

**TOWN OF GILMANTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
PUBLIC HEARING- TOWN  
JANUARY 6, 2016**

**APPROVED**

**Members Present:** Brian Forst -Chair, Stan Bean-Vice Chair, Mark Sawyer- Member, Anne Kirby- Member, Michael Jean- Selectman's Rep, Richard Bakos-Sawyer Lake Rep, & Robert Carpenter-School Board Rep, Richard Gelatt-Member Steve Bedard-Member

**Also Present:** Heather Carpenter –Recording Secretary, Paul Branscombe- Town Administrator, Marie Mora- Finance Administrator, Heidi Jackson-Rhine- Assessing Administrator, Rachel Hatch- Selectmen, Joe Hempel-Fire Chief, Matt Currier- Police Chief , Public comments from- Richard Kordas, Betty Ann Abbott, Carolyn Baldwin, Duncan Geddes, Kendra Reed, John Funk, and Brett Currier

Meeting Opened at 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Brian Forst welcomes everyone. He reminds everyone that the purpose of the Public Hearing is not to deliberate the numbers but to receive question or input about the proposed budget and warrant articles. On Saturday the Budget Committee will have their work session to come up with their recommendation for the budget to move it forward to the Deliberative Session.

**New Business- Warning the Numbers {all articles written in this document are as read by the Chairman and not to be used as voting material. When voting please have update information on the warrant articles}**

**Article #1-** Election of Officers

**Article #2-** Brian Forst states that he will only be addressing articles that contain monetary items because that's all the Budget Committee has jurisdiction over.

**Article #3-** Petition Article

**Article #4-** (By Petition)

“To see if the Town will authorize the selectmen to enter into a three year agreement with the year round library to fund that library in the amount of \$150,000 (\$50,000 per year) and to raise and appropriate \$50,000 for the first year's funding. This would require a 3/5 majority vote to pass. What this article, in essence is doing, is if it was to pass it would allow the selectmen to enter into a contract with the Year Round Library which we would be funding the library in the amount of \$50,000 per year for the next three years. What I have understood to be the intent of this is in the event of a Default Budget, as you all know last year we had a proposed budget that was voted down, we went into a default. In a default budget year, as we have been very challenged with up here, things get really funky and this would allow the library to basically have a contractual agreement to know that they had funding of \$50,000 a year for the next three years whether it's a default year or not. Now, you will also see further on that there is a petition article to just fund the library for one year. So there are two options on the Warrant this year as far as library funding. This article is to fund it for three years, the other article is to fund it for a one year period. Does everyone understand the gist of that?”

**Richard Kordas-Q:** If we default this year the library gets funded as it did last year?

**Brian Forst- A:** No. If we go into default, last year there was some confusion in the default budget process. The library funding which was voted on a Warrant Article which should have been put in as a Warrant Article. There was some confusion on how the MS 7 got done and there was some difficulty with it. This would be a contractual agreement that and in a default year, the default budget is defined as

the previous year's budget with any contractual obligations. In other words if you have lease payments on equipment, any of that stuff you still have to raise and appropriate the money to meet your obligations. That is what this would, I mean if you still go with a warrant article every year to fund the library, even in a default year it is supposed to go into the, if it's voted in the affirmative, it's supposed to go into the funding.

**Richard Kordas- Q:** So this year will be an anomaly?

**Brian Forst- A:** Let me give you an example to help you understand. If we go into a default budget this year, if the budget is voted down and we go to a default budget and an article for the library is voted in then the library is funded. The difference between the two articles is this creates contract between the town and the library for a three year period. The other way is the same way we have done it for the last 9 or 10 years. Does that explain it?

**Duncan Geddes- Q:** If it goes on the ballot for year by year and it goes into default, like it did last year. They will continue to get it that way?

**Brian Forst- A:** If it goes on petition and is voted down, default is not going to change that. Do you follow what I am saying?

**Duncan Geddes-** Yeah, but if it gets voted up.

**Brian Forst-** If it gets voted up then they will get it.

**Duncan Geddes-** Well this is about putting a contract in, it really has nothing to do with the Default Budget. They just want a contract for three years.

**Brian Forst-** Right, you are correct it really doesn't have anything to do with the way its being done right now as far as default.

**Betty Ann Abbott-** You said that we had a choice between the three year and the one year. In reality you can vote them both up and the one year only passes if the three year doesn't. So you can vote for both of them, you don't need to make a choice. There would be no circumstance that we would get both but if we vote for them both and we fail to get the 3/5ths on the contract then we fall back to a simple majority winning on the Petition Warrant Article for one year, correct?

**Brian Forst- A:** Correct and I guess I jumped ahead by announcing that there was a second Warrant Article, I was trying to bring everything out in the open while we were discussing it.

