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

Selectmen's Work Session

January 27, 2011

MINUTES

Present: Selectmen: Joel R. Mudgett, Chairman, Edward J. Charest, Betsey L. Patten, James F.

Gray and Karel A. Crawford (both absent with prior notice); Carter Terenzini, Town

Administrator.

ABC: Ed Marudzinski, Alan Ballard

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

- 1. 4th Quarter Report for Fiscal Year 2010: Heidi Davis, Finance Director, distributed the year end report and reviewed the expense and revenue section noting major over and under accounts and the reason thereof. Alan Ballard asked if the amount abated was set in value or taxes and Gary Karp responded that it was in value. The TA said that in the future we would specify that x was abated in value resulting in a refund of y in dollars. The amount unexpended in the snow and ice accounts brought a review of prior discussions as to the merits of establishing some sort of trust fund to smooth out the year to year variation in expenditure. The TA asked for any questions from the BoS and ABC by 2/07 so they could be addressed by the end of the month.
- 2. <u>Assessor</u>: Gary Karp was present to review his first six months and the lessons learned. They broke into three main areas:
 - 1) He has established and will maintain a closer relationship with Vision. The annual update field work will start in 3+/- weeks;
 - 2) The large number of neighborhoods will be reviewed to see if they remain appropriate with an eye toward condensing some of them, starting in 2013, over time. Larger neighborhoods will mean more properties in each neighborhood;
 - 3) Interior inspections were last done in 2000. There is a need to get through the properties on a periodic basis. He will use the full count of inspections in our Vision contract (750+/-) to get our full monies worth and make some progress on this issue.

Joel asked if we can adjust the time of year we do some of these inspections so we can see/inspect the waterfront, which is what we are all about in Moultonborough. Gary said the only problem is we have to inspect properties as of April 1st, so it precludes doing them in the best time of year for some of these (September/October) and then hit that April 1st target. Betsey and Ed expressed some concerns over the various neighborhoods, incorrect photos on the property record cards with some having buildings listed which aren't there. Paul McKenney of Vision Appraisal Technologies said that the first and foremost problem last year had been the loss of key staff on both sides. He said he is now much more familiar with the Town and much more comfortable. He addressed the photo issues explaining that the data files and pictures fields had not been "moved" at the same time. That was further complicated by the Town adding some pictures unbeknown to Vision. This caused the "indexing" to be incorrect which is what ties the right graphic to the property record card. They have now addressed the problem and he thinks most of it has been corrected. Vision will also re-photo as they do the inspections to try to improve the picture quality. We had moved to a new standard of how many sales we used in the analysis from one year of sales to sales which totaled 2% of the residential properties. Betsy asked if they "time trend" the sales and was advised they did; up or down. Another area of

complaint had been about the hearings where people thought they were not listened to or promised something would be "fixed". This year there will be more information available at the hearings and on the web. A lot of information was put on the web last year, but not ahead of time and as a "catch-up". Mr. McKenney said he will hold a training class for Vision staff, explaining they are there to collect/impart information and not to promise people anything until it can be adequately reviewed. He thought overall it was a rough experience, but a good one, and he is comfortable they will do a much better job. Betsey said that sometimes people just need to vent and advised Vision not to give them an off the cuff answer which we then have to back off from. Ed Marudzinski asked if the 2% residential will be by type of property (waterfront versus other lands). Alan asked if the "bottom line" from the main property (all the factors) will be added to the online property record card on line as otherwise people need to come in to Town Hall to view those. Carter said we will look at it. Alan said that the problem of features that don't exist, but somehow show up on the property card is the type of sloppiness that caused a lot of angst. Joel said this is why we need to get into all of the properties; as to the length of that "cyclical", Carter said the costs of the program (say every three, or five, or nine years) needs to be compared to our sense of the improvement in the data and confidence in the results. Betsey said she is not sure we can ever get the full 2% of each type of property. Mr. McKenney said that the schedule will delay permit inspections until late March and April and agrees that seeing the waterfront is important. There was a discussion of what assistance a variety of mapping tools (milfoil, GIS, and the like) might be to the process.

- 3. NH & FBI Criminal History Record Checks RSA 103-a & 103-b: A memo from Police Chief Dawson indicated that, while he is supportive of adopting these provisions, he felt this should be reviewed with Town Counsel. He also noted there might be legislation pending which would repeal the state law. Betsey was asked to check on the pending legislation before further work proceeded. With that report in hand, Carter was asked to then spearhead the appropriate team for research and a report back.
- 4. <u>Victory Lane (Warrant Petition to Accept)</u>: A report was distributed from the Town Planner and Road Agent relative to the conditions which should be attached to any acceptance. Joel felt the report should be reviewed and then the Board should make a motion at Town Meeting to amend it as needed.
- 5. Public Hearing Handouts: The packet for his evening's public hearing was distributed. There was a discussion as why it appears the BoS budget leaps up when the contingency is drawn down at the end of one year, with the monies actually transferred to the department in need, and it then is fully funded for the beginning of the next year. Ed noted the Town Clerk had asked for more hours and there was discussion of the \$27,500+/- in benefits that were triggered by the increase in hours. Ed Marudzinski spoke to the position of the ABC that we should look at moving anyone working less than full time hours, but getting full time benefits to a full time schedule to meet our needs first and that we should also do a work-flow analysis before adding more hours. There was no change in the budgets as a result of the discussion.
- 6. <u>Fox Hollow</u>: Carter reviewed the current status of the project advising the Board that as of today the State said all items were 100% eligible for cost sharing and the Town would not have to "eat" any cost 100% on our own. He also said there was a 600+/- sq. ft. of tax deeded property adjacent to one of the property owners and asked for permission to tell DOT they could have it for their Right of Way and/or their acquisition discussions with the property owner. The consensus was to inform DOT.
- 7. <u>Town Hall Roof</u>: Carter reviewed our efforts to get IKO, the manufacturer, or Chicoine, the general contractor, to stand behind the failed roofing at Town Hall. The Town ended up expending some \$100,000 on the new roof of which approximately \$30,000 was for the shingles

themselves. Carter reported that he recently became aware of a law firm that seems to be spearheading a series of class action lawsuits against IKO over the premature failure of their product. He did not know the current status of these suits nor could he say the specific percentage of recovery the law firm would want to take. He did estimate that if we could recover $\frac{1}{2}$ of the shingles and pay only 25% of the amount recovered to the law firm, it could mean a potential payment of $\frac{10,000+}{[((\frac{30k}{2})^*.75))]}$. He recommended we contact the law firm and see if there is an opportunity for us to join in this suit. The consensus was this was worth him spending some time on and he should proceed.

There being no further business the Chair adjourned the m	neeting at 5:37 p.m.
Approved	Date Respectfully Submitted Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator