



Town of Plaistow ♦ Board of Selectmen
145 Main Street ♦ Plaistow ♦ NH ♦ 03865

SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES

DATE: 12/03/2007

CALL TO ORDER: 6:33 pm

PRESENT: Michelle L. Curran, *Chairman*; Lawrence W. Gil, *Vice Chairman*; Daniel J. Poliquin; John A. Sherman

LATE: Charles L. Blinn, Jr.

PLEDGE OF ALEGIANCE

MINUTES:

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by Dan Poliquin to approve the minutes of 11/26/2007 with addendums.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

PUBLIC COMMENT:

S. Edwards states I have called Mr. Gil and Mr. Blinn on the severity of the stop sign on Old Danville Rd. It's not the way the road was supposed to be put in. I live directly across from the shoe store. My issue is that the state never put the road in correctly. Our doorbell rang one day before the road was installed and a woman from Busby Construction told us that road was suppose to come to a 45 degree angle with a working light. Route 121A was a single lane with Sanborn on the left and Hampstead heading right. There have never been this many accidents on that road. It's not my responsibility to address all these accidents and call the police to assist all these people. Because I'm a human being I try to help people out. These high school kids come flying down this road. They have made a new lane now. Because of the two lanes, if you make a right, people come around the person in front of them to continue on, and the people at the stop sign get hit. The state never put the road in correctly. It should have had a working light. The question now becomes how much is it going to cost the town to continuously send police officers out there for accidents that never should have happened. If the road was installed correctly there would be no issue.

M. Curran states we did discuss this and Mr. Gil did bring it to our attention at the last meeting so some of this information is relatively new. Jason did you have an opportunity to check and see what the state's plans were.

J. Hoch responds it's on the list of things that I'm following up on with the state.

M. Curran states the first thing we need to acknowledge is if there was another plan, if they were mislead to believe there was a stop light going in vs. the stop sign. However, we do acknowledge that it is a very dangerous intersection. I think some of our members were going to take a ride out there to become familiar with the situation. I don't know what the short-term solution is. Jason do you have some suggestions.

J. Hoch states unfortunately short term, we might be able to put up some signs but we need to do our homework and find out what was said in the past, what may have changed in those plans. Then we can figure out if we need to do something different and if so, how's it going to happen in the spring. Also, if it's a state responsibility they most likely will come back and say sorry it's not in our plan so then we have to work our way through around that issue.

S. Edwards states my suggestion is, that four feet before that stop sign we might want to put a speed bump in. I know they run around \$85.

7:43 pm C. Blinn arrives

M. Curran replies it's not the cost that's an issue; part of it is the plowing.

S. Edwards states the one's I've seen (speed bumps) they are not raised, but I can't remember who makes them. I can make a copy and sent it to everyone.

M. Curran asks Jason is part of the issue the fact that it's a state road, which is not part of our jurisdiction.

J. Hoch responds it is part of the issue. If it were our road, we could make the decision but since it's a state road, they need to be part of the conversation.

M. Curran asks can we also pull the state log for accidents in that area.

S. Edwards states this is a state created death trap and until someone dies, no one will do anything about it. Again, the doorbell rang; the women came to the door and told us what they were going to do. She told me a 45-degree angle and a light. What happened?

M. Curran states we discussed the fact that because of the placement of the stop sign, you actually have to pull forward beyond it in order to have clear vision of cars coming both ways. In all due respect to Jason, he was just recently given this information at that last town meeting and there is no quick fix. The appropriate venue would be to have Jason obtain the proper documents from the police dept and have Danny go out and analyze the situation. Then they would have a discussion with the state, and he can get back to us to let us know if we can do anything temporarily, and if they have a long term plan or any plan at all. This is definitely the first step now that you brought it to our attention.

S Edwards states I have a problem, because I spoke to Jason about three weeks ago in regards to this issue. I have a problem when people cannot return my calls and just let me know they are working on it. It's not that difficult to pick up the phone.

L. Gil responds in all honesty I should have called you.

S. Edwards replies I called you (L. Gil) over Thanksgiving, and I called Michelle but her voicemail wasn't working.

M. Curran states I'm sorry about he machine. I've usually very good at getting back to people.

L. Gil replies I called you back but I should have made a second call saying it's a state road and we are looking into it. I didn't call you back because I didn't have an update but I should have.

S. Edwards states I would rather just get a call saying that you are working on it.

M. Curran states we apologize it fell off the radar.

J. Hoch states in all honesty it didn't fall off the radar, I have a list of things I'm working on, and I'm sorry I didn't take your number and call you back to tell you where we stood. I followed up on the issue you raised regarding traffic at the end of the school day. I did have that discussion with the police dept.

S. Edwards states kids come flying around the corner and it's an accident waiting to happen. Asks is it that difficult to send a cruiser. Asks do you know how many times I've seen a cruiser in the past month.

M. Curran replies in all fairness I have seen an increased number of cruisers on that particular road because I pass them on my way home and on the way to meetings. It is hard, we only have a couple officers on duty, Plaistow is a big town, and they try to vary their patterns because if they got in the habit of being in the same place at the same time, everyone would know it and it doesn't work. I've seen a motorcycle patrol there as well. We will follow through on this and you can leave your number with us. Can't guarantee quick easy solutions because it is a state road but I will guarantee Jason will do everything possible to work with the police dept and highway dept to help convince DOT that we need to eliminate the problem there.

S. Edwards asks why is that a state problem if it's Old Danville Rd. Is it because it intersects 121A.

M. Curran states yes that is correct. States we did actually discuss this at length at the last board meeting. You may not have seen it because it was late at night but some board members had agreed to go out and take a look out there. I had other concerns about the sign itself and having to look past it. Jason took notes and knows what was on our hit list.

S. Edwards state I was dealing with the state. I would watch and two guys would come out every other day and were picking up the stop sign that the kids knocked over and were putting it back up. There is an island there so you know they were flying around the corner. It's not just the kids either; the adults are doing it as well.

M. Curran states I remember that time, it was going down on almost a daily basis. It was discussed at length at the highway safety meetings as well. Asks Jason any idea maybe we could update her next week.

J. Hoch states I could at least let you know where I am. I'm not sure about the timing on this. States Danny and I are looking at a meeting with the state some time around first week in Jan. States not sure if I can turn something around before then but I'll give her an update.

S. Edwards responds I know Christmas is around the corner and people have a lot to do and your calendars are inundated. Please just give me a call to say you are working on it.

M. Curran states jot down your number and give it to Jason. There is a tentative appointment scheduled in Jan. Will make a few phone calls to see if we can get something sooner. If not we will call you to let you know there is nothing new and we will have to wait until our appointment with Steve Ireland in January.

S. Edwards states we all pay taxes and I'm sorry but I don't expect the town to waste money to come out to accidents that were created by the state.

J. Sherman states seems like we should be able to do something on Old Danville Rd. I have been out there in that area many times and it is an issue. Something was brought up that I'm interested in as well, which is speed bumps. There are places that have speed bumps and they do get around them. I would like to hear more about the possibility of speed bumps and the issues surrounding them.

