

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE  
January 30, 2012**

A meeting of the Municipal Budget Committee was called to order at 6:30 PM in the Professional Development Room at Kennett Middle School with the following members present: Chairman David Sordi, Doug Swett, Dick Klement, Betty Loynd, Bill Marvel, Ted Sares, Maureen Seavey, Ray Shakir, Greydon Turner, Joe Mosca, Mike DiGregorio, John Edgerton, Brian Charles, Karen Umberger, Danielle Santuccio and Maury McKinney. Excused: Kelly DeFeo. Also present: Earl Sires, Lucy Philbrick, Paul DegliAngeli, Library Trustee Linda Fox Phillips, Library Treasurer Linda Hutchins, Police Commissioner Theresa Kennett, Police Commissioner Rodney King, Police Commissioner Dave Doherty, Chief Wagner, Lt. Chris Perley and other members of the public.

Maureen Seavey led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Sordi stated members should have two documents in front of them; one being the Agenda for tonight's meeting with a list of documents on the backside and the other documents are the non-profit budget presentations that we will be going through on Saturday. First up tonight, we are going to go through the Minutes that need to be voted on.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Ted Sares moved, seconded by Betty Loynd, to consider and accept the Minutes of January 4, 2012. In favor: 16; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.**

**Betty Loynd moved, seconded by Ted Sares, to consider and accept the Preliminary Minutes of January 11, 2012. In favor: 15; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1 - Bill Marvel.**

**Ted Sares moved, seconded by Betty Loynd, to consider and accept the Preliminary Minutes of January 18, 2012. In favor: 14; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 2 - David Sordi and Danielle Santuccio.**

Chairman Sordi stated the next meeting will be Saturday morning at Town Hall for the non-profits starting at 9:00 AM. We will not be voting on any Minutes then. Next Monday night we will go through at least the final Minutes for January 11<sup>th</sup> and the Preliminary Minutes for January 25<sup>th</sup> which you got in the last few days.

LIBRARY

Bill Marvel stated his question arose when he picked up their final Budget last week and noticed that the Library had overspent its Budget in spite of about \$8,000.00 in over budgeting for fuel and electricity and basically he was wondering how that was justified.

Linda Fox Phillips, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, stated first she wanted to comment that Linda (Hutchins) and she are members of the Trustees and are here in part because Tara (Thomas) the Head Librarian is in the hospital, she had an emergency appendectomy last Friday. They

believe they are going to be able to respond to all questions, but are sort of handicapped by her absence. They had a bad year for the building starting with ice dams, they had damage on several different levels, some of it to the electrical system and had to have folks come up. Ice dams were an issue last winter for a lot of buildings, both public and private. They also had problems with the heating system, cooling system and the technology system. In the last several years they have been trying to work with a bare bones Budget. A couple years back, as you may recall, the Selectmen reduced their Budget and for the most part if you look at the last 3 years since Tara has been with them, they are at net zero, but this most recent year ending December 31<sup>st</sup> they did have an overage. Most of them were unforeseen maintenance and repair issues.

Bill Marvel stated he did notice that exactly half of their line items were overspent including Adult Books, Children's Books, Adult Periodicals, Electronic Materials and Supplies, most of which seem to be discretionary and some of that was spent after we got the 11 month accrual at the last meeting and if those discretionary items had not been overspent, you wouldn't have overspent your Budget in spite of the maintenance problems.

Linda Fox Phillips stated she believed the Collection items had previously been spent. They purchase a lot of the Collections in the late Spring anticipating their Summer Reading Programs. This past year their Summer Reading included pre-readers, Elementary School, Junior High as well as Adults and this year they set an all time record with Children and Teens reading 261,000 minutes this Summer time. They buy the bulk of those things that are in the Collections prior to that. Tara (Thomas) is also responsive to patrons who come in and if there's a book that their Collection does not have and it's not in the State Library system, for those of you who don't routinely take out books, if Conway Public Library does not have a book, but it's in either the University system or the system of Public Libraries, they generally can get it for them within a week to 10 days, but sometimes patrons have a strong interest and really want to read something that's not available or other Libraries are not yet ready to loan it out because it's a recent publication and in those instances she will obtain a copy for our Collection.

Bill Marvell stated if you look at the Adult Books and the amount spent as of November, where you've already overspent Adult Books, another \$1,000.00 was overspent since then, not at the first of the year but at the end of the year. He wasn't quick enough to see how many other items were overspent even further in the last month. It just seems like you already know that you're over budget and just keep going. He wondered why the Library hadn't been over budget when he was on so he didn't notice this, but he did a quick check, not very quick actually, back 25 years and he found that for most of that time from 1987 to 2005 the Library never overspent its Budget except once by \$500.00.

Linda Fox Phillips stated that actually was not accurate because they researched it also. Bill Marvel stated it was from the Town Reports. From 2005 to the present, starting in 2005 you went over \$12,000.00, then \$5,400.00 the next year, then 4 years when you were not over and then over again. These are the amounts that the Library was under, one time as much as \$62,000.00 in 1999. Ms. Phillips agreed with 1999. Bill stated in

2004 you were under \$7,700.00, 2003 \$5,900.00, 2002 you were over \$519.00. It just seems like after 20 years almost of not going over, now it's almost a habit and he remembers when he was a Trustee that the argument used to be that because we decide the raises in September and they're retroactive, it's the wages that take you over and, in fact, in 2005 and 2006 it was the wages. This year it's partly wages, but it's a number of other items that were, as he said, discretionary.

Ted Sares stated he didn't know if it was okay for him to comment and he asked the group if they have any problems with him commenting because he's a Trustee. If anybody has a problem, please don't hesitate to let him know and he'll shut up. He thought that part of the problem has been the manner in which the last wages have been paid in that they were earned, and correct him if he is wrong, but they were earned in one calendar year and paid in the next or maybe in one fiscal year and paid in the next and it registers as kind of an overage when in fact it's not. He doesn't know, maybe it is. He thought they were going to check that out and see if there's been a history of that.

Linda Fox Phillips stated in looking at the pattern you'll notice that several of those years where their budget wasn't accurate was shortly after they doubled the square footage of the Library. Ted Sares stated that wasn't exactly what he said. Ms. Phillips stated that's part of it. Ted stated what he was talking about is the payment of wages at the end of the year. Ms. Phillips stated when they vote on the raises, they are effective for the entire year and it's an odd system. It was established under Margaret's leadership and to date they have not been able to totally resolve that issue. Ted stated but it runs contrary to normal accounting practices which punishes the Library and therefore created an overage this year. Ms. Phillips stated part of the overage this year, and Bill (Marvel) is correct, a lot of it is in Maintenance and Repairs and some of it was in the Collections. It's a combination of things. Ted stated he stands corrected and Bill's correct, they were over.

Chairman Sordi stated out of curiosity, how do you fund budget overages. Linda Fox Phillips stated they are one of the programs within the Town and as Bill (Marvel) correctly points out, most years they have been under. In any given year, there are departments that are over and under and her understanding for the year as a whole the Town is under. They cover one another, not literally and she asked Earl Sires if she was correct.

Earl Sires stated to be honest he was having a little trouble following the discussion with the blower going back where he was sitting. Linda Fox Phillips told Earl that it was asked how they covered their overage this year and she stated as one of the departments in the Town since other departments were under this year they balance off one another. Earl stated that's typically what's gone on and he had hoped to talk a little bit later about how they ended up overall. Something like that, just as they were concerned about the Police Department earlier in the year, they got to keep an eye on these things and it can be a problem if the overall bottom line is exceeded. The Library is a little different than the Police in terms of their statutory authority, but usually it works out and it is going to work out this year as well.

Chairman Sordi stated then the overage isn't coming out of the Library Endowment or the donation. Ted Sares stated no. Linda Fox Phillips stated the Town as a whole.

Ray Shakir stated in light of current technology and the rate of which technology is expanding, isn't it conceivable that you can both expand your function and at the same time consolidate your physical presence. Linda Fox Phillips asked what Ray was meaning. Ray stated meaning the physical structures with buildings and personnel, etc. can all be consolidated with electronic equipment, couldn't it. Ms. Phillips stated short answer no; in the last calendar year they had 105,000 visits to the Library. Even though technology has been a significant improvement for people to be able to access information, if you look at the wages of folks in this Valley, according to the UNH Study of Livable Wage, over half the wage earners in the Valley are working poor. They do not have sufficient funds to be able to access the Internet from their homes and if you look at the utilization patterns of the computers that they have to give folks Internet access, they're in constant usage to the point where when there's a waiting line, people have one-half hour to work on the computers and there's waves that come in the Library all day long. There generally is a line of folks waiting to get in at 10:00 in the morning or their opening time and it continues and then after school. For example, Conway El and she hasn't seen the data this year, but most years 52% of the kids qualify for federally subsidized lunches because their parents' income is such that they are below 200% of poverty. Youngsters come flooding into the Library after school to use the resources of the Library. In addition to that, if you look at the number of programs that they have in a given year, they had last year 528 programs with over 7,700 participants and that includes things like there was a presentation on the Redstone Quarries and then a walk over there so that the folks giving the presentation could actually show folks what they were talking about. The participation this year in the One Book/One Valley was record setting. They had several events scheduled at the Library.

Linda Fox Phillips stated she didn't see them needing less space. Part of the Library, as you probably know, in the downstairs is where they do their cataloguing, their book repair and a variety of sort of non-public areas. The Henney History Room for anyone who has used it to look at genealogy, is overflowing. They have too many materials for the space dedicated to it and they do have a committee with a member of the Board of Trustees on that Committee, trying to study how best to use the space because the Henney History Room is so over crowded. They are digitalizing a lot of it so now a lot of folks who are on-line can do some of the research, but the original maps and those things they are going to keep and treasure because they're several hundred years old. Ray Shakir stated they can all be put on disks. Bill Marvel stated some of them have. Ms. Phillips stated many of them have been digitalized, but many people also want them to keep those.

Ted Sares stated he kind of interpreted Ray's (Shakir) question a little differently and he was reading *The New York Times* business section and the headline is *The Bookstores Last Stand* because of Amazon and some other things. As technology evolves, the fate of a Library comes into question, not saying that it's fate is doomed, but the traditional Library may become different than what we know it as because of

technology. He is a 100% believer in that; however, as a Trustee others don't share his view but he does think the future of a Library will be to reduce rather than expand technologically speaking.

