

**OFFICE OF SELECTMEN
6 HOLLAND STREET
PO BOX 139
MOULTONBOROUGH, NH 03254**

Selectmen's Work Session

January 6, 2011, 4 P.M.

MINUTES

Present: Joel Mudgett, Chair, Karel Crawford, Ed Charest, Betsey Patten, Jim Gray (absent with prior notification)
ABC: Jean Beadle, Alan Ballard, Kathy Garry, Barbara Sheppard (arrived at 4:20 p.m.), Ed Marudzinski (absent with prior notification)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

1. Zoning Amendments: The Town Administrator distributed a package of the seven zoning amendments now under consideration by the Planning Board. There will be public hearings on 01/12 and 01/26. There may be changes and some may be dropped before the final list is ready for the ballot. He suggested the BoS contact Ed (their Planning Board representative) or the Town Planner, Dan Merhalski with any questions.
2. Conservation Commission & Land Use Change Tax: The Town Administrator said he had met with the ConCom following the BoS workshop of 11/19 to discuss the three areas of concern of the Board and ABC over dedicating a percentage of the LUCT to the ConCom fund. Those reservations centered on a belief that (a) annual budgeting may be a better way to tackle such issues rather than (further) establishing a fund, (b) having a cap for such a fund so it does not grow too large and (c) once monies are in such a fund it can be directly spent by the ConCom (albeit with a public hearing and BoS approval) and the subsequent expenditure is not truly tested against the will of the voters. The ConCom had responded with a memo explaining why they did not believe annual appropriations gave them the flexibility needed to respond to opportunities that arise quickly (a) and that the statute did not provide for either (b) or (c). Town Counsel concurs with their opinion on an inability to constrain the overall size of the fund or require expenditure to go back to Town meeting.

Ed supported the idea and spoke to the merits of conservation and loss of wildlife habitat and trails and preserving the character of the Town. He also said this is not costing us any money. Joel pointed out these are tax dollars we will no longer be able to apply to offset the tax rate. He has heard from people who aren't sure they want a committee making these decisions (buying land or easements).

Marie Samaha, ConCom Chair said that she thought this funding mechanism will actually bring more awareness to the issues as there must be a public hearing to proceed. Bill Gassman pointed out that in any effort to acquire land; the BoS has the ability to say no. There was a lengthy discussion of the ability to expend on land, after a public hearing, and contribute to other organizations to acquire land with a difference of opinion as to whether or not the latter requires BoS approval. Ms. Samaha did point out that if the BoS was opposed the ConCom would certainly have to take that into consideration.

Alan said he was initially intrigued by the idea (LUCT for land purchases), but as he looks at the price of land he felt they'd be looking at a large price. He said this also runs counter to their effort to extinguish these types of funds and asked why they can't identify projects ahead of time. Jean said she supports the effort as well, but has trouble reconciling how we create new funds when we are extinguishing old ones. Bill Gassman said, that unlike the purpose for many other funds, land opportunities come and go throughout the year and we need to be able to act as they arise. Ed spoke to an acquisition opportunity Meredith almost lost because they couldn't act in time as being a reason to support the proposed LUCT funding.

Betsey said she was concerned with the ConCom having this ability to spend and wondered if they'd be agreeable to a 25% sharing formula. If this isn't enough they can come in for more when the need arises. She said she was just more conservative and would have less reservation at this lower amount. Karel said she saw it as a gamble when you ask for a percentage. If the ConCom is looking for more of a sure thing she thought they'd be better off asking for a fixed amount. Marie said the other lakefront communities seem to use this approach and Carter suggested it might be because of the "Stealth" nature of the transfer. Marie said the ConCom would be open to the actual percentage.

After discussion the consensus was to support this level of funding (25% with a \$20,000 cap) with Karel having some continuing reservations.

