



## *Town of Plaistow ♦ Budget Committee*

*145 Main Street ♦ Plaistow ♦ NH ♦ 03865*

### **BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING**

**December 05, 2017**

**Call to Order:** 6:32 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

Present: Francine Hart, *Chair*  
Bob Hamilton, *Vice Chair*  
Sam Cafiso  
Laurie Milette  
Tricia Holt, *Leave of absence*  
Dennis Heffernan  
Lisa Lambert  
Dean Nifakos, *excused*  
Jay DeRoche  
John Sherman, *Selectmen Ex-Officio*

Also Present: Mark Pearson, *Town Manager* and Greg Colby, *Finance Director/Assistant Town Manager as well as several Department Heads.*

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by L. Lambert.

### **REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**★D. Heffernan moved, second by B. Hamilton to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2017 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 8-0-1 U/A.**

### **DRAFT WARRANT ARTICLES**

F. Hart noted the Budget Committee (BudCom) does not vote whether to recommend Warrant Articles that are not monetary in nature.

J. Sherman offered that all proposed Warrant Articles were provided to the BudCom as a courtesy.

L. Lambert questioned some items on the Warrant Article list that were boxed-out in red.

M. Pearson explained the language in those articles had not been “scrubbed” for legal clarity and conformity.

B. Hamilton noted that last year it was discussed that there would be uniformity in the language and terms, such as “Unassigned Fund Balance” versus “General Fund” that would be used in the Warrant Articles.

J. Sherman offered that he would take that reminder back to the Board.

G. Colby suggested the term “Unassigned Fund Balance/General Fund” be used.

M. Pearson read each of the proposed Warrant Articles, starting with the articles not previously reviewed by the BudCom:

**P-18-14 - Conversion of Fire Suppression Water System to Potable Water and Fire Suppression Water System – Not Budget Related**

It was noted that the language of the Warrant Article is what was proposed by Town Counsel Sumner Kalman. The language for the Voter’s Notes has not yet been approved.

**P-18-15 – Fire Suppression Line Capital Reserve Discontinuance – CIP Reference: W1D**

It was noted that there is language in the proposed Warrant Article that would make it null and void should Article P-18-14 fail. It was noted that the language is not necessary as the funds were only approved to be used on Route 125 and there are no plans for additional work on Route 125.

It was noted that this was not a monetary Warrant Article and the BudCom will not be making a recommendation vote for it.

**P-18-16 – Water Suppression Line Fun Discontinuance**

The same “null and void” language appears in this proposed Warrant Article, but it is appropriate here.

G. Colby noted that this Warrant Article was still on hold and should have a red box around it in the draft.

**P-18-17 – Water Department Pump(s) & Pump House Capital Reserve Discontinuance – CIP Reference: W1D**

M. Pearson explained that the related Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) was created to be able to replace the pump and pump house if it remained in service. With a potable water system the equipment would no longer be needed.

It was noted that many of the proposed Warrant Articles have CIP (Capital Improvements Plan) references. It was questioned if it were proper to reference the CIP since it has not yet been approved by the Planning Board. It was noted that the CIP is an ongoing planning document that is constantly being updated. It was also noted that this item has been on the ballot annually since 2011.

**P-18-18 – Water Department Capital Reserve Fund Creation and Deposit – CIP Reference: W2D (Not voted on by BOS)**

**P-18-19 – Building/Building Systems Capital Reserve Fund Deposit – CIP Reference: MB1D.1**

It was noted that this fund was created to have a pool of money available to fix unanticipated, emergency building repairs. The fund is usually capped at \$30,000.

D. Heffernan asked if any monies had been spent out of the account in 2017.

J. Sherman responded that they typically wait until year end to check all the invoices and see if anything should have been paid out of this CRF.

F. Hart asked if the repairs to the Town Hall doors can be paid from this account.

J. Sherman answered that more information was needed for that decision.

**P-18-20 – Library Capital Reserve Fund Balance Deposit – CIP Reference: MB3D**

J. Sherman noted that this proposed Warrant Article failed before the BOS. He added that they are waiting for the Library Director and Trustees to present their strategic plan and then the BOS will most likely reconsider voting on their recommendation.

**P-18-21 – Public Works Facility – CIP Reference: MB4.E**

M. Pearson explained that there was a Highway Garage Committee (HGC), made of up members from the BOS and BudCom, that has been seeking and reviewing presentations from contractors for the construction of a new Public Works Facility. He added that they had only seen a presentation from one company and had toured other facilities. The proposed Warrant Article is their recommendation to the BOS.

M. Pearson noted that the presentation they had seen was for a \$1.5M-\$1.6M “Cadillac” plan. He explained that they used that information to make a reasonable estimate of what the shell, foundation and some site work would be for a design-build project that would make the building workable to locate the Highway Department at the facility. Additional finish work could be done the next year. He suggested that the project could be supervised in-house and therefore eliminate the need for an outside project manager that would only increase the cost.

M. Pearson compared the \$600,000 estimate to construct the shell to an operational level with the \$750,000 that has been estimated for methane mitigation at the existing Highway Garage. He added that even with mitigation the Town would still have a thirty-year old building with a salt shed that is leaching into the ground.

D. Heffernan asked if a new salt shed would be included in the first-year build.

M. Pearson offered that it was proposed to make do with the existing salt shed until the second year when an Request for Proposal (RFP) could be done for a new shed. However, a location for a new salt shed would be included on the conceptual plan.

B. Hamilton, who is a member of the HGC and offered this was an exciting project that would mean a new building, centrally located, on land already owned by the Town, that will be more energy efficient and replace a building that is falling apart.

S. Cafiso, also a member of the HGC, added that a motion had been made and passed that the HGC would turn into the Highway Garage Building Committee when the time came. He added that it was the committee's feeling that the \$600,000 requested would get the building 80% completed. He noted that the office spaces would be done last.

M. Pearson reiterated that they would start from the outside shell and see how far the \$600,000 would go. Town Staff, potentially with the assistance of local consultant Charlie Zilch (SEC and Associates) would be the general contractors for the job and would then hire the subcontractors for utilities work once the foundation and shell are complete. Items that would need to be included in the foundation, such as drains and underground plumbing, would be taken into consideration at the early stages of the project development.

There was discussion about some of the proposed features of the new building. It was noted that there would be more room for interior storage that would prolong the life of equipment currently being left outside in the elements.

J. DeRoche reminded that it was important to consider the long-term maintenance costs that come along with an additional building.

There was discussion about things that would keep future maintenance costs down, including a more efficient heating system, potentially using natural gas and solar panels. The frame of the proposed building would be constructed to hold solar panels. It was noted that this would be in a year-two add on.

### **P-18-22 – Records Management – CIP Reference: MS1.3.1**

M. Pearson noted this was a recent addition to the CIP. He explained that some records, such as those in the Building Department, needed to be kept in perpetuity. The current system of boxing records up and storing them in the clocktower is not offering proper protection of the records. He noted that he had done a document scanning project in other communities with great success.

There was discussion about equipment and staff that would be needed for such a project. It was noted that the Town's IT (Internet Technology) vendor would be involved to recommend the best way to maintain the digitized files. It was also noted that once the files have been digitized. There was also discussion about providing a central computer that would give public access to the information. It was noted that this would not be a one-time project but would be ongoing.

There was discussion about a future upgrade to the building permit software that is intended to include the ability to scan documents and attached them to the related property file.

**P-18-23 – Energy Capital Reserve Fund Deposit – CIP Reference: MS5D**

M. Pearson noted that this CRF had partially funded the LED lighting project for the Library and that the Energy Committee was considering future energy-saving projects throughout the Town.

**P-18-24 – Pollard Road & Congressional Ave Flooding Mitigation – CIP Reference: T2E.1**

It was noted that the Warrant Article proposes to take \$46,000 from the existing Transportation Infrastructure CRF to pay for “design, engineering services, and partial construction” to mitigate a flooding situation at Pollard Road and Congressional Ave.

F. Hart questioned why this was proposed as a Warrant Article if the BOS are the agents of the fund. She suggested that the Warrant Article was unnecessary.

Tim Moore, Planning Board and CIP Committee Chair, offered that he was fairly certain the BOS were the spending agents for the Transportation Infrastructure CRF. He noted that this Warrant Article has been in the CIP for many years, and if the BOS are spending money for the intended purpose then a Warrant Article might not be needed.

**P-18-25 – Westville Road Bridge Replacement – CIP Reference: T4E.1**

It was noted that this is the third Warrant Article over the years related to the reconstruction of the Westville Road Bridge. This proposed Warrant Article is for the construction phase of the project, which is currently scheduled for summer 2018. It was noted that this proposed Warrant Article does not request any money from 2018 taxation. The money is proposed to come from the State Bridge Aid Program; the SB 38 Highway Aid Fund; the Fire Suppression Waterline Impact Fee; and the Unassigned Fund Balance.

M. Pearson noted that as part of this project water pipe, for future system expansion, will be put in the ground during construction. This will save future higher construction costs and makes good planning sense.

F. Hart asked if there was a matching fund requirement for the grant (SB 38 Highway Aid Fund).

M. Pearson noted there was not and it had been researched and found to be an appropriate use of the funds as outlined in the proposed Warrant Article.

**P-18-26 – Cemetery Expendable Trust Fund Creation and Deposit (Not voted on by BOS)**

**P-18-27 – Cemetery Revenue Fund Creation and Deposit (Not voted on by BOS)**

**P-18-28 – Town Hall Expendable Trust Fund Discontinuance**

**P-18-29 – Recreation Commission Capital Reserve Fund Discontinuance**

**P-18-30 – PEG Cable Access Fund Discontinuance**

**P-28-31 – Internet Capital Reserve Fund Discontinuance**

It was noted that the last four (4) proposed Warrant Articles were not monetary, but are intended to close CRF accounts that are no longer needed for the purpose they were created for.

There was discussion about the order in which the Warrant Articles will appear on the ballot. It was suggested that items such as the closing of CRF accounts be placed at the end, with “regular Warrant Articles at the front and everything else in the middle. J. Sherman will be discussing the order with the BOS.

F. Hart offered that the BudCom will begin their recommendation voting at the next meeting.

J. Sherman noted that there may be a few stragglers but this was the bulk of the proposed Warrant Articles. He noted that there was still a CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement) and the items that have been “red-boxed” to be considered.

T. Moore added that the BOS has not yet voted on any of the Voter Notes language.

J. Sherman noted that the Voter Notes were still attached to the Warrant Articles because it made sense during the discussion of each. He added that they will be pulled out of the Warrant Articles and put into a separate document.

It was suggested that the BudCom hold off and vote on the proposed Warrant Articles and Vote Notes language at the same time.

F. Hart noted that the Voter Notes do not fall under the purview of the BudCom.

J. Sherman added that he would make the Voter Notes available to the BudCom.

M. Pearson offered public thanks to T. Moore for his hard work and dedication to the budget process.

L. Lambert questioned a proposed Warrant Article that was in the packet, but discussed at a previous meeting. **P-18-08 Winter Maintenance Expendable Trust Fund Creation and Deposit**, which notes a 150% of the average cost of winter maintenance as the cap for the fund in the Voter Notes.

T. Moore noted that the Voter Notes language and the estimated cap have not yet been finalized, but the intent was to have a cap so that the fund didn’t just keep growing if it wasn’t needed.

**BUDGET REVIEW**

F. Hart noted a chart she had provided that showed the variance between the BOS approved and the BusCom approved budgets. There were eight (8) budgets listed where there is a variance between the BOS and the BudCom.

Assessing:

BudCom	\$149,307	BOS	\$150,307	Variance:	\$1,000
--------	-----------	-----	-----------	-----------	---------

It was noted that the difference between the BudCom and BOS approvals was \$9,000 for a part-time person to help in the Assessing Office and \$10,000 not funded by the BudCom in the Assessor's Contract Line.

J. DeRoche offered that since the BOS are the ones with the authority to authorize a statistical analysis he felt it was important the money be there should they decide to do so.

**★J. DeRoche moved, second by D. Heffernan to adjust line item 01-4150-30-312 by adding \$10,000 for a bottom line Assessing Department budget of \$159,307.**

J. Sherman noted that adding the money in does not mean that it will be spent. Conducting a Statistical Analysis is still up to the BOS.

D. Heffernan added that adding money for a part-time position (\$9,000) and then taking away \$10,000 from the Assessor's Contract line essentially took away the part-time position.

***There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 3-5-0 (Cafiso, Milette, Hart, Hamilton and Lambert dissenting).***

HR/Personnel

BudCom	\$2,007,174	BOS	\$2,011,174	Variance:	\$4,000
--------	-------------	-----	-------------	-----------	---------

It was noted that the variance was in an overtime line approved by the BOS, but decreased by the BudCom in favor of a part-time person who could assist in the Assessing Office. The part-time person would allow the current Assessing Clerk more time for HR/Personnel responsibilities without the need for overtime.

**★D. Heffernan moved, second by J. DeRoche to adjust line item 01-4155-00-115 by adding \$4,000 for a bottom line HR/Personnel Department budget of \$2,011,174.**

D. Heffernan noted that the number of hats worn by the current Human Resources personnel makes the overtime a little more confusing. He added that the request for the overtime was justified.

J. Sherman added that the BOS supported the request as reasonable.

B. Hamilton offered the reason behind the reduction initially was because there was going to be funding for a part-time position that would relieve the need for overtime. He added it also had nothing to do with the Statistical Analysis.

J. DeRoche asked what would happen if there was overtime.

F. Hart noted that in the past current personnel were staying and not taking overtime. She added there was an ebb and flow between the three (3) positions.

D. Heffernan reminded that they should not be considering the current personnel, but the position.

M. Pearson added that the person currently in the position makes sacrifices and does their best with time management; but they should be compensated for the time that they are putting in.

B. Hamilton suggested to eliminate the part-time Assessing Department position and restore the overtime line.

M. Pearson explained that it's not an either-or situation, the part-time position is intended to do filing for the Assessing Department, not to eliminate overtime in HR/Personnel. He added that the position is an hourly position and sometimes there is the need for overtime.

F. Hart noted that this was the first time this line is in the budget. She suggested funding it and reviewing it again next year.

S. Cafiso asked how the BOS voted on this line.

J. Sherman offered that the vote isn't tracked, it's either a yes or no.

M. Pearson added that he has seen an increase in the training available, which is all filtered through the HR/Personnel office. He also added that time is spent nights and weekends for the benefit of all.

B. Hamilton offered that he considers many of the lines based on historical usage, which cannot be done in this case. He added that adding a part-time Assessing Clerk should lessen those job responsibilities and allow that time to be focused elsewhere.

J. Sherman noted that the way to make it better is to compensate the person doing the work.

F. Hart suggested there could be a compromise on the amount.

**There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 3-5-0 (Cafiso, Milette, Hart, Hamilton, Lambert dissenting).**



**★F. Hart moved, second by L. Lambert to adjust line item 01-4155-11-115 by adding \$2,000 for a bottom line HR/Personnel Department budget of \$2,009,174. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 7-1-0 (Sherman dissenting).**

J. Sherman noted that he was dissenting because the vote was different than the BOS vote.

#### Solid Waste Disposal

BudCom	\$44,000	BOS	\$47,000	Variance:	\$3,000
--------	----------	-----	----------	-----------	---------

The variant between the BudCom and BOS approved budgets is in the overtime line for the landfill.

D. Voss noted an Environmental Fact Sheet, submitted by Highway Supervisor Dan Garlington, which notes that all operators at the landfill must be certified. This was a Parking Lot item from the last BudCom meeting.

**★D. Heffernan moved, second by J. DeRoche to adjust line item 01-4324-10-140 by adding \$3,000 for a bottom line Solid Waste Disposal Department budget of \$47,000.**

J. Sherman noted that since it has been confirmed that all personnel must be certified, the only way to work within the budget line is to reduce the hours for the landfill. He added that he felt this was a service that is much appreciated by the citizens. Plaistow is a very clean town despite there not being a lot of convenient ways to get rid of things.

D. Heffernan reminded that there have been several weather events, such as last year's microburst and other wind storms and the Wednesday evening hours at the landfill made it convenient for those who work weekends. He added that this is one service that people get a lot out of.

B. Hamilton asked if restoring the \$3,000 would mean that Wednesday nights would be fully restored.

M. Pearson replied that it would. He added that the certification of the remaining personnel would come out of the centralized training budget.