Linda Fox Phillips stated as one of those folks that on occasion disagrees with Ted (Sares), there's been some very interesting research on the different ability of college students to retain information they've read using a Kindle or an iPad as contrast with literally holding the book. What they're seeing is the students do not retain the information as well when they are reading it using one of the electronic devices as contrasted with actually reading a book and it has to do with the way the brain stores information and input can aesthetically as well as visually in terms of reading the words. Ted stated tell that to Borders.

Mike DiGregorio stated he thought Ted (Sares) was correct in that changes are coming for libraries and probably one of the biggest ones is the use of free libraries. In 1963, as most probably know, there was a law passed that said each town will provide a free library for its citizens, but during that time frame there was no Internet, there wasn't all of the things that we have today. His guess is what will probably be the biggest change going forward is whether it should be free or not. We're upwards of almost \$500,000.00 here in Conway on a Library and as you point out often there's a 100,000+ user or events that take place over there so really he'll let them decide the fee structure later on, that's not what he wants to get into tonight.

Mike DiGregorio stated what he wanted to talk about tonight was the mention of some damage to the building, some ice stuff and obviously that had to be early in 2011 or late 2010. Linda Fox Phillips stated early 2011. Mike stated Bill (Marvel) brings up a very valid point that if that damage took place early in the year, why didn't the Trustees start looking at what their expenditures were just like they've asked the Police Department and the Commissioners to make sure that they're not expending early in the year to keep an eye on that because the Town is not a cushion for these other departments. We all put the budgets together and expect you to come in at level or hopefully with a little bit left over. If Bill is correct on his time line and you knew you had these problems early on that you overspent, why wasn't the budget looked at a little bit closely during the year to try to skimp and save.

Linda Fox Phillips stated the damage from the ice damage is one of about five events in the course of the year that pushed the Maintenance and Repair items over. They do monitor their Budget on a monthly basis; they have reports from both the Town and then the portions that they pay for postage and the copier and they do watch it closely. This year they are over by just over 1%, most years they come in under. If you look at their track record, most years and she wouldn't include the anomaly, they had two odd years for budgeting the end of last century where they were way under, like \$60,000.00 under; most years they are within a few thousand over or under and they do watch it closely.

Chairman Sordi asked Mike Digregorio if he was all set and Mike stated he thought he got his point across that the Selectmen expect other

departments to watch their Budget very closely. They have to and he just thinks everybody knows that.

Dick Klement stated given that you had some unanticipated maintenance issues, did you continue to spend money on Collections after you knew you were already going to be in the red. Linda Fox Phillips stated they didn't know they were going to be in the red; they did not anticipate being in the red even at the end of November. It wasn't like they spent \$30,000.00 in January that was way over, it was bits and pieces throughout the year. Dick stated as he sees what he is looking at dated 12/14 which is probably the end of November, you overspent your Collections by almost \$3,000.00. Regardless of whether you had maintenance issues, you overspent that line item and they need to tend to that a little more he thought.

Bill Marvel stated not only that but in the last two weeks another \$1,000.00 was overspent in Collections. He just wanted to point out that the Police, the Highway Department and the School all of which have much more frustrating contingencies to deal with outside of their control, since 2005 the Police have under spent their Budget by \$4.50 to every dollar that they've overspent; the Highway Department has under spent by \$2.00 for every time they've overspent a dollar; even the School has returned \$7.50 for every dollar that they've overspent when they overspent. The Library is just about even.

Ted Sares stated in support of the Library, being just about even is not bad. There's nothing wrong with that, budgetarily speaking that's fine. Bill Marvel stated he understood that but his comment was in response to most of the time we're under. Ted stated it was comparative. Bill stated that may be, but when we're over we spend it all.

Chairman Sordi thanked Linda Fox Phillips and Linda Hutchins for coming in and asked that they wish the Committee's best to Tara (Thomas) and hope that she is back on her feet soon. Linda Fox Phillips stated they hoped to see her within the next few days.

#### POLICE DEPARTMENT

Ted Sares stated he had two questions of the Police and then he is fine with their Budget. On D.A.R.E., as he looks at budget line items he always sees them in this economy as musts rather than wants. There are things we must have versus things that we would like to have. Therefore, it seems to him and also based on Bill's (Marvel) salient points last time that maybe a Warrant Article would be more appropriate for D.A.R.E. He was going to talk about Tele-Talk but they're defective, Tele-Talk is defective and he won't. D.A.R.E. is one of those subjective things that if you ask 10 people your liable to get 10 different answers or 5 might be for and 5 might be against or 3 might say what is it and why do we need it. Therefore, he didn't think it was a must. He didn't think it was something that we have to have. Did we have it last year? Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated yes. Ted stated he just doesn't see it as a must item, he sees it as a Warrant Article which people could vote for and this group could recommend it and it gets voted for.

Ted Sares stated the second item was much more important which was the one on budgeting for the amount of money that would be incurred if somebody retired early or quit or so forth. He would be very much for that even recognizing Karen's (Umberger) objections because you're betting on something that might or might not happen. If you can show empirical evidence over a 5 year period that indicates that that's occurred because if it's occurred 5 times or if it's occurred 4 out of 5 times, it's likely to occur a 6<sup>th</sup> time. Therefore, from a budgetary perspective, he would support it if you can show that. Otherwise it's kind of like throwing it out there.

Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated to take Ted's (Sares) second question first, the last two years they have experienced that. Prior to the last two years, their work force was, she would say, more stable in that they had very few resignations. What they are doing now is hiring younger people who are more mobile so what they are saying is that the last two years it was very painful for them to suck that up because their Budget line items were very, very lean and so that's why this year, so that they do not have to reduce their force in order to not overspend their budget, they have decided to put that in there from their last two years of experience.

Ted Sares asked if the amount they are budgeting close to what it cost. Commissioner Rodney King stated 2009/2010, 2009 they paid out \$17,000.00, 2010 they paid out \$28,000.00 and in 2011 they paid out \$45,000.00 and they have one retirement that they know of which is \$30,000.00 of the money they are asking for and the other \$35,000.00 would be returned as long as no one leaves that they have to pay out on. He understands Ted wanted a few more years, but the best he could do was this and you can definitely see that there's been a huge increase and it definitely hurts the overall morale of the Department because basically they are down as much as two people all year to try and run a business. Ted stated it satisfied him personally.

Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated in terms of Ted's (Sares) first question, she just wanted to say that if they put D.A.R.E. on a Warrant Article the feeling is that they are saying "we're not sure if it's important, why don't you tell us" and she believed that Lt. Perley gave a very good description of why they feel it is important so that's why it's not on a Warrant Article. Ted stated he would back off, but he had to tell them that it's not a must item. Under no circumstances from a budgetary perspective is D.A.R.E. a must item. There's no way in the world that they can convince him of that, but he will back off because to be against D.A.R.E. and have that be against the entire Budget would be unfair. He's pro-Budget for the Police.

Bill Marvel stated to Commissioner Rodney King that Mr. King stated he knows they are going to have to spend \$30,000.00; aren't we running out of officers that can retire. Commissioner King stated he thought that too being the new Commissioner, but they aren't close to running out of officers and there's quite a few still with lengthy time here. Bill stated his opinion is that if you know your going to have an expense, you should budget for it, but that you should not budget for something that might happen or might not. Commissioner King stated he totally understood that and being the new Commissioner, all he could say is that the Budget

is so lean that he didn't understand why he has to go ask the Town to bail him out of some situation that really he knows could exist. He guessed that he could be penalized next year if he spends that money, but if he returns the money like he says they are going to do, then all he is really asking to do is that in November you don't say the Police Department overspent by \$35,000.00 because an Officer left. If one leaves in November, he really can't recoup that money. He can't even begin to get that money back. They were lucky this year when an Officer left in April, they were able to not hire an Officer all the way until July or actually August was when the first one came on and they were able to recoup that \$45,000.00, that's the only reason they were able to bring that back in line. Otherwise, they would be standing here in front of the Committee saying that they had overspent by \$45,000.00. Bill stated if we can hold the Library in line we might have that money.

Karen Umberger asked if they were going to stay around until we do the Warrant Articles because there are several Police Warrant Articles that she thought needed to be discussed and she would think that we should take care of them at that time. Chairman Sordi asked the Commissioners to stick around. Karen stated she did have some questions. You currently have 22 Officers on staff. Commissioner Rodney King stated they have 21 Officers with 1 opening. Karen stated plus you're asking for an additional person in the Budget. Commissioner King stated he believed it was in the Warrant Article. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated there's not an additional person in the Budget, in the General Budget. Karen stated she was sorry, she thought there was.

Karen Umberger stated when you budgeted for this person, how many months on board did you budget for. Commissioner Rodney King stated half a year; they won't hire him until July. Karen stated the vacancy is for half a year. Commissioner King stated no, the vacancy is for the full year. They haven't filled the position yet. Karen stated you've only budgeted for half a year for the vacancy. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated in the special Warrant Article. Karen stated in the Budget number. Commissioner King stated it was for a full year. Karen stated her question is what is the anticipated time of hire for that particular person. Commissioner King stated they are actually doing their research now and hope to have a candidate sometime in February. Karen asked a candidate or on board. Commissioner King stated it's not quite that simple. Let's put it this way: hopefully they'll be working for us before the end of February.

Karen Umberger stated on the Prosecutor's salary, she knows that when she asked the question earlier you came back and said that the Prosecutor is more experienced in handling cases and therefore she deserves all of this. Did you do any sort of a go around the community to see what lawyers were earning when you initially established the salary and whether or not their incomes have risen at the rate that this particular person has or was this just (hands in the air).

Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated in terms of research that is not in the public arena, she did not believe that research was done. Chief Wagner stated they didn't ask private lawyers or different law firms. What they did was call the 30 towns that are in their 30-Town Survey, the same way they do Police and Dispatch and everybody else, and determined



what their Prosecutors were making at that point and they hired her at around the average of what the other towns were doing.

Karen Umberger stated with the hiring of the Prosecutor, it says that your case load was between 800 and 900 prosecutions per year and are we seeing a change in the number of people that are being prosecuted or the argument she assumes was that the Police Officer that had been doing the prosecution didn't have time to do everything he needed to do so we needed to hire a Prosecutor so that we could do a better job of finding the guilty people.

