncas explained the current way in which the Cable Department is funded puts less of a risk on the Cable Access to continue versus the risk of funding it if this particular article does not pass. The current method maintains the money for the cable fund; the new method will reserve funds that can only be used for the Cable Division and the concern there was it could potentially accumulate into a very large reserve that could not be used anywhere else. The current methodology allows some flexibility. The proper way to do it is funds' flowing in and out of the general fund and that is the way the Tom Provencher, 75 South Road said the idea of a gigantic surplus is Budget Committee felt. whacky, that won't happen. Mary Soares, 3 Gail Road said for years we have been voting on the special revenue fund thinking that it was legal. Only in the past few years the town has been reaching into the funds. As a town we decided to fund the Access Center and buy equipment; many of us want a funded Cable Access Center. If it is changed now we will not have what we want. We pay taxes to get what we want and what we need. Jerry Connor, 1 Lance Avenue asked why are we changing this when we wanted a special fund. Councilor Farrell said we did not initiate the change. We were asked a legitimate question; the answer we got back was that we established a Special

865

866

867

868

869 870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878 879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904 905

906

Revenue Fund prior to the law that was allowing us to do that. The only remedy given to us was that we do what we did; we have to transfer the money to the general fund. The Council took \$200K and gave it back to the Cable. It takes \$260K to run the Cable Dept. That is \$460K of the \$535K. We are using the same money just accounting for it a different way, we are trying to do the right thing. J. Connor asked if any jobs are being lost. Town Manager Caron explained all departments except cable have had personnel reductions due to the economic times. The FY12 budget which is the current budget we are in the Council supported to reduce staff in the Cable Department from 3 to 2 but deferred that decision until FY13 out of respect to the Cable Director who announced a year ago she would retire in 2012. This budget does include a reduction in full time staffing from 3 to 2 which we found is consistent with other cable operations throughout the state. J. Connor asked which position they were looking at. The Town Manager responded what they usually do is look at the roles and responsibilities and we prioritize those and upon review we will have two positions called the "Director of Cable and Technical Operations" and "The Training Coordinator, Customer Assistant Representative." These proposals have to be brought forth to the Town Council for their review and approval under our Charter process for reorganization. J. Connor asked if this is something the town will be voting on; the Town Manager responded this is a policy decision for the Town Council. J. Connor said he opposes reducing the staff level; maintain it at the level of service it is currently at. Anne Gaffney, 28 Tokanel Drive said there is \$75K that was moved into the general fund that is not being used for the Cable Department as proposed in Article 12. The Town Manager explained that \$535K was transferred into the general fund, \$200K is recommended to use for future equipment replacement which leaves a balance of \$335K which still sits in the fund. The operating budget is about \$265K for FY13 which comes regularly from Comcast; the expenses are offset by revenues. A. Gaffney said we have the money to fund the 3rd position. Town Manager said if the town continues to dedicate revenue funds exclusively for cable you have enough revenues for three positions. What the Councils recommended budget is to consider all revenues which are not restricted by law and prioritize those and look at public safety, road maintenance, libraries, etc. A. Gaffney asked are we authorizing the Councilors to make the decisions about where that money goes or are we restricting them to a special fund that will maintain the level of services that we have in the past. Councilor Freda said right now all cable funds are headed to the general fund in Article 4. If Article 12 passes those funds are no longer going to the general fund. This article will make us short about \$380K because it was moved from the general fund to a special revenue fund. One of those line items is the cable, you take it out, and you have to raise property taxes by \$380K which is the revenue item. The expenditure items have the expenses for cable in the budget. The tax impact will be 12-13 cents per thousand. Councilor Farrell said if we are \$380K in the hole we lay off 4 people. A. Gaffney asked if we could shift costs budgeted in the budget to the Special Revenue Fund for Cable. Councilor Freda said no there is no money. Attorney Bart Mayer said there is no money in that fund. Discussion ensued. Budget member Dan Lekas said this particular article asks for all the franchise fees to go to the cable. Those fees are contracted and eventually that contract runs out; what happens when there are no franchise fees how will you fund the cable then. Mark Elliott, 107 Gilcreast Road said he fully supports this article; it should have a standalone budget which guarantees a first amendment, freedom of the press. Cindy Eaton, 16 Clark Rd said the special revenue fund was never legally established. Counsel told the Town Manager to legally establish it she said she had a letter from the attorney and proceeded to read a section from it. She said she