**There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 7-1-0 (Cafiso dissenting).**

#### Health

BudCom	\$81,749	BOS	\$88,749	Variance:	\$7,000
--------	----------	-----	----------	-----------	---------

The difference between the BudCom and BOS approved budgets is in the mosquito control line, specifically adulticiding.

D. Voss noted information that had been provided by Health Officer Dennise Horrocks, regarding the number of adulticiding instances since the mosquito control program began. This was a Parking Lot item from the last meeting.

F. Hart noted that in fifteen (15) years there had been six (6) instances where adulticiding was needed. She offered that this reinforced the idea to have an Expendable Trust Fund (ETF) to support adulticiding. The ETF could be replenished as needed.

J. Sherman reminded that if a Warrant Article for an ETF is rejected by the voters then “no means no” and the money would not be available if needed.

F. Hart offered that the possibility of a no vote was a flimsy excuse and fear mongering. She added that this is a health and safety issue and she felt the voters would recognize that and pass a Warrant Article.

J. Sherman asked again what would happen if the vote was a no.

F. Hart asked if there would be NHDES (New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services) money available.

D. Horrocks said that there was no State money available.

F. Hart offered that she couldn't believe that the town would vote down something that was a health and safety issue. She added that if they did she would fund it herself.

D. Heffernan added that he didn't think it was scare tactics, it was a health issue and he didn't think it was worth taking the risk of a no vote on a Warrant Article.

L. Lambert offered that when there was the microburst there was access to funds for natural disasters. She questioned if there wouldn't be funding available for this as an emergency.

M. Pearson explained that since this is a bottom line budget the money would have to come at the expense of another line in the overall budget. He reminded there was also a Warrant Article that proposes the creation of a contingency fund.

L. Lambert asked what happens to the money if it's in the budget and isn't used.

M. Pearson replied that it is returned to the General Fund.

J. Sherman added which is used to offset taxes in the nest year.

F. Hart also added that it gets calculated into the baseline budget for the next year as well. She noted with all the new and exciting things happening that will have to be paid for there is a tipping point.

B. Hamilton reminded that there was a Warrant Article for emergency plowing and he didn't see this one as much different from that one. He added that he couldn't see the voters denying this (the creation of an EFT for adulticiding), especially for the small amount of money.

**★J. DeRoche moved, second by D. Heffernan to adjust line item 01-4411-30-501 by adding \$7,000 for a bottom line Health Department budget of \$88,749.**

J. Sherman noted that BOS voted to include the money in the Operating Budget over the concern that adulticiding is a health issue and if voted down a no vote means no.

S. Cafiso offered that putting the subject matter aside, not wanting to put something into a Warrant Article because it might get voted down is circumventing the voters. He said that it's not like the town isn't going to plow if the emergency plowing Warrant Article doesn't pass.

J. Sherman offered that it did make a difference in how things are planned for.

***There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 3-5-0 (Cafiso, Milette, Hart, Hamilton, Lambert dissenting).***

**★F. Hart moved, second by L. Lambert to request the BOS to consider putting forth a Warrant Article that would create an ETF for \$7,000 for mosquito adulticiding. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 6-0-2 (Heffernan, DeRoche abstaining).**

#### Recreation

BudCom	\$187,220	BOS	\$191,220	Variance:	\$4,000
--------	-----------	-----	-----------	-----------	---------

It was noted that the difference between the BOS and BudCom budgets was \$4,000 for senior transportation

J. Sherman offered that the BOS approved a \$4,000 increase to the senior transportation.

**★J. DeRoche moved, second by D. Heffernan to adjust line item 01-4520-20-859 by adding \$4,000 for a bottom line Recreation Department budget of \$191,220.**

S. Cafiso noted that this was higher than the Recreation Department's original request in that line. He questioned where the increase came from.

Christina Cruz, Recreation Director, replied that it was brought up at an Elder Affairs meeting after the department budget had already been submitted.

J. DeRoche noted the history of the line to be much higher than the current request so the line was being used.

***There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 7-1-0 (Hamilton dissenting).***

Patriotic/Cultural

BudCom \$23,000                      BOS \$25,500                      Variance: \$2,500

The difference between the BudCom and BOS approved budgets is the Events and Activities line, specifically related to Old Home Day.

F. Hart suggested the discussion on this line be tabled until there is a decision on the BOS donation policy.

J. Sherman noted that the BOS has decided to continue the discussion on the policy.

B. Hamilton asked if the current policy did not allow for the solicitation of donations.

J. Sherman responded except by Department Heads.

B. Hamilton suggested that a policy needed to be created to allow for the sponsorship. He noted that other towns solicit sponsorships, citing a recent write-up about another community in the Carriage Towne News.

J. Sherman offered that they are reviewing the policy and taking the discussion at the BudCom meetings into consideration.

J. DeRoche questioned how long it would take to put a new policy in place. He reminded that these are volunteers who all donate their time. He offered that Old Home Day is an event that the whole town enjoys and he suggested that the budget be funded and reviewed if a new policy is put in place.

D. Heffernan noted that the Lions Club used to run the parade for Old Home Day, he asked where the money came from for that.

J. DeRoche replied that it was from the Town; the Lions Club were given a budget for the parade.

F. Hart asked if the Lions Club is still doing the parade.

J. DeRoche answered that last year the parade was put together by the YMCA.

B. Hamilton offered that he was not saying that volunteers should be required to solicit for donations, but that there should be a policy in place that allows for donations.

L. Lambert suggested the policy not be rushed. She offered the policy should be in place, it shouldn't be assumed that there will be a policy.

D. Heffernan added that finding volunteers from the community is a struggle of its own. It's always the same people doing the work.

**★J. DeRoche moved, second by D. Heffernan to adjust line item 01-4589-10-855 by adding \$2,500 for a bottom line Patriotic/Cultural budget of \$25,500. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 3-5-0 (Cafiso, Milette, Hart, Hamilton, Lambert dissenting).**

**★D. Heffernan moved, second by J. DeRoche to adjust 01-4311-00-140 by adding \$2,000 and adding \$2,000 in a line to be determined for the Cemetery Maintenance for a bottom line Highway Department budget of \$833,045.**

F. Hart questioned if the Cemetery maintenance was supposed to be self-sustaining.

M. Pearson explained that of the money paid for care at the time a plot is purchased, only the interest can be used to but the grass. He added that there has never been money to repair stones or fencing or any other type of maintenance.

F. Hart asked if there was a path to access the money someday.

M. Pearson replied that there was no way, that the State law only allows for mowing. He added that the Warrant Article for perpetual care does not access these funds.

***There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-2-2 (Cafiso, Hamilton dissenting; Milette, Hart abstaining).***

D. Heffernan asked when the RSMS (Road Surface Management System) would be discussed by the BOS.

J. Sherman noted that it was on their agenda for the next meeting, but the representative was not available. D. Garlington is working on negotiating a new date.

D. Garlington offered that he was hoping for the last part of December.

D. Heffernan asked if the paving line of the Highway budget would be affected.

J. Sherman replied that would be an issue of timing.

#### Police

BudCom	\$2,045,880	BOS	\$2,054,440	Variance:	\$8,164
--------	-------------	-----	-------------	-----------	---------

It was noted that the delta between the BudCom and BOS approved budgets is in the prosecutor line.

Kathleen Jones, Police Chief, noted that the prosecutor used to be shared by five (5) towns, two (2) of which have backed out. The prosecutor is assigned to the region by the County Attorney's Office. The former prosecutor has returned to duties at Rockingham County and the new assignee is provided at a lower cost. However, because of the two (2) towns, Atkinson and Hampstead, dropping out it has increased the cost to the remaining three (3) towns, which are Plaistow, Kingston and Danville. K. Jones noted having the prosecutor in house has been invaluable to the successful prosecution of cases for the Department.

F. Hart asked why the other towns had dropped out.

K. Jones offered that it was her understanding that they chose to go with a private attorney.

K. Jones noted that Plaistow averages approximately 600 cases a year, which has increased slightly over the last three (3) years.

There was discussion about doing a cost analysis to see if Plaistow would benefit from a private attorney as their prosecutor. There was also discussion about other staff picking up cases. It was noted that they do handle their own traffic cases. It was noted that the three (3) towns sharing the prosecutor pay a percentage of the salary based on the number of cases they have. It was noted that many towns have now gone to a private attorney, even if that attorney is shared between towns.