**Richard Gellat- A:** It also could be said that both the Warrant Articles could be voted down and the library would not be funded, if it did not pass the required percentage.

**Betty Ann Abbott- A:** True

**Kendra Reed- Q:** I just noticed on the print out that it will say recommended by the Selectmen, recommended by the Budget Committee, as I am looking at this you guys haven't figured out your recommendation which is why there is no yes or no on any of these, right?

**Brian Forst-** Yes, when we started I indicated that tonight was our chance to hear from the public and on Saturday we have our work session, where we make our recommendation to the budget.

**Kendra Reed- Q:** The other line where it says recommended by the Board of Selectmen, I notice on all the other warrant articles it is filled in saying yes, except the library one. So, I'm just curious if that answer is not known or is there a reason why that one doesn't have a yes or no?

**Brian Forst- A:** I guess I don't have the answer for that because I didn't ask that question of the Selectmen. The other thing I would like to point out so that you all understand, we just had these put in front of us tonight. We have seen drafts but this one we just received, in all fairness it was emailed earlier today.

**Betty Ann Abbott-** I would surmise that the articles that have yes by the Board of Selectmen has it because they are the ones that put it on the warrant. The petition ones do not have that.

**Brian Forst-** That may be and we have run into that before where, technically, the only way a warrant article can show up in front of us is if the Selectmen recommend it or it is petitioned. So, I think that it is a valid answer for right now to the reason for no recommendation.

**Carolyn Baldwin-** I just like to speak in favor of this Warrant Article if that's acceptable. It's about time that the Town of Gilmanton stopping being the only town in the State that doesn't support its library on a regular, consistent basis. This is an important step in that direction. I think the library has earned its keep. It's an important feature in this town and if this was voted down that library would close and what would we have lost. This library was given to the town or made available to the town without a nickel of town money. All that the town is asked to do is keep it open. So, I just urge the Budget Committee, I would like to see a yes in the line. The alternative on as well because 2/3 can be high.

**Article #5-** Brian states is the article is the article for the Towns Operating Budget in a whole. It states that, "Shall the Town of Gilmanton raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted within the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purpose set forth therein totaling three million five hundred and ninety four thousand four hundred and eighty seven dollars (\$3,594,487)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be three million five hundred and thirty six thousand five hundred and sixty nine dollars (\$3,536,569) which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XV1 to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only."

**Brian Forst-** OK, I have done a few numbers here for you just to help you put this in perspective. The \$3,594,487 dollar number which is the proposed operating budget for 2016. Last year we voted a default budget that number was \$3,515,283 dollars that was \$79,204 less than this proposal. Last year the proposed budget that the Budget Committee put forth on the ballot was \$3,458,130. That is a difference of \$136,357 between last year proposal and this year's proposal. Does everyone understand what I'm saying there?

I am going to run through the budget basically, department by department. The first on is the Executive part of the budget which is basically your Selectmen's office, Town Administrator and the operation of the Selectmen's office. The proposed budget for that is one hundred eighty two thousand, the other thing I would like to preface is in this year's budget, somethings have been removed and put into other departments. You are going to see lines, like in the Police budget and the Fire budget, where they've taken utilities of the Public Safety Building out of the general town government building. I believe it was presented to us that the reason this was done, was to try and show more accurately where money was being spent. When you see some budgets that are down it could possibly be because that budget had somethings removed from it and put into another department. Is that understood?

The proposed request for the Executive line is \$182,949.00. Last years was budget was \$157,215.60. As we go through these numbers you are going to see some increases, kind of across the boards, some of it is due to staffing, some of it's due to insurance changes, and I do believe that most of the members on this committee has shown concerns as we've listened to the presentations. I do anticipate Saturday being a long day for us, as we try and figure out why things are up as much as they're up.

The second one is your Elections, Regular and Vital. This number is up considerably this year, the \$17,996.00 that's because we have four elections this year. Each election cost a certain amount of money, last year was \$13,496.00 so you have better than a \$4,000 increase and it's due to the number of elections.

Finance Administration, the request brought forth is \$88,009. , last year was \$73,957 again this changes in salaries, personal changes is resulted an increase in that line item.

Town Clerk/ Tax Collector the request come in at \$167,268 which is actually down from last years \$171,363. Again, some difference in staffing and salaries required for that.

The Treasurer comes in with a budget of \$11,207 request, last year was \$11,066 not much of a change there.

Trustees of the Trust Funds is basically a level funded budget at \$8,205.

The Budget Committee has a proposed budget of \$3,878, which is up just a little bit from last years \$3,847 that's due to an increase in the training line. Feeling that we are looking for a couple new people this year we may need to additional training seminars for those people.