would like to make an amendment to the article. Paul DiMarco, 30 Holstein Avenue said he is a Comcast user and he has no problem with the monies going into the General Fund. He said he won't support the article. Dottie Grover, 537 Mammoth Road, Director of the Cable Studio said she is retiring in 2012 but does not have a date yet. She explained the history of the cable revenue funds and explained building up the funds to have 2 years reserve of monies in case the cable fees disappear. She said the Town Manager has said the cable revenues can't support 3 people. That is not true. She said as of 6/11 there is \$535K in the fund which will support 3 people. If they continue taking \$104-\$105K out each year it eventually will not be able to support the 3 people. Cynthia Eaton made a motion to amend Article 12, to appropriate \$327K from the undesignated fund balance for the purpose of self-funding the Londonderry Access Center including salaries for 3 employees to be established July 1, 2012. Second by Mary Soares. A. Baldasaro, 41 Hall Road said this is already part of the budget and voted on. If the amendment passes are we responsible for coming up with this money. Greg Carson called for point of order and said this article was not properly warranted therefore it is not valid; the Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) will throw it out. It is an invalid amendment. Attorney Bart Mayer stated he was in agreement with that observation and several others that it was invalid. The form of the question is prescribed by statute. The statutes say you may not amend the form of a question prescribed by statute. You can't do this. Secondly no one knew that you were going to appropriate money into the account and it is not properly worded. G. Carson asked the Moderator to declare it invalid to take it off the table for a no vote. Moderator Conley responded we can't go forward with the amendment as the attorney just explained. Cynthia Eaton said she has another motion to amend. She said she would like to add to that amendment at the end to read "related to the purpose of the fund or source of revenue to be established July 1, 2012." Attorney Bart Mayer reiterated that you can't amend the question when the form is prescribed by statute, so you can't add that. Secondly, the effective date is the prerogative of the Council. C. Eaton said she was told as long as it doesn't change the intent of the article she can introduce that. Moderator Conley asked to take a 2 minute break to talk to Counsel. After the brief break Moderator Conley said according to law we can't change the wording of the article. If that were done and we send it to DRA they will send it back. The amendment is out of order. Councilor Dolan suggested amending the language and change the words "to restrict all the franchise fees" to read "to restrict 70% of the franchise fees. Asst. Town Moderator Michaels said state statute allows that change. Greg Carson seconded the new amendment. Steve Young, 7 Fiddlers Ridge Road asked if the amendment were to pass can the Council take a vote on whether they will support it or not. Attorney B. Mayer said that is correct. Councilor Farrell moved the question, second by Councilor Green. M. Soares asked when does it take effect? Councilor Dolan said Council needs advice from the Town Manager and Finance Director so as not to make a hole in the budget. Budget member John Curran asked what is the tax implication. Town Manager Caron said the FY13 revenues are in the operating budget to pay cable expenses until 7/1/13. The funds should be transferred as of that date; Council will take a vote on it. If that sequence of events happens; the tax impact will be zero. Councilor Farrell made a motion to move the amendment. Second by Councilor Green. Vote to move the amendment passed. Moderator Conley called for a vote on the amendment and it passed.

947 948 949

907

908

909

910

911

912 913

914

915

916

917 918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926 927

928

929

930

931 932

933

934

935

936 937

938

939

940

941 942

943

944

945

Councilor Dolan made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.

SECOND by Councilor Green.

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 12 IS RESTRICTED FROM RECONSIDERATION.

Greg Carson made a motion to move to Article 18 at this point, second Al Baldasaro. G. Carson said he wants to address that article now while people are still here to vote on it. Steve Young said the same could be said for the union votes, we should stick with the order as presented.

Assistant Moderator Michaels asked for a vote to move to Article 18. Vote to move to Article 18 fails.

Assistant Moderator Michaels read Article 13.

ARTICLE NO. 13: [RATIFY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN AFSCME Local 1801 and THE TOWN OF LONDONDERRY]

To see if the Town will vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Londonderry and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 1801, which calls for the following appropriations for salaries and benefits over what was raised under any current agreements and policies for the employees of the Union:

Year	Cost Increase From Prev. FY	Tax Increase From Prev. FY	Total Estimated <u>Cumulative Cost</u>	Average Pay Rate Incr.
FY 13	\$ 6,764.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 6,764.00	0.00%
FY 14	\$ 23,557.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 30,321.00	2.00%
FY 15	\$ 24,800.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 55,121.00	2.00%

and further, to raise and appropriate the sum of \$ 6,764.00 (<\$0.01 on the tax rate) for the FY 13 expenses, such sum representing the additional cost attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those of the appropriation at the current staffing levels paid under any existing agreements. (AFSCME Local 1801 represents 19 full time and 2 part time employees, consisting of Public Works employees and Town Office staff support positions.)