Chief Wagner stated he thought what they were saying was that you can't compare a person that has gone to Law School with a Policeman that goes to Prosecution School for two weeks. The lawyer is much more able to look at a case that may be a simple Operating After Suspension or something simple, whatever that may be, and is more easily able to prosecute that case without having to spend hours studying the case and writing down their questions to ask the Judge and he thought that was what they were saying. They had two people doing what the one Prosecutor is doing now.

Karen Umberger stated so you're saying that it is speedier justice is what you have gained by hiring the Prosecutor. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated she thought they were saying it's more efficient justice. Commissioner David Doherty stated it's cheaper too; they had two full-time Officers in there. Danielle Santuccio stated that was only for one year, right. Chief Wagner stated he thought it was closer to two. Ms. Santuccio stated she knew that Lt. Perley had done it for about 15 years or some ungodly amount of time by himself.

Chief Wagner stated that Lt. Perley had done some research and if you want to hear it, we'll let you have it, but it is much more efficient now, not saying that the Policemen or Policeman that they have had doing it in the past haven't done a really good job because they have. Like he said, they are able to do it more efficiently now and it is working out very well.

Karen Umberger stated by freeing up these two Officers that are no longer doing prosecution work, she didn't get a good feel in the answers provided as to what activities these two Officers are now engaged in and that it brings to her mind anyhow if we have freed up two Officers, why then do we need to think about not hiring the replacement but hiring the additional Officer.

Chief Wagner stated that one of them, their lead Prosecutor before hiring an attorney took over the duties of the Road Sergeant. Karen Umberger stated she didn't understand what that job was. Chief Wagner stated he replaced basically somebody that retired in 2009, so he wasn't an extra person back on the road, he replaced somebody that retired and he took on his duties as a Patrol Sergeant. The other one is back on patrol or that position is back on patrol but that doesn't mean that just because they have somebody back on patrol that they need less people. They have close to 850 arrests this year, 910 arrests last year; it's Group A crimes which are the more serious crimes are up in Conway. They sent about 100 cases down to the Grand Jury last year to the County Attorney so you can tell that the more serious crimes are up in Conway.

Ted Sares asked if school truant issues were considered arrests. Chief Wagner stated no, other juvenile issues are, but not being in school is not a crime.

Bill Marvel asked Lt. Perley if he had noticed a significant change in the dismissal rates between the years when Officers were doing it and when you have a lawyer doing it. Lt. Perley stated that was a good question, but you're covering a lot of ground because the Conway Police Department has used a variety of lawyers and Officers for the function of prosecution since 1982. From 1982 to 1988, local attorney Bill Albrecht was their Prosecutor and he did a fabulous job and went off to be the Cheshire County Attorney and has since returned and is practicing civil law. He did it from 1988 to 1992; then a variety of Police Prosecutors did it from 1992 to 1998; 1998 to 2007 he was reassigned to that position; 2007 to 2010 another Officer, another layperson was acting as the Department Prosecutor, Sgt. Spittler, who did an outstanding job and has since been assigned to a Patrol Sergeant's responsibility and then in 2010 they hired Attorney Subers.

Lt. Perley stated that's a pretty wide spectrum to notice dismissal rates and dismissal rates can be in a couple of areas; they can be dismissed for fact or they can be dismissed for questions of law. He can tell Bill (Marvel) that since Attorney Subers had been working for them, he has not heard of any significant legal challenges on matters of law, like did they perform a proper search in compliance with the variety of decisions on search and seizure by the Supreme Court or arrests that weren't based on probable cause or procedural errors that they made. Those are the kinds of arguments that a lawyer is best to serve at arguing and more importantly not just arguing but looking at a case pre-submission for those fatal errors. The worse place to do your dirty laundry is out in public, that's why the clothes line is always in the back yard, right. The nature of that intellectual work in Court is that you need a sound legal mind to look at those cases and say "we might have mis-stepped here" or "we may not have sufficient proof there" and make that decision on what to enter and what not. That prevents a couple of things: that prevents dismissals in Court which can erode the faith that the bench has in the Department procedurally and it can also erode the faith in the community if they keep losing cases on legal grounds. It can avoid costly litigation if they prosecute someone and there's a fatal legal issue and then it's dismissed and that person capitalizes on it by suing the Town. It gives a better overall view from that tabletop of how they practice the art of enforcement, how they present it in Court and the overall scheme that they have in the community. In answer to the question, since she has taken over there have been no significant dismissals for questions of law or questions of procedure for that matter, but she does a really good job of ferreting those out because that's what they pay her to do.

Ted Sares stated just to clarify it in his mind: they are going to replace one person, they are going to add one person in an ideal situation, and they are hopefully going to get one through Federal funding and they've sprung loose one by getting the Prosecutor. Lt. Perley stated he wasn't sprung loose per se because he filled a retirement. Ted stated he thought it was said that there were two: one

became a Sergeant and another was sprung loose to do patrol. Lt. Perley stated back to patrol; he thought Ted was talking about the Sergeant. Ted stated so there is four; in the ideal world they are going to have 3 additions. He is supporting this, don't worry about it. Lt. Perley stated the person who left the Assistant Prosecutor position went back to patrol, resigned and has since been replaced. That's a net zero as well; that's not an extra person.

Chief Wagner stated they also had somebody that left in 2009 that they didn't replace. They replaced the Prosecutor with that position. They had a Lieutenant's position; the Lieutenant left and they replaced that position with the Prosecutor's position.

Karen Umberger asked what is the salary range from the lowest paid to the highest paid. You've got 22 people; the lowest paid person earns this and the highest paid person earns this. Chief Wagner stated the lowest paid person makes \$36,000.00 and the highest paid person makes \$90,000.00.

Chairman Sordi thanked the Commissioners, Chief Wagner and Lt. Perley and asked that they hang around for the discussion on the Warrant Articles.

#### PUBLIC WORKS

Earl Sires asked if there were general questions or did the Committee want to go over the Warrant Articles. Chairman Sordi stated first he was going to open it up to questions because someone asked for Public Works to be here.

Karen Umberger stated she asked for Public Works to be here because she didn't have all of the information she needed and when the Chairman sent the information this week, then that provided the information she needed so that when we get to the Warrant Articles she can ask her questions.

#### TOWN REVIEW

Earl Sires asked the members to turn to page 8 of the packet; he will refer to the hand written numbers and not the typed numbers. This is an overall presentation and summary of the Warrant Articles that are being proposed, their cost and their tax rate impact and he wanted to make a couple of updates. As they go through the 6 or so months of the budget process, it gets more and more difficult sometimes to keep all the different places that they present this information consistent. He wanted to make two changes: under Capital Reserves Funds, Facilities, that should be \$80,000.00 - that was changed by the Selectmen last week and the impact will be \$.06; the one below that, Solid Waste Equipment, should be \$75,000.00, not \$90,000.00, and the impact will be \$.05. Those are the only changes since they did this on Friday.

Earl Sires stated as far as the Capital Reserve Funds, there are 8 at this point, one having to do with the Police and the rest having to do with the Town or Public Works and then a new one. Seven of those are pre-existing funds and then they are proposing a Recreation Department Fund this year as well and Paul (DegliAngeli) will talk about the ones that relate to his operations first.

Paul DegliAngeli asked if there were any questions. Chairman Sordi asked if there were any highlights that Mr. DegliAngeli wanted to make. Mr. DegliAngeli stated as Earl (Sires) said Recreation is the new fund, previously it was a subset of Highway, so they thought it might be more accurate to pull it out on its own. If people would like to take a look at the infrastructure to see what road projects and construction are planned, he would be happy to answer any questions there. Earl stated that would be on pages 14 and 15.

Karen Umberger stated you're showing Thompson Road as a Capital Construction Project. She thought the Water Precinct was doing work down there and so she was confused why they are considering it a Capital Construction unless there's more to what they're doing than meets her eyes.

Paul DegliAngeli stated it was a fair question. As you know, and as the spreadsheet shows, there are those projects that are in bold and down in the left there is a key that says "Bold means it has been coordinated with the Precincts". It's no secret that they've done millions of dollars of sewer work these last several years and that's actually been accelerated by the ARRA Funding. The usual and customary practice when they are doing water and sewer in a road is that they persuaded Rural Development, who is the chief funding agency, not to trench our roads for water and then for sewer and then trench them for services and leave all of these patches. They demonstrated using simple arithmetic that it would be a better job and less expensive if they did a complete road reconstruction and the Town then came back and put on the final pavement, etc. They go with that program if it's both water and sewer in a road. If not, then they don't fund it that way.

Paul DegliAngeli stated Thompson Road had its sewer put in several years ago. Further, Thompson Road has had water all the way to the 90 degree corner at the end shortly before the pavement ends. What the Precinct has done in this Contract, Contract 7, is they've extended the sewer from where they stopped which essentially is from the large condominium development to the end and this reconstruction amount is for the Town crew, it's for them to come back and reconstruct that road. Anyone who has traveled that road knows it's literally pavement on wetland bog over corduroy. Corduroy being a term used in road building when people cut logs and lay them across wet areas and for years now they have been fishing logs out of the road that the frost has driven up. They are finally reconstructing that. It's drainage, under drain, road bed, new pavement, all new driveway culverts and ditches for that first section. From that 90 degree far corner to the end, that will be done by the Precinct which means in the following year, 2013, under pavement maintenance the lower half you'll see Thompson Road; just an "O" for overlay. That was an astute question.

Karen Umberger stated her other question was that they are going to reclaim and repave the North South Road. She was surprised that this needed to be done this early. Paul DegliAngeli stated it is a surprise to all. He made a decision not to add a fourth key there. What they are actually going to do is cold plain; there's a difference. When they redid the West Side Road, they ground up all of that pavement that was there. The machine went into the first 6, 7 inches of the gravel underneath it,

they left it in place, paved over it. What will happen with the North South Road from Mechanic Street to Artist Falls Road, which is also the section of the North South that has curbing on it so let's call it a portion of the North South Road that's in North Conway Village, that wearing course of pavement is gone. If you get out this Spring and take a look you'll see it's heavily cracked so they are operating under the stitch in time concept here. They are going to cold plain that; the milling machine is going to take off that inch, that top pavement is an inch thick and then they are going to put back an inch so that they aren't disturbing the 5 inches of pavement beneath that.