Eric (sitting in public) states I have a little input on this. I live next door to Sue and Debbie. My issue is where this road cuts off there is a very small areas. I've stood and watched someone drive right over my front lawn. I've replaced the mailbox so many times I now have a P.O. Box. It is very dangerous to get in and out of our driveways. At some point someone is going to drive right through my house.

D. Vigreault states I've been home a lot and from what I've seen the vision of people coming from Old Danville Rd is blocked by people taking a right. We had the same issue with the mailbox to the point where we had to move it across the street. Now cars skid across the street, take out the gravel and curbing and knock out the mailbox anyways. It's a nightmare in either direction trying to get in or out of our driveways.

M. Curran states if we can research the speed bump or if the highway dept has another suggestion on traffic calming on Danville Rd in order to help alleviate the problem. Asks Jason if you could look into this for us.

S. Edwards states I think a light would be nice. If it's something the town needs to pay for I think speed bumps are around \$85. I would prefer the light however because with the speed bumps, I know the plows will knock them out.

M. Curran states we need to weigh the pros and cons with it.

J. Sherman asks has the highway safety committee spoken about this recently.

M. Curran replies a couple years ago we had conversations about this but not recently.

J. Sherman asks why not.

M. Curran responds because they haven't met in over a year.

S. Edwards states I was so upset I emailed the governor of the state and his response was the transportation dept will have to look into it. That was two to three months ago. Where is the transportation dept, I haven't seen anyone.

M. Curran replies again Jason will contact Steve at DOT. States Eric if you would like to be contacted as well, please leave your number with Jason as well.

L. Blinn states Jason is going to meet with the state in Jan but maybe he should have a conversation with them sooner. Seems to be a terrible design and they stuck us with it. I always thought the DOT would come out for something serious. We'll get going on this.

Eric states I just want to mention that I have been hit there myself.

Jason, we will look back to see what the original designs were and the what was said and then figure out where we will go. We need to find out how to make it work.

M. Curran states thank you for coming out and we hope we can take a step in the right direction to get it remedied.

S. Edwards replies I really appreciate it.

M. Curran asks Jason to just give us a follow up too when you call them.

Town Managers Report

Cultural Budget -Old Home Day

J. Hoch states the events and activities portion is divided into three groups. First is the parade, slight increase from \$15k to \$15,500. I think the actual cost the Lions were predicting was \$15,200. Knowing our past experience for 2007, suggesting \$15,500 for 2008. Fireworks increased to \$11k and the last piece is the catch all for the meat of running the event. What is suggested is a 5% increase to \$11,314 with the rational that the number has not been adjusted for several years. This past year we had a credit of \$2k left over from year before. So what people saw was this year's money and a little bit of last year's money combined. That's the reason for suggesting the 5% increase.

M. Curran states I don't see the numbers broken down. I'm assuming the fireworks are \$10k.

J. Hoch replies I think this year the committee opted for \$12k in fireworks. They decided to put 2k additional towards fireworks because they had the credit.

M. Curran asks we budgeted for \$10k but they went for \$12. So they overspent their budget by \$2k.

J. Hoch states no they decided to put \$2k towards additional fireworks because they had the credit.

M. Curran states but they are asking to increase the fireworks budget to \$11k

C. Blinn asks you already booked the same company we had last year.

J. Hoch responds yes based on the response we had last year the preference was to go back to the company we used to have. So that was the agreement I signed to lock in a date.

M. Curran asks in doing that there was a price increase.

J. Hoch replies well the committee spent \$12k last year so we asked for an \$11k show for 2008.

M. Curran asks part time position - this is for the custodians only. I thought two years ago we decided we weren't going rely heavily on staff.

J. Hoch replies I can only speak for this past year and no we didn't rely heavily on them. Some of the staff we used were summer rec councilors to man the amusement type events.

M. Curran asks but that's not included in this budget, that's part of another budget. One of the conversations that we've had in the past and has been a concern is that there are hidden costs in this budget. For example the police dept, we actually pay the police dept to march in the parade. Asks so is rec part of the same thing or are they actually included in this budget

J. Hoch replies I'll have to look into the details and get back to you.

M. Curran states one of the concerns I had is that I haven't been on the committee for a year but the committee members ran these events. We didn't pay outside people. I would like to see it reflected in the budget more accurately if we are paying people to help run this event. Again we have had discussions weighing Old Home Day with the pluses and negatives. I still think it's a worthwhile event but we weren't reflecting the actual cost and I think that is something we could do better.

L. Gil asks is that also the fire dept that gets paid.

M. Curran replies I don't believe the fire dept gets paid. I think it's just the police dept, highway and staff. We agreed it wasn't an appropriate use of her time and they were asked to cut back on that. I know there was highway; police and rec last year and the rest were all factored into the budget.

J. Hoch states is the preference to move those other hours into this budget. Right now for at least detail, our own people are included in our own detail log. Because we don't have enough people to cover all our intersections we bring in a couple outside people to cover those areas.

M. Curran states but that's the town's responsibility. That's not actual people marching in the parade, which would be my difference.

J. Hoch states that's detail costs only.

M. Curran responds and that's part of our costs and is factored into the budget but paying people to march in the parade is separate.

D. Poliquin asks why do we pay the police dept to march in the parade.

J. Hoch replies we are paying detail to block intersections.

M. Curran responds no we actually pay people to march in the parade or we did two years ago when I was on the committee. We don't pay the fire dept but we also pay the highway for their time to be in the parade.

J. Hoch states we're paying the highway anyway because they are setting up early in the morning and then we are paying for them at the end of the event to pick everything up.

D. Poliquin states I don't think we need to pay them (police) to march in the parade. They can march if they want to but we are shouldn't be paying them, that's ridiculous.

M. Curran states we had the conversation before. Again I was asking for a more accurate number for the budget but it doesn't make sense that we pay police but not fire or highway but not another dept.

D. Poliquin states why do we pay anyone to be in the parade. Granted there are some organizations that need to be paid but town employees should not be paid to participate in the parade.

M. Curran asks Jason to get more figures on this please.

C. Blinn states Danny you have a good point. I keep seeing this using of personnel. I don't think we have the volunteerism we used to have in the past. There is a certain responsibility. This is part of something we believe to be a showcase for our town and we are all proud of. I feel uncomfortable consistently dealing with the financial part of it. They are the people of our town and I think whether we have to pay them or not they should be out there representing the town and it's our responsibility to be sure they are there. I don't believe you need to pay them for marching but you should for details.

D. Poliquin states but on the other hand you have other organizations (town's people) that are volunteering their time. As far as I know, no one gets paid for anything that day on the fire dept. We do details, demonstrations and everything else. Not one person ever gets paid for it. I know I've done it for 25 years and never got paid.

C. Blinn states it's time to give back to the Town Of Plaistow

M. Curran states again I haven't been on the committee in over a year and a half but I remember the memo going out saying the committee was no longer doing what the other committee used to do. That concerns me. How can we encourage volunteerism if they are volunteering and all of a sudden another group comes in and gets paid. I believe it should be dealt out like it was two years ago. It used to be everyone had a responsibility that was assigned by the committee. At the time the staff was being utilized to help organize but last year that was put an end to. They felt the staff was being over burdened and it went back to the committee. I would just like to go forward knowing that if this is the budget we are approving, that it is an accurate budget. I didn't realize until a year ago that the police were being paid to march in the parade. So I would like an accurate account and is it fair to everyone, and are we isolating volunteerism by paying some depts, while not paying others.