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise an additional 6,764.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate increase of < 0.01 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; The Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote (6-0).

- Councilor Farrell made a **MOTION** to move Article 13 for discussion 993
- **SECOND** by Councilor O'Keefe. 994

Town Manager Caron explained the proposed agreement covers a three year period, from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2015. The parties have agreed to the following:

997 998 999

1000

1001 1002

- Cost of living adjustments at 0% in FY13, 2% in FY14 and 2% in FY15
- Employees will continue to pay 20% of their health care premium costs
 - Employees have agreed to defer some end of service payments in order to help the Town avoid any supplemental retirement assessments issued by the New Hampshire Retirement System

1003 1004 1005

If you are on a step system and you are under an expired contract you cannot move to the next step. The amount of money that is being requested to be raised is to allow the 5 of the 21 employees in this unit to receive their step increases.

1007 1008

1006

1009 Budget member Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supported Article 13, 6-0-1010

1011

1012 Open for discussion – No discussion

1013

1014 Moderator Michels stated that Article 13 is moved to the ballot.

1015

- 1016 Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- **SECOND** by Kathy Wagner. 1017

1018

1019 AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 13 IS RESTRICTED **FROM** VOTE IN THE RECONSIDERATION. 1020

1021 1022

Assistant Moderator Michels proceeded to read Article 14.

1023 1024

Councilor Freda made a motion to waive the reading of the Article, second by another voter. Assist. Moderator Michels called for a vote to waive the reading and the vote passed.

1025 1026 1027

ARTICLE NO 14: *[RATIFY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN]* AFSCME LAEA - PUBLIC SAFETY and THE TOWN OF LONDONDERRY]

1029 1030 1031

1032 1033

1034 1035

1028

To see if the Town will vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Londonderry and the Londonderry Administrative Employees Association (Public Safety), and in doing so, to approve the cost items within said Agreement, which calls for the following appropriations for salaries and benefits over what was raised under any current agreements and policies for the employees of the Union:

Deliberative	Session-Budgetary	Session

1036		Cost Increase	Tax Increase	Total Estimated	Average
1037	<u>Year</u>	From Prev. FY	From Prev. FY	Cumulative Cost	Pay Rate Incr.
1038					
1039	FY 13	\$ 756.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 756.00	0.0%
1040	FY 14	\$ 27,762.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 28,518.00	2.0%
1041	FY 15	\$ 28,441.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 56,959.00	2.0%

and further, to raise and appropriate the sum of \$ 756.00 (<\$0.01 on the tax rate) for the FY 13 expenses, such sum representing the additional cost attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those of the appropriation at the current staffing levels paid under any existing agreements. (AFSCME, LAEA-Public Safety represents 15 full time management and professional positions in the Fire and Police Departments.)

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$756.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate increase of <\$0.01 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; The Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote (6-0).

Town Councilor Tom Dolan made a **MOTION** to move Article 14 for discussion.

SECOND by Councilor Green.

Town Manager Caron said this is also a three year agreement with the same cost of living adjustments. In addition to the concession made in the prior agreement they have agreed to a reduction in the maximum amount of sick leave to be paid upon separation by 50% and the merit review eligibility levels have been further decreased. The \$756 cost represents the employees who these members supervise have a benefit in their agreement in which they receive a life insurance policy from the town in the amount of one year salary up to \$100K. This unit currently has a maximum of \$50K so we have agreed to increase that to \$100K. The cumulative cost of all the employees is \$756 in FY 13.

Budget member Chairman Todd Joncas stated that the Budget Committee supported Article 14, 6-0-0.

Open for discussion – None

Assistant Moderator Michaels stated that Article 14 will be on the ballot.

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 14 PASSES.

Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.

SECOND by Kathy Wagner.

VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 14 IS RESTRICTED FROM 1080 **RECONSIDERATION.**

Assistant Moderator Michaels proceeded to read Article 15

Anne Gaffney made a motion to not read the narrative. Second by Kathy Wagner.

ARTICLE NO 15: [RATIFY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN AFSCME LAEA – TOWN ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL and THE TOWN OF LONDONDERRY]

To see if the Town will vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Londonderry and AFSCME LAEA-TAP and in doing so, to approve the cost items within said Agreement, which calls for the following appropriations for salaries and benefits over what was raised under any current agreements and policies for the employees of the Union:

1095		Cost Increase	Tax Increase	Total Estimated	Average
1096	<u>Year</u>	From Prev. FY	From Prev. FY	Cumulative Cost	Pay Rate Incr.
1097					
1098	FY 13	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	0.0%
1099	FY 14	\$ 17,176.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 17,176.00	2.0%
1100	FY 15	\$ 17,636.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 34,812.00	2.0%

and further, to raise and appropriate the sum of \$0.00 (\$0.00 on the tax rate) for the FY 13 expenses, such sum representing the additional cost attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those of the appropriation at the current staffing levels paid under any existing agreements. (LAEA-TAP represents 11 full time and 1 part time management and professional positions in six Departments.)