Paul DegliAngeli further stated from Artist Falls Road to the Common Court Connector, will just be an overlay because there's no curbing there, they don't have drives, they don't have heights of other intersecting streets, don't have curbing, don't have drainage structures to worry about. They are just going to overlay that. From there to the intersection of 302, through the median section and the roundabout, that's newer than the North South in the Village and although there is cracking there, they are going to crack seal that. The type of cracking that they have in the Village, in the second section, isn't the long crack where there was an old joint or where the pavement just broke because of shrinkage, the kind of cracking that they have in the Village is because that pavement is desiccated now, it's dry. The bituminous that's in pavement now is not lasting. He talked about this with Mike DiGregorio about two years ago; they've been looking at this that long. After this, they'll start to see large chunks leave. What they are concerned about is ruining that 5 inches beneath it; there's a base, a binder and a wearing course layer, so they are going to cold plain off that wearing course.

Kim Umberger stated she knew that when they first paved that road, they switched to a new pavement. Paul DegliAngeli stated that was correct. Karen stated so what you are telling me is the new pavement isn't that great. Mr. DegliAngeli stated it's not as elastic as the old mix. Karen asked what kind of mix are we going to put on. Mr. DegliAngeli stated the Town of Conway still uses the marshal mixes, they don't use the super pave. They are having a more difficult time getting that mix and the super pave of the era of the generation when the North South Road was built is not the same super pave today, it's closer to the old marshal mix because DOT has realized its error. In fact, there are three mixes, believe this or not, on the North South Road and each year they changed. The first and worst mix was from the Mountain Valley Mall Boulevard Road to the intersection and all of Redstone. Remember what happened to Redstone? They worked on it and in two years it was gone. So that's gone. There's a different mix from there to Artist Falls and yet a different one in the Village.

Ray Shakir stated most roads are scheduled for reconstruction so he would assume that they have already been flagged that they are all in bad shape. A simple question is: how far out are you on those projects and when do you anticipate they will be addressed. Paul DegliAngeli stated as you can see, this shows you the year they just came through so you can see what they got done and then 3 years: 12, 13 and 14. At one time he used to show this for 10 years at a time, but they stopped doing that because the Precinct's and the District's 10 year future was too

uncertain and they were wasting their time. On some of those roads, for instance Echo Acres, Sunset Two, those are in North Conway Water Precinct. Ray stated he guessed that's why they didn't have an estimate. Mr. DegliAngeli stated we know that they have infrastructure that they want to upgrade, but they don't have a schedule to it yet so they think it's foolish to reconstruct those roads. They just made the decision to go 3 years into the future because beyond that their accuracy dropped way off so they stopped it.

Ted Sares stated he wanted to move to the vehicle replacement. The simple question is when was that done, that matrix. Paul DegliAngeli stated the Highway Vehicle replacement, the first year they put that into place was in 1998 so the budgeting in 1997 is when they produced it and it has been in place since that time. Ted stated if you had done that in the year 2005, which was the first year of the economic downturn and the mortgage debacle that created it, would you have done it the same way. Mr. DegliAngeli stated yes. Ted stated what he was getting at was he wouldn't have, if the first year he could have done it was then he would have taken into consideration the times and would have said, again ideally, we would have the dump in 2012, but he would make it 2013 and would just extend everything because everything changes in a new economic paradigm and we went to a new economic paradigm in 2005, a deadly one where Libraries closed, Schools closed, Police were laid off in Providence by the scores and it became really bad and we're still feeling the impact of it as housing remains bad.

Paul DegliAngeli stated that was an excellent point. In that 1998 time frame, they were replacing dump trucks, say for instance number 17 on your list, they were replacing dump trucks every 7 years and when they proposed going to a Capital Reserve they said they would have the money in the bank, it's in reserve, we don't have to replace it in 7 years. If the money's there, we can stretch it and see and we can track and see where they are making that repair/replace decision, in other words, when an annual maintenance is not frugal. At that time in 1998, they went from 7 years to 10 years; around about the time when things were going crazy with the market and Bernie made off with our money, they went from 10 years to 12 years. Ted Sares stated he had nothing to do with 2005, nothing; he had nothing to do with it. Mr. DegliAngeli stated it was his own sarcasm and apologized. Mr. DegliAngeli further stated that in fact he (Ted) picked up on exactly what they did; they stretched out the vehicles. They will note that this past year they had two vehicles scheduled for a 15 year replacement, neither one of them made it, but the good news is that previously they were scheduled for 12 years and they went 13 and 14 years. Ted stated what you're saying is that this is reflective. Mr. DegliAngeli stated exactly.

Karen Umberger stated to Earl Sires that he stated the vehicles for Parks and Rec came out of the Highway Department. She didn't see a corresponding decrease in the Highway Department vehicle replacement to make up for the \$20,000.00 you want in the Recreation Department. Either we're taking them out or we're not or we're adding. Paul DegliAngeli asked Karen if she had the funding for the previous year for the Highway Department or the allocation for that department. Mr. DegliAngeli asked Lucy Philbrick what was contributed to Capital Reserve for the Highway Department for 2011. Mr. DegliAngeli stated the answer should be that at

that time those numbers should have been higher and the Selectmen had cut the budgets and that's when they had to extend the life, the years or the spreadsheet wouldn't make sense. There would be lots of negative numbers at the bottom. Lucy advised Mr. DegliAngeli that they funded \$185,000.00 and at that time the request was \$205,000.00. Mr. DegliAngeli stated it was anticipated to go up to get it back on track, but when they created the Parks it just didn't need to go up as much; it did go up from \$185,000.00 to \$195,000.00 but if you look at the department request when it was \$185,000.00, the request was \$205,000.00. The bottom line is that they aren't doing them on schedule, they've extended them and he goes to the Selectmen when they do one beforehand and he shows them the replacement cost, the average maintenance over its life and when they get to a single year when they are going to have a repair bill that exceeds the depreciated capital replacement plus annual maintenance then that decision says to replace rather than to repair.

Karen Umberger stated the combination of the Parks and the Highway are up \$30,000.00 from a year ago. Paul DegliAngeli stated that was correct, not from department request. Karen stated she understood that and knew that the Selectmen make the decision and that's as it should be. Mr. DegliAngeli stated he wanted to point out the life cycle of these vehicles, we probably all in this room got here tonight with our own vehicles; how many are running something that's 15 years old and plowing.

Karen Umberger stated according to the Parks thing, the first item that we are purchasing is in 2014 and that's projected to be a One Ton Pickup and it will be 10 years old and she guessed her question is, she knows the Parks Department goes around and visits the parks and does all of that other kinds of stuff, but what kind of heavy lifting do they do on their One Ton. Paul DegliAngeli stated the One Ton pulls a trailer and the trailer has two riding mowers on it and in the One Ton itself is rakes, wheelbarrows, spare barrels for the trash cans, maintaining parks and grounds, the grounds for their buildings, cemeteries, trash every day during the season. Karen asked if it was mileage that was causing the problem or is it wear and tear on the vehicle; she was trying to get to the 10 year life cycle of that particular Pick Up Truck or One Ton. Mr. DegliAngeli stated he guessed mileage was sort of synonymous with wear and tear, it's an indication of how much use it is getting. They do plow with these vehicles in the winter time. They put a projected life in there based on experience and they adjust accordingly. They have demonstrated that they have vehicles programmed for 10 years and replaced them at 12; they've had vehicles programmed for 15 years and replaced them at 13, so it kind of goes both ways. Therein lies the beauty of Capital Reserve. Speaking with Jim Hill this fall, he understands they fell into that trap, they were doing \$36,000.00 repairs in one year, the last year of that bus.

Maureen Seavey asked why did they call the Capital Reserve Fund Recreation Department Vehicles and not Parks and Recreation. To her it seems like it should go to that. Paul DegliAngeli stated his says Parks and Grounds Vehicle Replacement. Earl Sires stated it's a good point; it probably should say Parks. Parks is part of their Recreation Department. They can certainly be specific and say Parks. Mr. DegliAngeli stated to Maureen that when she was working for the Town, there was the Rec Department and the Highway Department did Parks and Grounds. Several

years back, Parks and Grounds went over to the Rec Department; maybe that's part of her confusion. Maureen stated she still thought that it's considered Parks and Grounds. Mr. DegliAngeli agreed.

Paul DegliAngeli stated he just wanted to say regarding Operating Budgets and whether to overspend or not overspend, if the weather keeps up as it is, they will definitely overspend the Salt line item. At the Deliberative portion they will likely be requesting an adjustment for that.

Chairman Sordi asked how they were doing on plowing. Paul DegliAngeli stated salting is synonymous with plowing. The fact is freezing rain is more expensive than a snowstorm.

Karen Umberger stated the Solid Waste money that is being put in, is it the same as last year. Paul DegliAngeli asked if Karen was talking about vehicles or expansion. Karen stated vehicles. Mr. DegliAngeli stated no that went down; they went from \$90,000.00 to \$75,000.00.

Karen Umberger stated on the other two for Solid Waste. Paul DegliAngeli stated one is Closure and that's the same, \$1.00. The other is Expansion and that's the same. They are designing their expansion this year and expect to be building it in 2013 and expect to go into Phase 3 in 2014.

Karen Umberger asked Lucy Philbrick if there was sufficient dollars in the Capital Reserve Fund to meet everything associated with replacing the Landfill or adding to the Landfill. Lucy stated she could tell Karen how much there is in there, but she couldn't tell her if it was sufficient or not. Paul DegliAngeli stated that last year when they were making the reductions they did a cost estimate based on Phase 1 and Phase 2 and then they solicited the input of their consultant since they built Phase 2 back in 1999 and the two figures were very close and they projected that they would have enough money. We'll see what happens when it comes time to open bids. Lucy stated that at the end of the year there was \$1,715,000.00 in the Expansion Capital Reserve Fund.

Karen Umberger stated going back to Solid Waste Vehicles, you said you wanted \$75,000.00 this year, but the Warrant Article asked for \$90,000.00. Earl Sires stated that may be as he updated on that other sheet the need to do it there as well. Thanks for pointing that out. Karen stated in Article 13 the figure should be \$75,000.00, is that correct. Paul DegliAngeli stated that was correct.

Chairman Sordi asked if there were any further questions on Capital Reserve Funds down to Landfill Expansion. There being none, he thanked Paul DegliAngeli for coming in.

Chairman Sordi stated he wanted to proceed with the Patrol Officer and the Police Officer Warrant Articles right now so that we can let the Police representatives head out after questions.

Ted Sares stated he had an observation. He thought the Committee had vented both. It seemed to him that it had already been discussed. Chairman Sordi stated that Karen (Umberger) indicated that she had some questions on the Warrant Articles.



Karen Umberger stated if she understood what the Chief said before is that instead of hiring a Police Officer a year ago or whenever the Prosecutor came on, she guessed it was 2 years ago, you chose to eliminate one of the Police Officers so that you could hire the Prosecutor. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated they switched a Lieutenant; they traded a Lieutenant for a Prosecutor. Karen stated now we are coming back to the fact that in two years you believe that you need another Police Officer to replace the one that you let go because you didn't need it. Commissioner Kennett stated actually there were two Police Officers doing prosecutions. By hiring a Prosecutor, they got two people back on the road. For all of those years, they have asked for additional Officers. They have needed them for a long time. Not new, not something they need because they have a Prosecutor, they have needed them all along. By virtue of a report that this Committee asked to be researched, they need 37 Officers. That's not what they are asking for, but the fact is that they have needed more Police Officers for several years. These special Warrant Articles are a way for them to acquire them without breaking the budget.

Joe Mosca stated if the Budget is being increased, how do you know you're not breaking the Budget. If you look at the economic situation of the country, not just this town, there's no money, and by increasing the budget and trying to add more Officers, you are breaking the Budget. He disagrees with Commissioner Kennett's statements completely. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated adding one at a time versus asking for 4 at a time. Joe stated it still has an impact on the taxpayers. Commissioner Kennett stated they understand that and they also understand that by putting it on a special Warrant Article the voters will decide whether or not they get to have another Officer. The other Article, the one that you see on there for the 3 years, a Grant will become available and hopefully it will be funded. That's an Article they will probably have on this Warrant every year because they never know when the COPS Grant is going to be offered but they never want to be caught in the situation they were caught in last year. Just so you understand.

Joe Mosca stated the Budget right now reflects the hiring of an Officer this year sometime in February. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated the Budget that they have just discussed tonight has 22 Officer positions in it. Joe stated that's a full contingent. Commissioner Kennett stated they have those positions in the Budget, yes. They have 21 of those positions filled right now; they still have another position to fill. They did not fill positions this year trying to make up some of the buyouts that they incurred that were not planned. Joe stated he understood that, but he didn't see, personally and he was speaking for himself Joe Mosca, the need to increase the size of the force to 24 or 25 Officers when you look at the County and the County has 24 or 25 county wide; 22 county wide. Right now we're at the same number as the County, does the Town really need to be bigger than the County force. He's having real difficulties with that.

Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated before she gives this to somebody else who probably has more detailed information, our Police force is over burdened and were over burdened this year with the absence of a couple of positions and when that happens Officers are working many more hours than

it is safe for men with guns to work. In order for people to be able to take their vacation time, work only 40 hours per week, you need a certain number of Officers. A study that was requested by this Committee three years ago indicated that the Conway Police force, given the level of activity, would require 37 Officers. She did not think 24 Officers even comes close to that. Joe Mosca stated his point is where does the money come from to pay for it. When businesses are closing, homes are up for sale, homes are being foreclosed on, is this the right time to be expanding the Police force. Commissioner Kennett stated it's on a special Warrant Article and they hope that the voters will support them and in fact it is up to them what they want for their community. By putting it on a special Warrant Article versus in the Budget, they are giving the voter that choice.

Joe Mosca stated with the COPS Grant, if in fact a Grant does come through and the voters do accept it, in year 4 the Town is going to be on the hook for about \$100,000.00 for that Officer, between salary and benefits and then so on and so forth going forward. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated if that's what an Officer costs 4 years from now, that's what they will pay. Joe stated given the rate of inflation in salary increases and medical benefits increases, if it's \$80,800.00 now a round number of \$100,000.00 is probably fair for 4 years from now. Commissioner Kennett stated but if we need that Officer now and that COPS Grant is offered and they can get 3 of those years paid for through a Grant that our taxes have already gone to fund. Joe stated that was his point exactly, we are still paying for that Grant. We, the taxpayers, are still paying for that Grant; it's not free money, it comes from tax dollars. Commissioner Kennett stated she understood that. Joe stated one way or the other the people in this room and this community are paying for that. Commissioner Kennett stated she understood that, but we'll pay for that whether they get a cop out of the Grant or not.

Ted Sares stated he thought what the Police Department was saying is that the Police Department has looked inside, has looked at the crime rate, has looked at the fact that over the last 2 years the amount of overtime has gone up because they haven't had a full compliment and they think they need thus and so and therefore are throwing this out to you, the people, because we, the Police Department, believe we need this. That's all they're doing and if you don't think so, then vote "no".

Chairman Sordi stated to the members to remember they are to be focusing on questions and not comments tonight.

Joe Mosca stated what was thrown at him he thought he had the right to respond to. That's like saying the School Department thinks they need all the money that they need and last year we cut them. Ted Sares stated that's correct and we haven't responded to that yet. You will have your chance to respond. Joe stated and he would.

Karen Umberger stated she had a question on the construction of the Warrant Article. She didn't believe that there was any money left in ARRA; she thought that was over, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, that's over. There may be a Justice Department thing that they can look for, but she didn't believe there was any funding left in ARRA.

Commissioner Theresa Kennett questioned Chief Wagner on the language of using ARRA when that is over. Chief Wagner stated that was the wording they got from DRA. Earl Sires stated if it's not ARRA, then whatever it is needs to be identified, but that was what he was given from DRA.

Ted Sares asked if Karen (Umberger) was saying it should be taken out. Karen stated no, she was just saying that ARRA is not an appropriate place to apply for those funds because the ARRA Program is closed. Ted asked what was the appropriate place and Karen stated she didn't have a clue.

Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated that previous to ARRA there were COPS Grants offered. Chief Wagner stated the COPS Grant has been going on for quite a long time. He thought back in 1995 the Police Department actually received a Grant from COPS and he wasn't sure what it stood for. Any way, he will look into it but that's the wording that Earl (Sires) got from DRA. He will look into it and get back to the Committee.

Chief Wagner stated he wanted to make a couple of points about the policemen in Conway and whether we need them or not and so on and so forth. He really didn't know but thought that the Sheriff's Department only had 12 full-time people so they are already past that. The latest they got from the State of New Hampshire on crime reporting the Town of Conway responded to 1,288 Group A offenses. That's 12<sup>th</sup> on the list in the State of New Hampshire. This lists the top 50 and the only other one in Carroll County is Wolfeboro and it's number 50, responding to 336 and he thought they probably have 12 to 15 Officers. They are not sitting around. Joe Mosca stated he wasn't saying that. Chief Wagner stated what's the cost of crime in the Town of Conway; your home gets broken into, what's the cost to you. Joe Mosca stated a bullet. Chief Wagner asked Joe what if he wasn't home. You can't put a price on your freedoms either or whose going to stay up at night and guard the Town of Conway and make sure that the people of the Town of Conway are doing what they're suppose to be doing. You don't have to answer, he'll answer for him, it's them.

Chairman Sordi stated we're not going down that road tonight, he wanted to get questions answered tonight.

Danielle Santuccio asked Chief Wagner to explain what a Group A offense was. Chief Wagner stated the Group A offenses are the more serious crimes. Danielle stated she knew that but did they determine that when they go or was that determined based on when they go to Court, that's what she was trying to figure out. Chief Wagner stated every crime has what they call an IBOR and their computer has a list of all of the IBORS and whatever crime is committed that's what they put into their computer and send to the State. Danielle asked if that was as they were going out or afterwards upon reflection. Do they know when they are going out that it's a Group A. Chief Wagner stated they do not.

Karen Umberger stated we're looking to support the Grant; we're asking the voters to agree to the Grant, but she didn't think that we could ask for the 4<sup>th</sup> year of funding until the Grant expired. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated they are getting permission to accept that Grant and

informing the voters prior to them giving permission of what all the costs are.

Chairman Sordi asked if they were asking for funding in this Warrant Article. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated no, that cost will be part of the Budget, it won't be a special Warrant Article in the 4<sup>th</sup> year.

Karen Umberger stated that she would just ask that somebody check out and figure out whose going to own the COPS programs because if you apply for it under this, you'll be sorely disappointed. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated good point and thanked Karen for bringing that to their attention.

Mike DiGregorio stated we were talking about how we don't need the Police Department and not that he wants to go into the real long spiel of how busy they are because most of us have gone through the presentation, but Lt. Perley talked a few years ago about the volume of calls, not just the Class A, but correct him if he is wrong, but wasn't the amount of volumes of calls somewhere up in the 70,000 or 80,000 calls or something like that. Lt. Perley stated he would say conservatively 73,000 to 74,000 calls per year. Mike asked if they come in on 911. Lt. Perley stated no, that's all aggregate calls for anything. It could be a loose dog, it could be a murder, it could be a fatal car accident. From that aggregate of total calls for service, it then dwindles down into offenses which could be a number of things, whatever crime is discovered or if the call results in a crime and from that the breakout becomes the two Group A and Group B crimes that the Chief talked about. Those are based on the IBORS which is an acronym for Incident Based Offense Report System that every police agency, virtually every police agency in the country uses so there is a quantifiable uniform language that all police agencies use to report all of these crimes to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for statistical purposes.

Lt. Perley stated the way it breaks down in New Hampshire for us is Group A, the most serious: rape, robbery, murder, burglary, car theft and the like; Group B is: DWI's, disorderly conduct, drug possession and things like that. Our Group A crimes are so significant they are closing in on the top 10 in the State of New Hampshire and that's from the largest city, Manchester, all the way down to the smallest that's reported on the top 50 list and that was Wolfeboro in 2009; 2011 is not available and the most recent data, 2010 that the Chief spoke of puts them up a couple more notches. They were 13<sup>th</sup> and it put them up to about 11<sup>th</sup>. Cities like Claremont, Hudson, you know, where there's tens of thousands of residential people. That's what those IBORS mean; it doesn't matter what you go to, somebody could call and say their home has been broken into and the door blew open. It doesn't matter about the call, it matters what they report and, of course, that wouldn't result in an IBOR. It's a very unified nationally accurate and quantifiable language that they are using when talking about IBORS and, like he's said before, they want to be number one in a lot of things in the Town of Conway, but this isn't one of them, but we're closing in on it and those facts stand alone. You can't massage them, they report themselves and it is what it is as they say.

Mike DiGregorio stated he had a quick follow up and stated to Lt. Perley that the list compares us to Manchester and everywhere else in the state. How are we compared to a population of 10,000 residents. Lt. Perley stated first of all when they did the study back in 2009 which they already know they've had double digit increases in IBOR activity since 2009 in the most serious categories, Group A. They don't quantify Group B too much because they have a lot of it because we're a vacation resort and that's like DWI, disorderly conduct and recreational drug possession and things like that, but the increases since 2009 have been significant. Mike stated he was just curious about the 10,000. Lt. Perley stated we were number one in our population bracket in the entire State for activity; we beat communities in all population brackets above us up until recently. We went up to 9,999 bracket and then there's the 10,000 to 14,999, then 15,000 to 25,000 and 25,000 and above. We have more activity than 11 communities in the next bracket and we have more activity than one community in the 25,000 and over category and that was Merrimack, New Hampshire in IBORS. Some pretty huge population pools which drives your crime rate, your demographics, the people who live in the communities and social economic things that effect crime that we're all responsible for, we're not just responsible for our own homes or that of our neighbor, we're responsible for everyone and whether they have a gun or not to protect themselves they should still be protected.

Ray Shakir stated in your opinion, where does the Group A category stop. What is the least offense that is categorized as Group A. Lt. Perley questioned question. Ray stated at what point do you categorize it from B to A; what offense. Lt. Perley stated first all, they don't make the decision, that's the national standard. Ray asked what is it? Lt. Perley stated he would say that people would consider the least serious thing that's in Group A would be car theft because it's a piece of property, but it's pretty significant if your car gets sold. He would say as far as personal harm, it's car theft which he believed last year they reported 20 and then you've got robbery which is significantly increasing in our community and as a precursor in many cases statistically to homicide and then there's rape and then there's burglary and then there's a variety of serious assaults which he means assaults with injury not simple assaults that's a category B and of course kidnapping which they've had a significant up again which is included in custodial kidnapping and, of course, unfortunately as we've all experienced homicide.

Chief Wagner stated he only had one copy of his list and he would pass it around for the members to look at the Group A offenses. Chairman Sordi asked if the Committee could keep the copy and Chief Wagner stated no, it's the only copy that he has.

Joe Mosca stated he had a comment question because he needed to get the comment out. Joe stated to Chief Wagner that he has no problem with the Police Department and to please don't think that he does. He's looking at pure economics and what he thinks can and can't be afforded and having said that, do you think the up tic in Class A incidents is a result of the economic down turn of what's going on and he knows that's an opinion on the Chief's part. Chief Wagner stated he didn't think there was any study that shows that an economic down turn skyrockets crime and the national trend right now is that serious crimes are going down but it is not in Conway. He really doesn't have an answer to that; he didn't know

what the problem is, whether it's more people, more residents, more people coming to visit, he really didn't know.

Karen Umberger stated she guessed her question is more directed to Earl (Sires). Ted Sares asked Karen to speak up as he couldn't hear her. Karen stated the Article that passed that said once the Grant expires you have to agree to continue to fund it. How do we handle this particular requirement when, if she's not mistaken, once the Grant runs out, the funding runs out without an Article. Maybe you can't answer that question right now. Earl stated he could answer what they thought they were doing which is they believe that this Warrant Article complies with that direction from the voters and that direction, as you mentioned, 6 or 7 years ago a Warrant Article was passed that said if any program that starts through Grant funding to be continued must be continued through the voters and that's why they felt they had to include that approval for that 4<sup>th</sup> year in this Warrant Article. In essence, the voters at the start are saying that they understand that they are committing to continue to this once the Grant runs out and it was also a requirement of the program itself. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated so it would go into the General Budget the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Earl stated that's what it says, it goes into the Operating Budget in the 4<sup>th</sup> year.

Karen Umberger stated she can understand that that's the Grant, that we're committed for 4 years, but she would think on the 5<sup>th</sup> year that we should vote on whether or not we want to continue it because the Grant and the conditions of the Grant have run out and so therefore it's over until we vote to accept it. She can live with the 4<sup>th</sup> year, and she'll still be around. Earl Sires stated that could be the way it is going to be done.

Chairman Sordi stated the way the Warrant Article reads, it just mentions the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated that's the requirement. Chairman stated but the way you're stating it in there, it does not give you authorization to continue with it in the 5<sup>th</sup> year. Earl Sires stated he could understand the Committee's view of it, but they thought that this gives that acceptance. If that's not the way people see it then at that time it can be put to another vote.

Karen Umberger stated she understood that was the condition of the Grant and she had no problem with adding the 4<sup>th</sup> year in here, but to her that's the end of the Grant. Earl Sires stated if that's the way everyone agrees that's the way we are going to consider it, then great and we'll take care of it then.

Ted Sares stated he didn't think we should have any illusions about a Grant disappearing or the impact of a Grant, a Grant will evolve into a line item. If he were the Town or the Police Department, what he would do is put it into the Budget. John Edgerton stated they have to put it into the Budget the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Chairman Sordi stated the Warrant Article specifically says the 4<sup>th</sup> year in the Operating Budget, the 5<sup>th</sup> year however could be questioned.

Mike DiGregorio stated that's exactly the debate that they (Selectmen) had is that they are obligated for the 4<sup>th</sup> year to be in the Budget, the 5<sup>th</sup> year, if they're making budget cuts or depending on what happened,

would they cut it out. They certainly had the discussion that chances of reducing that Officer in the 5<sup>th</sup> year would be pretty slim because he assumes things will be growing crime wise 5 years from now rather than reducing. Ted Sares asked Mike if, in the 4<sup>th</sup> year, is it still funded by the Grant. Mike stated no, 3 years in the Grant and the 4<sup>th</sup> year by the Town in the Operating Budget, 5<sup>th</sup> year someone could come to us and say "cut that out" or ask to have a petition put out there to cut it out. His guess is, as Ted said, once it gets in it's probably going to be in forever. Ted stated then this has the impact of the one in front of it, same thing. You've got two Warrant Articles that essentially are the same for an additional body.

Chairman Sordi stated he thought that Earl (Sires) had to confirm with DRA about the wording of the Warrant Article because the way it's worded it says 4<sup>th</sup> year, it doesn't say 4<sup>th</sup> year and beyond. If the intent is to keep it in the Operating Budget beyond the 4<sup>th</sup> year, you may need to change the Warrant Article language. Earl Sires stated there were two issues; one is there is no guarantee that anything in the Budget is going to be contingent from year to year so you wouldn't want to have something that says we're going to have this one Officer forever because it just doesn't work that way. Karen's (Umberger) point is one that has to be looked at which is his assumption was because this Article says we will continue to fund this for the year after the Grant money has run out, that was satisfying the voter direction that was approved several years ago that anything starting with a Grant has to be voted on if it's going to be continued. Even in that case, if something's voted on by the voters, for example the School Resource Officer was voted on after it was no longer funded by a Grant, people said "yes, we'll continue to support it". There's no guarantee that can't be reduced or eliminated by the townspeople or by recommendation of the Police Commission or the Budget Committee in any given year. Chairman stated he understood that every budget is contingent; his point is that once it gets into the general Operating Budget the assumption is that it will remain there. All he was saying is that the public should understand that the intent is not just for the 4<sup>th</sup> year but that it would remain there beyond the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Earl stated all he was saying is there never is a year that anything remaining is a guarantee.

Ted Sares stated if this position is in the 4<sup>th</sup> year, wouldn't it become part of the collective bargaining agreement and you're saying it's not going to remain. Earl Sires stated what he was saying is that there's never any rock solid guarantee. Ted stated in the public sector when you're talking about the work force and you get an added body into your Budget, show me where they disappear. Earl stated they reduced a position last year. Ted stated and now you're filling it this year; you're replacing him this year at the dump. Earl stated things do come and go.

Mike DiGregorio stated he thought they went by the wording they were told by the DRA to satisfy the law and he was not sure how you would rectify it. Even if you put in that last sentence "If approved funding for the position will be contained in the Operating Budget in the 4<sup>th</sup> year 'and beyond'", then you'd be obligating the voters forever, so you can't word it that way. Chairman Sordi stated good point. Mike stated this is how they told them to word it and that's how they believe it is the right choice.

Bill Marvel stated he didn't understand how we can word it like this because one of the recurring themes in Town Meeting is that one Town Meeting can not bind a future Town Meeting to an expenditure and by this Article we, the 2012 Town Meeting, are binding the 2016 Town Meeting to pay this amount of money. He didn't see how we can do that. Mike DiGregorio stated because you could reduce the Budget in whatever year and this would have no impact. Chairman Sordi stated but in the 4<sup>th</sup> year you have to have that in there. Mike stated you have to have this in there, but you could reduce that dollar figure from somewhere else. It may not happen, he was just telling you it could. Bill stated he still disagreed and would explain why later.

Earl Sires stated that was a good point and that is a fact. As he understands it from discussions with DRA is because they are in essence entering into a Contract to accept this Grant, much like the Non-Precinct Fire Agreement or the Ambulance Agreement, we can enter into multi-year agreements. In the context of a contract or agreement for multi-years, the Town Meeting can act on this. That's how they see this. John Edgerton stated it has to be a Warrant Article.

Chairman Sordi stated that's a good point and if that's the way it is, if this is "a contract" and the contract length is 4 years, and in the 5<sup>th</sup> year, you would have to come back to renew the contract under a Warrant Article for the Police Officer. Doug Swett agreed.

Karen Umberger asked about the \$44,000.00 for the vehicle; that's one vehicle this year. Chief Wagner stated two vehicles. Karen asked if they had money in there already. Commissioner Theresa Kennett stated they appropriate the same amount every year. Karen stated you're going to buy two vehicles this year; one you already have the money for in the Capital Reserve and the second one you're asking for money for the Capital Reserve. Commissioner Rodney King agreed. Karen asked if the \$44,000.00 included all of the equipping of the vehicle with radios, antennas, the little machines that they need, with all of the stuff that goes with the vehicle or are there additional charges. Chief Wagner stated, no it just includes the vehicle. They are changing platforms this year but he would say the majority of the stuff, the real expensive equipment, the radios which are about \$6,000.00, the light bars are \$2,500.00 to \$3,000.00, they all switch over. They also received a Grant, the Edward Burn Grant this year for \$12,000.00 and they are going to use that to buy the extra equipment for the new cars until the whole transformation is done.