J. Hoch asks are you looking for those officers participating in the color guard.

M. Curran states if depts. are being paid to march I want that entered into the budget and if rec and staff are being utilized, I would like to see those numbers as well.

J. Hoch asks is the preference to see any other hours of any staff associated with this budget and would it include police details.

L. Gil states if we are trying to get a handle on the total cost of Home Day than yes we would need that figure.

J. Hoch responds if you are looking at big numbers, that is the big number that we are paying for. If you are paying for an hours worth of time in between details, yes it's money but the big cost is police detail.

M. Curran states if you could break it down that would help.

D. Poliquin states I don't know if full time firefighters are reimbursed, that would need to be looked at as well.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by C. Blinn to recommend the Cultural Budget for \$38,182.

Discussion

M. Curran states I would just like to restate that John's motion was to recommend to the budget committee as is.

J. Sherman states this budget has always been understated as far as the true cost. There have always been additional costs that have been created because of Old Home Day. I'm assuming then, that if we get the breakdown we requested, we may adjust this budget and reallocate from one budget to another.

M. Curran states just a clarification of my issues; whether or not we are presenting this extra money; is it an appropriate way for it to be utilized; whether it is practices we want to continue with or not.

Vote Passes

3-2-0 D. Poliquin and M. Curran vote no

J. Sherman asks why are you voting no.

M. Curran replies I'm not comfortable with the budget as it is presented. I would like the additional information before I vote yes.

D. Poliquin states in all honesty that's why I voted no as well.

M. Curran states if we were asking to take it into consideration I would have voted differently but I'm concerned with the word recommend.

J. Sherman states and if the motion was to take it under consideration we couldn't forward it to the budget committee.

M. Curran states exactly and that's part of the conversation from last week that I'm following through with.

Personnel Administration

M. Curran asks do you have the numbers for us on the merit and performance adjustment. You were going to get that to us and I didn't see it in the folder.

J. Hoch responds I'll get them to you tomorrow.

M. Curran states just for clarification we've asked for these a couple times now.

J. Hoch replies sorry it escaped me last week, I'll get them out to you.

Health Insurance

The Health Insurance memo is attached.

Additional discussion on the following items:

D. Poliquin asks why would we have to reduce the number of non-union participants either through buyouts or adding positions in order to move everyone over to the CIGNA plan.

J. Hoch responds because the union has an interest in having more union people in their plan.

D. Poliquin asks why can't the non-union have the same contract with CIGNA.

J. Hoch replies because the teamsters negotiate the contract. When we were looking at the Primax Harvard Pilgrim Plan last year, I realized you can't even purchase an equivalent plan within the private market. The same dollars on the private market gives you less coverage. This seems to be the same type of deal with the teamsters. Honestly, after looking at the coverage and seeing it was a lesser plan. I backed away from that once the employees expressed they would rather change the ratio. Even at 85/15 we are consistent with other communities.

M. Curran states we are the only one that offers the BCBS-300. What is the difference between the 100 and 300 plan.

J. Hoch states we are not offering that plan. We are offering the Basic Blue Choice.

D. Poliquin asks is that a copy of the plan.

M. Curran states one of my concerns is that there is no one else offering that same exact plan. We have no idea what level of coverage they are being offered. I don't think it's a fair comparison because one town might be offering 100% but of what. We don't know what the coverage consists of. It could be half the benefits we offer. I just don't think it's a fair comparison.

J. Hoch responds it's listed for us as Blue Choice, BCBS-300. We offered that and had two people that participated in it and paid for the higher costs on their own. Our core plan is the BCBS-100 plan.

M. Curran states you are showing us the numbers and they are 80-20 or 100% but we don't know what the actual coverage is. If we went with lower coverage, we might be able to offer 100% coverage. I also noticed that not everyone is on a family plan. Again, having no idea of what the actual coverage is, I find it hard to compare apples to apples.

C. Blinn states so this is reflecting 85/15. There is a considerable savings there.

J. Sherman asks what was the change in dollars in going from 90/10 to 85/15 because there was more than one variable.

J. Hoch replies the change is around \$30k

J. Sherman states that sounds about right, around a \$30k difference.

J. Hoch states my suggestion for the buyout plan would be to offer half the total cost of the plan for individuals to opt out.

J. Sherman states I have a file of stuff related to health insurance and I cut out an article about Hampstead offering a buyout. They looked at it as a win/win situation. They had similar types of numbers. The article was about two employees that were already enrolled in the family plan but were opting for the buyout. Instead of paying \$30k for their health insurance premiums, the town will pay them a total of \$7,500. You're not impacting everyone by doing that, but you're allowing people that would prefer to have the financial incentive to get out of the health insurance all together. If you're saving \$30k by going from 90/10 to 85/15, the buyout would offer similar savings while not impacting all employees.

M. Curran asks how many people have showed an interest in a possible buyout.

J. Hoch replies yes there are two or three people that might be interested. I haven't pursued it with the union so this is strictly non-union employees. Right now, that \$2-3k range is where they may need to be. They would be covered by their spouses plan and, in most cases, those plans have some sort of deductible as well as additional premium costs in order for them to be added to their spouses plan.

J. Sherman states there are a number of towns that offer the buyout. Looking at this information, it seems to be the growing trend. They mention that Hampstead, Derry and Raymond all offer buyouts and that was a couple years ago so there are probably many more now.

J. Hoch states there is the possibility of a further adjustment with the section 125 pretax account, if we made a larger deposit in their pretax account, we don't pay taxes on that money so our dollars go further. So if we go the buyout route, we can save a few more dollars on the tax line by encouraging use of the 125 pretax account instead.

M. Curran asks which one of these benefit plans do we have.

J. Hoch replies option one.

M. Curran states so this plan pretty much covers everything at 100% of almost everything with a couple items with a \$10 copy. States you said there were a couple people that opted for option three.

J. Hoch replies no there were a few people on the 300 plan that were paying for the additional cost out of pocket. They will not be participating in it next year so it will no longer be an option or issue.

M. Curran asks did you work out what the savings would be for 80/20. Does it amount to \$30k.

J. Hoch replies yes it would.

D. Poliquin states I can't understand, after reviewing the plan, other than eyeglasses I had the exact same plan for \$750/mnth. I have three people. Everything is identical except for the eyeglasses. I don't understand why it would be over a thousand dollars if we are in such a great pool.

J. Hoch states part of the pricing you get is based on the age, and previous claims experience. I don't know how that factors in on our end vs. yours. One of the things I shied away from in the private market is looking at our claims experience over this past year going up 20%. That did not show me that I was going to be getting real competitive rates elsewhere. We have smoothed that over by being part of this larger network.

D. Poliquin states when I was looking into different insurance plans from different companies, claims didn't play a factor. These were just standard policies; they didn't look at your previous claims.

L. Gil responds my wife works in insurance and they look at claims all the time when determining pricing. I would be surprised if they didn't.

D. Poliquin states they wouldn't even know what our previous claims were. They come to me with a plan and state this is what it costs.

L. Gil responds they would do a couple things. They would look at your company and the profession you are in and rate it based on similar companies doing similar things.

D. Poliquin states it has nothing to do with the company. If you call Anthem Blue Cross they come to you and say these are the five options they have for you. It has nothing to do with my company because I haven't given them any information yet. I only set up an appointment for them to come in. The numbers they present are the numbers they go by. I don't think that what we offer our employees is necessarily an excellent plan compared to what is out there. I'm not sure why I can get a cheaper plan than the town. It could have something to do with claims, the private sector or whatever.

J. Hoch states when I went to the private sector last year, for the same coverage, I got a higher private sector price than from LGC.

M. Curran states it mentions here that you showed the employees two other plan alternatives. Do you have those to show us as well. One of the things we requested at the last meeting was other coverage options.

J. Hoch replies no I don't have them. They were not received as reasonable options from the employees so they are not part of my recommendations.

M. Curran states understand that and I respect that but we requested to see alternative options.

J. Hoch responds I pursued other options and what I recommend as your manager is what I put in this memo.

D. Poliquin states I would like to see the other alternatives. I think we, as a board, should be presented with all alternatives.

M. Curran states based on the conversation we had, we were concerned with the numbers. Yes, you adjusted the numbers but you didn't give us other alternatives. You came back with one recommendation for the 15%. One of the things we talked about at the previous meeting was an 80/20 split and we talked about possibly changing coverages. I realize this is not the popular suggestion or the one you are making but I thought the idea was to have conversation regarding what else was out there. This is a concern and will be a concern going forward. I appreciate you giving us the other form but I can't see how we are suppose to compare other towns at 100% when we aren't even sure what our own employees are getting.

J. Hoch responds our employees are getting the blue choice at 90/10

C. Blinn asks have we been in touch with a real good company that can represent the private sector

J. Hoch responds I did last year. I had a conversation earlier this year and they said expect 12% increases for Blue Cross; expect 10% increases at least for Harvard Pilgrim. What started this analysis for me is I came in with a 7.8 % increase from Blue Cross. That beat the two private sector estimates that I had, which is why I pulled back at that point and said I don't need to keep chasing these because the advice I received was it was going to be higher numbers. I don't see the value in chasing it.

M. Curran asks for option two and three, do you know what the price difference would be. States they are very similar in coverages so what would the savings to the town be.

J. Hoch replies I've been chasing all of this for the past week. Not sure exactly what the problem is that I'm trying to resolve. I came in with a reduction in the increase that we looked at last week. I came back with a reduction in employee benefits. I'm happy to keep chasing things but I need a target. If you tell me the problem I'm trying to solve, I will try to come up with a solution for it. What I came back with was a solution to what I thought was the issue.

M. Curran states you came back and you changed it from 90/10 to 85/15. We talked about other plan options; we talked about reducing coverage. And we talked about 80/20. Those items were all discussed at the last meeting and the only one you came back with was the 85/15 with the exact same plan we currently have. I'm looking here at the benefits that we are offering and notice the other coverages is not that different. I see you brought them to the employees but didn't bring us anything comparative to look at. Maybe we could still do the 90/10 but just slide over to a similar plan. Maybe we could do 100% of a different plan. Those of the options and the discussion I thought we were going to have.

J. Hoch replies I'm not seeing that I have any numbers from LGC for those plans. The plans I have are two more expensive plans; a less costly plan would be a \$3,100 out of pocket co-pay.

J. Sherman states the other numbers were the buyout and I still think that makes a lot of sense. I think that if we can persuade employees to take the buyout, like many surrounding towns have already done, I think that's the option that makes a lot of sense.

M. Curran asks are you agreeing with Jason that 85/15 would be a good start.

J. Sherman responds I'm not agreeing with the 85/15. I'm just talking about the buyout because I think we can accomplish the same type of savings if not more and be impacting fewer people than if we did it across the board.

M. Curran states I'm in favor of the buyout but I'm also in favor of a different split or a different plan. I thought we would be presented with more than one option. It's frustrating that the staff was given options and not us since we are the one's that approve the budget.

J. Hoch states let me throw a question back at you, if I knew what I was solving it would be easier. You hire a manager to make recommendations and I came back to you with what I felt was the best recommendation I had considering you concerns about cost and my concerns about staff retention and my concerns about not setting us up with a discrepancy between union and non-union. I'm happy to go and look at something again but I need a target from you. I think instead of all of us sitting here trying to choose a plan, if you look at the bottom of the page, you'll see right now the town pays \$546.47 for single/month; \$1,092.93 for two person/month and \$1,475.46 for a family/month. You give me a target number of what you think is reasonable for the town's share going forward and I'll come up with the best approach to cover our employees to do that. What I'm showing now for the town is a \$10 increase/month for single; \$21 increase/month for two person and \$27 increase /month for the family plan.

D. Poliquin responds, which is a \$40,701 increase per year.

J. Hoch asks do you have a different target that you want me to meet. So can slice some of these things different ways. If you give me a dollar target, I can try to make it work. When we start talking bout 80/20 and those sort of different pieces that has a huge ripple effect across our pool of employees. I'm trying to give you a reasonable alternative while at the same time realizing the interests of the staff of which I think it's in our best interest to try to retain. I probably had twenty individual conversations with people, trying to sort out their own individual anxieties, concerns and needs to try to put together something that is responsive to their needs while trying to retain costs.

J. Sherman states just to clarify the 85/15 was for both union and non-union.

J. Hoch responds no the 85/15 is just for non-union.

J. Sherman states so Dan's statement earlier that the changes you just talked about equals \$40k is not true because a lot of that increase is due to the union side. This only affects the non-union. In addition, if it were half and half (\$20k union/\$20k non-union) the rate increase doesn't account for the total increase, it's partly due to changes in coverage. I think we can accomplish the same thing but in a better way by offering a higher incentive to take a buyout.

D. Poliquin states the problem with that is that you can't guarantee it for the 2008 budget.

J. Sherman replies no but you can poll the employees and get a solid number before we have to commit to the budget

M. Curran states I understand could be a benefit but maybe not a long-term benefit. Things change in people's personal life. I think it's important to offer a good health plan I'm just concerned that the only alternative is the same one being brought forward tonight. I don't want to necessarily have to encourage the rate difference but if you are adamant about staying with this particular plan, I would be more in favor of offering an 80/20 split with the option to buy out.

J. Hoch states at the 80/20 split that means the town would pay less for the coverage in 2008 than it did in 2007. Is that the intent.

L. Gil states I'm looking at the numbers we had a week ago and we were talking a \$140k increase. The round numbers were to reduce that in half. I think the idea of the buyout makes sense to me and what I will suggest that we could do is this represents a meaningful step to reduce the insurance costs. Issues such as 80/20 and other options are better served when looking at them over longer term, over the next year or so vs. saying we are changing the rules.

M. Curran states I don't understand what you are saying. My only concern is that we did tell Jason last year that we are reviewing this. This evening he said that he felt that what he looked at was not comparable price wise or plan wise stopped looking and opted to continue with the same plan with one option. He tried to look at other plans and didn't like what he was seeing so he stopped looking and that concerns me.

L. Gil states he basically hit a 50% decrease in costs.

M. Curran states and part of that he said he had some numbers miscalculated as well. He cut the non-union by \$30k. The other numbers were miscalculations.

J. Hoch states the other thing that happens is people move up and down the scale with single to family and that affects the costs. Our current plan we pay 90% of whatever package an employee chooses.

L. Gil my perspective is that we accomplished what we wanted to do. We reduced the budget by around \$60k.

M. Curran states but for clarification, only \$30k was dealing with the budget itself, the rest was Jason clarifying numbers for us.

J. Hoch states the option I'm presenting to you tonight at 85/15, the town pays \$10/mnth single; \$20/mnth two person; and \$27/mnth family. At 90/10 it was and increase of \$43/mnth single; \$86/mnth two person; and \$116/mnth family.

D. Poliquin asks why doesn't this include dental.

J. Hoch responds because it's a separate package. I didn't look at it because the premium didn't change from 07-08 and honestly \$17k out of \$600k I figured I couldn't wring much more savings out of that. I have employees that are looking to supplement and buy better dental coverage than what we offer.

J. Sherman states I still believe the buyout is where we should focus.

J. Hoch states responds if you look at the back page, I included the \$13,356 so I'm going to payout the \$3,339 for a two person plan. That leaves me \$10k in savings per person. So if two people opted out, it would save the town \$20k.

J. Sherman states it would only take three people to reach the \$30k number.

M. Curran states at 85/15 we are paying \$18k for one family plan per employee.

J. Hoch states no one opting for the buyout currently because it is only \$520 per year or \$10 per week so I have 43 people taking insurance.

J. Sherman states that's one way we could reduce the health insurance cost is to offer better incentive to buy out.

M. Curran states it's a gamble and to put all your eggs in one basket is not wise.

J. Sherman states we could take the gamble out by polling the employees.

D. Poliquin states then you have to make some stipulations. A buyout means you are out for one year. You have to wait until the next enrollment period anyways.

J. Hoch states it would be preferable to explicitly state that. You could have a case where a spouse has an employment change.

M. Curran states my concern would be if it is only temporary and people come on and off.

J. Sherman states it's not typical for people to jump on and off the insurance. In most places there is a yearly annual enrollment unless you meet a qualifying event. I don't think it's a gamble.

C. Blinn states I see the buyout as a good alternative whether we change it or not. I like what he did with the 15%. I don't see a giant increase by the employees. At the same token, when you have the 15% and then you have the buyout, then all this is affecting you. Stops the bleeding from all the people. No body likes to pay more money and that's their rights. The 15% the employees could agree to and the buyout could be set up along with it. I understand your situation and I think John has a good idea but I really wonder who would buy out at these prices. Maybe the single plans. It's a phenomenal plan with great benefits and it's really been around for quite some time and that's why people come to municipalities. We are doing our job trying to save money for the town and I think we need to look at this again next year.

M. Curran states no matter what I would like to look at this again next year with some additional options and maybe have a workshop. Jason, I apologize if you feel you are being attacked. I know you researched this and had conversations with your employees however, we were never provided to us for consideration. Therefore being presented with such large numbers and I know you were very creative and amble to bring that number down by \$60k but for us not seeing anything but the 85/15 we have no options to look at alternatives for the employees. I figured it out and 45 employees at a cost of \$686k is a lot of money. I do want the employees to have great coverage but at the same time I need to consider the taxpayers as well. I think we need to come to some sort of happy medium.

J. Hoch replies it is and when you start looking at different plans, they are saying you are asking me to take a \$2-3k pay cut, because in some cases that's the cost. What we are looking for are people that have they know municipal government offers a pretty high quality health insurance plan and we understand we trade off a certain amount of wage compensation relative to the private sector for that.

J. Sherman states I only hear people say lets compare to the private sector. I don't hear people say lets compare salaries.

C. Blinn states I think we need to find something that fits the people in the office as well as the people of the town that are struggling to pay their own insurance increase.

D. Poliquin states or have to give up their insurance.

L. Gil asks is this correct the section 125 plan has savings for us as well because we are not paying taxes on the money in this plan.

J. Hoch replies whatever dollars our employees choose to put in there we are not paying taxes on. Same with the buyout, if the choose to utilize the 125 plan that money would be pre-taxed as well. If you go that route, it would be in our best interest to try to save a couple bucks along the way by encouraging it.

M. Curran states Buzzy just mentioned that he would like to see some of this information brought back to us. Option one, two and three, I would like to see this information as well. If you could give us more information on how many would be interested in the buyout.

J. Hoch states tell me when you want me to solve, give me a target because I can bring plans back for the next six months in various forms.

D. Poliquin interjects which should have been done over the past year.

M. Curran states I would like to see prices on options on one, two and three.

J. Hoch states let me back up a second.

Poliquin states I won't give you a dollar figure. I want to see this information.

J. Hoch states so the board would like to choose the form design and style of the health insurance plan in its entirety and you would prefer I just dump the raw information out for you to choose.

M. Curran states no Jason, that's not what I said. I asked for specific options now having seen something and if you would include the two options you showed the employees that would be helpful as well. I would like to see some number comparisons if we looked at the Blue Choice Plan by looking at one, two and three. I would also like to know who might be interested in the buyout based on your calculations on the back.

J. Hoch states let me ask a different way. We have what we pay currently. Is there an interest in keeping that number the same, increasing it or decreasing it.

M. Curran states I would be in favor of keeping it the same or decrease it. That's only because I haven't seen any of the other options. One of these other options may be a better choice.

J. Hoch states the reason why I'm trying to ask is because I had twenty different conversations and everyone is at different spots. I threw out an option that would lower costs and I thought was reasonable but they said no, but we are willing to do this. If I have a target number it gives me a better sense of how to frame the discussion with employees needs and goals. Picking a number out of the air may or may not be a reasonable fit. So if you can suggest a budget and parameter to work with, then I can put together the best possible plan to meet your goal for money and our employee's goal for money.

D, Poliquin asks what is wrong with us being involved in this process. You keep fighting us on giving us the information we are asking for. We are not receiving it. I want the information in front of me. I don't want to give you a number to shoot for. I want the information. The more knowledge I have the better decision I can make.

J. Hoch states and I'm trying to strike a balance between the goals of this board and dealing with the 47 employees on this plan. I'm struggling with a dollar challenge and a philosophical opposition and that's fine.

D. Poliquin states their opposition is not philosophical, it's reality, it's the numbers in front of us. I am on the board of selectmen, it is my job to oversee what is on the budget to the best of my ability and if I don't have the information, I can't do my job. This was a large increase in expenditures and I want to see what all the options available are within reason. At least three members of this board have told you exactly what they want to see and you have not provided it. Now I'm saying I want it. Regardless of what the other members want, I want those numbers and figures and I won't vote on this budget until I see it. The time has come that I'm going to demand this information or I'm not going to vote on this stuff.

► Motion by D. Poliquin and second by C. Blinn to table the Health Insurance portion of the Budget.

Discussion

M. Curran states that I really did think last year when we gave you the challenge of looking over the options on health care, that it would have helped to provide some of the information going forward with this new budget. That was one of my disappointments that it didn't go any farther and the large number that was presented originally was frightening. Granted you have worked to bring it down. But I don't think you haven't come up remedy going forward. I think next year we will be back to square one.

