

**TOWN WARRANT**  
**TOWN OF GILMANTON**  
**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**Minutes of the First Deliberative Session**  
**Article # 7 through Article #30**  
**Saturday, February 1, 2014**

**FIRST SESSION:** *(109 voters of 2,428 Total Registered Voters = 5% Voter Turnout)*

**To the Inhabitants of the Town of Gilmanton in the County of Belknap, in said State, qualified to vote on Town Affairs:**

**You are hereby notified to meet at the Gilmanton School Gymnasium in the said Gilmanton, on Saturday, the 1st day of February 2014, at 10:00 a.m. This session shall consist of explanation, discussion and deliberation of the Warrant Articles numbered Seven (7) through Thirty (30).**

The Warrant Articles may be amended subject to the following limitations:

- (a) Warrant Articles whose wording is prescribed by law shall not be amended, and
- (b) Warrant Articles that are amended shall be placed on the official ballot for a final vote on the main motion as amended.

**SECOND SESSION:**

**To the Inhabitants of the Town of Gilmanton, in the County of Belknap, in said State, qualified to vote on Town Affairs:**

**You are hereby notified to meet at Gilmanton Academy in said Gilmanton on Tuesday, the 11<sup>th</sup> of March, 2014; polling hours will be open from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. This session shall be the Voting Session to act on all Warrant Articles numbered One (1) through Thirty (30), as amended, including the proposed budget, as a result of the action of the "First Session".**

**Article #1:** To choose all necessary Town Officers for the year ensuing.  
*(The election of the Town Officers will be on the ballot for the March 11, 2014 Election.)*

**Article #2 - #6:** *(Zoning Articles are not amendable at the First Session; Articles two through six will be on the ballot for a vote at the March 11, 2014 Election).*

## Article #2:

1. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - **Zoning Ordinance (Article III. F) Signs Political Signs:** A sign that supports a candidate, party, or political ideal. A political sign shall be exempt for a period of ninety (90) days prior and seven (7) days subsequent to any Town, State, or Federal election. Unless the election is a primary and the advertising concerns a candidate who is a winner in the primary. The term “election” shall include any town or school district annual or special meeting.

## Article #3:

2. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - **Zoning Ordinance (Article III – L) Residential Lake District:** In the Residential Lake District retaining walls may not exceed five (5) feet in height from the preexisting ground level. Walls shall be constructed with materials and landscaping to complement the existing setting. Retaining walls must meet setbacks for other structures from roads, waterfront, and property lines as set forth in Article IV Table 2. Unless otherwise necessary for slope preservation.

## Article #4:

3. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #3 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - **Zoning Ordinance (Article XVI – Definitions) “Lot of Record”**  
A lot which is part of a subdivision approved by the Gilmanton Planning Board and recorded in the Belknap County Registry of Deeds. Also a lot or a parcel described by metes and bounds, the description of which was so recorded prior to zoning (1970).

## Article #5:

4. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - **Zoning Ordinance (Article XVI – Definitions) “Setback”** The minimum distance from the property lines as set forth in Table 2 of this Ordinance for each zoning district. The front property line is defined as the boundary between the right of way of the Road and the subject property. The setback is a line which runs parallel to the property lines. The areas between the property lines and the setback lines shall contain no structures.

## Article #6:

5. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #5 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - **Zoning Ordinance (Article XVI – Definitions) “Street”** A public highway as defined in **672:13**. "Street" means, relates to and includes street, avenue, boulevard, road, lane, alley, viaduct, highway, freeway and other ways.

*Moderator Sisti opened the Town of Gilmanton's Deliberative Session at 10:01 a.m. The session began with the Moderator asking all to stand for the pledge of allegiance, led by Stan Bean. Moderator Sisti asked for a moment of silence for those who have passed.*

*"Folks, for those of you who are aware and those of you who are not are aware, this is a Deliberative Session. Rules are a little different from what the old town meeting format was. Basically you'll be presented with a number of warrant articles as well as the petitioned warrant articles; they're open for discussion throughout this particular session, and some will be open for amendment. There are some that cannot be amended...such as the zoning warrant articles. What I am going to actually have you do, for clarity of the record, is that when you do stand to address the body, clearly state name for the record."*

*Moderator Sisti also lets the body know that there is a fund raiser this evening at the Laconia Elks for Julie Perkins and her family, with regard to medical expenses, and it's from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. It's a \$10 donation for a spaghetti dinner.*

*Tom Scribner asks Moderator Sisti if there will be reconsideration of the votes. Mr. Sisti states that this is a poignant question...everyone has had clear notice of when this particular meeting was to take place and that when we close an issue, we close an issue. We will go through the articles and amendments one at a time with opportunity to discuss. The articles will be addressed in an orderly fashion in the order that they appear. There will not be reconsideration. Moderator read through Article #2 through Article #6 for discussion, stating there would be no amendments on these articles. There being no discussion, Moderator Sisti draws the body's attention to Article #7.*

**Article #7:** "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 Two Hundred Seventy Nine Thousand One Hundred Sixty Two Dollars (\$3,279,162)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be Three Million Three Hundred Twenty Two Thousand Four Hundred Ninety Seven Dollars (\$3,322,497), 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 XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only."

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Tom Scribner **moved \$3,279,162**, Article #7 as written and read; **seconded** by Brian Forst.

**AMENDMENT #1:** William Donovan **moved to amend** Article #7 by increasing the recommended operating budget by **\$10,400** with the intent of adding it to, and thus level funding, the Fire Department's Part-Time Salaries Account #27001-42201-115-04. The new budget total would be **\$3,289,562**; **seconded** by Betty Ann Abbott.

*Selectmen Guarino spoke to the Selectmen's position of reducing \$10,400 through this fiscal year we were looking at the Fire Dept. budget and in the process we referenced back to a vote that we had in 2004 and why we placed the third full-time firefighter was placed on to cover and*

*the Board of Selectmen decided that...we were to be covered by full-time firefighters seven days a week, twelve hours a day, so that we had that coverage which we don't have here presently. We have the 2004 Town Report, the 2003 Town Report, to see what we voted for and by the fact that the Board of Selectmen felt, which the Chief knows, we are not trying to cover this issue, is that at that period of time the Fire Chief had, as a salaried employee, most likely covered a couple of shifts and then full timers were on through seven days covering, we had three firefighters that would rotate out with the Chief and cover...the actual 164...168, so if you take the Chief's forty hours and you take the three firefighters and you give them forty eight hours that comes to 168...it comes to 184 and then...what we did was sounds fairly complicated, all we did was remove a Sunday. If you take a \$200.00 shift adjustment for a full-timer for a part-timer covering the Sunday shift, times fifty two weeks times \$200.00 comes to \$10,400...everybody says, well you're referencing something that comes from ten years ago? The position of the Board of Selectmen is that that's what we voted on ten years ago, we had a third full-time firefighter so that we had in the station full-time Gilmanton firefighters covering a Sunday shift not part-time firefighters so there was a little bit of a disagreement between the Fire Chief and the Board of Selectmen, I wanted you to know why we went and took the \$10,400 from the budget...and so we're sitting here today with an amendment to add the \$10,400 back into the budget to allow to continue as it has been at least for, well we don't exactly know, but for at least the last three years...we're trying to document how long it's been that way...*

*Chief Hempel states this has been an ongoing discussion for the past three years, the bottom line with this cut, it is a cut in services...we can talk about part-time verses full-time. We have used part-time certified personnel as long as I can remember...I have been on the department for thirty five years...we've seen continual improvement in how we've evolved into a wonderful service. The Board and I disagree on how to go about staffing my department. Since 2004, when we hired the third employee, we have a lean staff some days; we staff our station seven days a week. Prior to the addition of the third firefighter in 2004, the lights at the stations were off on Sundays there was no personnel, we relied on our call help to handle those calls... former Chiefs, Chiefs before me, chose to use their part-time hours staggered during the week, maybe not on Sunday's, maybe Tuesday's and Wednesday's, it was revolving, my schedule has brought those part-time position hours to Sunday's, that's all, that's all we do. I'm concerned that a cut in this manner and actually the elimination of the part-time employees creates a safety issue. Most of you know the recent business of late has been a topic of conversation that I am a forty hour salaried employee; I typically spend my week Monday through Friday with two additional Firefighter/EMT's, I choose that schedule because I think it is more appropriate to accurately communicate when there aren't any of our call staff. Most of our call staff works out of town. We rely heavily on our full-timers during the weekday hours; we rely heavily on our call staff to supplement us at night when we don't cover and then during the day. So the best use of our assets, I think, is that Monday through Friday. The topic has been, "make the Chief a working chief," "make him pair up a couple days a week with a single person". There's a lot to do...there's administrative work, it's not all about administrative work, it's not all about what I do with my work week, it's about serving the community in the most appropriate way. There's a lot going on and in the answering of calls I feel as a qualified department head, that I should be the one to improvise the most appropriate manner in which to run the department. I appreciate your consideration in restoring the \$10,400 so we can go on and continue to provide you with*

*what I feel is a great service...and we thank you and look forward to continuing to serve the community...*

*Nate Abbott supports the amendment...believes all should regard Mr. Guarino's statement as an argument in support of the amendment and the reason for that is that his statement indicates a dysfunction of reasoning in the current Board...We are here to prepare a charge for our legislative body for the annual duty of this Board, which is also elected and it changes every year. They take our charge and execute the fiduciary responsibility of taking the actual appropriations that we direct them to do on an annual basis. There is no extended authority given by our annual vote. We charge them for one year, each year and then they decide over the course of the year what the best course of action, as I did as a Selectman in 2004. I recall that Chief Robbins, at that time, made that commitment to us. Reasonably, we could not expect that commitment to endure year to year unless it was somehow endorsed by this body or taken up as a policy of the Selectmen. It seems like the Selectmen are saying that they're ready to take up all the policies enacted by our Boards and take them as their mandates, including the six years of my own. But I don't see that as their practice. Since 2004 we've had a new safety building, certainly a thousand people in turnover of the population of the town...there is a different fire chief, there a different people on fire service, there are different people here. These evaluations should be made on a basis of existing conditions, not some statement made by a fire chief in 2004. It's invalid reasoning.*

*Teresa Donovan stated she had two points to make. This [Amendment] provides level funding to the 2013 budget, it's not an increase. That amount of money would be about two one hundredths of a percent on the total budget. Number two, I think we get mired into the debate of 2004...there may be disputing reports...even in the minutes of the Selectmen most recently they pulled out to try to corroborate their position in the November 29, 2004 minutes. Chief Robbins said this would allow them to have 12 hours of coverage; seven days a week...when I consider public safety, I have every confidence in our fire department and our Chief, there are certifications, there are requirements by state law. I will defer to the judgment of the professional to run our fire department...I want to look forward and make sure that we plan ahead...there is no place for politics in public safety...support this amendment to level fund their budget and let's let the fire department do their job...*

*Selectmen Guarino restates the position of the Board for the reduction of \$10,400 based and on 2004 meetings, you guys can go any direction on this...history is important...the Board would like everyone to know what their position is based on and their concern for safety.*

*Chief Hempel ...the current level of service has been funded for as long as I have been here, you funded that level when Chief Lockwood was here...when I propose a budget and it's passed by this body, as a department head I look at it and say, the voters have vowed to give a certain amount of money to manage this department, you pay me to make those decisions, and one of those is the best use of those responders. My job is to assess the risk, to protect the people at risk, with the best team available at any given time and currently we do that...the reduction of our part-time hours is a reduction in services of 24 hours of staffing...and it is concerning...as a fire chief I wear different hats, and to roll up to a building fire, I want to have the best team have*

*the best opportunity available for a successful outcome. If I roll up to a scene of a building fire with only two personnel, myself included...on a day that I am covering a twelve hour shift, there are some decisions that are going to have to be made that won't allow me to implement certain strategies, I would be wearing two different hats, I would need to have additional personnel on scene. My job as Chief and incident Commander is to protect you and to protect my personnel...I can't run a truck, I can't run a pump, I can't run into a burning building, and set the stage to prevent tragedy in a burning building...Chief's job is to stage and maintain communication and control of the scene...please support this amendment...*

*Brenda Currier states she would like to have faith in Chief, but can't...last summer she met with Chief Hempel to talk...discussed many things...one of her concerns was the use of the facility...not staffing the Public Safety Building...staffing of the Iron Works Station...She stated he had admitted considering it... she couldn't trust the Chief's judgment....*

*Moderator Sisti asks if there's any further discussion and asks that we stay focused on the \$10,400 amendment figure.*

*Chief Hempel...responded in regard to Brenda Currier's comment...it's actually in the minutes of a Selectmen's meeting, the Board gave me the purview to ask me whether I would consider talk about not manning the Corner's Station and my response is...of course it was discussed as part of strategic planning to best serve...I told Board I had no intention at this time to not staff the Corner's Fire Station, if that came to fruition it would certainly be discussed with a Board of Selectmen...to this day, that stands, there is no intent not to staff at the Corner's Fire House...*

*Brian Forst...speaks to Budget Committee's recommendation on the dollar figure. When both recommendations are the same as Selectmen's it is based on the Budget Committee's vote and decision that when they looked at the fire budget and they looked at the monies that were used last year, there was about \$57,000 left on the table. So we felt this cut to bring the bottom line to the \$574,837 fire budget was an appropriate amount of money and all of this staffing and hours and everything else is left up to Department Heads and the Board of Selectmen. But I do not feel this \$10,400 needs to be in the fire budget for the fire department to run a safe and efficient manner and it was the feeling of this Board that with the money that was left over from last year that the budget was sufficient at that amount; so as we speak to this, I would like you to understand that the budget number put forward by us reflects us feeling that that dollar figure is sufficient enough, regardless of all these other issues.*

*Tom Scribner asks the Chief to speak to this.*

*Chief Hempel...I understand what the Budget Committee's position is; I appreciate the job they do for all of us. We did have a surplus at the end of the year. Just because I have it, I don't spend it. I'm a taxpayer too, we try to be fair with the budget and not overspend...the main reason I want you to support that particular line item is because it is a true reflective accounting of what that account costs...as it stands right now the line for the part-timers is at \$18,600; the additional \$10,400 brings it to \$29,000, the amount that was funded for the previous two years...I am being transparent on our spending account properly for that use. With the*

*restoration of the \$29,000 to cover part-time hours and to replace sick days and vacation days...willing to look at it in 2015 and make those adjustments where necessary....in spirit of accurate accounting, I was looking to restore the number to make for a more accurate accounting.*

*John Funk stated there was a surplus of \$57,000 last year, asks the Boards if we have run into deficits in some years? What's been the pattern? Seems to him if we look at it from year to year basis and make judgments on that, it isn't necessarily reflective of overall costs...what's been the pattern of previous deficits verse overages?*

*Brian Forst responds he's not really prepared to answer his question and he does not have the exact numbers, so he doesn't want to stand here and speak numbers. When the Budget Committee looks at a budget presentation that they are given, they look at the prior year expended to date. Some parts of the budget will be overspent; some parts of the budget will be underspent. But the big thing we look at is the big number. Is the budget being used or not being used and if it's not being used, sometimes there's a good reason as Chief Hempel has said, he's mindful of his budget. He doesn't use all of the money maybe every year. I think typically the fire department has come in very tight. They watch their budget well. They do a good job...the Budget Committee presents to the people their recommendation on this budget. I understand where Mr. Hempel is coming from where he is trying to see a line restored. That is not the Budget Committee's forte, he believes, to have specific lines restored. Our job is to make a recommendation to the taxpayer...*

*John Funk responded that Brian said there was a \$57,000 surplus last year and his concern is that some years where there were a series of fires that might tax the budget of the fire department and it should run over the budget, in looking at surpluses and deficits, it's useful, but it doesn't necessarily predict what is happening in the current particular year. It's like the school budget where you can't predict a Special Education Child...*

*Chief Hempel states a couple of years we had surpluses and really the biggest factor of surpluses are call pay account. We can only forecast our call pay. Call pay is our monthly expenditure for call members...we fund it at a certain level...number of years that line has been very much needed...there is a line for our call pay that is fluid many years we don't over expend that line...there are always different variables for the need of calls...don't want to short-change...don't know what kind of activity we're going to have in the coming year...*

Moderator Sisti calls **Amendment #1** to a question in the amount of amending Article #7 to **\$3,289,562?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Amendment #1 passes in the amount of \$3,289,562.**

**AMENDMENT#2:** Selectman Guarino **moved** to amend to reduce the operating budget of Article #7 by \$32,994.00 for a total of \$3,256,568.00; **seconded** by Brett Currier.

*Selectmen Guarino...reduced looking at the fact that we're down a full-time fire fighter and we have the opportunity to cover a full-time firefighter with the Town of Gilmanton, actually for 48 hours, and we decided that we would like to cover that full-time position with two part-time fire fighters, each not exceeding 24 hours; so we'll replace the full-time firefighter with two part-time firefighters and that's the amount of the money that we would reduce to save the taxpayers in the budget. This didn't come to us by ourselves...we had a discussion with the Chief at a meeting on Wednesday...I haven't had an opportunity to talk with the Chief since Wednesday other than this morning, but the Chief at the meeting was in agreement with the Board of Selectmen...we had a full-timer move to another department the end of November...part-timers have been handling the 48 hours by the fact that we are down a full-timer, and we asked the Chief with the part-timers that we have available, she said there's between seven and eight part-timers, so we asked the Chief if we could cover that 48 hours and he told us that he could, and to be fair to the Chief, other than the fact that there was just a short email on Thursday, we haven't had a chance to discuss why he says that he doesn't agree with this. I just wanted to let you know this had been thought of before...*

*Chief Hempel responded ...first of all, when we received the new policy it says I cannot use part-time employees anymore. Now the Board comes to me and says it wants me to use part-time employees and give up the full-time employee...I'll be honest with you, I was hoping to avoid this discussion, because I was at a public meeting with the Board on Wednesday, but I wasn't informed this is what the meeting was going to be about. I was informed we would be having a discussion on call pay and part-time pay, that was originally the intent. I attended the meeting, the meeting promptly changed to a discussion of moving a full-time position into a part-time position. I was really taken aback...I was ill prepared for this discussion...we've been negotiating staffing for over two years now...the merits of part-time staffing...would tear up our part-time policy and you can manage your department any way you want to...In my haste of not knowing which road I should take, I agreed verbally to their plan and I walked out of that meeting pretty disappointed and upset by what had just occurred. It took me some time to digest the subject. I met with my officers, who were extremely supportive and they were not pleased with the outcome of this, we seemed to be backed into a corner...this is not right, this is not the intent of the voter, this is not in the best interest of the community and it needs to be staffed accordingly...on Thursday, at 7:55 a.m. I wrote an email to our Town Administrator to tell him to please distribute the following to the Board of Selectmen:*

**From:** Joe Hempel [<mailto:jhempel3@metrocast.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2014 7:50 AM  
**To:** [townadministrator@gilmantonnh.org](mailto:townadministrator@gilmantonnh.org)  
**Subject:**

Arthur,

Please pass on to the board.

Gentlemen, after a long and sleepless night I have come to the conclusion that I cannot endorse the elimination of our full time position. In order to remain true to myself and the do what I think is in the best interest of our community and our department my position remains as it has. For the last several years I have been arguing for what I believe is the proper way to manage our personnel within the constraints of our budget. I have been sensitive to maintain our budget to acceptable levels. When I left the meeting yesterday, although I agreed with our negotiated outcome, I was not happy. You have all been speaking of the will of the voter for some time. Your issue arose from wanting to do the will of the voter from 2004. I believe it is important, and

the will of the voter to have a fulltime person fill the vacancy. I will continue to uphold the practices that I think are in the best interest of our organization and our town. I hope that you take the time to listen to the voter on Saturday. I will be prepared to follow and implement your policy of Jan 3<sup>rd</sup> as necessary.

Respectfully

Chief Hempel

*The policy delivered to me on January 3rd allowed me not to use part-time employees any longer for staff purposes. It allows only using part-time personnel now to fill in for sick and vacation time of full-time personnel...*

*Anne Kirby states she appreciates coming to these meetings and try to make informed decisions. It feels really unfair for us to try to make a decision on something that came from three days ago related to public safety. She absolutely opposes this amendment. She stated we can't be informed; we went to public hearing a week ago and Super Saturday and heard the fire department budget...*

*Kristyn Fischev stated she is disappointed in the Board that we have right now. We have appointed people and elected people in this town...feels issues have been politicized and made into personal agendas...Fire Chief is an appointed representative, he does a diligent job for this fire department along with many others who volunteer their time or they are paid or stipend ...everybody that is appointed, elected, or hired is supposed to be a public servant to the people of this town. I feel...people are doing their own agendas and it's not for the betterment of the whole of this town. It's really disheartening...I work for the town, our job is acting as a servant of the people and that should be your first priority if you do your job for the town. Whether it's a selectman, a town administrator, fire chief, police department, budget committee member, highway or if it's sitting behind the desk doing clerical work, it is a service to this town and its' people...We love Gilmanon...but when people want to move away because of the pettiness of issues that come before this town, they're disappointed and it makes people want to move away; that's really sad because this town was built on something more...the fire chief, the issue of whatever the thing is in 2004, I'd like to know who brought this to the attention of the Selectmen because you say that you are the voice of the people, I want to know what people stood before you and said that the Fire Chief and his department are not doing their job. Because I haven't heard any complaints whatsoever in the two years that I have been working with our emergency services for either the fire department or the police department. I have only heard high praises...if you're elected, appointed or hired and you're the headship of that department, you should be able to delegate to people below you, not told what you can and cannot do...you should trust the skills of the people that have been put there to do the job...*

*Duncan Geddes...not for or against the fire department, but would like to say he appreciates these guys trying to save us tax dollars...doesn't agree with what's going on here because of the time and thinks it should have been worked out before...this all shouldn't have been brought up, he's interested in knowing whether the Board got the email that the Chief sent? The Board responded, "No." Mr. Geddes responded that this was misrepresented and he does not think we should vote for this...does appreciate the Selectmen trying to save some money.*

*Janet Breton thinks what they said is that we are having a hard time filling positions at full-time. We're small town, offer 12 hour shifts, we don't offer 24 hour shifts and if we're having a hard time filling positions at full-time then go to part-time and fill it with people. We're fortunate that there are a lot of part-time people that work 48 hour shifts that can fill the 12 hour shifts, they're trained and hopefully we can retain them and that will be a good working relationship for both of you and you don't have to keep going through the turnover every few months when you train someone at full-time and then they go on to 48 hours somewhere else...makes sense if we're not able to hire people for positions that are full-time, then we should go to part-time...might get better trained people that are already in the community...*

*Teresa Donovan...really can't believe we're having this discussion about significantly altering the services at a fire department that has not been fully debated, the budget committee did not have this discussion about losing a full-time fire position. We're a community. You need to think about the implications of what you're doing. We've seen neighboring towns, other towns, when they start to disassemble vital public services like police and fire, think about, if you're not as concerned here as I am for public safety, think about property values, about attracting good people to live in your community...I support the schools, I support public safety of the police department I'm proud of, a fire department I'm proud of; we're not talking about spending more money, we're talking about level funding a responsible budget. Look, we can get into personal issues and agendas, we do that at the ballot box when we elect Selectmen...should not be settling scores with public safety, that's a service that we rely on. I want to know that the fire department is going to show up, the police department is going to show up and an ambulance is going to show up, but by the Grace of God go all of us people...*

*Elizabeth Strauss...I needed a fire department ambulance; they showed up very quickly, I was really grateful for that...I would like to suggest instead of nickel and diming the department, we fund this.*

*Brett Currier...I've been criticized by this fire department for years, I know what's going on, I know what the deal is with services. I want a good fire department and I think we have a good fire department; so, I see the odds are stacked against the Board of Selectmen today on this issue, which is fine, that's why we went to SB2 in this town, and I for one think it's a good thing so everyone gets a vote, not just a select few. This fire department, in 2003, had a budget of \$263,000. We covered six days a week with three men, a chief and two firemen/EMT. The chief worked shifts with one other man, ask him he'll tell you, that's a fact...he was chief in 2003 he was hired again in 2011...In his SOG packet my wife and myself were in the department at that time...Seven thousand eighty eight hundred dollar line was for the call for the fire department part-time budget...was to cover Sunday, shifts, not to cover Sunday shifts, to cover holiday, sick and vacation time for the full-time fireman that was absent. It was not to cover a Sunday shift at all. We had a \$56,000 dollar call line...call pay are not part-time people, they're call people, if you get a call, you respond...it used to be volunteer...I was on that part; there were a lot of guys on it. They changed it...they didn't want working guys responding, they gave you a stipend, a certain amount of hours...but what happened to it, and I'm not saying this chief started it, but it started and, all of a sudden they're taking money from a line that's supposed to be on the call side and putting it into part-time so somebody didn't have to work Sunday. That's a fact, that's*

*not made up. We voted for the 4<sup>th</sup> full-timer in 2004. It came to us by Chief Robbins saying we're covering six days a week from 7a.m. to 7p.m., you guys want Sunday covered, give me one more man. We did that. All of a sudden, we're doing fine; our full-time employees are covering the shifts. We have this \$56,000 pile of money...let's make it easy for us, let's hire to work shifts on Sundays so that we don't have to. Good deal when people aren't watching the budget...in 2003 we had 402 calls for the Gilmanton Fire Department. Today in 2013 at the end of the year, we had 436...our budget went from \$262,000 to this year's projected budget of \$586,000. Roughly we saved \$100... If we don't get thrifty by cutting services by putting part-time employees into these positions, when nobody's there, you're not hurting anyone. You're gonna put guys on 12 hour shifts, it's not going to hurt anybody...just like Janet Breton said, it's a good thing for the town, you don't have guys getting their EMT-I's, moving to Laconia, moving to Gilford, moving to Concord so they can work 48 hour shifts in two days and have the other days to do what they want. It's not the Selectmen micromanaging...that's not true at all...they're leaving because there's no action in Gilmanton. They don't want to sit around a fire station waiting for one call a day...do I get criticized for trying to save the taxpayers money, criticize me if you like...this year everybody knows that the taxes have gone down...we picked on someone, one person, all of a sudden...the fire chief, we're picking on him...it's a scare tactic...we're looking at the dollars...in ten years we're going to have the same amount of calls, and we're going to have a 1.1million dollar fire department, suit yourself.*

*Moderator Sisti states he is going to start stepping in and cutting people off. He wants people to speak to the dollar amount. He does not care who got stabbed in the back, this is about money, so if you want to step up to the microphone, let's talk about money.*

*Jennifer White...we need to be able to maintain the fire department that we have...in 2010 she was in a rollover, ejected out the windshield...they were there in minutes, had to stop in Belmont for a paramedic to be treated on the way to the hospital...they were there within moments and appreciates that...we do need to have proper trained paramedics and staff.*

*Dennis Comeau ...couple of points...was a full-time firefighter here in town and did move to the Laconia department...still serves Gilmanton as a call man, as a lieutenant, my services are still here five days a week. I draw a larger paycheck from Laconia because it is a larger city. The job is the same, what we're paid to do is the same...there was a study done by LGC, hired by you folks a few years ago and the reason why those of us do go as professional firemen elsewhere is because the of the money...we're also now wasting time over \$10,000, which was amended, which was voted on, and it was passed, but now we're going to try it again, so, in a little while, we're going to vote again to make sure we've already voted twice for the same money.*

*Brian Cottrell...I did work for this town, left the town of Barnstead making more money than Gilmanton because I felt this town was my home at this moment right now I don't feel like this town is my home because of the way everyone is getting treated in town. Not from everyone out here but from the front of the room. I'm not pointing fingers; this is a general government thing. In 2008 I gave my resignation to go back to Barnstead because the Board, at that time, was going to cut our pay...like everybody here in the audience I had a wife and a baby to take care of, a house to maintain, fuel oil to put into my tank. It does work for the almighty dollar for us,*

*just like it does for everybody else in this room. But to cut services is wrong and for anybody that has a handicapped family in town, such as I do, it's wrong...the way the fire chief runs the fire department is spectacular compared to the way it was in the past. I worked here in 2004 with Chief Robbins with what allegedly had happened, I didn't see any of that, but I was here as a full-time employee. Without pointing fingers...people need to think about the services of the town...I did leave, to go back to Barnstead, I wasn't going to be making more money; I did it because I was going to be making less money here...safety is a number one priority, it's about customer service, not about a dollar.*