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$0.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate increase of \$0.00 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; The Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote (6-0).

Councilor Tom Freda made a **MOTION** to move Article 15 for discussion **SECOND** by Councilor O'Keefe.

Town Manager Caron – said this has the exact same explanation as the previous agreement except that these employees have not requested an increase in their life insurance coverage's. The FY13 cost is zero.

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas said the Budget Committee supported Article 15, 6-0-0.

RECONSIDERATION.

1122						
1123	Open for discussion – No discussion.					
1124						
1125	Assistant Moderator Michaels stated that Article 15 will be on the ballot.					
1126	Assistant Moderator Michaels stated that Article 13 will be on the bandt.					
1127	Kathy Wagner made a MOTION to restrict reconsideration.					
1128	SECOND by Anne Gaffney.					
1129						
1130	VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 15 IS RESTRICTED FROM					
1131	RECONSIDERATION.					
1132						
1133	Assistant Moderator Michaels proceed to read Article 16					
1134	1					
1135	ARTICLE NO. 16: [AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL MEETING ON COST ITEMS]					
1136	·					
1137	To see if the Town will vote, if any of Articles 13-15 is defeated, to authorize the Town					
1138	Council to call one special meeting, at its option, to address Article 13-15 cost items only.					
1139	(This article, if passed will have no tax impact.)					
1140						
1141	The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously					
1142	recommends a yes vote					
1143						
1144	Town Councilor John Farrell made a MOTION to move Article 16 for discussion.					
1145	SECOND by Councilor O'Keefe.					
1146						
1147	Town Manager Caron explained this Article will allow the Town Council to schedule one Special					
1148	Town Meeting without having to petition Superior Court for approval should the voters reject either					
1149	of the proposed Agreements in Articles 13-15.					
1150						
1151	Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas said the Budget Committee supported Article 16, 7-0-0.					
1152						
1153	Open for discussion – Anne Gaffney asked if we had to have a special town meeting do we need to					
1154	have a separate meeting for each article or can we have one for all 3. Attorney Bart Mayer said the					
1155	one special meeting will cover all contracts.					
1156						
1157	Moderator Conley stated that Article 16 is moved to the ballot.					
1158						
1159	Pam Jorgenson made a MOTION to restrict reconsideration.					
1160	SECOND by Kathy Wagner.					
1161						
1162	VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 16 IS RESTRICTED FROM					

1165 Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article 17

1166 1167

Anne Gaffney made a motion to move the reading, second by Kathy Wagner

1168 1169

ARTICLE NO. 17: [ESTABLISH ROADWAY MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND]

1170 1171

1172

11731174

1175

To see if the Town will, pursuant to RSA 31:19a, vote to establish an Expendable Trust Fund, to be called the Roadway Maintenance Trust Fund, for purpose of maintenance, replacement, removal or improvement of the Town's roadways and to raise and appropriate the sum of **TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS** (\$250,000) to be placed in this trust fund; to authorize the use of the June 30 Fund Balance in the amount of \$250,000 for this purpose; and to designate the Town Council as Agent to Expend (Majority vote required).

117611771178

(If passed, this article will require the Town to raise \$0.00 in property taxes, resulting in a tax rate impact of \$0.00 in FY 13 based upon projected assessed values.)

1179 1180

The Town Council unanimously recommends a yes vote; the Budget Committee unanimously recommends a yes vote.

1183

- 1184 Councilor Freda made a **MOTION** to move Article 17 for discussion.
- 1185 **SECOND by** Councilor Green.

1186

Town Councilor Freda said this Article is in concert with Article 2 and it is proposed to begin the process to transition funding for Road Reconstruction activities from long-term bonding to the property Tax Support. It is the Council's intent to request an increase in funding for this purpose during each successive fiscal year, including any available funds resulting from the Town's declining debt service obligations.

1192

Budget Committee Chairman Todd Joncas said the Budget Committee supported Article 17, 7-0-0.

