Present: Jim Morris, Paul Bartoswicz, Leo Racine, Dave Strauss, Mellisa Seamans & Jory Augenti Excused:

Absent:

Select Board (SB) Present: John Meisner (Budget Rep.), Henry Spenser, Lenny Espie Other(s) Present: Police, Chief (PC) T. Butts, SGT A. Sacco. Library M. Spenser, E. Jones.

| 1. Meeting | | Called to order 6:30 p.m. |
|----------------|--------------|---|
| 2. Approval | Motion | Approve minutes of 10/24/17. |
| | | Noted the price for Freon units and appliances were reversed. |
| | | Corrected error. |
| | | Second |
| | | Majority approved |
| 3. Budget | Discussion | Covered the desired procedure of obtaining the budgets from |
| Committee | | the SelectBoard (SB). |
| | | Noted the Library and Town Clerk budgets are independent of |
| | | the SB budget. It was stated that the SB is responsible for the |
| | | complete town budget and the town votes on the budget as one |
| | | warrant article. |
| | | The SB rep. covered how the SB reviews budgets. |
| | | It was decided that the Budget Committee (BC) would try to |
| | | be more PRO active in having the SB review all budgets prior |
| | | to being submitted to the BC. |
| 4. Dog Officer | Motion | To accept the \$500 budget for discussion. Second |
| budget | | |
| | Discussion | Question about the amount of canines the department has |
| | | handled to date? PC explained that they have handled 10 |
| | | cases. |
| | | |
| | | Question on income derived from services? PC noted that they |
| | | do receive any. |
| | | |
| | | Question how captured canines are handled? PC covered that |
| | | attempts are made to return them to the owner and if that |
| | | cannot be done they are turned over to the humane society. |
| | | |
| | Motion | To accept budget as submitted. Second |
| | | |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-yes/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-yes |
| | | Jory A-yes/John M-yes |
| | | |
| | | Motion passes 7-0 |
| 5. Police | Motion | To accept the submitted budget minus salaries for discussion. |
| budget | | Second |
| | | |
| | | |

| 5. Police budget continued | Discussion | Question on the difference between equipment purchases and protective gear line items. PC detailed that equipment covered items such as Tasers, ammo and pepper spray. Protective gear purchases were for items such as vests and uniforms. Question on budgeted 3K for cruiser expenses and if it was sufficient? PC detailed the line item and explained he felt the amount was sufficient. Question on how the 3 rd cruiser was used and stored? PC covered his logic on how using the 3 rd cruiser was cost effective. He noted it is used primarily by the part time officers and most times stored in town when not in use. Question about long term plans for having a 3 rd cruiser? It was noted the BC had not budgeted for a 3 rd cruiser in last year's budget and had not planned on increasing the Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) for cruiser purchase. PC stated that they do not plan on having a 3 rd cruiser once usage of this one ends. Question on the hours per week provided? PC stated two 40 hour positions with 16 hours of part time. Question on the hours per week provided? PC explained that even though the price seemed stable and lower than last year right now he felt keeping it at the high price per gallon was prudent. Question on amount of Secretary hours? PC stated it is 6 hours per week. Public Question on amount of road coverage the town receives for the hours stated? PC stated that he did not meet most of the grant requirements. |
|----------------------------------|------------|---|
|----------------------------------|------------|---|

| 5 D 1 | D | |
|---------------------|--------------|---|
| 5. Police budget | Discussion | It was noted that the submitted budget total for the Police did not include Retirement/ CRF/Expendable Trust |
| continued | | Fund/Insurance or building maintenance costs. Therefore the |
| continueu | | true cost of our police department was not reflected. |
| | | the cost of our ponce department was not reflected. |
| | Motion | To accept \$25,140 budget minus salaries. Second |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-yes/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-yes Jory A-yes/John M-yes |
| | | Motion passes 7-0 |
| 6. Library | Motion | To accept the \$59,595.00 budget for discussion. Second |
| budget | | |
| | Discussion | Question on why salaries are increased using a town |
| | | comparison? It was noted that last year the submitted budget |
| | | had salaries greatly increased using the submitted comparison |
| | | of towns. Library Rep. (LR) stated that even though it had been done last year the board felt (by majority vote) to readjust |
| | | the salaries again this year. |
| | | the satures again this year. |
| | | It was stated that using a town comparison should not be the |
| | | only factor in determining salary. Factors such as |
| | | retention/location/towns ability to pay and usage need to be |
| | | considered. |
| | | |
| | | Question if the Library had done an analysis on resident to |
| | | non-resident usage? LR stated they have approximately 250 |
| | | people use the library a month and on file they have 750 card |
| | | holders. They felt the non-resident usage was low but did not |
| | | have numbers to present to the BC. If the BC desired this data |
| | | they stated it could obtained from the library. |
| | | It was requested the library provide resident/non-resident data for future budget submittals as it was important for the |
| | | residents of the town to know the library's population usage. |
| | | |
| | | Question if the library had looked at charging non-residents |
| | | for library cards like Wolfeboro does? LR stated they had |
| | | looked at this and felt it was not a policy they wanted to enter |
| | | into. |
| | | BC member detailed their support for the library and falt the |
| | | BC member detailed their support for the library and felt the wage comparison to the submitted salary request was not |
| | | sufficient. |
| | | |
| | | |

| 6. Library budget continued | Motion | To amend the library budget from \$59,595.00 to \$63,322.00. NO second. |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---|
| | Discussion | Question on where the proposed increase would have been used? The librarian would have increased \$3/hr and the Assistant librarian would have increased \$1.50/hr. |
| | | Question on why the Assistant was receiving a \$15/year raise and the Librarian a \$1377/year increase? LR stated the board had looked at the wage comparison and education to determine the requested increases. |
| | | Question on hours provided? LR stated the doors are open to the public for 24 hours a week and 2 additional hours a week are provided for administrative duties. Two people 30 hours per week. |
| | | Question on how to handle the line item requesting \$2000 for the CRF? It was determined that it will be addressed at the SB budget. |
| | Motion | To amend the \$59,595.00 budget to \$59,072.50. |
| | Discussion | Second Providing a 2% raise to both employees was the logic for the budget adjustment. It was stated that the BC could not dictate how to reduce specific line items. It was pointed out the adjustment was the bottom line only and just the logic for the adjustment was provided. |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-yes/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-no Jory A-no/John M-yes |
| | | Motion passes 5-2 |
| | Motion | To accept \$59,072.50 budget. Second |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-yes/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-no Jory A-no/John M-yes |
| | | Motion passes 5-2 |
| 7. SB road Budget | Motion | To accept the submitted budget for discussion. Second |
| Buuger | Discussion | SB chair covered the employee raise unwritten policy. |

| 7 (D) 1 | D' ' | |
|---------------------|--------------|--|
| 7.SB road Budget | Discussion | Question If the submitted budget was for all of 4312? It was noted that the 4312 did not have a total expense line item. |
| continued | | Question on the amount of road that will be completed for the requested \$217,500. SB chair detailed the paving plan for Green Mountain road which was derived from previous SB plans and the UNH study. This would be a 4 year plan to complete all of Green Mountain road and require at least the requested amount each year. It was also noted that \$7500 of this total was budgeted for crack sealing. |
| | | It was debated if the town could afford the \$200K plus increase each year. SB chair noted that roads are multiple years behind on the maintenance schedule and he envisions that they will be requesting at least this total each year forward in order to maintain our paved roads. He also stated that now that the bridges have been funded it is time to address the roads. |
| | | Question on Granite road bridge not being funded? SB chair detailed that the board was looking into how to proceed with that project but had not come to a consensus. |
| | | Question if the SB had considered a bond to do the Green Mountain road project as this would spread the cost? SB chair noted that even if they did go for a bond it would be for the project length (4 years) and they would be requesting similar amounts for each subsequent year. He was also concerned about the town carrying debt so he did not see a value in doing this. |
| | | It was Suggested that the paved road resurfacing & repair road amount of \$217,500 be brought forward to the voters via a warrant article. SB and BC agreed with this suggestion. |
| | Motion | To accept budget 4312 for \$500,500.00 minus paved road resurfacing & repair road amount of \$217,500. Second |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-yes/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-yes Jory A-yes/John M-yes |
| | | Motion passes 7-0 |
| | Discussion | A suggestion was made to review and approved SB submitted budget 4316 street lighting totaling \$7500.00. |

| 7.SB road Budget | Motion | To accept the submitted budget for discussion. Second |
|---------------------|----------------|--|
| continued | Discussion | Debated the value of street lighting and amount of street lights the town has. |
| | Motion | To accept \$7,500.00 budget. Second |
| | Motion Vote: | Jim M- yes /Paul B-yes/Leo R-no/Dave S-yes/Mellisa S-yes Jory A-no/John M-yes |
| | | Motion passes 5-2 |
| Adjournment | Motion | To Adjourn. Second |
| | | Majority approved |
| | | Adjourned at 8:10 p.m. |
| Next Meeting | November 14, | Welfare Officer and Transfer station will be discussed. Any |
| | 2017 6:30 p.m. | other business which may arise. |