*David Strang would like to make a couple of points, first, I would like to thank the Chief for running his department so efficiently that he has a budget surplus, of any number, and to do that in this day and age when the economy is not in great shape is admirable. However, I resent the implication that staffing a position of the fire department with two part-timers instead of a full-timer is going to affect our safety. When you use the term public safety I think that's an insult to the level of dedication and skill of a part-time firefighter or EMT just to think they're going to operate less than they're capable of simply because they're being paid on a part-time basis...we have been listening to this debate for almost an hour. I think the concept about spending money of citizens of this town is extremely complex and we elect people, such as those who are among us here today, who volunteer their time, they're not paid, they volunteer their time to tackle this immense and difficult task and I would think that with all the time you spend looking at these issues, I for one trust the recommendations that you're making and I think it's time that we listen to the Board of Selectmen, all their volunteer hours, looking at these complex issues and making decisions on this matter.*

*Catherine Austin stated she needed ambulance service...our fire department was at a fire and she needed to wait for mutual aid...Belmont responded, which took a little longer...concerned about not having enough staff on...Chief needs to be able to maintain leadership role of situations for the safety of his staff and victims...does not recommend any cutback in this budget...*

Moderator Sisti calls **Amendment #2** to a question in the amount of amending Article #7 to **\$3,256,568?**

**By voice vote in the negative, Amendment #2 fails.**

Moderator Sisti called **Article #7 as amended** in the amount of **\$3,289,562?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #7 as amended, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$3,289,562.**

**Article #8:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty One Thousand Two Hundred Dollars (\$21,200) to fund wage increases and all associated cost to all full time and part time employees excluding call employees and selectmen. If approved, this amount will then become part of the default budget as of 2015.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$21,200**, Article #8 as written and read; **seconded** by Tom Scribner.

*John Funk asks what's lowest wage that we are paying an employee in this town? The minimum wage is \$7.25...the President is urging that the minimum wage increases to \$10...*

*Moderator Sisti asks for a figure of what the minimum wage is for any part-time or any full-time employee is...need a number?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator, responded, roughly \$15.00 an hour is probably the lowest for a call firefighter. It is stated to Mr. Capello that we are looking for any employee in the town...Mr. Capello states, again, the lowest salary, without the numbers in front of me, is approximately \$15.00 an hour...It was pointed out that the part-time employee in the Town Clerk's office is not making that; he asks Kristyn Fischev what she makes, she responds \$13.00; Mr. Capello responds, it would be \$13.00 an hour. Not counting elected officials, or call fire fighters, roughly \$13.00 an hour, I'd have to look up the numbers exactly...*

*Tom Scribner asks if we vote this in does every part-time and full-time employee going to receive this raise automatically.*

*Selectmen Currier responded, yes, it is a cost of living increase; everybody in this will get their raise.*

*Kristyn Fischev, you're saying it's a cost of living increase, but if you want to go through the budget, it's not just cost of living for everyone...there are some raises involved.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #8** in the amount of **\$21,200?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #8, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$21,200.**

**Article #9:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Nine Hundred Dollars (\$900) to fund wage increases and all associated cost for the Elected Town Clerk/Tax Collector. If approved, this amount will then become part of the default budget as of 2015.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$900**, Article #9 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #9** in the amount of **\$900?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #9, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$900.**

**Article #10:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Nine Hundred Dollars (\$900) to fund wage increases and all associated cost for the Elected Road Agent. If approved, this amount will then become part of the default budget as of 2015.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$900**, Article #10 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #10** in the amount of **\$900?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #10, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$900.**

**Article #11:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) for the completion of listing and revaluation of all properties for the revaluation scheduled for 2014. And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) from the Revaluation Assessment Updated Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$75,000**, Article #11 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*Stan Bean states, it's not a comment on this article per se, but I thought I would use this moment to make a comment. We all received a handout that talks about tax impact. Unless things changed in the last two years, the last I knew, if we withdrew funds from the Capital Reserve accounts, they did not affect the tax rate, and yet this sheet would have you believe that this is going to increase the taxes by \$0.16 per thousand. I find this throughout. You get down to Article #18 the fire engine; it would suggest it was going to cost you another \$0.98 per thousand*

*and that is not the case unless they have changed the laws in the last two years. When you have money that does not come out of the taxes in that year, it is not going to impact you. When you have to appropriate the gross amount, that is where the money comes from, it only comes from taxes that year.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #11** in the amount of **\$75,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #11, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$75,000.**

**Article #12:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Fifty One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Four Dollars (\$51,964) to be deposited in the Capital Reserve Bridge Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$51,964**, Article #12 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #12** in the amount of **\$75,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #12, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$51,964.**

**Article #13:** 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 Capital Reserve Self Contained Breathing Apparatus Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$17,500**, Article #13 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #13** in the amount of **\$17,500?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #13, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$17,500.**

**Article #14:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000) for document restoration. And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000) from the Document Restoration Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$4,000**, Article #14 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #14** in the amount of **\$4,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #14, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$4,000.**

**Article #15:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Eleven Thousand Dollars (\$11,000) to fund the final coat, and all associated cost, for the final paving coat of the parking lot at the Public Safety Building. And further fund to this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Eleven Thousand Dollars (\$11,000) from the Town Driveway Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$11,000**, Article #15 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*Tom Scribner...in taking money out of the Town Driveway Capital Reserve that money was saved before the Safety Building was ever built. So those accounts are based on the Capital Improvement Program which has criteria anyway...we're taking money out of that fund...maybe we should be looking at putting some money back into that fund...*

*David Strang...wants to make a distinction between...what we've been taxed on previously years, which is the money in our capital reserve fund verses what we're being taxed on this year. This item, Article 16, the previous one, Document Restoration are all coming out of our capital reserve funds, what we saved from previous years tax bills. Why are those items showing up on this year's tax bills?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator responds that it's gross budgeting; the revenue shows up on the revenue side, so you will not be taxed on it.*

*David Strang...so anything that show up as a warrant article on this single page handout, those will not total into our tax rate this year?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...no, anything coming out of the capital reserve fund is at the top as the estimated revenues for 2014 includes money if it's voted in that comes out of the capital reserve fund to offset it.*

*Stephen McCormack...not sure what I'm looking at here; how this document affects taxes...is there another document here that shows the actual tax rate?...I'm concerned...what are the actual figures?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...if you take the top tax rate and add in just the warrant articles that will impact the tax rate, which would be something not coming out of the capital reserve fund, would be your overall tax rate if everything passes...I can tally it up in a couple of minutes...*

*Stan Bean...This handout suggests that there is going to be \$2.05 if all of these particular warrant articles pass and that is not correct. The ones that are withdrawn from capital reserve do not affect the tax rate...yes, I agree, they should have shown up in the estimated cash revenues, or some other place taken out of what was going to be raised in taxes; but the implication here to everybody here in this room is that these are all going to raise your taxes by this alleged \$2.06, if you take and add that to the \$3.42, we come up with \$5.47 or \$5.48 which says it's the town's portion, not true! What would need to be done is for any of these items that would come out of capital reserve; they should not show up as an impact on your taxes this year. The impact on your taxes was the year these were appropriated, so I know there is some confusion, I was afraid there would be, and I hope that we can get this resolved...*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #15** in the amount of **\$11,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #15, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$11,000.**

**Article #16:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000) to fund the purchase of a new Solid Waste Container . And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000) from the Recycling Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$4,000**, Article #16 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #16** in the amount of **\$4,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #16, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$4,000.**

**Article #17:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000) to fund milfoil treatment for the lakes in Gilmanton.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$1,000**, Article #17 as written and read; **seconded** by Stephen Bedard.

*Leslie Smith...I'm pretty much in favor of this, but every time there's an environmental concern anywhere in the world it sometimes seems that the cure is a bigger problem than the original problem. I think milfoil is horrible, I've seen it in the lake that is infested with it, but I'm curious as to what will be done. Can anybody tell me what's going to happen?*

*Linda Hamilton...Gilmanton has the largest land mass on Rocky Pond...the treatment on the pond will be this area (points on map)...Western section and northern section...Gilmanton actually has most of the problem, most of the issue area is in Gilmanton...scheduled to begin June 18<sup>th</sup> ...treatment...*

*Tom Scribner...also in favor...recall at a public hearing last year we voted in \$1,000 last year for milfoil treatment...concern is that we are giving money to somebody...money should not be expended unless there is absolute proof of a treatment...*

*Elena Ball...there was a bill passed just last week by the conservation department to spread chemicals in all ponds that had milfoil and I wonder if the Selectmen have heard anything at all about what's coming to Gilmanton for their portion of that?*

*Selectmen Guarino responded no.*

*Leslie Smith...asks if anybody knows exactly what is going to be done...*

*Stan Bean...In the Suncook Valley Sun, Wednesday, January 29, 2014, page 7, there was a notification of aquatic vegetation management for Rocky Pond in Gilmanton, Loudon and Canterbury, NH put out by the state, Dept. of Agriculture pesticide control explaining what they plan to do.*

*David Strang...would ask the Selectmen to be more specific about which lakes are going to be treated here in town, we have several and this one does not mention which one will be treated and to the extent that some of these lakes remain private...do not feel they hold the right to spend public funds on lakes and ponds that have only private access...*

*Selectmen Guarino...this article was written...previously used...understanding that Rocky Pond is the only one that milfoil exists...*

*Jennifer White...has issues that there is no public access in Rocky Pond for the Gilmanton side. To access that you have to go on the Loudon side...Loudon looking to put campground in...boat*

*launch for Rocky Pond is on the Loudon side, so someone else on the Loudon side is bringing in this milfoil...there is a sign at the boat launch that says no trespassing...as a town...someone needs to be putting more pressure on the Canterbury and Loudon side...*

*Elizabeth Strauss would like someone from the Board to address the funds that were given and not used last year...*

*Selectmen Guarino...the Board of Selectmen...approved...explained to us that there wasn't enough funds available to do a treatment last year...they were trying to recoup funds...through the property residents that Rocky Pond shared amongst the other towns...it won't happen again we'll be addressing that...the funds will not be expended unless they are used to treat milfoil.*

*Leslie Smith...milfoil is not new, it's been happening for years...just because we don't have access, doesn't make the problem go away...*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #17** in the amount of **\$1,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #17, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$1,000.**

**Article #18:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Hundred Sixty Nine Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars (\$469,900) for the replacement of a fire truck 9 Engine 1. And further fund this appropriation by acceptance of a Fire Act Grant equal to 95% of the cost, being a total grant of Four Hundred Forty Six Thousand Nine Hundred Five Dollars (\$446,905) with the remaining 5% balance of Twenty Three Thousand Four Hundred Ninety Five Dollars (\$23,495) to be funded by authorizing the withdrawal of that amount from Town Replacement Fire Truck Capital Reserve Fund. No funds will be expended if the grant is not approved. If the grant is not approved this article will be null and void and will defer to Warrant Article #19 for purchase.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$469,900**, Article #18 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*John Funk...general comment...suggest in upcoming years we consider bonding for a long time period verse rather than placing funds in reserves...thinking is that when we obtain a very low interest loan that it's paid over a long time period over twenty years rather than put the burden on the taxpayers of this town and paying for it over a shorter time period...it would add significant changes to the taxes that the taxpayer is paying...asking that in the future on major apparatus purchases that we continue to take a look at this approach and give ourselves the option of borrowing...*

*Moderator Sisti thinks this is a fair comment but doesn't think it really has anything to do with Article #18...perhaps should wait for Article #19 for that argument.*

Tom Howe...Where does the Fire Act Grant come from?

Chief Hempel...this grant is a federally funded grant and not to confuse the issue, there are two Warrant Articles to help obtain to purchasing the replacement of 9 Engine 1. Article #18 allows the funding mechanism; if we are fortunate enough to receive a grant for the replacement of that vehicle which is the 95%...there is no telling when the grant will be awarded, there is no telling until it is awarded as to who will receive the grant. So we wanted to be able to have submitted for the grant, to have the funding mechanism available for receipt of the 95%...Article #19 speaks to a straight out purchase agreement vehicle lease...

Moderator Sisti called **Article #18** in the amount of **\$469,900?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #18, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$469,900.**

**Article #19:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize entering into a five year lease/purchase agreement (with no escape clause) the cost for the replacement of Fire Engine 1 for a total amount of Four Hundred Sixty Nine Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars (\$469,900), and further to raise and appropriate the sum of \$190,000 to be used as a down payment on that lease/purchase, with that appropriation being funded by authorizing its withdrawal from the Town Replacement Fire Truck Capital Reserve Fund. The lease will have annual payments beginning in 2015 of Sixty Thousand Eight Hundred Forty Eight Dollars (\$60,848), to be raised by taxation.” If the grant in Warrant Article #18 is approved, then this article will be null and void. 3/5 Majority Vote required for approval.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$469,900**, Article #19 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Chief Hempel...not sure on the information that was given out on the tax rate on Article #18...indicates an impact of \$0.98 per thousand to the taxpayer. I'm not certain that's the case...if we receive a grant, 95% funded by the grant...remaining 5% would come from Fire Truck Replacement Capital Reserve Fund...there would be no tax impact...Article #19...\$190,000 being funded by Fire Truck Replacement Capital Reserve Fund...remaining lease payments of \$60,848 would not begin until 2015...no impact this year...asks for clarification...

Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...the total tax impact, if everything passed, would be \$3.78 on the tax rate. This [handout] shows what we have if we didn't have the revenues to offset; so your total taxes back to the warrant articles that do not have off-setting revenues, the total tax impact with the bundled non-warrant article that do not have off-setting revenues, would be \$3.78, roughly.

*Stan Bean...the way this Article is written, there would be no tax impact this year. The first impact is next year when the first payment comes due. I don't think it's fair to show people something what the money would have been, if the money were there.*

*John Funk...suggests that you [the Board] give consideration to enter into a contract to purchase a leased fire engine and give yourself the flexibility...consider that...you bond the rest of the purchase of the fire engine so that...it's spread over a twenty year period...so it's not as big a tax impact in one year...please give consideration to that when you're entering into a contract...*

*Brett Currier...this fire truck...we talked about this fire truck, I was at the budget meeting and there was some concern about funding with the Budget Committee about which truck to purchase...the lease agreement, committee members were in support of the fire truck, but not this particular one. I'd like to have some of those guys speak to this issue, if they would.*

*Brian Forst...I'm going to speak to what Mr. Currier would like have spoken to, but as you see in front of you the Budget Committee supported this fire truck by a vote of the Budget Committee. Was there certain people there that were concerned about the particular piece of equipment? Yes there were. Was I one of them? Yes I was. I've had discussions with members of the fire department; I've had discussions with the Fire Chief about this particular truck, about whether the one they wanted was the right truck. Had I had those discussions prior to the Budget Committee meeting...that would be Saturday's meeting? Some have been my fault; I won't say I should have done some of those things ahead of time. When the Budget Committee votes their recommendation it is a vote of the majority. The majority of people at that meeting voted to recommend. So it was forwarded as recommended to the town. At this point whether or not there was a person on the Budget Committee that didn't feel that was the right truck, I don't see how much that matters right now. What I do see the pattern is that these things come forward to the town, they're presented as such, they're presented with a recommendation or non-recommendation. If there were enough people that didn't agree with that, there would have been a non-recommendation. It was recommended. What I would like to say as a taxpayer is...as we had a little discussion about how to fund this equipment that lease/purchase agreement is going to cost the taxpayer \$24,680. The raise and appropriate number is \$469,900; add \$24,000 to that because that's the final number that we are going to pay out...talking of how we fund this stuff, whether we do a twenty year borrow, we raise and appropriate one year and we put it in a capital reserve; to do this fire truck is going to cost us \$24,000 more in, let's say, interest because of the lease/purchase program over five years. We are also not looking to fund this year for capital reserve on these items. That was not brought forward to this body or presented to the Budget Committee. I brought this up in the public hearing. If it is the will of the town to do it that way, I understand. But I want you to all keep in mind, that when anyone comes into this kind of forum and tells us that bonding this over twenty years is going to save us money, it's not possible.*

*Moderator Sisti speaks of the 3/5ths majority that will be needed on the ballot. The only thing that is needed today is a simple majority to have this question on the ballot.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #19** in the amount of **\$469,900?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #19, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$469,900.**

**Article #20:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for DWI Enforcement, said sum to be funded by New Hampshire Highway Safety Grants for salaries and associated taxes and will not be expended unless the grants are received.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$5,000**, Article #20, as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #20** in the amount of **\$5,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #20, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$5,000.**

**Article #21:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Thousand Five Hundred (\$4,500) for Speed Enforcement, said sum to be funded by New Hampshire Highway Safety grants for salaries and associated taxes and will not be expended unless the grants are received.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$4,500**, Article #21 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #21** in the amount of **\$4,500?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #21, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$4,500.**

**Article #22:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$5,500) to fund the purchase of a new A Ventilation System for the

Highway Garage. And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Five Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$5,500) from the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$5,500**, Article #22 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*Duncan Geddes...this capital reserve fund was set up years ago for particular pieces of equipment: grader, truck, backhoe...isn't this capital reserve for those particular items, not just for anything?*

*Selectmen Guarino...we looked at this and it's completely legit...we didn't want to place a warrant article in front of you that asked you to vote for a ventilation system...in this particular fiscal year we wanted to leave off some bucks...it is completely legit, we checked with Town Council before we brought it to the body.*

*Duncan Geddes...there are two more articles; you're going to be taking out of this capital reserve fund that was earmarked for equipment...not putting any more money into this fund...*

*Selectmen Guarino...we decided...not to do that this particular year...we didn't bring forward investing money to these capital reserves. Many times we would see through the years that we would like to replace the Capital Reserve Highway by say, \$50,000, we're going to replace the Capital Reserve Salt/Sand Shed by \$5,000; we decided not to put that burden on the taxpayer on this particular year so we're using that Highway Capital Reserve Fund to take care of a few things we need to do which is what we're speaking of right now.*

*Duncan Geddes...they need this ventilation system very bad, I'm not arguing that; but I don't think it should be coming out of this fund, because this is earmarked for replacement of our highway equipment...*

*Tom Scribner...asks Budget Committee if there is some criteria set up?...*

*Brian Forst...Yes, Tom, the Budget Committee was concerned about the use of this capital reserve, however, the Department Revenue Administration said the title of the capital reserve fund at this point several years ago...didn't identify any particular piece...DRA handed down that this was not improper use of the capital reserve...was it intended for this purpose? I think that's the question that could go into quite a bit of discussion. However, it was presented that this is a need at the Town Shed for this ventilation system...for employee protection in the workplace environment...would like to have seen this put somewhere else but we didn't feel we should put it anywhere else at this point, that we should support it and let it go forward...looked at it that the interest in this account covers the cost...*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #22** in the amount of **\$5,500?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #22, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$5,500.**

**Article #23:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Thirty Two Thousand Dollars (\$32,000) to fund the purchase of new gas pumps for the Highway Garage, And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Thirty Two Thousand (\$32,000) from the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund. This will allow the town to monitor and track which town employee and equipment is using the fuel

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$32,000**, Article #23 as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*Duncan Geddes...I don't think this should be coming out of the Highway Department it isn't what we voted for when we put it in the fund...I think it's just wrong. I would like someone to speak as to why it's all coming out of the highway fund...the Police Department and the Fire Department use...why isn't it coming out of their budgets too...why can't the departments find another way, should be able to do this a lot cheaper than this too.*

*Stan Bean...stands in opposition of this article. The computations that were made on capital reserve for highway equipment has nowhere in it anything to do with replacing gas pumps...addressed twice before and was decided it wasn't necessary to get some kind of card system to track the use of this fuel. Now, do we care if it comes out of the Highway Fund or not...you have the Police Department going there, you have the Fire Department going there...I don't see it getting spread across the departments...it's going to take \$32,000 out of the capital reserve so when the Highway Department needs a new grader, or needs a new loader, dump truck...you're going to have to reach in your pocket for that money, because it isn't going to be there...*

*Malcolm MacLeod...question as to whether the money we would save would be greater than the money we're going to have to pay for these pumps?*

*Selectmen Guarino...we were hoping that by installing this system could actually see roughly where the fuel was going...so I can't say that it's going to, in five years, cover the cost of the expenditure.*

*Brian Forst...brought to the Budget Committee as a need for a better accounting system for fuel. However, this is fuel being used by three different departments being used by the police, fire and highway departments. To fund the purchase of this equipment out of a capital reserve fund designated by highway...I don't understand it. I understand the need. I think the cost should be split between the three departments. I did the math, it's fairly simple, it's about 50%, 25% and 25% according to their fuel budgets...was brought forward because of an issue...Budget Committee asked the question, "Is it possible to account for fuel usage within each department with some simple record keeping...brought up to the Budget Committee that we had to do this before the State says we're in violation of DES rules...double walled tanks are installed right now...is this a need for the town? Yes...right away? No.*

*David Strang...Are we being asked to appropriate this money to replace aging or broken fuel pumps, or is this simply to track which department is using the fuel? Because if it's the latter, I think we can do this far less expensively than spending \$32,000. If we have police, fire and highway using these pumps, how about a system of clipboards: blue for police department, fire is red and highway is yellow and you write down what your expenditures are...track usage...a lot less expensive. Would someone from the Select Board say if we are replacing aging equipment or simply tracking usage by the town departments?*

*Selectmen Guarino...it's both...*

*Fred Zajchowski...the fire department, at one time, was getting diesel fuel at the Recycling Center...do they still?*

*Chief Hempel...responded, yes.*

*Stan Bean...question of procedure with SB2 relatively new...if we just simply vote no, it will not show up on the ballot? Or do we need to make it zero to not show up on the ballot?*

*Moderator Sisti states that you can vote no on this but this article will still show up on the ballot. If you want to alter Article #23 you know how to do it. At a Deliberative Session, this is going to take some education, you're vote of no is greatly appreciated, but guess what? This article would go as written on the ballot in March whether every one of you vote no on it today. There is a way to alter an article.*

**Amendment #1:**

Stan Bean **moved to amend**, Article #23 to **\$0.00**; **seconded** by Betty Ann Abbott.