Mike DiGregorio stated he had a quick question for Chief Wagner on the equipment and transferring from one vehicle to another because you are going to a totally different car. Has anybody checked to see that it will fit the way you think it will. Chief Wagner stated Ford has told them that it will fit. He didn't think there were any out there yet to even check on. The short answer is no, but Ford has told them that the radio is not a problem, they said the light bar will transfer over, they are going to have to buy different back seats, different cages and stuff like that, but all the lights and stuff like that will transfer over.

Karen Umberger asked where the Grant was accounted for. Chairman Sordi asked Earl Sires where the Grant was accounted for. Karen stated Chief



Wagner stated he got a \$12,000.00 Grant and she didn't know where it was. Lucy Philbrick stated they are having a Public Hearing to accept it; she didn't know if it had been noticed yet. He (Chief Wagner) just notified her that he's getting a Grant and she knows that Karen (Hallowell) has been given the information for a Public Hearing. Karen asked aren't we suppose to put that in the Budget. Lucy stated no, you don't have to put unanticipated funds in the Budget.

Chairman Sordi thanked all of the Police representatives and stated he appreciated their patience in wading through all of the Warrant Articles.

Chairman Sordi stated on the remaining Warrant Articles there's the Emergency Ambulance Service which he knew we've heard about, the Municipal Parking Lot, the Library materials, the PEG Trust Fund and then the last one which is the Non-Precinct Fire Agreement. Chairman asked Earl Sires to maybe just touch on the Parking Lot, the Library materials, the PEG and the Non-Precinct Fire Agreement real quick, especially the last one.

Earl Sires stated he was on page 9 and at the bottom is the Collective Bargaining Agreement, that's going to have a no cost to that; in fact, there will be a reduction. They've modified the pay plan with the consent obviously of the Union representatives to a Price Index Plan that they'll peg from CPI and depending on one's performance and pay in relation to the average for one's position, you can potentially earn .5% above whatever the CPI is and if your performance falls below, you can potentially be earning 1.5% less than the CPI. Can't go below 2.5% and can't go above 3.5% so there's a little bit of wiggle room in there. They felt that it made more sense to be looking at Cost of Living these days then anything else.

Karen Umberger asked what CPI were they using. Earl Sires stated All Items. Karen asked if it was the same Social Security was under or is it the one Boston Greater Area or whatever. Earl stated it was the one they had been typically using for Town purposes; his contract for example, CPI All Items. Ted Sares stated he was not sure he understood Karen's question. Karen stated there are about 5 or 6 different CPI Indexes out there. Ted asked with different market baskets. Karen stated yes, with different market baskets, different areas, different everything and Social Security uses one; other things use other things; there's one that's called Northeastern CPI. Ted stated there's one put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Earl stated that's the one, they're using All Items from the BLS. Ted stated that's the one that everyone uses. Karen disagreed and stated guaranteed that's not the one. Earl stated there will actually be a reduction in cost, but they show it as a no cost increase. Again, that's the way the law says you do it whether it makes any sense or not.

Earl Sires stated he would now go to page 11, Ambulance Service. Just as we talked about before, you had discussions with the providers, the total in the Article is \$106,666.00 and that is to fund the Agreement from in essence May 1<sup>st</sup> through April 30<sup>th</sup>. The \$106,666.00 is the remaining 8 months of the Contract. They have 4 months that's already in the Operating Budget and the other 8 months have to be appropriated with the renewal of the Contract and that's what the \$106,666.00 is.

Earl Sires proceeded with the Non-Precinct Fire Agreement in order to provide fire services to areas outside of a Precinct, areas along the West Side Road, along 153, and other areas. They have an agreement that was entered into 10 years ago, this will be the 3<sup>rd</sup> renewal, the simplest way to explain the formula is that they take Budgets of the Fire Departments and allocate that number based on the assessed values of the non-precinct areas so, in essence, they're paying the same sort of rate that a Precinct payer would pay in an average sense and only those people, as himself, that live outside of a Precinct pay that amount. This year that amount is, if you look on page 8 at the bottom, it says "Add for non-precinct residents", the Non-Precinct Fire Agreement \$256,191.00 is the amount and it amounts to \$.78 per thousand on the tax rate of non-precinct payers. It ends up being about \$300.00 or \$400.00; about what he ends up paying to have the driveway plowed and in his mind that's a fairly decent deal.

Chairman Sordi asked what the implication would be if it fails. Earl Sires stated if it were to fail, there would be no formal agreement for fire service for areas outside of the Precinct. That's the best thing he could say. Chairman stated fair enough. Earl stated everyone would want to become real good friends with any firemen that they know.

Earl Sires proceeded with the Warrant Article on the Municipal Parking Lot. If you are familiar with where the HEB Engineering office is or the Chamber of Commerce in North Conway across from Schouler Park, there is a large parking lot in the back that used to be the parking lot for facilities that were associated with the Catholic Church back in the 80's. There are about 80 spaces he believed in there and about 50 of them, and those numbers could be not exactly right, but he thought it was split about the same in terms of what is used for the private business and what has been used for public parking for the last 20 years. That Lease has run out and the Selectmen have negotiated an agreement with the owners of the property which are in essence the HEB principals to continue the Lease. The parking lot needs some improvement so they have entered into an agreement with the owners to cost share some of the improvements. There will be pavement overlay, lighting, curbing has to be replaced around the island that's in the parking lot that separates the two areas and the cost share results in the estimated \$40,000.00 needed to do these improvements. The private owners or the Landlords would contribute \$10,000.00 for the improvements on their part of the parking lot and the Town would have a 10 year Lease for a viable parking lot in North Conway Village.

Dick Klement stated he had two questions; one: is the Lease free. Earl Sires stated he thought it was \$1.00. Dick stated so essentially free; is the property taxed. Earl stated the property is taxed based on its value and the use it's being put to.

Ted Sares asked if the asterisk after Police Officer under COPS plan, is that technically correct. Earl Sires stated he thought what the summary sheet was showing the tax impact for 2012 and because this money is only spent if the Grant money comes in, there is no tax impact because all of the expenditures are paid for by the Grant. Ted stated he understood that, but if it is approved, then 3 more years later we hook the

taxpayers. Earl stated if it is approved, then there is that obligation. Ted stated it has an impact on 2015 automatically. If this one is approved, it triggers a tax impact 3 years later. Earl stated yes, it does; absolutely. Ted stated he thought that should be explained. Earl stated he could do that. He was just trying to show what was for the next year. Ted stated based on a half hour discussion, he would think we should.

Chairman Sordi stated on the PEG Trust Fund, how does that compare to previous years. Earl Sires stated that's kind of a plug number; actually they just got their 4<sup>th</sup> payment and now know what the total amount is, it's \$134,871.00. The Selectmen tomorrow will take this issue up; they haven't approved this Article yet because they didn't know what they had to work with and they will find out tomorrow that \$134,871.00 was received and they can use some or all of that towards this contribution. They will decide that tomorrow. Chairman asked how the \$134,000.00 compared to previous years. Earl stated it's up by \$7,000.00 or \$8,000.00 which was kind of typical over the last 3 or 4 years there's been that amount, that percentage of an increase.

Joe Mosca stated the overall Operating Budget on page 8, last year it was suggested by this Board that when a Bond is retired the money should be returned to the people, the taxpayers, and that shouldn't be included in the Budget. Looking at last year's figures, if he takes out \$315,000.00 for the Bond and \$100,000.00 for the Ambulance to get apples to apples, he comes up with about a 6.25% increase. Earl Sires stated that could be. Joe stated he thought that was more reflective of the numbers that the people in town should be looking at, 6.25% versus 1% because 1% looks like we're doing a great job and 6.25% looks like we're doing an okay job. Based on what happened last year, he thought that we have to be fair to the School because the School got hammered over a retired Bond. Earl stated he didn't know what went on with the School, but he did know that the 1% is reflective of the increases and the decreases. It would have been less if a lot of things had happened; it would have been more if other things had happened. You can play a lot of different approaches to how you look at this, but the fact of the matter is the net is 1%. Now, if they hadn't retired the Bond, it would have been \$300,000.00 more. If the Police hadn't asked for \$300,000.00 more, it would have been \$300,000.00 less. We can certainly go through that exercise. Joe stated he thought he would be remiss if he didn't bring it up because of what happened last year. Earl stated he wanted to make sure that everyone understands that he was absolutely clear in defining all of those issues in the Narrative.

Ted Sares asked how the School got hammered. Chairman Sordi stated because they retired a \$1.1 Million or a \$1.2 Million Bond and they used it all up. Joe Mosca stated last year it was a big thing and just to be equal, he figured he would bring it up and he appreciated it and thanked Earl. Earl stated he understands.

Bill Marvel stated he did prefer to see it the way it was being described with the Bonds taken out, it seems more honest for anyone.

Dick Klement stated when we look at the total bottom line with Warrant Articles in there, it's about \$10.9 Million roughly; have you figured the

tax impact yet. Earl Sires stated he was waiting to get everything wrapped and then they'll do that. Dick asked if the Committee was going to get that before the vote. Chairman Sordi stated you will have it by Public Hearing and then we vote the night after.

Mike DiGregorio stated he had to point out or reiterate that Earl's absolutely right. You're looking at 3 different Budgets that make up the whole here. The Town's portion they tried to put together as fiscally as they could; other departments are up which affected the percentage that Joe (Mosca) was talking about. If you took them out, we went down, he thought they did okay. You're sitting here talking to the Town Manager who had no control over those other departments. He shouldn't say no control, last year they tried and attempted very hard to try to cut some budgets and in a matter of 5 minutes they went up \$90,000.00 on the Police Budget and the Library was given back their money without any questions and they spent all season long, budget season, trying to figure out how to cut stuff and in a matter of minutes it was all put back. You can argue whether they went after them as much as they wanted to this year or did they just say why because it was immediately put back. He thought Earl (Sires), for his portion, did a good job.

Earl Sires stated he wasn't being critical of the Police, he was just saying the fact of the matter is they had a significant decrease and a significant increase so it's kind of a wash and you go from there.