K. Jones suggested that they could not have a cost analysis done in time for this budget. She suggested that the prosecutor be funded for the next year and allow the time for a cost analysis to be completed. K. Jones added that she did not want to have the quality of the prosecutions affected by the decision to stay with the County or to go with a private attorney.

F. Hart asked if the proposed number for the prosecutor was definitive. It was confirmed that it was.

J. DeRoche asked what happens if there isn't a prosecutor.

K. Jones replied that there would be some very unhappy victims.

There was more discussion about participation in the County system. It was noted that if someone drops out then the salary is absorbed by the remaining participants.

K. Jones offered that she would be sending out an RFP to get a better idea of what other towns are paying for costs so that she will have a better number for budgeting.

F. Hart suggested that the contract costs are what they are and there may be little choice but to fund the line.

K. Jones reiterated that having an attorney who sits in the building and is available to review search warrants, affidavits and the like for felony cases has been a huge benefit and difficult to put a financial number to.

**★J. DeRoche moved, second by L. Lambert to adjust 01-4210-10-120 by adding \$8,164 and for a bottom line Police Department budget of \$2,054,440. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 8-0-0 U/A.**

D. Heffernan offer that he would like to suggest a change to the Government Building budget considering recent discussions regarding the maintenance of the new Police Station and renovated Fire Station.

**★D. Heffernan moved, second by J. DeRoche to adjust 01-4194-20-430 by adding \$2,500 for a bottom line Government Buildings Department budget of \$262,784.**

D. Heffernan recalled the discussion regarding all the new systems and offered that maintaining the Town's investment justified an increase.

***There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 2-5-1 (Cafiso, Milette, Hart, Hamilton dissenting, Sherman abstaining).***

There as discussion about the Library and the shift in the property and liability insurance premiums. It was noted that their apportionment wasn't property assessed to them. It was also noted that there has been an increase in premiums as well.

J. DeRoche offered that he has spoken with Cab Vinton, Library Director, and has had his questions about a single full-time position versus two (2) part-time employees answered. He added the Library is also considering a Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) to save more money.

M. Pearson noted that the Library doesn't have the same health insurance as the rest of the Town's employees.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Public Safety Complex Building Committee (PSCBC)**

D. Heffernan reported that the Committee will be meeting the next day (Wednesday, December 6).

### **Highway Garage Committee**

Discussed previously in the meeting.

### **Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)**

No report

### **Town Report Committee (TRC)**

No report

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Parking Lot**

All Parking Lot items have been addressed and an updated spreadsheet provided to the members.



## **NEW BUSINESS**

The BudCom was advised to pencil in January 9, 2018 for a potential meeting date in case there are any matters that come up prior to the public hearing.

It was noted that the Budget Committee Public Hearing will be on January 16, 2018. There will be a meeting starting at 6:00PM for any last-minute items and the Public Hearing will begin at 6:30PM. The BOS will be in attendance and will maintain their own minutes in case they need to vote on anything that might change at the Public Hearing. It was noted that January 25, 2018 is the last day for the BudCom to deliver their budget to the BOS. It was also noted that the Default Budget is not yet ready.

M. Pearson offered that he let the BOS know that there are some items still out there that still may be coming, such as the Town Hall computer system, the system has been converted from a single-server to three (3) servers, Town Hall, Police Department and Fire Department. The costs will be split out between the three (3) departments.

There was also discussion regarding the landfill and the puddling that needs to be per a NHDES requirement. The cost is approximately \$60,000.

There was discussion regarding the confusion between the Water Department budget and the Fire Suppression system when it's the water system.

M. Pearson noted that the potable water system would be an independent enterprise.

B. Hamilton asked if the BudCom would have anything to do with that enterprise.

M. Pearson explained that if there is a discussion to do a debt service enterprise fund the BudCom would be part of the discussion, but that would have no impact on taxes. He added that it is not part of the Operating Budget, but shows up in certain budgets for DRA (Department of Revenue Administration) purposes.

There was discussion about net appropriations and how they are reported. J. Sherman noted that they are all listed in the Town Report. F. Hart noted that the Highway Block Grant has always been approved by the voters.

There was no additional business before the Committee and the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Dee Voss  
Recording Secretary