3. Review of Revenue Projections: These were calculated on a so-called five year rule. The staff had analyzed the actual revenues of the past five fiscal years, thrown out the high and low year and then averaged the remaining three to use that as the "Requested" column. Then, based upon actual trends and their knowledge of any changes in fee structures or statute they adjusted that request up or down. Jean observed that this seemed a sound method to minimize effort, yet yield a reasonable degree of confidence in the numbers.
4. Review of Staff Brainstorming Revenue: It was noted that the Board had acted upon the Transfer Station/Beach permit fee already. The consensus was to have a public hearing on the balance of the items on page 162 and to have the appropriate staff present. The "Other Items Mentioned" (page 163) would be set aside for now with thanks to the staff for their efforts.
5. Review of Staff Brainstorming (Handout): It was noted that the BoS had already acted upon the insurance and fire tower issues noted "For Action Effective 01/01/11". The consensus was to adopt Score 17 (Use of Attorney) for an annual savings of \$2,000. The monitoring of items noted will be continued and the "Other Items Mentioned" would be set aside for now, except to reduce the number of nights Town Hall is open for meetings, which was not considered viable, with thanks to the staff for their efforts.
6. Recreation Fund(s): The Director had previously presented a memorandum citing certain concerns over abolishing the Revolving Fund (proposed) and the need to continue the Playground Improvement Fund (not proposed to be abolished). The TA distributed a memorandum containing the joint advice of the Finance Director, Town Counsel, and Town Auditor, who saw no problem with abolishing the fund as proposed. In addition the Chair of the Trustees of the Trust Fund outlined how it could accept donations on the department's behalf.

7. Status of Fox Hollow & Dispatch: The TA reported that it would be another week or so before he could report fully on Fox Hollow, but he would definitely need to ask for an amendment to the amount of time to complete the project. He was meeting with the Carroll County Sherriff's staff tomorrow on Dispatch so that report would need to wait.

8. Tally of Actual & Proposed Amendments: The TA distributed the latest "Tally" showing the additions and deletions to the budget to date. It currently sat at \$32,500 above last year or some .35%. Ed felt we can cut DPW and that deferring road repairs won't hurt. Joel disagreed believing the current program is a good one and that deferring it will simply cost more money in the long run. Betsey asked if we had not pulled out equipment from last year's budget that was needed and it was confirmed that we had (the same 6 wheel dump as proposed again this year). Joel asked if we could pull \$32,500 from the Highway Capital Reserve to get this net increase back down to \$0. Kathy Garry suggested that the Board cut \$5,000 from the Historical Building Fund which was agreed upon consensus. After a brief discussion it was agreed to recheck the math to make sure it had hit the \$0 target adjusting the withdrawal from the Highway CRF to do so. Jean Beadle said she thought it had been a good job by the Town Administrator to go through and scrutinize the expenses carefully and Alan Ballard agreed.

A question from the audience was raised as to why the Road Agent is reimbursed mileage for the use of his truck. The TA said this situation was similar to that of the CEO where it had been determined it was cheaper to pay the reimbursement than to purchase and maintain a dedicated vehicle (as we do for the Police and Fire Chiefs).

9. Letter of R. Gedden Re: Town Budget/Report: Mr. Gedden had submitted a letter which appeared to ask for the similar types of accounts for all departments [i.e. salaries (00100), supplies (00300), and supplies (00600)] be collapsed together to compare them. After a discussion of both Boards it was agreed that the time required did not provide the ease of presentation it might seem and to stick with the department by department presentation as being the most effective way for folks to draw sound comparisons. He had also asked for an account by account publishing which was previously abandoned as a means of reducing the size of the annual report and printing costs. The consensus was to continue the current practice.

10. Date for Budget & Roads Hearing: This was set for January 27, 2011 at 7 p.m. to be preceded by a 4 p.m. work session. The Warrant would be acted upon during the business meeting of February 3rd.

There being no further business the Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Approved

Date
Respectfully Submitted
Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator