



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

SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES

DATE: 12/10/2007

CALL TO ORDER: 6:34

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

EXCUSED: Charles L. Blinn, Jr

PLEDGE OF ALEGIANCE

MINUTES:

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by Dan Poliquin to approve the minutes of 12/03/07 with addendums.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

PUBLIC COMMENT:

J. Levitt states I would like to make some comments in regards to the board's recent meeting discussing the employees benefit pkg. Over the past few months I've seen several packages. Our benefits are being cut and the percentage of costs the employees are expected to pay is being increased. We're not represented by the union and feel because of that, we are being singled out. Because of timing issues, we are not all able to watch the meetings on TV. Some of us must tape the meetings and then watch them at a later point in time. This causes us to become reactionary vs. proactive. I believe it's important that the committee realizes that the town employees go above and beyond their normal duties, saving the town much more than this increase.

J. Sherman states originally one suggestion was to keep it at the 90/10 it's approximately a \$75k increase. If we change it to 85/15, it's approximately a \$55k increase. So the difference between 90/10 and 85/15 is approximately \$20k.

J. Levitt replies so far we are looking at about a \$75k increase in the health benefits package for all employees including union. Asks do we know what the split is on that, union vs. non-union.

M. Curran replies before the recommendation the union's part was \$51,590 and the nonunion was \$26,647.

J. Levitt states so basically the un-represented staff is looking at approximately a \$20k increase. We have been watching over the last several months and basically what we have been witnessing is the potential for the staff to have to absorb this \$20k increase, which was unpalatable or indigestible by some board members.

M. Curran responds the conversation started when we were notified of a \$105k increase. That's what started the concern, but that wasn't the only issue. The other concern was that Jason was asked, over a year ago, to look at several other options. I think a committee was formed on that. What happened to that we are not sure. When only this was brought back to us with a \$105k increase, we asked Jason to bring back some other options. At that time we did not give

any direction on what those options were, except to look at different plans or breakdowns to see if there is a solution. When he came back, he brought the number down quite a bit due to a miscalculation. The amount of benefits was about \$30k that was presented to us at that time. Over the weekend Jason worked very hard on the schedule for this evening and the true number is about \$26k for nonunion.

J. Levitt states I did happen to watch last week's meeting as well as the previous meeting. Mr. Gil made several viable options and there were some other ideas thrown around by Mr. Sherman as to buyouts. If three employees took the buyout that would offset the increase.

M. Curran responds Jason has looked into that and no employee has agreed 100% to take the buyout.

J. Levitt asks was there anything sent out.

J. Hoch responds you should have received something last week.

J. Levitt states there were several viable ideas and it appears that some have been looked into and that's good. There seems to be an undercurrent by the board to decrease coverage, change contribution offers and increase out of pocket costs. Some of these increases presented by the town manager we found to be indigestible and unpalatable due to the fact that with our 2% increase this year it would increase out of pocket costs by almost \$4k.

M. Curran states just to back up, so you know, the two options that were presented to staff were never presented to the board. We never saw that information.

J. Levitt states Jason asked us to look at this and comment on it. We commented to him and he was very clear when speaking to this board relaying the fact that these were not beneficial to any of us in any way shape or form. One thing I have not heard discussed by any of the board members is what the full time staff has done for the town of Plaistow. I can speak for the fire dept. In the year 2000 they hired two employees to work for the Chief doing day to day activities which have increased dramatically from there. We serve on committees; we have served as contract negotiators for this town. If you take the current ambulance contract that the town of Plaistow now has, the full time members of this dept negotiated that. Throughout the life expectancy of the current and previous contract the town of Plaistow will see a savings of \$324k minimum. We were paying \$32k a year in the first three-year cycle, looking at an increase of \$38k/yr for three years, renewable after the three year extension. We were able to negotiate that down to a zero dollar contract, which the town of Plaistow now has for the next six years, at a savings of over \$300k. There are a couple other points I would like to make, it was brought up last week in regards to Old Home Day, who received reimbursement and who didn't. The full time staff for the town of Plaistow has participated in OHD at no cost to this town in our effort to keep costs down. We have served on committees after hours to purchase new equipment. We have served in meetings and what is given to us under labor laws, we would have been able to put in for reimbursement and we never did. Those savings alone far exceed this \$20k increase that has been discussed for the past three weeks. Part of having full time employment is not just the cost put out by the town but also what we provide for the town by being here. You have some very good staff that has areas of expertise you wouldn't have on a part time basis. When you cut those packages, that do exceed the private sector, you take away the need for full time staff to come and work here. You'll turn this into a revolving door facility and it won't just be one or two people, it will be several more. I urge the board to seriously reconsider the action it has taken. The town manager was very clear last week. If you create a wide disparity between represented and unrepresented staff, you will force unrepresented staff down a path that none of us want to take, but may have to in order to defend our positions. We have given countless hours to this town, which it has benefited from. When you have this discussion tonight, I urge you to keep in mind what we have saved this town by being here. We are not talking about just \$20k but a couple hundred thousand for one contract period alone.

M. Curran states just for clarification, the budget is \$679,407 you're talking about an increase of \$20k for the nonunion employees.

J. Levitt responds I'm also talking about a savings of over \$38k/yr by nonunion employees and I wish that would be recognized and taken into consideration.

J. Sherman states a lot of numbers get thrown around. The numbers in the paper last week were wrong. I contacted the respective reporter and mentioned it to her. She wasn't at the meeting, but printed that the town employees receive 100% health coverage. She was going to print a retraction but I haven't seen it. Point is, it's important to get the right numbers out there. Health line was \$600k. The first proposal increased it by \$105k. That seemed high because Jason said the plan didn't go up that much on a percentage basis. Later he admitted he made a mistake and it wasn't really \$105k increase. But that was what the first reaction was to. We got into the discussion and found that one of the reasons for the big increase is not just the cost of the plan but also people moving up to family plans. We used to have seven people in the family plan and now there are thirteen. That adds a lot of money to the budget. So what we are trying to do is get the right numbers in order to make the best decisions. Last year the budget was approximately \$600k. What we have before us is a couple of options. One option would be if we stayed with 90/10 and the increase would be approximately \$75k. If we went to 85/15 the increase would be approximately \$60k. So the difference is \$15-20k. If we change to 80/20 the new budget line would be around \$640k or a \$40k increase. So the 5% change is about a \$20k difference in the overall budget. This is so people can be dealing with the right numbers. This is the first time publicly that we have seen this chart. We will be discussing and reviewing it.

D. Poliquin states a lot is being said about nonunion personnel. These numbers reflect the changes in nonunion but when it came time for union; it was handled in the same way. This isn't just directed at nonunion personnel in any way, shape or form. Sorry if it came across that way. The biggest issue is that we haven't been given all the facts. I can't make a decision without them. Now that we have more information tonight, different options, charts and figures and found issues with the original numbers. Now we have some information in which to make an informed decision. A little information goes a long way.

L. Komornick states what would the shift from single to family be for the nonunion.

J. Sherman states there are no changes in the nonunion. All changes were on the union side. That's why the budget is going up by so much. It's more than just the rates; the bigger portion is the changing from single to family.

L. Komornick states when you mentioned changes apply to the union, maybe there is a misconception on my part but the union negotiates separately.

D. Poliquin states that's correct when it comes time to negotiate; this is what we will bring forth to the union.

L. Komornick states so what ever you negotiate with them; the starting point is the same.

D. Poliquin states correct, well not necessarily.

J. Sherman interjects wait, what the board would negotiate is up to the board and we haven't had that discussion yet. That's another thing to remember we haven't taken any vote and an individual selectman has no vote, it's majority.

L. Komornick asks is the union on the same timeline.

J. Sherman states they are on a five year contract and we are in the middle of it. I haven't heard anything about reopening that contract so if individuals are implying that, speak with them. As a group, we have not had that discussion and are in the 3rd or 4th year of that contract.

M. Curran states like anything else, policy changes going forward and it doesn't mean this isn't going to be effected it just a totally different discussion.

L. Komornick states as John (Levitt) explained, to force a group of people who hope they have the trust and respect of a board that is making decisions such as these. We feel we have put in some good time and don't want to have to go to a union just because we don't want to be at the whim of a threat every year. It is because we don't have a union contract

that we are affected. It's kind of a difficult space to be in. I know a big part of why I work here is because of the benefits. I would like to thank John for speaking on our behalf. We care about what we have and hope you do look at all the number

J. Sherman states traditionally we do try to keep the benefits insight for union and nonunion. We don't play one group against the other. We try to be consistent and fair and historically that is what we have done. The benefits are similar, they are not exact but they are similar. I would also like to add that I'm in favor of the buyout option. I believe it is a good idea for employees that would like to take a cash buyout. We could save thousands of dollars, so if that's a good option for an employee you should consider it. We are going to use a higher number for the buyout than what 's in the current plan to make it a better alternative.

M. Curran asks if anyone else from public would like to speak.

Power Point Presentation Regarding Police Staffing Needs.

Presented by Kathleen Jones

Copy of the presentation attached.

Additional discussion as follows:

C. Savage states by way of introduction you will notice as we get into the plan that it is really a take off of the 2001 plan. It has been quite some time since we updated that 2001 plan and that is what we are trying to do here. There is a significant amount of man hours involved here and I think you will see what is readily apparent as we get into the numbers. We have some interesting information not only for the board members but also for the public as well.

K. Jones states like the chief said we have spent the past couple months putting together a lot of information. Some of you will remember that we came to the board in 2001 about our needs. We also came back to the board in 2003, still reiterating our needs. Through our research in 2007 we were very surprised at the results we found and hope you will find it as informative as we did.

J. Sherman asks when you are talking about officers does that include school resources and detectives.

K. Jones patrol officers only.

J. Sherman states remind us again what call for service means.

K. Jones replies a call for service can be a walk in, a domestic fight, where someone needs a police officer at his or her home or a report for theft. It's every event.

D. Poliquin states I assume where it states Timberlane School District coverage, those are just the employees in Plaistow.

K. Jones replies that's correct, just in Plaistow.

M. Curran states you just mentioned the difference between a patrol officer and detective. Asks wouldn't the robberies be covered by the detectives.

K. Jones yes it would but the patrolling officer still has to complete the initial paperwork before passing it along.

J. Sherman asks regarding your conversation on the inadequate staffing, where would be the most significant areas that need to be covered.

K. Jones responds I believe it's the quality of life issues. Those are the most important issues to the town's people and I would like to be able to better address them. It would be nice to be proactive rather than reactive.

M. Curran states while discussing the results you said back in 2002 you had seven part time officers but then changed to one fulltime officer. Asks were those seven part time officers splitting the one full time position. I'm trying to understand why we cut back on the part time positions.

C. Savage states the plan in 2001 was to be creative in ways that made sense financially. To us, because we were spending a ton of money on attrition issues, losing part timers, training them, and having them move on to other places of employment. So we came in with the plan that through attrition we wanted to reduce the number of part timers and hire four full timers. Part of the problem with part timers is that they have full time jobs as well, and are not always available when we need them because they still need time with their families. It doesn't matter what they say when we hire them, they are just not available to do the things we need and over a short period of time they move on to full time jobs. We are viewing it as a way of getting our full monies worth would be to have fewer full time employees and insure the availability of staffing and patrol. The way to do that was to reduce the part time staff and we have done that and saved some serious money.

D. Poliquin states out of the eleven full time patrol officers, this doesn't include detectives. Asks how many detectives have we added since 2000.

K. Jones replies none. States I don't believe we have added any, we had two in 2000 and we still have two today.

D. Poliquin states so as far as staffing title, it hasn't changed.

J. Sherman asks what are your recommendations.

C. Savage replies we weren't anticipating any recommendations. States we feel that four is a realistic minimal level. We need to come up with a plan on acquiring them. I'm not suggesting we hire all four this year. We need to come up with a plan that is reasonable for the taxpayers to consume. Understanding the staffing plan, we cannot continue the way we are now. This board is aware of the need for staffing. We need to come up with a plan for how to hire, when to hire, and what's the cost, and is it going to be a one, two, three, or four year plan. We can't ignore the plan from board to board. We can't decide one year there is a need for four officers and then the board or manager changes and we are back where we started the previous year. We need to think about a long range plan and how are we going to acquire that plan. We are suggesting four but be mindful that the national average is six.

L. Gil states regarding the numbers; they state NH is 1.8 and Mass is 2.3. Asks do they use residents as a way of calculating it or, it would seem more logical to me, do they factor commercial as well.

K. Jones replies the numbers are based strictly on population

C. Savage states I heard from a resident today that was in agreement that we needed more officers but she was really perplexed by the work we do on route 125 and its really a hard thing to explain to these folks. Fire dept also has the same kind of drain. As long as you have that commercial property out there, and the people from our town as well as surrounding towns are shopping, we have an obligation to provide safety to those people. People that are frustrated with taxes need to understand we can't walk away from all the issues out there. Some of those events can be very defining for people. From purse-snatchers to other things that occur that involves the detective unit and a tremendous amount of time. The police and fire dept just can't walk away from it.

L. Gil asks if you added the commercial use those numbers would be considerably higher.

K. Jones responds you are right but you won't find anyone who will commit to those numbers. The FBI only uses population.

D. Poliquin asks do you have a rough percentage of residential vs. commercial.

C. Savage states it's not current but back in 2001 we looked at each individual call and back then 60% were residential and 40% were commercial. I don't know what the numbers are currently. As you can tell, going back to those individual calls to determine what they were, its mind-boggling and it's huge and it gets very complicated in how you determine that.

M. Curran states you said you didn't actually have a recommendation for tonight. I know you have given this a lot of thought and we have talked several times during the year, and I know you have worked with Jason regarding a staffing plan in general. Asks do you have any idea on how you were thinking about proceeding with this evening.

C. Savage replies I do. We were going to leave this off our presentation unless asked directly. I think our plan is to ask for two fulltime officers this next year, sooner rather than later. I understand from a taxpayer point of view it's kind of favorable to stagger them. . Understanding when you hire someone full time you has a six-month academy. So when you hire half way through the year, there is not any real value to the unit or the residents until the following year. Then there is another six months of field training. When you start doing those types of calculations you can understand the perplexity of hiring somebody in Sept. It forgoes some of the cost. So we would look at two hires in 2008 and one in 2009 in the form of a warrant article and we would present it to the board.

J. Sherman asks would you be in favor of two school patrol officers.

C. Savage states we tried for two years to get school patrol officers. The people listening should understand that is absolutely critical that we get someone over there. The first time we lost by considerable votes, last time we lost by 69 votes. In listening to people who work for me the overtime is killing us. They cannot continue the way it is now. I would be very interested in an additional article if someone wants to do something with a warrant article for a resource officer but right now my priority is patrol units.

J, Sherman states the amount of money and time we invest in training is typically because we are hiring non-certified people. Asks is there a around that.

C. Savage replies yes there are two ways of looking at it. We have one vacancy currently. We started at 18 and are down to 7. There are probably three that are full time certified but in my experience full time certified doesn't necessarily mean someone that I'm going to hire. There is value to hiring someone that really wants the job that is green, just wanting to start a career. Hopefully they will stay with us for a reasonable amount of time. I guess sometimes when you go through a background process, sometimes it's better to hire someone without any experience than those that do, so I guess I would favor someone that's green, really wants to excel and is just starting their career rather than someone just moving up the ladder

J. Sherman states I wouldn't get involved in the process of whom you want to hire. It does bother me in some ways that we spend a lot of money training and as you say, there is a lag time before they are up and running, so I just want you to consider that.

C. Savage states if we hired someone effective 1st. It would be our goal to get them into the academy fairly soon. That's a six month academy and there is still a six month training schedule following it. Sometimes we may abbreviate that. If they come fully certified they may not have to go to the academy but there is still a significant amount of field training to adapt to Plaistow.

J. Sherman asks if we were going to pursue two officers, I assume you would want to stagger them.

C. Savage responds yes we would stagger it but not several months apart. We would be looking more likely at 30 days. It's up to you.

L. Gil states in the past you tried to access grants where their portion paid for half a year and then transition over. Are there any homeland security grants or anything out there to help offset the costs.

C. Savage responds there are no grants, homeland or otherwise for police personnel. Those are usually ongoing, three or four year grants and there were many, many times when the grants ran out and the community didn't accept the position.

J. Hoch states the Chief has presented a lot of information that could be taken in many different directions. Looking for initial response as to some direction for the Chief and I as we go back and try to structure some options now that he has provided the information so that you can see the gap that we are seeing.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to direct the Town Manager to work with the Police Chief to draft two warrant articles for hiring patrol officers during the 2008 fiscal year with starting dates to be staggered.

Discussion

L. Gil states you were here for the previous discussion about insurance. Unfortunately that insurance bill that we were presented with three weeks back still needs to be addressed, along with other items. I believe it is our responsibility as it is yours to provide the town's people with what we think are our best choices and decisions with respect to how we protect the town's people as well as their taxes. I don't see how we can make these decisions based on what's before us. When all the budgets are in, then we can make some informed decisions. One of the things that John and I felt we had to do is to wait until all the budgets are in and then we can make some decisions. We are going to have to make some unpopular decisions.

C. Savage states I realize it's daunting with costs skyrocketing for police and fire but just a comment I would like to make. Between the Deputy, Sergeant Anderson, Sergeant Miller and myself we have worked for the city for over 80 years and that's only four of us. We have always been committed to Plaistow and will always be committed to Plaistow.

K. Jones states I understand what you are saying but we were here in 2001, 2003, and here we are again.

J. Sherman states I agree with Larry, we need to go back and revisit operating budgets looking for things to cut because of the health insurance increase. Larry is right we are going to have to make difficult decisions but I'm still in favor of additional police officers.

J. Sherman asks could we have something drafted for tomorrow for the budget committee. I understand that might not be possible but even if you didn't have start dates.

J. Hoch states we could put together some numbers. We talked about a bunch of different start dates. I would probably pick something in the middle. If we start with July 1st that gives you a half-year point where you can adjust by a quarter up or down.

J. Sherman replies I will stick with my motion; you and the chief can come up with the recommendations.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Town Manager's Report

Personnel Administration

J. Hoch states there's a variety of different plans offered to you with a variety of ways to slice benefits. One of the things that's useful to us when looking at their packages is that hardened number. We can then work with LGC and our staff to allow them to slot themselves where they fit best. Some may choose to buy up while others choose to buy down. We did look at the buyout option discussed last week. Our union rep advised me that their agreement with their health provider wants a number I approached them earlier in the week about polling their membership.

J. Sherman asks exactly how many people are enrolled in the plan.

J. Hoch states I believe it is. They committed to the 20 positions.

J. Sherman states so they have 20 in that plan and they committed they would continue to have 20 people in the plan.

J. Hoch states so that narrowed my pool quickly with union employees.

J. Sherman asks the buyout option is that part of their contract.

J. Hoch responds they do have buyout language in their contract. It's the same personnel language as nonunion. I had one employee suggest possible interest in the buyout. Couple others are checking on circumstances, some of that may be timing issues or determining the coverage that may be available under the spouses plan in order to determine if our buyout would be a reasonable number. Proceeding with the buyout procedure seems like a good policy even if we even if we have no takers this year. Later in the year, employees could change over and provide us avoided costs. Started looking at some of the numbers earlier. Bottom segment of chart shows retirees. We show them but they are wholly reimbursed. NH retirement pays a portion and employees pay the balance.

J. Sherman asks when is the open enrollment and when can they change.

J. Hoch states usually at calendar year, unless changing event, at which point they would be eligible.

J. Sherman states we know in the case of the union there are 9 people that are going to change. They are either new hires or changing because of a family event.

M. Curran states and that's what you show the \$4k for, which is not enough.

J. Hoch responds it may or may not be enough. Take a 90/10 for nonunion if you have an employee change one way or the other, that's a \$12k swing. This could be an advantage or disadvantage.

J. Sherman states so we are comparing to the wrong thing. We are already going to overspend this budget by \$20k. Through eleven months we have spent \$658k and this budget is \$646k. So for eleven months we are running at a rate of over \$15k. We are going to overspend that account now, so this is a case where we should compare to 2007 actual vs. 2007 budget.

J. Hoch states going forward its one of the pieces with the greatest variability.

J. Sherman states it's really \$20k less of an increase. Your chart is actually low; we are running much higher than what's stated which is why the increase looks as large as it does. We are actually trending hire than that.

J. Hoch replies yes that was our best estimate when we sat here last year.

M. Curran states I went over the chart with Jason and if you look at benefits and try to be equal to everyone, we're not. A single plan is only \$7k in coverage while a person needing a family plan is provided with \$19k in coverage, which is not necessarily fair to the employee that doesn't need that coverage. So there is a large gap in what's fair. One thing to look at in the future is to pay a specific amount to everybody regardless of their policy and then change it accordingly for the single, two person or family so that we provide benefits equally for everyone. We may be able to pay 100% for a single or two person and have employees pay the difference for the family so the amount we pay is consistent and fair to everyone.

J. Sherman states not sure you could make them equal but yes the general concept that if you ask for the family plan you need to cover more dollars.

J. Hoch states you'll see that some towns do a decreasing scale. But that would be going forward not for current employees.

M. Curran states this way we were comparing the whole package and everyone equally.

J. Hoch states I want to touch on the question if we are looking at making a policy change other than 90/10 as well as doing the buyout, my numbers reflect a Jan 1st date. If we are going to make a change we might want to adjust the date with our personnel plan to Feb 1st. The other reason is that at least some of the employees have interest in some different plans with the 85/15 split. To be fair this would give them time to evaluate whether that plan would work for them.

J. Sherman states I'm not in favor of changing the percentage. As you stated that is certainly one of my concerns the change will be right away. We are in Dec and changes will occur next month. That doesn't give people a lot of lead-time. I know it's a big impact to our budget and I'm going to support we make cuts in other places. If we can't support this increase and all the other increases we have seen so far. I would recommend cuts in both the warrant articles and the operating budget to reduce the burden on the taxpayers. I'm still in favor of the 90/10.

M. Curran states I understand what you are saying. I think the information you provided shows you worked very hard and heard us. I was not aware that the personnel had several options to choose from within the 90/10 plan. I think some of my personal frustration, and I apologize to your staff, because sometimes you don't always realize the anxiety it causes to others, and this is a very personal budget but when we are looking at the numbers, we will have to make cuts in other places in the budget. So are we cutting something that would be more beneficial to the taxpayers in lieu of what we receive from a quality staff. We merely asked Jason to bring us this information. We asked for it over a year ago and what was presented, looking at those numbers, we had reason to panic, \$105k increase. That's almost a half million dollars for 45 employees. The discussion came from a couple different places. You had more information than us. Having Jason bring this and seeing the breakdown makes it much easier. Its definitely more palatable but we will still have to make a decision as to where the cuts need to be made.

J. Sherman states obvious from a lot of different levels. My take on the budget is what we are running is a service organization and it's labor intensive. Salaries and benefits will go up each year and by more than the cost of living. It's tough and we need to recognize that fact. If we keep in mind what we are, a labor-intensive organization and that we as selectmen do nothing but set policy. What gets done is by our employees. This is a big increase and as selectmen we need to do something about it and look at options. I'm glad it's lower than the \$105k. Now that we have accurate numbers and now that we can see other things that have gone into it like participation changes throughout the year. It's still sizeable and we still need to do something about it.

L. Gil states we cannot just take this off the table. What we originally started out with and planned is that we look at all the budgets, and then decide if the total budget is palatable to us. I still think we need to look at that. We need to have all the budgets approved and then go back look at all of them and then determine whether that tax increase is something we want to present. I can't do it right now; I want to see where the budgets are. We just had the police dept with their justification for officers. We need to look at everything to see where the money will come from.

M. Curran Larry you would like to move it on to the budget committee. We will have a workshop next Monday night where all the budgets will have been approved and then we can go through, as a board, and spend some time to see where we can pool numbers and how it will effect each item.

L. Gil states we had three personnel administration budgets presented to us on the 16th of November the increase was \$109k, on the 30th it was \$ 42,700k and now it's \$59k. If this is the number ok, but in three meetings, we've had three different numbers.

M. Curran states the \$59k is the one with the 85/15.

L. Gil states we talked about changing the amount of the buyout to around \$3k. No matter what happens that's a good choice and would be a policy change.

J. Hoch regardless not enough to make a budget based decision on it but we need to write the policy. I had another curve where a family plan may change to a two person. Another twist to think about

J. Sherman states I would support that if we were going to change the personnel plan to include the buyout and would also support making it more flexible when people could choose that buyout.

M. Curran states on performance you asked a \$5k increase why on that line

J. Hoch states I took the 2% of eligible wages. There is a question there, last year you gave me 2% and took taxes and benefits out of it. So the 2% last year was functionally less than 2% because of the taxes taken out.

M. Curran states I would like to see the same as last year. That would be the only change to the budget right now

J. Sherman states I would be in favor of leaving it the way he presented it. I would like to see it be a full 2%.

D. Poliquin states the proposed personnel budget given last week. On the health insurance line the proposed budget would be 85/15 split, that's what you are showing us.

J. Hoch states if you use the budget dated Dec 7th and throw away everything else.

D. Poliquin asks why is there a \$20k difference based on the same proposal

J. Hoch states going back and making the chart I realized some of the original figures were incorrect.

J. Sherman states move going back to the 90/10. The \$659,981 is the 85/15 split, recommending 90/10 at \$679,407. That's almost exactly a \$20k increase.

L. Gil asks if we were to do that it would still be open to review at a later date.

J. Sherman states you can bring it up again. We always have been able to.

M. Curran states but that will be the budget committee's starting point

D. Poliquin asks so what's the total health insurance line.

J. Sherman replies \$724,635

J. Sherman states now that we've seen the chart and Jason presented us the with the \$20k difference we now know we will be overspent because of 9 employees that picked up new coverage or had a change in coverage.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Personnel Budget for \$1,174,432 increasing the health insurance line from \$659,981 to \$679,407 in order to go back to the 90/10 split.

Discussion

J. Sherman states I'm in favor of doing this. I know it's a sizable increase but I think this is the way to go. It's been my opinion all along that I wouldn't support all the budget increases presented. We are going to have to make cuts in other areas in order to balance the budget.

Vote Passes

3-1-0 M. Curran votes no

Warrant Articles

Warrant Articles attached

Additional discussion as follows:

J. Hoch states the budget committee has requested seeing as many articles as possible. We will try to add some language associated with some of the items we discussed last week. May I suggest as we go through them, if there are items we have discussed before and we are comfortable with them we should pass them on to the budget committee.

Highway Equipment Trust Fund, Article P-08-03

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Highway Equipment Trust Fund, Article P-08-03.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Highway Garage Office Trailer, Article P-08-04

M. Curran asks so this would be electricity, office furniture, and basically all expenses involved with the trailer.

J. Hoch replies yes this is the entire budget

M. Curran states everyone should know that this isn't just for the cost of the trailer, it involves outfitting the trailer as well.

J. Hoch states the trailer was under \$10k but then we are moving bathrooms, plumbing, heating and electrical all have to be factored in.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Highway Garage Office Trailer, Article P-08-04.

Discussion

J. Sherman states the article states to be located at the Highway Department. Most people don't know where the Highway Dept is. States this should have details as to where it is located.

J. Hoch replies I will add located next to the existing highway garage.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Building Capital Reserve, Article P-08-05

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Building Capital Reserve, Article P-08-05.

Discussion

M. Curran states this is a new fund for things that happen when you least expect them. It is to be used as a safety net or insurance policy. In the past we have had some very expensive things happen that we were unprepared for and effected the budget.

Hoch states I will be bringing to you some suggestions of things. I've identified about \$6k in system type issues that I would like to see if you might be interested in approving. There have been issues with the generator at the safety complex, a voicemail failure at the safety complex as well as some other issues.

J. Sherman asks what's your feeling as to what you expect to spend. Asks are we looking at around \$10K. States I'm in favor of recommending this at least for one more year but then I don't want it to continue forever.

J. Hoch states we should identify a decent benchmark of what's our biggest annual fear, which is probably the septic failure and use that as your starting point.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Fire Capital Reserve, Article P-08-06

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Fire Capital Reserve, Article P-08-06.

Discussion

J. Sherman states if the number is off, please be sure to correct it.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Water Capital Reserve, Article P-08-07

► Motion by L. Gil and second by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Water Capital Reserve, Article P-08-07.

Discussion

J. Sherman states the Route 125 expansion ends in 2013. Asks is that the latest.

M. Curran states it depends on which section. They broke it down into two parts. We jumped a little bit a head of schedule because of the end of Route 125 with the new developments. They actually pushed it forward but the section near Old Danville Rd had been pushed out until I believe 2013.

L. Gil states in all likely hood it will be pushed out vs. pushed back. It's not going to happen any sooner.

Sherman not sure what the latest official date is.

M. Curran states I can see two projects that could possibly encourage that to happen soon.

J. Sherman states I would like to see a cash flow. I've been in favor of this since the get go. I would like to see a cash flow of what we are going to put into the fund vs. what's coming out. If that work on 125 has really been pushed out, maybe that is a place where we can cut.

J. Hoch replies I will try to break out the numbers you are looking for. This reflects the change. I think it's part of the capital improvement plan discussion but I'll try to break out just those numbers for you.

M. Curran states how will that effect, we do get a revenue from anyone that is connected to that water line every year and I thought part of the push for this or the money being put aside is that when those new developments do go in we need to be proactive and prepared and that we could if potentially they were willing to bring a line there. That was one of the concerns and it is a yearly revenue of approximately \$73k and we have two potentially new sights. If we are not showing that we are being proactive and ready to go when they are, we miss out on that revenue. We don't necessarily have to wait until 125 are done. We can make other alternatives because we have gone down to Westville Rd and crossed it. We are really in a good position and if we needed to we could move on without the state and jump onto those capital developments. I know we have several large developments coming up soon and I would hate for us to lose out on this opportunity by not being proactive. I would hat to lose out on that possible revenue.

J. Sherman states I couldn't agree more especially with the new developments. However, having been involved with it, I can tell you it was a fairly arbitrary number. It wasn't as precise as the highway or fire vehicle.

Curran states if you could look at it Jason, through the CIP I'm sure you had this discussion.

J. Hoch states your starting point here is an informed shot in the dark. We are expecting the Old County Rd to be around \$180k or \$190k and we put \$40k in the reserve in 07 because we were using a \$250k number so we put \$210k in the budget and \$40k in the reserve.

J. Sherman states construction costs may have gone up and we haven't revisited that number. States we can get a little bit closer to the real number.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Conservation Fund, Article P-08-08

J. Hoch states the Conservation Fund had \$39,278 at the end of 06 with an additional \$5k this year.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Conservation Fund, Article P-08-08.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

J. Hoch states I'm going to skip articles 09 and 10.

J. Sherman asks are these patrician articles.

Hoch they did not come through as patrician articles last year. In 06 and 07 they came through the regular budget process.

Water system Study, Article P-08-11a, 11b, 11c

J. Hoch states water tower was originally built to supply additional power and pressurize the water system. Most of that now we have a single source of pressure, which is coming from the reservoir on Maple Ave. A while back the town acquired land on Sweet Hill thinking with the height you will have the pressure. My understanding is when the water line went in on Elm Street it was designed with connections so that anything coming over Sweet Hill would eventually be tied in. So there is a relationship between the water tower piece and the Sweet Hill piece. The drinking water piece would end up fitting into that when we began looking at the feasibility of doing something on Sweet Hill, worthwhile to consider at that point looking at options for anything going in in terms of a reservoir capacity with the possibility of using it for future drinking water.

L. Gil states right now I would assume that when Verizon, or whoever services it, they climb up there, it is in reasonably good shape. We both have insurance but if not, who will be become liable.

J. Hoch responds I'm not sure I would rather look at the contract and see what we have committed to.

L. Gil states that as owner of tower, that report dictates the burden presents and imminent danger or not. As long as the tower structure is sound, then I would say we are ok. But if someone got hurt because of corrosion we may have an issue on our hand.

J. Hoch states there is paint flaking so there are the initial signs of deterioration.

D. Poliquin responds there weren't any major issues brought forth. It was just esthetics and since it's not being utilized as a current water suppression system it was suggested to dismantle it.

L. Gil states the contractor may have equipment that might be able to assist the town with the maintenance of the tower. I would be interested in the cost.

J. Hoch states we maybe able to get a resource up there but we need to decide is it worth repairing.

L. Gil states we could probably get around the pressure issues regardless of if we have the tower or not. The tower is currently being used as an antenna support and bringing in revenue. Asks so why would you want to offset the revenue source if we don't have to, by putting in repairs that aren't needed.

J. Hoch states at the very least there are cosmetic issues if nothing else.

M. Curran states I would like to continue to have it as a revenue source and it's definitely worth the cost of the cosmetics.

L. Gil states there was the presumption that technology would change and that source of income would dissolve.

J. Hoch states the other option is at some point do you look at replacing it with an antenna rather than repairing it. Hence, the reason to dig in and really get some facts and figures as to what the issues are there.

Hoch looking at the existing water system, we started talking to firms about this last assessment and asking questions. The wheels started turning if there was a crises down the road we are luck to have the pipes running through town and we have a water source that can provide the town water. Most towns base their flows on fire flows. Because if you are looking at households you're not driving the demand. So the question was what if we wanted to convert it over. Is it feasible, what would we need to do. My reason for suggesting it is more for advanced planning. So if the issue comes down the rd we are not scrambling. We thought about it, here's a plan, here's what we need to know. Also if we get a report back that states in addition to the treatment system we would have to sanitize different sections of the pipe or fix leaks we are ready. That piece of it, not exactly time sensitive. There is no reason why that part has to happen in 2008. I just wanted to bring it forward but not for the 2008 budget.

J. Sherman responds I happen to believe in pushing out the water study. I believe there are no structural issues, it is only cosmetic.

D. Poliquin states the water supply to and from the tower has issues and needs to be addressed. A lot of that portion of the system from the pump house to the tower, a lot of that should be removed. I know at one point, 4 years ago my company did some work to repair it, and that was the first time we found significant issues with the interior core. It's not a structural issue in itself but as it continues to deteriorate you have the issue of falling pieces. The structure of the tower, I don't believe has been inspected in years. The legs or structure seem to be in good shape but should be checked for density to judge the level of corrosion.

J. Sherman states the water study we can push out but the water tower, I would be willing to spend the money now. We need to know is it going to cost us more in the future if we wait and is there a safety issue.

J. Hoch states the safety is unknown. The second piece is the future disposition of it. Until we know where we are, we can't commit to a maintenance budget. There are plenty of companies that want to buy out your tower leases. If all the towers go away, we are still stuck with a deteriorating water tower. That revenue isn't forever so we need to come up with a plan.

L. Gil states I thought one of the recommendations when it first came through would be to put part of the revenue into a fund for either repair or demolition. I shudder to think that we are thinking about that now rather than during the original agreement.

J. Sherman states I'm in favor of 8-11b not convinced of 8-11a.

D. Poliquin states I agree not high on the priority list.

L. Gil asks aren't we going to be able to review all these articles. I have no problem adding it now so the budget committee can see it as long as we can review it later.

M. Curran states we are the ones that decide whether or not it goes to warrant, not the budget committee. I just want to be clear the budget goes no matter what we say.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Water System Study, Article P-08-11a.

Discussion

J. Sherman states I think I won't be in favor of it

Vote

4-0-0

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Water Tower Study, Article P-08-11b.

Discussion

J. Sherman states I would be in favor of this.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Motion 08 b

Sherman in favor

Vote 4-0-0

► Motion by L. Gil and second by D. Poliquin to recommend the Water System and Tower Study, Article P-08-11c

J. Sherman states I find this confusing and unnecessary.

L. Gil states I don't think this is that difficult to understand. If it went before the voters, item c does three things, which includes maintenance or removal of water tower; water storage system and feasibility of converting the existing fire suppression system to portable drinking water system. It's the more complete study of the water system

J. Sherman asks was that your content Jason.

J. Hoch states I started with a & b. Then, thinking about the conversion, is where Sweet Hill was introduced. Now, if you are interested in the Sweet Hill idea I would rather enter that back into A.

L. Gil states the issue of the tower as part of the water system is that in the event that you lost power and therefore couldn't pump from the reservoir then there would be a problem.

D. Poliquin states you wouldn't be able to power the system.

L. Gil asks if you moved the facility to Sweet Hill Rd would that take care of the pressure issues.

D. Poliquin states I'm not sure if the property was purchased as replacement or addition to the system but I do believe that the preparations made currently with the junction of Palmer Ave and Elm Street, that the elevation should take care of that. Not sure if there is enough water in the reserve for a 750k gallon supply which is what we would probably

require. The elevation was the key factor because it was the highest point at the time so it should be able to maintain both volume and pressure at a catastrophic event.

J. Sherman asks Larry, what's your thought.

L Gil replies I would like to keep a third option.

M. Curran states Jason you are leaning towards changing it so feel free to bring us different options. If you can clean the language up a little or maybe open another version

J. Hoch states I appreciate this how you are carrying forward to get the conversation but I'm struggling on how you would get a, b and c on the warrant.

L. Gil states we've done this before where if the town's people voted on option A, then they no longer have to go to option C. It would have contingencies in it. Option C is more but it provides the best picture of the towns infrastructure and the water system.

J. Sherman states I would not support it in this case because if you put all of it on the warrant it will be confusing. I will vote for C or now so the budget committee can see all three of them.

J. Hoch asks if you were to do c, that you would still want to get what you can for the \$20k and put it towards that whole basket or are you looking at a, b, and c, going forward, if approved, throwing \$40k in this budget.

M. Curran states I think we are just trying to get them on the board but only up to \$20k.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Meals on Wheels, Article P-08-12

M. Curran asks are all 107 clients in just Plaistow.

J. Hoch states I'm pretty sure it is but I'll check to be sure

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to recommend the Water System and Tower Study, Article P-08-11c

Discussion

L. Gil asks does the Meals on Wheels Program service any other communities.

J. Sherman states Meals on Wheels is across the whole country but they are looking for Plaistow to support our area.

Curran can you confirm that the people they are serving at the Vic Geary Center are only Plaistow residents. I am all for this program but I just don't want to give the false sense to the public that the number is only for the town of Plaistow.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

M. Curran states I noticed the Sad Café has been removed from the articles and I would like to make a motion to put it back on the warrant. One of my reasons is that although it is a worthwhile program, the amount of money it pays for rent. It pays most of its money for rent and salaries than for its outreach programs.

J. Hoch states it was not on the warrant for 2006 or 2007.

M. Curran states they came in and did a great presentation but it's all about the money they are paying for that facility. I don't think paying their rent and staff best spends our \$5k. They talked last year about finding a different facility. I believe they are paying \$36k in rent. That's a huge portion of their budget. I'm concerned it could be a great program but if they continue to pay exurbanite rents and salaries, their programs are missing out. I'm so much for supporting kids but they have been given so much money from the state and towns but it's not going to the right places, it's going to pay the landlord.

Town Managers Report

Town Manager's Report is attached.

Additional discussion on the following items:

Correspondence

M. Curran asks in regards to OHD, we normally pay the regular detail but we are now asking the police to march in the parade and therefore that triggers it to be an overtime expense.

J. Hoch replies any police that have been scheduled for the day, during the day are paying an overtime rate. Those officers that are in the color guard and are using their shift for that, they're being paid overtime.

M. Curran asks if they are not in the parade would they normally be there.

J. Hoch responds they may not be there or they may be doing a traffic assignment if not marching in the parade. If we are short on detail we may pay for one or two details from out of town.

L. Gil asks in reference to Haynes Blvd can we get a counter to see how many people are using it.

J. Hoch states I will look but unsure what we will find for traffic counters. The other thought is that with most traffic patterns we are only one month into the new plaza so habits will change.

L. Gil states and that would help determine if we want to sell it or not.

M. Curran states I would like to see how it will impact the plaza. Before they did the big swap on the Haverhill side, there was a purpose on how to get in and out of that plaza. I would be interested in how that change does effect the plaza but it would help to know how many cars are being effected.

J. Hoch states given that we are only one month into this, I would prefer to put it on hold and let things settle down.

Budget

Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to direct the town manager to increase the standard mileage rate from 48.5 cents per mile to 50.5 cents per mile.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

Discussion

J. Hoch states reimbursement is only for mileage when they are using their own vehicle. They could be going to a training session.

J. Hoch states if you have specific recommendations for the budget, if you could send those to me during the week I would appreciate it. The more I can put together, the more productive the conversation we can have on Monday. Something I need to ask all of you to think about is, which direction we want to go in. Something that may be helpful in figuring out our direction is a target range for a tax rate. We are looking for a tax increase of - I believe it was 34 cents last week. I've found in the past that trying to use a target like that gives you a concrete way of deciding where we are going. We all know that if we put something together and the tax rate is too high, it's going nowhere.

J. Sherman states on that summary chart the net, which should be the tax impact to the town doesn't equal the net town tax. Can you get those in synch because I'm concerned.

J. Hoch states I will try but I'm not sure I have the information for that level of analysis for Monday. .

J. Sherman states there was an income from 2006 of \$80k highway –looking at last year's warrant articles and we offset them. Trying to figure out how best to represent them on the chart. Even if we budgeted the same amount of money for highway expenses, it will cost us \$80k more because we don't have the 80k to apply. Then it states take \$40k from block grant from the year before and we did that twice. That's \$80k that we had to offset warrant articles. I don't know how to show that on the chart and if we are level funding, we are \$80k in the hole.

J. Hoch states yes the \$80k last year was something we found that was unspent, unclaimed funds that are eligible for this purpose and we also didn't have to gross appropriate them because it was a carryover. So you are right in terms of our level of investment. It's kind of like when you use the surplus, it doesn't show up on that list. I don't know if you can bring this in without creating more confusion.

J. Sherman states you have to represent it somewhere because you think you are level funding but you're \$80 in the hole. Whether you put it as a separate line on the revenues or added in a line of prior year revenue or something. There are two highway articles, one for drainage and the other for paving.

J. Hoch states I see your point but it only matters if trying to compare total expenses one year to total expenses the next. I have to increase expenditures by \$80k and then increase revenue by \$80k

J. Sherman replies yes but we are taking the gross numbers and rolling them into the operating budget and they are not going to be offset by \$80k. Third question is what's been our change in assessment from last year to this year. Shouldn't our possible budget increase be tied to the fact there is an additional assessment. That's what the gross would be.

J. Hoch states the increase between April 07 and 08 is the growth of the tax base. States you're right, need to see what data sources we have on that. The best proxy is building permits, which will put us in the ballpark

J. Sherman states our best numbers aren't great numbers because they aren't assessor numbers but we can come close.

J. Sherman asks what do we need to get that changed.

J. Hoch states I'm pretty sure that is town ordinance, which can be changed at town meeting. Not possible but I believe so.

Other

Donation of Banner

M. Curran states I would be in favor of accepting this donation of a "Plaistow supports our Troops" banner. I think it shows our support.

► Motion by J. Sherman and second by L. Gil to direct the Town Manager to display the Plaistow supports our troops.

L. Gil states my only concern that it doesn't detract our environment.

J. Sherman states we reserve the right to have it removed in the future.

L. Gil states unfortunately it has potential to open a can of worms but I support displaying it.

J. Hoch suggests you display it until the spring, at which time we can address this again.

Vote Passes

4-0-0

M. Curran states please send a thank you note.

Signature Folder

L. Gil states I had a few opportunities to pass through State Line Plaza. It is largely complete and is a noticeable improvement and very attractive. One issue is coming from Atkinson on route 121 and trying to determine the entrance vs. the through street.

M. Curran states it's a state road and on the MA side. That part of the plan has been totally changed from what the planning board agreed do. Unfortunately it's on the MA side.

L. Gil states the signage is terrible. There could be a little bit better delineation so the public has a clearer idea as to which one is the road. Other than that I'm pleased with it.

M. Curran states I just want to mention that if I said the wrong thing last week, they are not taking down the old CVS they are actually just going to reface the CVS. I was referring to taking down the drainage. They are actually going to put in a clock tower and it's going to be beautiful.

J. Hoch states the lower entrance is Haverhill; the traffic light entrance is in NH.

L. Gil states one other question I was asked is if I could find out if the city of Haverhill would be supplying water to the old Shaws.

J. Hoch states they have started looking at it but there are some issues. Only seen concepts at this point.

M. Curran asks Jason the letter from Oct on the rec fields, do I have it.

J. Hoch responds I'll check if I didn't give it to you already, I will.

L. Gil asks regarding the rec fields, when is that going to come up.

J. Hoch replies probably first meeting of the New Year

L. Gil asks is the recommendation from the state with a timeline.

J. Hoch replies I have to look and see.

M. Curran states before that I would like to have a discussion with this board. Four of our members do not know what the context of that letter is. We have never seen it. We don't know what it is. I only know of it from your presentation and brief conversations with the conservation commission. We've never seen anything from the state either. I know it was brought up again at the last conservation committee meeting but we don't even know what the issues are yet

L. Gil states I thought this board was aware of a letter from NH DES stating after the site inspection of the rec fields, additional work needs to be done to restore the stream to it's original path. We all need to come to some unanimity about what is said and where we go from here.

Additional Old and New Business

D. Poliquin states in regards to the safety complex, there are a lot of items in there, are they really all covered under that RSA.

M. Curran states I spoke with Michael on Friday and he went to the RSA and it's 674:21 and it lists a bunch of different items under there and it lists establishing equipment so it could be used. The RSA is very general and loose regarding it. The question is when we first developed this it was to expand the complex. We decided to do a mini or minor expansion which is still allowable.

J. Hoch states this is one of those pieces where trying to make things clearer and pulling in add people has only made the situation worse. One of the recommendations we received last year was to involve the planning board with regards to the fees. We have been feeling our way through this year and how to do that. We have engaged the planning board in more conversations. On the technical piece of the question, the understanding we've had is the whole outfitting of the expansion space is eligible. You haven't achieved much expansion unless you make it a functional space. We have now involved the planning board in the conversations and they are now seeing the invoices coming through for some of the long-term projects.

Poliquin states I'm on the safety complex committee and we've had one meeting. Asks where is all this other information coming from. It's being collected and distributed and then presented before going before the committee.

J. Hoch states there is no new direction or information but there is still trailing information. As soon as we have new information that means getting the committee back together but we are still dealing with the pond issue. The application has been made to the state but that's it.

M. Curran states we have approximately \$494 in the public impact safety fees. The last couple checks have been for the dredge and fill permit, wetlands preservation, trailer and electric. ,

d. Poliquin states some of the items are quite a far stretch for those monies. Poliquin A refrigerator, drop clothes, mini blinds, and keys.

J. Sherman states so you would suggest we don't pay for some of these items

D. Poliquin responds I'm not going to suggest that at this point. I just think maybe it needs to be looked at a little more closely.

M. Curran states I was not at Wed night's meeting so I wasn't sure about the RSA I know it was very vague and they felt some of these things should have been established. This is something we should look at, whether we can or should be more specific with the language going forward. It is the planning board's money. We do need to start paying these fees down because after six years we have to give them back. I think having said that we are going to have the discussion so it is a little more cut and dry and if we do a presentation it needs to be with both boards or at the same time so there is no chasing of the tail. That is allowable under the RSA. Mike and I felt it was vague enough.

D. Poliquin states I just want to be sure they are used for what they were intended for.

L. Gil states they are expenditures that are needed but at least in my mind I had higher visions of where the money was going.

J. Hoch states the expectation is, to some degree, to make it operational.

D. Poliquin states my understanding was that it was for structural upgrades and not to make it functional.

Selectmen's Reports

J. Sherman states reviewed the operating budget and have gotten half way through the budgets, will finish and warrant articles tomorrow night. Wednesday is a Recreation Commission meeting.

L. Gil states the Conservation Commission met last week. I arrived a couple minutes late and they appointed me for a few items. NCRS is to develop a history of how the town came to acquire the development easement rights on the Cox Farm. Coming up in February is National Wetlands Day, they will have a presentation at the Pollard School and I may be called on to speak. There was a ZBA hearing regarding Birch Street. I was very shocked and disappointed regarding the decision by the board. That was a crummy site and we had more than enough justification to say this is not a good go and they decided otherwise. They found a loophole rather than look at the true intent of the ordinance

D. Poliquin states nothing to report this week.

M. Curran states there was a meeting on Wednesday that I was unable to attend due to car trouble. They went over ordinances going forward. Pat was there regarding issues that concerned her, the sale of vehicles, talked about sign ordinances. We may have four warrants coming up. Due to several delays, we will be sending letters out stating they will reclaim their bond if not paved by May 1st. Our next meeting we will be seeing two of the applicants for the elderly housing. The continuation for Rite Aid is set up for that meeting as well. They gave approval to route 108, the Northland mall, regarding the kios with additional parking in the back.

ADJOURNMENT: 10:47 pm

Respectfully submitted by,

Karen Iacozzi
Recording Secretary