1194

1195 Open for discussion – No discussion.

1196

1197 Moderator Conley stated that Article 17 is moved to the ballot.

1198

1201

- Anne Gaffney made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.
- 1200 **SECOND** by Dan Lekas.
- 1202 **VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, ARTICLE 17 IS RESTRICTED FROM** 1203 **RECONSIDERATION.**

1204

1205 Moderator Conley proceeded to read Article 18.

1206

1207 ARTICLE NO. 18: [RE-DISTRICTING COMMISSION]

Shall Londonderry establish a re-districting commission to divide the town into 2 or more districts for the purpose of electing representatives to the General Court? (By Citizens' Petition)

12101211

Councilor John Farrell made a **MOTION** to support Article 18 with discussion.

12121213

SECOND by Councilor O'Keefe.

1214 1215 1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222 1223

1224

1225

1226 1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234 1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240 1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

The Petitioner was not in attendance. A. Baldasaro said we re-district every 10 years after the census. The legislative body already voted on re-districting, this should have been brought up 2 months ago. We can't re-district for another 10 years in Concord. He said he would make a motion to amend from "the town into 2" and put "0". Attorney Bart Mayer said he can't change it. Marilyn Hoffman asked the voters not to decide anything. We are the largest polling place in the state. Anne Chiampa, 28 Wedgewood Drive said she is not clear on what it means. Councilor Farrell said the Council was asked to put this on the ballot and we did not want to do that so the petitioner went and got the required signatures. The way it was explained is that it is a vote to establish a commission like the Charter Commission. The Council will have to appoint people to that commission to decide if it is feasible to have wards. Councilor Dolan said this is a vote to create a commission not to do any re-districting. If that commission comes back with a recommendation it will be at least a year away. Councilor Green said if we divide the town it will have extra costs. Greg Carson 19 Tokanel Drive said he is the Secretary of the State Republican Committee, the sentence says divided into 2 or more districts. He said cities divide up cities in the state no towns in the state do that and stated that the petitioner gave false information. You can break up into two districts so that the people can vote in two different places which is what happens in Derry and Salem. They don't elect their state representatives by one part of town and the other part of town – they are all at-large just as we do in Londonderry. The way the law stands today we can't do it. The only reason this article is coming forward is because the minority party in Londonderry wants to be able to divide the town up so they can concentrate their activity to get one Democrat state representative elected. All it is doing is trying to get rid of a state representative. This petition should fail. Jerry Connor, 1 Lance Ave. said if this is an attempt to get a Democrat elected he said he doesn't think it will happen. He said all this is doing is forming a commission. He asked the Town Manager if this article was run pass the Secretary of State. Town Manager Caron responded yes it was. They recommended if the community wanted to vote in the commission and if their vote is to re-district then it is up to the Secretary of State's office. Tim Siekmann, 89 Hovey Rd. said it is just a study group it is up to the townspeople. Councilor Green asked the Town Clerk if it will cost more money to re-district and she confirmed it will be additional costs if the town decided to move forward to re-districting. Marilyn Hoffman explained why the proposal came up and stated it is a very long process. **She moved the question,** Bruce Campbell, 7 Willow Lane asked to get this back on track.

1246 1247

Town Moderator Conley stated that Article 18 will be moved to the ballot.

1248 1249 1250

Councilor O'Keefe made a **MOTION** to restrict reconsideration.

1251	SECON	D by	Council	or Green.					
1252									
1253	VOTE	IN	THE	AFFIRMATIVE,	ARTICLE	18	IS	RESTRICTED	FROM
1254	RECON	SIDE	ERATIO	N.					
1255									
1256	Reed Pag	ge Clai	rk said 1	33 people came today	. He proceed to	say tl	hat at	the 1946 Town Mee	ting and i
1257	had over	100 pe	eople vot	ing but they had enoug	gh time to have a	a bake	d bear	n supper afterwards a	nd asked i
1258			_	or supper. Moderator	•			ith the meeting but v	ve will no
1259	adjourn ı	ıntil th	ne Budge	t Committee can vote	on the amended	d Arti	cle.		
1260	Budget C	'hairm	an Todd	Joncas asked for a vot	te on Article 12 a	as ame	nded.	They voted unanim	ously for a
1261	no vote o	n Arti	icle 12 as	s amended, 0-6-0.					
1262									
1263	MOTIO	N TC) ADJO	RN by Councilor Fa	rrell.				
1264	SECON	D by	Council	or Green.					
1265									
1266	VOTE I	N TH	[E AFF]	IRMATIVE TO AD	JORN THE T	[OW]	N DE	LIBERATIVE SE	ESSION
1267	AT 11:3	4 PM	•						
1268									
1269	Respects	fully S	Submitte	d:					
1270									
1271	Marguer	ite Se	ymour						
1272	Town C	lerk/T	ax Colle	ector					