Karen Umberger stated she agreed with everything that Earl (Sires) and Mike (DiGregorio) have said, but as far as the people are concerned the percentage of increase is 6%. If everything stayed the same, if everything was the same, it would have gone down \$400,000.00. Earl stated that was true. Karen stated people in Town government chose not to recognize that and added not only the \$400,000.00 back in but additional to that and so that's the point she thought we were trying to make. If nothing changed, it would have been down \$400,000.00. Earl stated the easiest way to say that in his mind is that they had a significant decrease in a Bond payment yet the Budget went up 1%. That's the fact.

Karen Umberger stated she was curious as to why or when it was decided that we need to expand the Landfill in 2013. She didn't think we had a projected date when that was going to occur. Earl Sires stated that's been in discussion over the last year or two and we're beginning to get to the point where the cell, this is expanding a cell within the existing Landfill, so it's time to do the next one. This is still some time later than originally planned and it's still tracks with the idea that they are expanding and extending the use of the Landfill. Now it's time to do this next cell.

Chairman Sordi stated to Earl Sires that Earl had sent him some information from the *Legislative Bulletin* and we're talking about the Budget and revenues, HB1674 they want to reduce the interest rate on delinquent taxes from 12% to 6% per lien and 18% to 19% post lien. Is that something, Karen (Umberger), that you've heard about. What kind of impact would that have on our discussions tonight if that passes. Earl stated probably \$30,000.00 to \$40,000.00. Karen Umberger stated that was defeated last year. Chairman stated it's back up so you may want to keep an eye out for that. Karen stated she would.

Mike DiGregorio stated he just wanted to comment, it's not just the dollar figure that we're talking about today, but it's perhaps an incentive for people to pay on time. If they reduce that rate down to somewhere around where a bank would give you money, then what's the sense of them ever paying. Chairman Sordi agreed. Mike stated part of our argument because Crow Dickinson goes down there on their behalf and argues for or against legislation. They certainly didn't support that and part of their argument was at 18% it makes people wake up and get in there and make sure they pay. Just so you know, they ask Rhoda (Quint) every year where are people paying, are more of them behind or is it less of them are behind and even though as Ted (Sares) has pointed out this economic time that we are in, according to Rhoda the numbers that are delinquent are about the same. It may be different people, but the overall number is about the same.

Karen Umberger stated she had sent some Budget Committee legislation out and she would really like to get some feedback on that and maybe we could take a few minutes, not tonight because people may not be prepared. Chairman Sordi stated next Monday we'll add it to the Agenda. Karen stated tomorrow she was presenting one of the Bills that was in the group that went to you on the Default Budget.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Stephen Steiner of North Conway stated he had three statements. One is referenced to D.A.R.E. and he wasn't here to bash D.A.R.E. but any drug prevention for the kids in the town is a good thing. On the other hand, he has to raise money for his organization, there's no reason why the Police Chief can't get on the phone and raise \$5,000.00. That's pretty easy to do. Everybody was asking what is an A, what is an A and he heard about murder, he heard about car jacking or whatever it was and he heard all of these crimes, but what he didn't hear was the one that causes it all and that's drug trafficking. He heard about recreational drug use like it's some little thing going on. It is killing this town. We have a Police Department that isn't pro-active. There's a revenue stream. A few years ago he was at a Conference with the DEA, they confiscated \$3 Billion in cash; now he isn't saying there's \$3 Billion in cash here in Conway, but he could tell you one thing there's a h\*\*\* of a lot of money and a lot of assets that can be seized that can help fund what they want to do but they need to be more proactive. We don't need more cops giving out traffic tickets, we need more cops going after the drug traffickers that are affecting our schools and our quality of living in this town. That's what we need.

Stephen Steiner further stated thirdly he's buying a house in this town and when he first came here it wasn't easy for him, but he's buying a house and he wants to build a business in this town. The taxes in this town are crazy, crazy what goes on. You just look down the strip, just look at any of these businesses, talk about the Smoke & Water Grill that went out of business; he's paying \$10,000.00 in rent so his Landlord can pay his property taxes. That's a travesty. What he's saying is that he's not here to lecture, but you guys have got to do something because it is crazy. If you want commerce and if you want this town to grow and not die, you've got to do something about the Budget. Thank you.

Chairman Sordi stated that the next meeting is Saturday, February 4<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM at the Town Hall. If you can't make it, let him know; send him an e-mail or give him a call and then the next meeting will be Monday night at 6:30 PM here at the Middle School. Ted Sares asked what the Committee would be doing then. Chairman stated final School questions and what he wanted to know was other than Dr. Nelson who else did members want to see, were there any other departments.

Karen Umberger stated we did not discuss the Kindergarten the other day and she didn't know why, but it wasn't discussed. Chairman Sordi stated he thought it was discussed. Karen stated she would like someone from one of the Elementary Schools, she didn't need all three Principals, to come and talk about that particular issue. Bill Marvel stated he thought Syndi White did the study on that. Chairman stated he would let Janine (McLachlan) know also and if Janine wants to come or Syndi. Dick Klement asked if the Chairman would like him to ask. Chairman stated yes, we're interested in talking about the Kindergarten. Betty Loynd asked didn't we talk about that with the School last week. Joe Mosca stated we didn't talk about the Kindergarten. Chairman Sordi stated we're doing three meetings with each. We've talked to the Town twice and the School twice and now we have final questions that might remain. That was the Town tonight and the School will be next week and then we go to the Public Hearings, then we vote and then go to the Deliberatives.

Karen Umberger stated the other issue that she wanted to talk about was the Teachers' Contract; there were some things in there that she had questions on. Chairman Sordi stated Carl (Nelson) could talk about that. Karen stated she thought that most of her other questions Dr. Nelson should be able to answer.

Dick Klement asked Karen Umberger to be more specific in her questions concerning the Teachers' Contract. Karen stated she didn't have that with her. Chairman Sordi stated that Karen could e-mail him the questions beforehand and he would forward them to Carl (Nelson). Karen stated no problem; she would do that.

Doug Swett stated this Grant, the Police Grant, for the additional year. Was that put in there by the Selectmen. Mike DiGregorio stated no. Doug asked if they insisted it be in there, the Grant people. Mike stated yes; they tried to do it last year but they just didn't get it filed in time. In fact, if you'll remember, there was an article about doing a special meeting and all of that stuff and it turned out that they missed all of the dates, not through any fault of their own, they missed all of the dates so it was all canceled. The requirements are you get this 3 years of money and you have to commit to the 4<sup>th</sup> year. Doug stated that kind of circumvents what the voters voted for that said we have to vote after the Grant was used up. Mike stated he didn't like the wording any more than anyone else, but as you know, you've been around long enough, they write it up, they send it down there, they check off and say change this, change that and it goes back and forth ten times and then finally DRA says that's what they want and it's ridiculous because it's often times confusing by the time they're done writing it, but this is what they say.

Ray Shakir stated going along with that topic, he's heard that over the last several years about the wording on the Articles and how they have to conform to the DRA requirements, blah, blah, blah. Is there any other specification, regulation or whatever that says after the words are approved, is there any other regulation that says we can't, "we" whoever, add underneath that paragraph a summary that makes it real clear and real simple.

Earl Sires stated Ray (Shakir) had a great point and what they found out a couple of years ago when it was brought it up was that you can't do that on the Warrant itself or the Ballot, but what they've been doing is, they created that Voter's Guide that everybody gets and in the Voter's Guide they try to explain in as plain English as they can what the Warrant Article is doing. Ray Shakir stated he thought it should really be attached actually to the Ballot. Earl stated the law says all you can put on the Ballot is the statutory stuff that goes on there, but the Guide goes in the Town Report in the section that people use to hopefully read up on the election and their choices. Hopefully they're reading the explanation of the language. It's kind of absurd that you have to do that, but that's what they have to do. Ray stated in other words you can't keep a separate pile at the polling place that people can pick up. Earl stated we can have the Town Report there. Ray stated and that would be at the polling place. Earl stated yes. Ray stated so we could make it very clear to people that if you want a summary or a simplification of the Articles, take one of these. Earl stated they would have a Voter's Guide also for the Deliberative Meeting and if anybody wanted to review his attempt at making the Warrant Article seem more straight forward, please do.

Ted Sares stated he thought the other message we can give is to vote it down as a Budget Committee; say this one is defective because it's not worded properly and it will hook us to two rather than one and vote no. That's certainly what he intends to do.

Mike DiGregorio asked Ted Sares why he thought it was defective. Ted stated because he thought looking at Joe's (Mosca) argument, replacing one Police Officer, adding another is fine, but adding a second is not so fine in these times and he misread that thing, it confused the heck out of him. Don't get him wrong, he's very pro-Police big time but when he read that, he said whoa I guess that doesn't really hook us in, but it does. Mike stated he was curious about the word "defective". What you're saying is that you don't want the third Officer. Ted stated the defective part is the ARRA part. Mike asked what was defective, the writing, the wording. Ted stated no, the part about ARRA that nobody seems to understand whether they are still around or not. Karen (Umberger) made some comments and now she's not so sure. Ted asked Earl Sires what was right. Earl asked Ted to explain what he was not sure about. Ted stated about the way that Warrant was set forth. If ARRA doesn't exist any more, how can it be in there. Earl stated there's a mistake in the identification of the funding agency, but the rest of the Article is as per DRA. Ted stated the funding is predicated on two things: COPS and ARRA; one of the two things is apparently no longer around which therefore makes it defective, in his opinion. Earl stated as it's currently written it is defective, so they will change it to the actual Grant agency and there's a difference between confusing and defective.

Sometimes that's even hard to tell. As Bill (Marvel) will recall, they had a special town election over a semicolon one time, 8 or 9 years ago. Ted stated the other thing is that it has an impact on the taxpayers.

Chairman Sordi stated he thought the Chief and the Police Commission stated they were going to look into it. Earl Sires stated probably what happened is what DRA told him as he looks back on it was they've had a number of these requests and this is what they've told the other towns to do. They sent us one, and to be honest he has no idea who the Grant agency is, he assumed that was it. The Chief is going to look into seeing who the actual agency is, we'll get it fixed and everyone can decide what they want to do from there.

**Joe Mosca moved, seconded by Danielle Santuccio, to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 PM. Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Iris A. Bowden, Recording Secretary