J. Sherman states part of the discussion with the budget committee was that they wanted the selectmen to be sure they understood the time crunch for the budget committee so they could have a recommendation to act on it in a timely manner. I'm bringing that up. They need the recommendation way before the hearing because they look at all budgets three times. They didn't establish a deadline other than by statute they are authorized to tell us but they didn't give us a firm deadline.

M. Curran states some of my frustration is that not all the information is being put into the packets over the weekend and I find that frustrating going through and trying to be prepared for the meeting to go forward and not having all the information is difficult.

J. Sherman states I don't see the need of tabling this because of the policy we have, we could go back at anytime and reconsider any of our budgets. I would still be in favor of putting it before the budget committee and letting them start their discussion similar to this. And get there on what they would recommend. . Don't think it's good to delay that. Recommend something so we can get that process going. After this discussion I am going to make a motion to ask the town manager to pursue the buyout options. I guess what I am saying is that we need to be clear on what are needed. If we want every possible option presented to us and we would do the analysis and make a recommendation; we have never done that in the past, we always allowed the town manager to make the decision. If we didn't like it, we could ask for something else. But to get into the kind of comparing plan by plan and option by option, if people want to do that, on their own time, that's fine but I'm not sure that as a board we need to go through every plan and every option. I'm not in favor of tabling the budget but in favor of moving forward and keeping in mind that we can always revisit.

D. Poliquin states that the only problem with revisiting is that once we approve the budget and send it to the budget committee the only thing we can do after that is make a recommendation as to any changes we may wish to see.

J. Sherman states that's what we have always done. You can change what the selectmen have recommended at any time.

D. Poliquin states I feel the budget should go forward the way we would like to see it and this is not the way I want to see it. I think the committee should see something we agree upon

J. Sherman states I agree but you already acknowledge that it has happened on many budgets.

M. Curran states by recommending it, we actually recommended budgets to the budget committee that was not complete. Going through the ones that I just asked Jason to review, he has added new things to them. I think my problem is the word recommend which means that this is the way I want it to go forward for them to consider and it's not accurate and I don't believe they have to allow us to reconsider.

J. Sherman states their column is their budget but there are other columns and we can change them.

D. Poliquin states but their column is what goes to warrant.

J. Sherman replies but of course.

D. Poliquin states so it's their budget.

J. Sherman replies their column is their budget, not our column. They don't dictate to the selectmen.

L. Gil states in the past there have been warrant articles where a single item was not agreed to by the selectmen and was indicated not recommended by the board of selectmen.

M. Curran states which we can't do any longer based on the new RSA. We have to go back to town warrant. So as it appears, going forward it will say recommended by the board of selectmen and recommended by the budget committee. Not only that but the numbers they are basing their analogy on are the ones that are second to them. For example the

first three don't reflect the gas lines some of the additions Jason has just added. So yes we have a process that has worked but going forward we are presenting something that is not accurate. Nor have we really approved the bottom numbers because there were elements missing from each and every budget so far.

L. Gil asks how do you establish how much it will cost in fuel if the price goes up every week.

M. Curran replies I know what you are saying but it wasn't just the fuel line that needs to be added in.

L. Gil states it doesn't make any difference. If one item is going to change on the budget such as fuel, it applies to any item on the budget

M. Curran states that are correct but the first three budgets we saw did not reflect the new raises. Going through, there are some new things that have been proposed for the budget that are in our new packets that we never looked at before for the budget committee.

J. Sherman states what was presented to them is what we voted on.

J. Hoch states the packets I give you are new information that has come in since that point in time, errors, or came from your input. That's been the way that we have worked. You've talked about them, passed along the draft to the budget committee, and gathered your feedback and the budget committee's feedback with the understanding that everyone is going over them again.

M. Curran states I'm confused and feel the RSA binds us. Asks John is their terminology they make a motion to take under advisement.

J. Sherman states they take it under consideration.

M. Curran states that is one of my holdups.

J. Sherman asks what difference does that make.

M. Curran because they are going on what we are recommending and half the time we are recommending incomplete budgets with numbers that are missing. If push comes to shove technically they could say, that's what you recommended, that's what we are working using.

J. Sherman replies they can recommend anything they want to. They could recommend something completely different. We have been saying all along that those budgets are not final and we reserve the right to make changes. The budget committee certainly hasn't given us any indication that we will no longer be able to make changes.

M. Curran states I just want to be sure that we are doing what we are suppose to and by us saying recommended we understand the full intent of that. Whether we change it later or not, that's what we've recommended.

J. Sherman states and once we change the recommendation, they consider our revision. It's been done like that for the past 15 years.

Vote – Passes to postpone the meeting – wording on vote doesn't match motion

3-2-0 L. Gil and J. Sherman vote no

J. Sherman states clarification is we are not sending the budget to the budget committee tomorrow night.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil for town manager to poll the employees to see who would be interested in a buyout plan of and estimated \$3,300.

Vote - Passes

5-0-0

Town Manager's Report

Town Manager's Report attached.

Additional discussion on the following items:

Recreation

M. Curran asks regarding the letter from Harold Lambert requesting that Park Avenue be made two ways, does he live on Park Ave. I would like to hear specific concerns beyond the letter if he does.

J. Hoch responds unsure he used a P. O. Box

L. Gil states there is a Lambert that lives on Forest Street.

D. Poliquin asks regarding the rec field anything for 2007. There is nothing in this packet from 2007 that I can see. I'm just wondering why we are revisiting it if DES hasn't been in touch with us.

J. Hoch states I got it this afternoon and will check. There is something from Larry from Aug in there. There is a trigger letter that pushed us to do this. In order to sit down with the state, we need to gather what's gone on in the past.

Finance

M. Curran states in regards to the auditor's reports, because we had the discussion off record, I asked about the report and you said you received the draft but not the final copy.

J. Hoch replies yes I received the draft and will get the copy out to you.

Budget

C. Blinn asks the union contract which includes a 3.5% increase for 2008. Is that part of a three year contract.

J. Hoch replies that's correct. I believe we were at 3% for 2007.

J. Sherman states I think we should use the same index number as last year for the cost of living raise.

M. Curran would like to reserve the right to see what the number is because we did talk earlier about using the Soc. Sec. number.

J. Hoch states fine, we do have a social security number at 2.3%, We are bumping up against the union number at 3.5%, I just want you to have all the numbers so when I give it to you in a couple weeks you can put it into context.

J. Sherman states if we are going to use that index, then that should be it. You shouldn't be shopping around for the lowest rate. I don't think that's how you should decide a cost of living raise. If we want to change what index we are going to use next year, I'm for that but I don't want to see what the options are and then choose the lowest one.

J. Hoch states that you should decide if you want to use the same index or change that for the future.

L. Gil asks the rational for using the Boston number is because it's reflective of the region.

J. Hoch states yes there is no local number for southern NH.

L. Gil asks the union's 3.5% what does that represent.

J. Hoch replies the union contract has a number each year as they move the schedule up. Their number is negotiated.

L. Gil states so that's not directly related to price index.

M. Curran asks the CIP number that is in the articles folder, how did you arrive at that.

J. Hoch replies it was last year's number. I haven't changed the numbers, the formula stayed at what we used last year and I believe it was at 2%. As I mentioned the gray boxes are changes from what we last discussed. There are a number of reasons behind those, my intent is to put together a memo explaining what they are but I wanted to get the information to you as soon as possible. Couple things, I provided a revised summary page that should be attached to it. It's a revised summary of the water budget, library budget and an article comparison budget. The trick is if you have a question on any version, at the bottom of the page you will see a date and time. If you see two pages that look the same, always take the page with the most recent date and time.

Planning

J. Sherman states just an FYI that hearing on the Rite Aid project that is scheduled for the 19th is in conflict with the regional meeting on the 19th.

M. Curran states I called the next day to check on the packets and asked what's our game plan for the next agenda item. We have the board of selectmen meeting and what happens then. She said they don't have enough information for us. I said well then, we have some issues so it was good that we had that discussion earlier.

J. Hoch replies yes we avoided wasting peoples time and everyone appreciates that. As I mentioned at the end, I'm not holding out any promises but once we see where we are from CLD. I want to be sure a joint meeting is really necessary. There is a piece that involves just this board and it may be more productive and somewhere in the back of my head I knew there was a conflict but it was more about procedure so I'll get back to you once we hear from them on the 11th.

M. Curran states in regards to Northstar and the State Line project, I asked Leigh last night and only one permit was pulled and it's under Northstar. CVS doesn't have a separate permit and CLD has not signed off on the project. She also stated this is all under one project.

J. Sherman states I would still be in favor of pursuing the donation. I think that budget discussions have shown that it is important to receive those funds as soon as possible.

M. Curran states my theory is that if they are going to give us the money it would be great anytime but I don't think we should be adjusting our budget because that money could allocated other places at a different time. I'm always open to discussion after completion of project but I don't think it should be used as a bargaining tool in our budget.

J. Sherman states I don't understand.

M. Curran replies I guess looking at some of the things we have asked for in discussions about the money, if it means that if we accept the money those budgets specifically mentioned could be dropped by that amount, I don't agree. I think if people really want these items we should go forward and pursue them and not all of a sudden take those items off the budget in lieu of that money.

J. Sherman states I wasn't suggesting we remove those items from the budget; I was suggesting that it would be good to have that revenue and would reduce the tax burden on the taxpayers.

Other

J. Hoch states in regards to the drainage pond, this is really to continue the conversation from two years ago. A starting point with that plan is the pond. I bring it up because the notification for the drudge and fill goes out by certified mail so we will have abutters in that area that will be receiving their letters.

J. Hoch states the new website is up and running. We are continuing to work on edits. Our new sight is Plaistow.com so if you see something is missing or you would like to see added, please let us know. Staff is continuing to add more pieces to it. We have five people trained, who are the points of contact but anyone can go in that is associated with those five. What we are aiming to do with those five people is to divvy up the depts. in order to manage it better and to be sure everything is posted.

Proposed Money Warrant Articles from CIP

List of proposed money warrant articles (from CIP) attached.

Additional discussion on the following items:

J. Hoch states you have a quick sheet on these to introduce them. We need to be fairly comfortable with corrections and specifics in fairly short order, which is why we are reviewing them now.

Recurring Articles

M. Curran asks are these numbers before revenues.

J. Hoch replies yes. These are gross numbers only.

M. Curran states for the record, these raises (Town Clerk and Tax Collector) have to be given this way because they are an elected position and that's established. Jason, you don't give the raises, there is no extra compensation going on.

J. Hoch responds they are not part of our agreement plan so any elected official stipend has always been an article.

New Articles

J. Hoch states these three are from capital improvement plan. The construction trailer for offices for the highway garage - the idea here is moving the offices and bathroom out of the garage and into a separate trailer. Deals with methane issues and gives a little more space. It's not a permanent solution but by only going for the permanent solution every year we miss the interim piece. I would expect to get the trailer for around \$10k. The difference would be the additional work to move the bathroom into it. Also the outside wiring was based on interior wiring costs and I didn't realize the cost for exterior wiring would be significantly more.

M. Curran states I'm just concerned, I would like to see competitive bids because the numbers are pretty high and we have lots of local people out there that could do the work.

J. Hoch states the drinking water study I added based on previous conversations over the past year. This is not time sensitive by any means. Simply based on some of the conversations I've had over the past year. I thought if we had crises would it be worthwhile to do some advanced planning. Also, if we decide to do something five or ten years from now, we don't miss an opportunity going forward.

J. Sherman asks are there any potential funding sources for that.

J. Hoch responds none come to mind although I haven't looked too extensively for them. If there is interest looking forward I can do some research for any feasibility money that might be out there.

J. Hoch states the water tower removal study is to figure out what we are going to do with it. There are a couple issues there. One, the tower is not currently being used for its original purpose. If we if we are going to keep it, it needs maintenance. It's currently serving as an antenna, which is revenue to the town, but do we want to stay in the antenna business and get rid of the tower. If so, we need to come up with a plan to convert that. We might get someone to take on the antenna portion but we are still left with a deteriorating water tower.

M. Curran asks so the study will cover all options.

J. Hoch states there are way too many questions to go barreling ahead. We need to come to terms with what the future of the tower will be but it requires more than a cursory analysis to do that.

L. Gil states Dan and I have spoken about this and it's been rejected because you have to add pressure. If the need of the pressure is low you don't need any power. What I don't know is, the way it is configured - if that system is large enough to provide water pressure for the whole system, or is the system we have so large it requires special pressure. (I couldn't hear well enough to figure out what he said)

D. Poliquin states that should have been part of the last study but wasn't.

J. Hoch states the last study does talk about the storage capacity vs. the reservoir and that the pressure we were able to generate at the pumps had significantly more volume.

D. Poliquin states unfortunately if it goes off line for any period of time, people that are paying rent for us to supply them with fire suppression, which we are required to do, missing ending unsure of his point

J. Hoch states the study we had done identified that using the reservoir by the base of the tower and manually pumping it into feeding the system would provide sufficient storage and pressure.

D. Poliquin states there is not a truck in this town that could supply sufficient pressure and volume to keep it running. If there is an event of any significance such as Home Depot, and you need water at that scene from the hydrants, a truck of that size will never be able to handle it. I don't think they took that into consideration. But that's a whole other ballgame. But it may or may not enter into this. We haven't discussed what it would cost to get that tower back up and running, it may not be worth it. It would almost be better to utilize the second location, which would give you a better water pressure supply, as long as the water is still there, once we put all these developments in.

J. Hoch replies that kind of thinking, if you are going to do something about boosting the water pressure going forward, it's probably not the water tower, it's probably something else. That feeds into my previous thoughts about the drinking water study; go in with your eyes open. Before you build something else, build that other thing right with the ability to convert.

M. Curran states so my suggestion would be to just change the wording of removal.

J. Sherman asks when are we going to review that water study; when would be the appropriate time, before warrant articles; unrelated.

J. Hoch replies we can review the tower or we can discuss the subset that relates to the water tower.

D. Poliquin responds we discussed the removal of the pump and heaters.

J. Hoch states I've been looking at those pieces that were time sensitive vs. lets get through this piece and then the broader conversation could wait until the spring.

D. Poliquin states I definitely agree with the \$5k for the study.

J. Hoch states those are all recurring articles or have been discussed in the CIP. The only two possible money articles that I'm aware of to this point separate from what we have already seen. There is a caveat out there, the first being that I've thrown a lot of stuff in the operating budgets because I wanted to have the conversation about the budget while the dept. head was here. One of the conversations you may want to have is to pull some of those items out of operating budgets and pushed them into articles. In terms of new material the only other conversations I have had are staffing with police and staffing with fire. I can certainly schedule a conversation on the staffing of police and check back with the Chief, his intent was to run that test. Remember he was going have some additional overnight coverage and additional

shift coverage was looking at how that shift premium would work vs. additional people. So those were the two non-CIP items I saw.

J. Sherman states one of the members of the budget committee asked if you are purchasing a vehicle does it need to be a warrant article. It was my recollection that we do not have that standard.

M. Curran states I've only been here during the purchase of one vehicle and that was a swapping of vehicles so I don't have that experience.

J. Hoch asks did you do that as a warrant.

M. Curran responds I don't believe so.

J. Sherman states I don't believe requiring a warrant article is standard procedure.

J. Sherman asks when will we see these two warrant articles. Suggests maybe we should see them next week, but I'm just speaking for myself.

J. Hoch responds police will be ready to go forward. Fire, I'm not sure if we are ready to go forward with that yet. We had that conversation back when we first talked about the fire budget. The chief and I have not reviewed what his numbers are. He might not even want to make that recommendation now. We just raised it as a possibility.

D. Poliquin states I know he instituted one of the recommendations he made that night and it's been in effect for 5-6 weeks now and I know there has been a response as far as sign up. But I'm not sure I'm not sure how it has actually followed through though.

J. Hoch states and that was our intent to try it for a few weeks to see if it was feasible so we could either consider continuing with it or, if it didn't work, we need to talk about staffing.

J. Sherman states the two options are next week or the week after.

J. Hoch states that's fine I can slot them in.

J. Sherman responds my first choice next week.

J. Hoch responds yes I would like to get them out of the way. We will try to do police next week and if we need fire it will be the 17th. In terms of money articles that's all I'm aware of at this point so if there is something I'm missing or something new has come up, let me know. The last piece, the non-monetary articles, things so far are, request a special detail or reserve fund. That came from the chief. The second item is a request from the conservation committee to restate the purpose of the conservation fund to be consistent with the RSA. Third is provision to show recommendation votes of the Selectmen and Budget Committee on the ballot. Anything on your hit list let me know so I can add it.

M. Curran states one lady from Westville called regarding a partition article for the water drainage on their properties. Whether she goes forward with it or not, I directed her, but that might be a planning article.

J. Sherman asks was there a new Human Service agency that came in that we will need a warrant article for.

J. Hoch responds I believe it was meals on wheels.

J. Sherman asks can you track it down and add it to the list.

J. Hoch states we talked about it. I'm pretty sure it's meals on wheels so I'll add it to the list.

Other Business

J. Sherman states have we given thought to meetings after the 17th. We have two Holidays Mondays in a row with Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve.

M. Curran states I haven't thought that far ahead. I'll be unavailable Monday evening and it seems we are all in agreement the 24th will be a non-meeting. The other is New Year's Eve will that cause a problem.

J. Hoch replies no it shouldn't cause a problem but I would suggest between the 17th and Jan 7th that we at least schedule an alternate night place holder so if A, something comes up or B, we need to do a little follow up on some of these budgets that we don't feel we can close by the 7th, we aren't scrambling.

M. Curran asks so tentatively we should leave them both off.

J. Hoch replies let's schedule it as tentative for Thursday the 27th.

Selectmen's Reports

J. Sherman states the Budget Committee meeting last week, as previously discussed, they expressed their concern about not having the personnel budget in time to act on it. Other than that, answered all questions in detail. Their budgets all match ours except conflict of interest, which we should meet on. Coming up would be the rec commission meeting on the Wed 12th.

C. Blinn states Old Home Day Committee met and it was Tami's first adventure in her new job. She went through a whole program of what went on last year and further discussion of who will be helping out. There were six of us attending. Looks like she has a good handle on it will getting in touch with us in regards to moving forward. She proved to be very organized and people attending were very attentive. I think that hopefully we can get some extra support. We are trying to spread the word of the committee and increase our members. The list seems to be protocol and she did a good job.

L. Gil states nothing to report.

D. Poliquin states nothing to report.

M. Curran states I had a Planning Board meeting. Rite Aid was on the agenda. We saw the Northland mall when and had the presentation of the **ATM kios**. They actually listened to us and came back with putting it in the middle of the mall. The bank seemed to be much happier with the final presentation. Larry **Buzzwell's** Law Office is for sale and a chiropractic office has applied to go in there. The board approved it unanimously. We also saw a proposed three-story office building off Atkinson Depot Rd. It's the one right over the bridge as you are going into Atkinson. They need a lot of waivers due to parking and landscaping. It was not received well at all. So poorly received that the engineer said he would reconfigure and come back. One of the concerns is that the new three-story building is proposing an addition 14 offices. There is only one floor that is handicapped accessible. They are trying to say that the 14 offices would generate less parking spaces than they require now. That was continued. Camp America, they continued as well. They are proposing to have recreational vehicle sales, repair site, used car sales and pool sales on that site. Concern about mixed uses on that lot. Would be under new ownership. We had a discussion on the length of these meetings. Past couple meetings have dragged to midnight and 1 am. This isn't fair to the applicants or to the people on the board trying to make decisions. We always try to look at ways to improve so I thought I would mention that. Lastly, we had a conversation regarding a couple weeks ago we turned down Auto Sales. Somebody wanted to come in and rent an office for wholesaling without actual use of the parking lot of that property. We voted not to allow it to go on because our RSA states we do not allow sales within the thousand foot rule. We did tell them that they them that they could go to the ZBA. We did check the language of our zoning and it does state display and sales. We do have a meeting this Wednesday and we will start to see our first elderly housing developments coming in. Nobody else applied for this month.

J. Sherman states one thing that came up during our meeting is about new roads and the width of new roads. Is there a standard?

M. Curran replies yes and it depends on if there are sidewalks or not.

J. Sherman states Dan brought it up because if it's a 28 ft width it impacts his budget.

M. Curran states it depends on if they put in curbing or not. We have a really good layout in our zoning, which has just been updated.

J. Sherman asks what drives that.

M. Curran states it depends on the developer and if they want raised sidewalks and curbing makes a difference.

J. Hoch states the gradation here shows major street, secondary street for residential and non-residential and minor street. All of those have minimal pavement widths. Minor street is 22 feet, residential secondary street is 24 feet, secondary residential is 32 feet, and major is 40 feet.

J. Sherman states Oakridge is 40 feet and on the plan for next year. Dan brought up the fact because the roads that are wider and have the curbing increases his cost.

ADJOURNEMENT: 9:55 pm

Respectfully submitted by,

Karen Iacozzi
Recording Secretary