Assessing proposed at \$109,098, last years was \$98,755.

Legal is requested at \$40,000. Last year was \$41,000 which is down slightly.

Planning Board is requested at \$51,320. Last year was \$29,439, again quite a lot of this is an increase in a consultant cost, which was explained that was something they were looking to having to add to their budget.

Zoning Board of Adjustment is proposed at \$9,726. Last year was \$9,325 again that is up slight due more to office supplies.

Historic District comes in at \$5,097, down slightly from \$5,376 last year.

This is where you are going to see in Government Buildings the proposed request is \$71,850, last year was \$100,850. This is one of the places where I explained that there's been some numbers moved within the town operating budget into different departments and this is one of those proposed places.

Cemeteries is \$8,996 for request, last year they were at \$8,500. That little bit of increase is due to the change in the way they are going to have handle their grounds keeping. They've had to hire it done instead of getting it from volunteer work, is the little bit of a change there that we are seeing.

Insurance is in at \$68,089 which is down considerably from last year at \$90,558, which is due to overpayment. Due to the fact that we got our money back we don't need to budget as much money for this year. The cost is going to be about the same but because we over paid, we got money back we don't need to raise and appropriate as much this year to cover it.

**Kendra Reed- Q:** We don't need as much this year but next year?

**Richard Bakos- A:** Next year goes back up.

Police Department's budget, this year's request is \$551,566, up roughly \$10,000 from last year, last year being \$541,565. So, basically like I said in the Government Buildings, the Police Department is acknowledging expense for heating and electricity at the Public Safety Building. Where before it was in the Government Buildings line, it was felt that it would be more accurately reflected if each department was picking up their true cost.

**Richard Kordas- Q:** What is on the Planning Boards agenda that's going to need \$15,000?

**Brian Forst- A:** They are updating the Master Plan. That is quite an undertaking and they have to bring a consultant in to make sure it is done correctly.

Fire Department budget is proposed at \$623,116, last year was \$595,171.70. Some of the change here is the same as the Police Department.

**Chief Paul Hempel- I** would like to add that \$11,000 to that is computer upgrades that are necessary.

**Brian Forst- A:** Right, before the computer upgrades were handled in the Executive budget or more in the Executive budget.

Building Inspector and Code Enforcement is proposed at \$23,899. Last year was \$20,055 so that's up due to salary of the clerk and some adjustment to more appropriately define the hours. Several of these positions you have one person that's clerking two or three departments. They have defined the hours better so that each budget is more clearly reflecting the work that the clerk is doing.

Emergency Management is requesting \$2,500 which is the same as last year.

There is two pieces to the Highway Budget. You have Highway Administration requested at \$408,812, last year was \$394,701. Then you have Highways and Streets which is proposed at \$349,763, last year was at \$301,133. A lot of that increase is in supply cost and snow plowing. Last winter, as we all remember was a pretty big winter for snow removal. We are only six days into 2016 but so far things have been a lot more manageable.

Road Betterment and Grants is proposed at \$268,363 that is up from \$226,508. The money that it is up is from the Block Grant money that we get from the state. That number is up but that isn't money that has to be raised by taxation. That is the money we receive from the state to help with repairing and rebuilding our roads.

Hazardous Waste Collection is requested at \$85.00 this year because last year \$2,825 they encumbered the money for Hazardous Waste Day, so they don't need to raise and appropriate that money for this year. The money has already been encumbered to cover that cost.

**Brett Currier- Q:** Does anyone have a reason on paving supplies, why they only spent \$3,758.13 but there is \$50,400 budgeted? Is that accurate? (The item he is referring to is under Highway and streets, line number 01-43121-690-06.)

**Brian Forst- A:** The answer we got when we asked that question was there was outstanding invoices to be paid. I have to agree with your comment that at this point we should be seeing the expenditures coming into line. We are only six days into the New Year but these sheets that we have in front of us were run of on the 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Brett Currier-** It seems like paving season has been over for a while.

**Brian Forst-** We certainly will be asking that question on Saturday as to whether or not these are accurate figures so that we can look at whether or not things keep needing to be appropriated in that amount.

Transfer Station budget is requested at \$252,347 up slight from \$251,763.

Animal Control is requested at \$500 which is the same as last year.

Outside Agencies are requested \$29,982. The reason you see a substantial difference the \$83,114 last year would be that last year's net budget is showing the Gilmanton Year Round Library at \$47,975 as a line in here because that is where the Warrant Article is voted in the affirmative to fund the library, it has to be placed somewhere in the budget, it's placed in outside agencies because that's what is classified as. However, the request for that is in a petition warrant article this year, as it is every year, so that's why you don't see it carried forward in this line.

There was one other outside agency that didn't send in their request of \$1,000, Greater Lakes Child Advocacy Center. We asked this year that they send in a written request to the town for funding. They did not submit a letter so it's funding did not get brought forth.

The Welfare budget is proposed at \$36,809, last year was budgeted at \$39,950. So as you can see that is down a little bit.

Parks and Recreation is proposed budget at \$14,553, up about \$1,000 from last year at \$13,552.

The Corner Library is proposed at \$17,500 up substantially from a year ago of \$3,700. Much of this increase is due to building maintenance and repair that they propose to be done in the 2016 year, as you can see listed in the request.

Iron Works Library is the same as last year at \$1,000.

**Kendra Reed- Q:** Just curious why it's not listed in outside agencies, because this is the one that the town doesn't own, right?

**Brian Forst- A:** Correct

**Stan Bean-** What they did this year was took the libraries in total and moved them out of the outside agencies for this year.

**Brian Forst-** The next one is going to be the Gilmanton Year Round Library which is a warrant article, so I'm not even sure why that's a page in the budget at this point, like you just asked. I'm not sure why it's moved there.

**Brett Currier- Q:** Why would that be listed at \$2,000 in the 2016 Default Budget line?

**Brian Forst- A:** Again, I don't see why it would be because it's not a part of the operating budget so it shouldn't be a part of a default budget.

Patriotic Purposes is proposed at \$3,875. That is the same amount as in 2015 that is your 4<sup>th</sup> of July fireworks.

Conservation is requested at \$3,963 that is down slightly from 15' where they had a budget of \$4,013.

Debt Service which is the contractual obligation of the town to pay our debts is at \$162,166 which is slightly different from \$162,093 in 2015.

**Paul Branscombe, Town Administrator-** The reasons that the three libraries were put outside the outside agencies is, normally in New Hampshire charitable organizations are treated as outside agencies not town libraries.

**Article #6-** Read as written "To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate fifty thousand five hundred and eighty nine dollars (\$50,589) to purchase and equip a new Fire Department Command vehicle and further to fund this appropriation by withdrawing thirty seven thousand dollars (\$37,000) from the previously established Fire Command vehicle Capital Reserve Fund with the balance of twenty three thousand dollars (\$13,589) to come from general taxation."

This would to replace the Fire Command vehicle that is in the CIP, Capital Improvement Plan, to be replaced this year. It's a ten year old vehicle.

**Article #7-** "To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) to purchase a new Fire Department Lucas Device for the Ambulance."

**Carolyn Baldwin- Q:** What is a Lucas device?

**Chief Hempel- A:** The Lucas device is a tool that we use when we have a patient in cardiac arrest. It will do automatic compressions for us so when we are transporting over a long period of time it will handle the compressions while our personnel are doing things. It is very useful.

**Brian Forst-** Correct me if I'm wrong but you have one of these devices now.

**Chief Hempel-** We were gifted with one years ago from our partners at LRGH. We have one ambulance with one and our goal is to put one in the other ambulance as well.

**Brian Forst-** So basically this would buy a second apparatus so there is one in each ambulance.

**Article #8-** "To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500) to be deposited in the Self Contained Breathing Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund."

**Brian Forst-** This is a fund that we have been funding over the last several years with the goal and purpose in 2018 replacing this equipment.

**Article #9-** “To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of eight thousand (\$8,000) to be deposited in the Fire Radio Capital Reserve Fund established in 2015.”

**Article #10-** “To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate thirty nine thousand nine hundred dollars (\$39,000) to purchase and equip a new Police cruiser.”

**Brian Forst-** This is to replace a cruiser that is in rotation to be replaced this year.

**Article #11-**“To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of one hundred and seventy five thousand dollars (\$175,000) to purchase a six wheel dump truck and further to fund this appropriation by withdrawing one hundred and seventy five thousand dollars (\$175,000) from the previously established Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.”

**Brian Forst-** This would be a fully equipped plow truck for the Highway Department, it doesn't explain that here. A six wheel dump truck, fully equipped with plows and equipment would be a better definition, just so everyone understands. This \$175,000 would be coming out of Capital Reserve, there would be no tax impact at this point. You have already been taxed and that's why the money is in there.

**Article #12-** “To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of nineteen thousand one hundred dollars and twenty dollars (\$19,120) to purchase a new Compactor for the Transfer Station and further to fund this appropriation by withdrawing nineteen thousand one hundred and twenty dollars from the previously established Recycling Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.”

**Article #13-**“To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) to be deposited in the Bridge Capital Reserve Fund.”

**Brian Forst-** I will have somethings to add to this, not to add to the article, but this is a very important fund. We have three bridges in this town that we are going to be looking to do replacements on by 2020. I know some of us sit here and think 2020 is a long ways off, not anymore.

