



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

**PLAISTOW BOARD OF SELECTMEN MINUTES**

**DATE:** November 9, 2020

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** 6:32 p.m.

**SELECTMEN:**

Selectwoman, Francine Hart, Chairman

Selectman, Julian Kiszka

Selectman, Jay DeRoche

Greg Colby, Finance Director – Remotely

Marybeth Walker, Assessing Agent – Remotely

Steven Whalen, Visions

Sandra Schmucki, Visions

Selectman, Greg Taillon, Vice Chairman

Selectman, John A. Blinn, Sr.

Mark Pearson, Town Manager – Remotely

*G. Taillon motions to approve the minutes of October 26, 2020. Seconded by J. Kiszka.*

*Vote: 5-0-0*

*Motion carries*

*G. Taillon motions to approve the minutes of November 4, 2020. Seconded by J. Kiszka.*

*Vote: 4-0-1 (abstain J. DeRoche)*

*Motion carries*

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**RELEASE OF BOND FOR EUGENIA LANE**

F. Hart asks if the Board has any questions regarding the release of the road performance bond which has been held for two years. According to a memo from Highway Supervisor, D. Garlington there have been no problems with the road.

*G. Taillon motions to release the two-year performance bond for Eugenia Lane in the amount of \$16,553.42 plus accrued interest and to close the account. Dan Garlington, Highway Supervisor has monitored the street throughout the two-year period and supports releasing the bond.*

*Seconded by J. DeRoche.*

*Vote: 5-0-0*

*Motion carries*

## **VISIONS**

F. Hart asks Mr. Whalen when he was aware that Visions was behind on their benchmarks.

S. Whalen replies about one (1) month ago. He states they were unable to take the live data base and let multiple people work on data entry. Therefore, there was only one (1) person working on data entry. There are over 3500 parcels in Plaistow. It is a large project.

F. Hart states she emailed him on October 2, 2020 asking for an update. She received a response on October 5, 2020 that was brief and generic. He did not mention being behind. On October 6, 2020 S. Whalen emailed M. Walker, Assessing Agent for Plaistow and told her they were behind.

F. Hart states Visions was supposed to send out data mailers on October 6, 2020. She asks Mr. Whalen how the process went.

S. Whalen replies they were sent out in two (2) groups. The first group was sent out at the end of August and the second group was sent out at the end of October.

F. Hart states the second group was sent out without the self-addressed return envelopes. In her opinion that shows lack of attention to detail. Other dates were missed, and communication was poor.

S. Whalen states they contracted out the data mailers with another company and the return envelopes were supposed to be included.

F. Hart states the bottom line is Visions did not tell the Board. The Board had to chase you for information and answers.

F. Hart states on November 3, 2020 our Assessors pulled twenty-six commercial property record cards at random to review them. Of the twenty-six (26), twenty-three (23) had significant errors. The fail rate was 88%.

S. Whalen states he was aware they were being reviewed however he has not seen them yet. The cards can be confusing and difficult to read.

F. Hart asks when Visions received permission to extend their benchmarks. It is not in the contract and the Board was never told.

F. Hart asks M. Walker for her findings.

M. Walker would like to backup a bit. She states the file was never unavailable to Visions. Back in July there were emails between Plaistow's IT group and Vision's IT group. Visions IT department stated they were all set. Plaistow had no way of knowing they were having problems.

As far as the twenty-six random commercial cards pulled, she just got the file last week. The process was supposed to include field review as well as measure and list. She received a new live file today and a lot of the errors have been corrected. There are still many small errors. Property values are still going up in Plaistow. Last year a statistical update was done to bring the ration up to 96.9%. The file from Visions has the current ratio at 88% which is very concerning.

Sandra Schmucki from Visions states she was not aware of the time frame. She worked with two (2) years of qualified sales from 4/1/18 – 3/30/20. She states she can update the ration to 100%.

F. Hart states the contract calls for a full list and measure. She asks if Ms. Schmucki is aware of what values anew means. The fact Visions was not aware of it for the first ten (10) months of the process is very disconcerting.

F. Hart asks how does Plaistow set the tax rate and get the tax bills out on time?

S. Whalen states as soon as our assessors review the information, Visions will make all necessary adjustments and start phone hearings for residents.

J. Kiszka asks how soon is soon, five (5) days, one (1) week, one (1) month?

M. Walker is concerned with the 88% ratio. Values should be based on Market Value as of April 1, 2020 at 100%. She states S. Whalen was in the meeting when it was discussed and was aware of the

expectation. As of today, she still does not have all the files. M. Walker states it is not the data itself, the values are way off. She did receive a new file today at 6:10 pm with  $\frac{3}{4}$  of new sales. The remaining  $\frac{1}{4}$  will be sent tomorrow. M. Walker is still concerned the information is not benchmarked to the State of NH guidelines. You cannot just look at sales from August and September and adjust the other two (2) years of sales.

J. Blinn states he is hearing that the information M. Walker received tonight is of no value to us. He does not think it is feasible to continue.

G. Taillon asks why Plaistow was not made aware of the problems Visions was having accessing our data base with Team Viewer. We could have fixed the problem.

F. Hart asks if S. Whalen understands the Plaistow Board of Selectmen are your customers. She is beyond disappointed by their performance and not reaching out to communicate.

J. Kiszka states he is very disappointed too. This is a small community, and we need to send out tax bills. It is a serious matter. We need a path forward.

F. Hart agrees. She states the Board will need to make a decision soon. She thanks Steven Whalen for joining us tonight.

### **POLICE DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF MICS SOFTWARE**

M. Pearson states the software we have in the police department is twenty-six (26) years old and has reached its life end. Management Information Computer Systems (MICS ) was developed by professionals in collaboration with State and Federal partners. He recommends buying the software to replace the outdated software at a cost of \$87,100. We can pay for the software by using \$55,921 (approximate, actual to be determined once the account is closed out) from the Capital Reserve Fund, the \$25,000 that was encumbered in 2019 for new software, and using \$6,179 from the current budget.

G. Taillon asks if we need a warrant article to remove this capital reserve fund once it is closed.

G. Colby replies, yes.

J. Kiszka asks why we would close the account. We may need it again in the future.

M. Pearson replies as we review the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) we may consider making a deposit to a similar account. We need to check the creation language. The original warrant article was created in 2018.

J. DeRoche asks if the software is just for the Police Department.

M. Pearson replies, yes.

G. Taillon states the original warrant article was a finite one and we should not reuse it.

***G. Taillon motions to approve the withdrawal of the entire balance in the MICS Capital Reserve Fund created at the March 2018 Town Meeting for the purpose of the MICS Software Replacement. This balance is approximately \$55,952. as of September 30, 2020. Seconded by J. Kiszka.***

***Discussion: J. Kiszka asks if this fund plus the others mentioned will pay for everything necessary.***

***M. Pearson replies yes.***

***Vote: 5-0-0***

***Motion carries***

### **DISCUSS FUNDING FOR THE PHASE III RADIO SYSTEM**

G. Colby states on August 24, 2020 the Board voted to pay for the final phase of the radio system from the contingency fund. After the vote it was discovered that back in 2018 the voters approved the final phase of the project to come from the Capital Reserve Fund. Therefore, we do not need to use the contingency fund and the prior vote from August should be rescinded.

***J. Kiszka motions to rescind the action taken by the Board at the August 24, 2020 meeting to pay for the final phase of this project from the contingency fund. Seconded by G. Taillon.***

***Discussion: J. DeRoche asks if all Selectmen were present at the meeting on 8/24/2020.***

***F. Hart replies, it does not matter as this is a new motion.***

***Vote: 5-0-0***

***Motion carries***

### **PRESENTATION ON SOLAR PANELS FOR THE SALT SHED**

G. Taillon researched solar panels to see what options are available for the salt shed. His goal was for basic understanding and how to build the project and make it worthwhile. The salt shed can hold one hundred seventy (170) panels. The panels are rated in watts. The higher the wattage the more energy is produced. In New Hampshire we average 4.61 sun hours a day. Solar panels produce DC power which has to be inverted to AC power. Inverters are part of the solar panels. Energy generated by solar panels can be used at the Public Works Garage or turned over to the power company to get credits to use elsewhere. Plaistow's cost of kWh is \$0.29 with Unitil. If you take the number of panels X the watts X the efficiency (75% is common) X the sun hours/day (4.61) X 365 (number of days/yr.) you end up with about \$8,801.73 per year off the Town's electrical bill. The cost of panels is about \$3.20/Watt. It would cost \$176,800 for one hundred seventy (170) panels. We have \$64,000 allocated to solar panels. We can purchase about 35% of the roof area with current funding. Both the proposals we received were under \$3.20/Watt. Revision Energy came in at \$2.66/W and TAF.Solar came in at \$2.94/W. G. Taillon explains Net Present Value (NPV) and Internal Rate of Return (IRR). NPV is one of the best methods to calculate your return on investment. IRR is used to estimate the profitability of a potential investment. Both of these techniques are used to determine how desirable a project will be and whether it will add value to the Town. There are four (4) options the Board can choose from.

1. Move forward with Revision Energy or TAF.Solar proposals.
2. Resubmit a RFP for using \$64,000 in funds.
3. Resubmit RFP for 170 panels with a 2021 warrant article.
4. Move forward now and then submit a 2022 warrant article for the remaining 96 panels as Phase II of the project.

G. Taillon supports option #4.

J. Kiszka agrees with moving forward with what we can do now and sending a new RFP for a long-term plan.

J. Blinn would like to start now.

J. DeRoche asks what the benefit of sending out a new RFP is.

G. Taillon states we only received two (2) proposals and there are many more companies out there. We could send two (2) new RFP's one for Phase I and one for Phase II.

J. DeRoche would like to put up we can now. Maybe we should start a warrant article in 2021 and partially fund phase II and fund the remaining portion of Phase II with a 2022 warrant article.

F. Hart states it seems to be the consensus of the Board to use the \$64,000 and start now.

***G. Taillon motions to approve Revision Energy as the first phase installing what they can for the \$64,000 and creating a warrant article in 2021 and 2022 to fund phase II. Seconded by J. Kiszka.  
Vote: 5-0-0  
Motion carries***

F. Hart directs the Town Manager to let Revision Energy know they were awarded the bid.

### **WARRANT ARTICLE DISCUSSION**

F. Hart states she and G. Taillon worked on these. The goal for 2021 is to have less warrant articles at lower amounts. Next week we will discuss all the warrant articles. Tonight, is just a quick review.

### **TOWN MANAGERS REPORT**

- Attended Several Meetings
- Plaistow Landfill Cap Project
- Sweet Hill Waterline Project
- Westville Road Waterline Project
- Town Paving
- Public Works Garage & Salt Shed Construction
- Electronics & Video Equipment at the PWG
- Joint Loss Management Committee (JLMC) Meeting
- Staff Meeting
- Road Construction Next to the Public Safety Complex
- Busby Construction is starting the construction of the roadway extension to the Palmer property next week.
- P.A.R.C. Drainage Project
- Highway Dump Truck Body
- Assessing Conversion Meeting

### **ACTION ITEMS REVIEW**

Item #1 is removed. It was to put money away for values anew in a capital reserve account by warrant article.

Item #2 has the due date pushed out to 11/30/2022. It was for a possible new RFP for solar panels at the Public Works Garage.

Item # 8 is removed. It was to reduce the Budget Committee to eight (8) members instead of nine (9) members.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

F. Hart reminds everyone there will be a Veteran's Day Ceremony on Wednesday, November 11<sup>th</sup> outside at Town Hall at 9:30 a.m. Everyone is welcome to attend.

### **SELECTMEN'S REPORTS**

J. DeRoche

- He was unable to attend the BOS meeting on 11/4/2020.
- Voting – he states everything went well at the polls.

- He cannot attend the Recreation Commission meeting which will be held on Thursday. J. Blinn will go in his place as the alternate representative.
- He will attend the first Budget Committee Meeting.

G. Taillon

- Voting – he states he received positive feedback from voters.
- He discussed with Mr. Pearson creating a document to explain all capital reserve accounts and posting the document on the website.
- Attended the Planning Board Meeting.

J. Kiszka

- Voting – he states everything went well at the polls.
- He attended the Energy Committee.
- He attended the CIP Committee.
- Has been working with the Fire Chief on house numbers for Public Safety.

J. Blinn

- Voting – he states it really went great.

F. Hart

- Attended the Planning Board Meeting.
- Voting – was at the polls all day. It went well.
- Attended the Halloween Parade at Park.

F. Hart ask the Board to think about the values-anew process. A decision should be made next week. G. Taillon states the Board should probably make a decision tonight. He states the tax rate last year was set on October 27<sup>th</sup>.

***G. Taillon motions to enter non-public session under RSA 91-A:3 II (A) Public Employee; (B) Hiring; (C) Reputation; (D) Property Transactions; (E) Pending or Threatened Litigation; (I) Emergency Functions; (J) Confidential Information in Adjudicative Proceedings; (L) Consideration of Legal Advice. Seconded by J. Blinn.***

***Board Polled: F. Hart = yes, G. Taillon = yes, J. Kiszka = yes, J. Blinn = yes, J. DeRoche = yes Motion carries 5-0-0***

F. Hart states the Board will not come back to a public meeting tonight. She adjourns the meeting at 8:29 p.m.

F. Hart resumes the public session at 8:41 p.m.

***G. Taillon motions to seal the minutes of tonight's non-public session. Seconded by J. Blinn. Vote: 5-0-0 Motion carries***

F. Hart adjourns the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Beth Hossack

Recording Secretary