**Richard Kordas- Q:** Is that for all three?

**Brian Forst- A:** There are three bridges right now that are slated to be repaired, two on Stage Road and one on Crystal Lake Road. I actually attend a Selectmen's meeting on Monday night where this was discussed. This all came to light on Monday night and I went to see the Selectmen with concerns of the Budget Committee. There is a forthcoming warrant article that's not on this warrant. I need to warn it tonight so that everybody understands that it is forth coming but it could not be placed on here because it has not gone before DRA or legal counsel to make sure it is a correctly worded warrant article. This warrant article will be to remove some funds from the Bridge Capital Reserve Fund to start the engineering process on these bridges that need to be replaced because it's a two to three year project to get the bridge construction. In other words engineering has to be done and we will have to have a proposal that comes back before the town in a warrant article that says that we are going to expend, whatever the cost of this bridge is. Then there is state aid that comes back in to help us with the cost of the bridge. We have to approve funding the repair before we can get the state aid. This is a process that is going to take time. There is another warrant article that will be coming up here that's going to change some verbiage on Non Capital Reserve accounts and the Selectmen had wished to change some verbiage on the Bridge Fund so that they would be agents to expend and the Budget Committee felt that we didn't want to see that happen because that is a fairly large fund that the town has put money away for future repairs. I presented that concern to the Selectmen on Monday evening because the Budget Committee

felt that we should have a warrant article to get some money to start the process but we don't wish to change the language on the reserve fund so that could be expended without a vote of the town.

**Richard Gelatt- Q:** The Selectmen Chairman, could you clarify the presentation with the Selectmen on Monday for bridges, was not for repair of bridges, it was for replace obsolete bridges. Is that more correct?

**Rachel Hatch- A:** Monday night when the Selectmen met we were finalizing our warrant articles. If you look at Article #19 it indicates that the town would vote the Selectmen as agents to expend from the following Capital, Non Capital Reserve Funds. The Bridge Replacement Fund was on this list. When Chairman Forst, Mr. Bean and Mr. Gelatt came forward, they wished for us to remove that capital reserve fund from this language and asked, if we as Selectmen would work with them. If we gave them a number asking than how much it would cost for the engineering cost for 2016, that would be a separate warrant article. The warrant article with the \$50,000 to be deposited in the Bridge Capital Reserve Fund stands. What we are going to be asking the town is to come up with a separate warrant article to fund the initial start of the engineering cost of, and we will decide this Monday night, one bridge or two bridges. Because we have not had a meeting since Monday and we aren't meeting until next Monday. This will be a topic of conversation were at the time the Board of Selectmen will decide A) which bridge or two bridges, B) How much for the initial engineering cost in 2016. We will then come up with language to have our Town attorney and DRA review it. So, unfortunately we don't have that warrant article for you to present but it will be forth coming. Chairman Forst indicated that he needed to warn the numbers tonight of what we would be coming up with. So, we are looking at anywhere between 50 and 150,000-200,000 dollars. We don't have firm numbers yet. When you do get your ballot you will see Article #13 which is the Bridge Capital Reserve Fund but you are also going to see a subsequent article and we are asking you to give us permission to draw X amount of monies to begin the engineering studies for the year 2016 only. We are not going to be agents to expend, it's a request that we bring before the Town each year. Does that make sense?

**Brian Forst-Q:** What I would like to add to that and correct me if I'm wrong, but 80% of that cost is reimbursed.

**Rachel Hatch- A:** Yes Sir.

**Brian Forst-** So even though that number sounds really big, that we have to remove that money from our capital reserve. We have to put the money up front for this. Then the state will reimburse us. In essence, we are having to spend a lot of money but we have to do that to get the process started.

**Duncan Geddes- Q:** But it's going to come out of Capital Reserve, not something separate?

**Brian Forst- A:** Correct, if we were going to say we were going to raise and appropriate that money by taxation, then we would have to take it in tax dollars, expend it, only to get back once the state reimbursed us. If we take it from the capital reserve is tax dollars that have already been taken and put away for this purpose. It won't create an immediate tax burden, that tax has already been collected.

**Richard Kordas- Q:** In reference to this article, is it the Towns position that it's going to take \$50,000 till 2020, each year to reach?

**Brian Forst- A:** Yes, a couple of years ago we stepped up the money the amount of money put into this account to reach the goal of 20% of the cost in that account. There was so discussion on Monday whether we were going to be ok and that's still kind of a work in progress but these bridges are in need of repair so we need to get the ball rolling on the engineering. We are going to put \$50,000 away for the future but we need to access some money at this point.

**Brett Currier-Q:** Is there any way you cannot put \$50,000 in and tax the \$50,000 that you want put in and use it for the engineering? If you are going to raise fifty grand then you're going to go put it away and take eighty out? Can you change that? To make that so one warrant article that we need 50,000, if 50,000 is enough money?

**Brian Forst- A:** Part of my dilemma is that we don't have those numbers yet. At this point I would like to warn both. Then once we have all the numbers, as you know we can go to Deliberative Session and we can change numbers but we can't change the article. We could adjust number to say instead of raising the money and putting the money away, things could be changed at that point. I think some of the idea was not to raise this engineering, if we need a couple of 100,000 for engineering, not to raise it by taxation.

**Brett Currier-** I understand that.

**Rachel Hatch-** In reading previous the intent of the former Board of Selectmen was to ear mark and ask the public to put away fifty thousand dollars away every year, steady. Then each year take out what we only needed. So I think and I hate to us the word transparency because it's so overrated, but I think the intent of the former board if you will, is to have it ear marked fifty thousand dollars a year and take it out as we used it. I agree with Brett that it's kind of redundant to put fifty and then take 80 but it's just a matter of accounting so that we have a history, of this is what we ear mark every year and this is what we use every year. Just to foster some consistency. I think that was the boards plan at the time.

**Brian Forst-** If I remember correctly, a few years back when we looked at this we were funding this in quite bit less amount and it came forward that these repairs were going to be needed sooner than later and we bet up the ante, as far as what we were putting in. It seems redundant to put money in and take it right out, I understand that. The reason why we have left the verbiage this way is because until Monday night we didn't have this orchestrated.

**Rachel Hatch-** I think it also fosters DRA consistence. I believe my last year or the year before when we discovered and realized how much it was going to actually cost and when we planned out to 2020, when we collectively with the Budget Committee, we came up with that fifty thousand dollars a year.

**Brian Forst-** Correct

**Brett Currier- Q:** I was just wondering if the Town Administrator had talked to the engineering firm or the company Monday night that you guys were talking to, you said you were going to call them this week? Have you talked to them?

**Paul Branscombe- A:** Yes I have.

**Brett Currier- Q:** Do we have a number?

**Paul Branscombe-A:** Yes we do.

**Brett Currier-Q:** Is it public information?

**Paul Branscombe- A:** Not until it goes before the Board of Selectmen but I can assure you that it has to have approval of the Board of Selectmen before it goes to the town attorney before it can get released by the Administration.

**Brett Currier- Q:** The town can't know what the number?

**Paul Branscombe- A:** I supplied it to the Budget Committee today.

**Rachel Hatch-** We were given a few numbers Brett, which we collectively have to discuss Monday night to see which way we are going to go.

**Brian Forst-** A lot of it depends on if it's one bridge or two bridges being done.

**Rachel Hatch-** Right.

**Brett Currier-** I guess what is kind of funky is that you guys are warning this but it isn't written yet and it seems like it could have been written already for the people to see tonight. If the number is already known?

**Brian Forst-** We have run across this in the past, a little bit, and in order to have a warrant article on the warrant it needs to go before legal counsel and DRA. You can't just drum something up and put it on here and find out later you couldn't do it that way. Being Monday night, short notice, it's Wednesday night I am trying to work with this the best I can. I don't want to disclose a number I don't have. As soon as we get it, it will be disclosed, it will be on the Warrant and at that point it's public information. Which I would say, is long before Deliberative, correct?

**Rachel Hatch-** Just to advocate for the Board of Selectmen. We had proposed warrant articles that include agents to expend in that Capital Replacement Fund. Members of the Budget Committee, yourself, Mr. Bean, and Mr. Gelatt, came to us this past Monday night, a couple of days ago, and brought this to our attention. In the spirit in trying to work with the Budget Committee and in good faith standing, we decided to amend it. Having said that, it is going to take us a few days to A) get those figures which we have B) We are meeting Monday night to decide which way we are going. C) We have to get town counsel and DRA to approve the warrant article. It's not going to happen overnight. The reason why we are kind of stuck is because the Board of Selectmen trying to work with the Budget Committee and we are doing the best we can. We asked that you warn it tonight, having said that, we are going to do the best that we can to come up with the warrant article with a final figure as soon as possible. And I would ask the Budget Committee to give us latitude because we are working on it diligently.

**Brian Forst-** Okay. As Stan has just told me, if I didn't warn this to the public tonight, this could not happen. Collectively, because this committee indicated to their Chairman, last week, which they wish that I visit the Board of Selectmen on Monday night and ask them to remove the Bridge Fund from that article. That started this whole process. If we are going to change the funding mechanism for this engineering, when I say mechanism, you going to have a warrant article that the town's people get to vote on whether or not they wish to expend this money to do this. Instead of the Selectmen being agents to expend from your Bridge Fund. This is the way it needs to happen. In order for all the pieces to fall into place it can't happen in two days.

**Article #14-** "To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of eighteen thousand dollars (\$18,000) to purchase a new generator for the Academy Building."

**Brian Forst-** This would be completely raised by taxation.

**Article #15-** "To see if the Town will vote raise and appropriate the sum of six thousand dollars (\$6,000) for municipal document restoration? This appropriation will only be valid if the default budget is adopted. If the operating budget passes, this article will be void."

**Brian Forst-** The purpose of this article is last year because of the default budget, there was not a separate warrant article to fund document restoration. It had been left out of a previous year's budget because they were asked to skip a year and it was cut from the budget. We went to a default budget, the Town Clerk/ Tax Collector had put in her budget, \$6,000 for document restoration but because we fell to default budget she could not do any document restoration because there was no money to do it. This year under legal advisement that's why you see this article. If the town votes to approve the proposed

budget, this warrant article will be void. If we go to default and this warrant article is voted in the affirmative then there will still be money to do document restoration.

**Article #16-** “To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of six thousand two hundred dollars (\$6,200) to be placed in a “Capital Outlay, Maintenance” account for the purpose of controlling and preventing the continuous and ongoing erosion to the Crystal Lake Park Beach.”

**Brian Forst-** This is to do a onetime project at the beach because there is a large problem there with beach erosion.

**Article #17-** “ To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of eighteen thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars (\$18,980) to fund cost of living increases and Town associated costs of 1.5% for all Part time ad Full time staff including the elected Road Agent and Town Clerk/ Tax Collector. This does not include call fire fighters or elected officials except as named in this article. This will then become part of the default budget as of 2017.”

**Brett Currier- Q:** Does this mean it’s going to be every year, 1.5% on the default budget, the way it’s written? So if we don’t want to give this COLA next year and we vote a different budget, this isn’t going to be a warrant article anymore? Is that what that means? That’s what it sounds like to me is. When it becomes a part of the Default Budget it becomes automatic again, right?

**Brian Forst- A:** I am going to have to ask the Selectmen. Was that the intent of that verbiage?

**Rachel Hatch- Q:** Can you clarify Brett what you are trying to ask?

**Brett Currier-Q:** Say we vote this in and then next year we don’t want to vote it in again, is this automatically in there?

**Rachel Hatch- A:** It’s my understanding is that it is not.

**Brian Forst-Q:** Bear with me here for a minute, because I’m hearing his question. The verbiage indicates “this will then become part of the default budget as of 2017”, which is next year’s budget. This verbiage exactly the question being raised. Does that make it a part of the Default Budget in 17’ that there is an automatic 1.5% COLA increase.

**Rachel Hatch-** I see what you are saying.

**Heidi Jackson-Rhine-** I believe the intention here is to maintain the dollar figures of the proposed salaries, so that if we went to default for 2017 it would be at the current rate of pay should they receive those vs defaulting back to a different pay.

**Brian Forst-** The verbiage here is kind of bad. If the salaries get voted and they get a 1.5% increase then they automatically become part of the Default Budget because that is what’s there. This saying this then will become part of the Default Budget as of 2017 indicates to me that this article will become part of the default budget.

**Rachel Hatch- Q:** In the event that we don’t get the default budget, that we get our proposed budget in 2017 and that’s not in there. What would happen?

**Brian Forst- Q:** What’s not in there?

**Rachel Hatch-** If we have voted in a regular budget for 2017 and this is a part of the default budget the employees will not get this raise.

**Brian Forst-** But this is already in their salaries for 2016, so if you go to default you use the 2016 salaries.

**Brett Currier-** I have just never seen it written this way ever.

**Brian Forst-** I haven't either because we've been dealing with COLA's as a warrant article for a few years now.

**Heidi Jackson-Rhine-** I have the Annual Report, page 116. Last year's ballot, Article #22.

**Brian Forst-** (he reads aloud) "This will then become a part of the default budget as of 2016." It's the same exact verbiage as last year.

**Brett Currier-** I guess I've been mistaken but I still have some question about it.

**Brian Forst-** I guess this is the exact same verbiage as last year. The dollar number is different but it is exact.

**Rachel Hatch- Q:** If last years was forever than why are we bring this forward for one year only? We wouldn't do that.

**Richard Bakos-** This is still ambiguous language based on reading it straight forward. Understanding what Heidi said the intent is correct. This is just ambiguous language, that's all.

**Article #18-** "To see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to fund Milfoil treatment for the lakes of Gilmanton."

**Article #19-** "To see if the Town will vote to appoint the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from the following existing Capital/Non-Capital Reserve Funds: This would allow the Selectmen to expend funds from these accounts when the need arises."

**Brian Forst-** The basis of this article is all of these Non-Capital Reserves which have money that has been raised through taxation and put into accounts. We are being told that the verbiage on them does not allow the Selectmen to expend them. So this article is very important to correct the verbiage those accounts because some of them have money sitting in them that should be being used.

**Article #20-** "(By Petition)" To see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) to fund the Gilmanton Year Round Library for 2016. This article shall be null and void if the article authorizing the selectmen to enter into a three year agreement with the year round library to fund that library in the amount of \$150,000 therein passes."

**Brian Forst-** So basically this is a one year funding article for the library vs the first article that we talked about, which was a three year contract.

**Kendra Reed- Q:** I just noticed again that there is no recommendation from the Board of Selectmen. I understand why your recommendation isn't here but last year it did give recommendations.

**Brian Forst- A:** I think those came forth after this.

**Kendra Reed:** Okay

**Brian Forst:** I think the previous statement that the Selectmen have to recommend a warrant article to get it to this point. Sometimes after the Budget Committee does their business on Saturday the Selectmen may not continue to recommend. Part of the reason there was confusion last year, is after Deliberative Session numbers were changed. The Selectmen at that point did not recommend and the Budget Committee did not recommend. So we had both parties not recommending the town budget. I think, this is just my personal thought on this, I think people went into a voting booth looked at Selectmen don't recommend and the Budget Committee doesn't recommend we aren't going to vote for it. Thus we fell into a Default Budget that was \$90,000 more than the proposed budget. So, we are going to try this year to not have this situation. That is why sometimes the recommendations don't match after

this. We will have a final meeting after Deliberative where the Budget Committee makes recommendation or not recommendation and the Selectmen kind of do the same thing.

**John Funk-** Going back to article #17, I think it correct the last sentence to say, “this will become a part of the base salaries of the employees” I think then that is what is intended so it’s not just one time and then we take it away. So it’s a part of the growth in their salaries. I think that language will elevate that concern.

**Brian Forst-** I think the COLA has always become a part of the base salary. I don’t know if a COLA was ever given in one year and then taken away in the next.

**John Funk-** So, alternatively it could say absolutely nothing at all and the assumption it’s a part of the salary.

**Brian Forst-** I think that’s correct. We can’t change verbiage so I’m not sure where this goes from here. It’s been discussed, it’s been warned. This committee doesn’t have the ability to change the verbiage nor does anybody at Deliberative Session to change the verbiage of a warrant article.

**Brett Currier-Q:** Can it be changed before the 12<sup>th</sup> by the Board of Selectmen?

**Brian Forst- A:** That is possible.

**Brett Currier-** I think if that didn’t say it on there, I think people will get confused. Even though it was on there last year, they might think it’s an every time deal.

**Brian Forst-** That would need to be brought up at the meeting with the Selectmen.

Article #21 and #22 these are articles that do not concern funding. That brings us to the end of this Public Hearing as far as warning the Town of budgetary requests of the upcoming fiscal year.

Are there any more questions?

**Carolyn Baldwin-** I think it needs to be noted on Article # 21 whether it requires a 2/3 vote, I think it does but somebody should make sure. It should be a note there.

**Brian Forst-Q:** On Article #21 the petition warrant article about SB2, which requires a 3/5th vote doesn’t it?

**Rachel Hatch-A:** It does Sir.

**Brian Forst- Q:** Would it be important that the language is put in there so that we don’t need up with the scenario we had last year on the Historic District situation, where the language wasn’t correct in the warrant article.

**Rachel Hatch- A&Q:** Yes. Can I go back to ask a question about Mr. Curriers recommendation for Article #17. If we put that last line and add “this will then become a part of the employee base salary”, would that satisfy the Budget Committee? Take out the part about the default budget as of 2017?

**Brian Forst-** I think the best thing for you to do there is get legal advice. I’m not sure that the last sentence needs to exist.

**Rachel Hatch-** We will get legal advice.

**Brian Forst-** We need to discuss the \$18,980 dollars, the concern over whether it becomes a part of the default budget, I don’t think is major concern as that verbiage was there last year. What has been brought to attention tonight, is that is not comfortable verbiage and what can we do to change it. The Budget Committee is concerned with the \$18,980 number.

**Rachel Hatch-**The Board of Selectmen is recommending and bring forward the 18,980, it’s the Selectmen’s concern that we word it correctly so that the residence understand. We each have a job to do before Saturday.

**Conclusion-** Meeting on Saturday for the Budget Committee work session.

**Motion to Adjourn:** Robert Carpenter

**Motion seconded:** Richard Bakos

Board voted unanimously

**Adjournment:** 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Carpenter