Moderator Sisti calls **Amendment #1** to a question in the amount of amending Article #23 to **\$0.00**?

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Amendment #1 passes in the amount of \$0.00.**

Moderator Sisti called **Article #23, as amended**, in the amount of **\$0.00**?

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #23, as amended, will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$0.00.**

**Article #24:** To see if the Town will vote to establish a Non Capital Reserve Fund called "Computer Replacement or Repairs for Town Clerk/Tax Collector Non Capital Reserve Fund",

and to appoint the Selectmen as agents to expend from that fund; and further to see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) to be deposited in such fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$2,000**, Article #24, as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #24** in the amount of **\$2,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #24, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$2,000.**

**Article #25:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) to fund the purchase of two new/used plows, plow arms and two new/used plow wings. And further to fund this appropriation by authorizing the withdrawal of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) from the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$25,000**, Article #25, as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #25** in the amount of **\$25,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #25, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$25,000.**

**Article #26:** To see if the Town will vote to establish a Non Capital Reserve Fund called “Health and Dental Cost”, and to appoint the Selectmen as agents to expend from that fund; and further to see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of Seven Thousand (\$7000) to be deposited in such fund.

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: Yes**

Brian Forst **moved \$7,000**, Article #26, as written and read; **seconded** by Frank Gianni.

*David Strang...Could the Select Board please explain...specifically going to be used for town employees or town residents who may need some help...*

*Moderator Sisti asks the Board of Selectmen to respond.*

*Chairman, Ralph Lavin, asks to defer the question to Arthur Capello, Town Administrator.*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...the purpose of this fund is to help offset cost for town employees, for example, I don't take health insurance through the town, but if I were to leave, or be replaced and someone came in and were to take health insurance, this allows you not to have to raise and appropriate it every year. We establish the Non Capital Reserve Fund with a dollar amount. Once that dollar amount is reached, which is roughly \$10,000, you never have to put money into it anymore unless you take money out; but it allows you to decrease your operating budget if you don't have to budget for a potential insurance.*

*David Strang...so this would be used at the Board of Selectmen's discretion as part of a compensation package for a future hire.*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...it can only be used for health or dental insurance. So if you hired somebody on a single plan and somebody comes in on a family plan, this would be used to help offset the cost of the family plan.*

*David Strang...have we used something similar in the past...was this in the operating budget before?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...in the past we would budget for it in the operating budget, but rather than budgeting for it in the operating budget, this is a way to decrease your operating budget but you would still have access to the funds if you needed them for the health insurance.*

*Brenda Sens...Dental plans are quite simple...never heard of dental with health insurance, never heard of covering dental insurance...*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...the current benefits covered by the town is health and dental to the employees. This town currently pays for health and dental coverage.*

*Teresa Donovan...understands this would help out for one year because you hadn't budgeted for it, but the next year we should not be surprised to see a change in the budget; likewise we might see a decreases from year to year and have surpluses, for example, in the budget because somebody left, they had a family plan when they were hired. Will this also be used in those years when we have an extraordinary rate increase or is this only to deal with employees coming in and out?*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...the intent of the Board is for only employees coming in and out.*

*Teresa Donovan...other towns, that I'm aware of, that have established these kinds of reserve accounts, it's been to provide some funding mechanism over a period of time that when you do see those spikes, in rates unanticipated, that that is more than appropriate use of this type of account and the normal operating budget procedures when you're looking at overall budget should be able to absorb a plan for employees coming and going.*

*Deb Chase...question...even when you leave...coverage doesn't necessarily end...if there is concern about providing care...there is COBRA...*

*Arthur Capello, Town Administrator...the town currently provides disability insurance...up to employee that may leave if they wanted to pay for their health or dental insurance...it extends at the employees cost to COBRA, the town doesn't pay any cost when the employee leaves.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #26** in the amount of **\$7,000?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #26, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$7,000.**

**Article #27:** To see if the town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to sell the following properties in the Town of Gilmanton to be sold at public auction.

1. Map 117 Lot 13 – Willow Ave
2. Map 118 Lot 40 – Birch Ave
3. Map 120 Lot 10 – Orange Ave
4. Map 121 Lot 11 – Orange Ave
5. Map 121 Lot 35 – Fox Rd
6. Map 132 Lot 23 – Malecite Ln
7. Map 132 Lot 69 – Lakeshore Dr
8. Map 132 Lot 99 – Tamarack Tr
9. Map 106 Lot 58 – Mountain Rd
10. Map 124 Lot 7 – Province Rd
11. Map 410 Lot 26 – Sawtooth Rd
12. Map 424 Lot 70 – Province Rd
13. Map 421 Lot 17 – South Rd

Ralph Lavin **moved** Article #27, as written and read; **seconded** by Brett Currier.

**Amendment #1:**

Carolyn Baldwin **moved to amend** Article #27 to add the phrase “lots that do not conform in acreage to the existing zoning requirements shall be sold only to abutters, to be merged with an abutting lot.”; **seconded** by Tom Scribner.

*Carolyn Baldwin...speaks to amendment...it has been the practice in the past to sell these tiny lots...to abutters to improve the...value...simply clarification...*

*Moderator Sisti...clarifies...it's “lots that do not conform in acreage”*

*Tom Scribner...if they can only be sold to an abutter, then why would he buy it?...*

*Robert Hyslop...asks if lot #9 could be sold as non-buildable lot...all swamp...anyone that would want to buy would have to get all kinds of permits...wants this sold as a non-buildable lot...*

*Selectmen Guarino...must be careful...town council says we cannot change intent of the articles...amendment changes the intent...just want to offer at auction...don't want to get involved to this abutting parcels...*

*David Strang...would like the Select Board to explain how they obtain these properties, are they foreclosed properties, abandoned properties, how is it that the town owns them?*

*The Selectmen ask Debra Cornett, Town Clerk/Tax Collector, to answer the question...the Selectmen obtain the properties through the tax deeding of properties for non-payment of taxes. They hold those properties for a period of three years giving any for owner or legal interest, such as a mortgage holder, the opportunity to repurchase by paying all back taxes costs, interest and fees associated...after that time period the Selectmen can place those properties on a warrant article, as you see here, for a vote by the people to have them auctioned off by the Board of Selectmen to get them back on our tax roll. After a three year period the town can keep any profits realized by the sale...*

*David Strang...speaking to amendment...if you're mandating that it can only go to an abutter...the town would be shooting itself in the foot...if an abutter doesn't want to buy...*

Moderator Sisti calls **Amendment #1** to a question to add the phrase “lots that do not conform in acreage to the existing zoning requirements shall be sold only to abutters, to be merged with an abutting lot.”?

By **voice vote, too close to call**, Moderator Sisti asks for Amendment #1 to be hand counted.

**Hand Count: Yes: 35      No: 47\***

**By hand count in the negative, Amendment #1 fails.**

*Paula Gilman...can I amend an amendment?*

*Moderator Sisti states, no, you make an amendment; we take them one at a time.*

*Paula Gilman stated she would like to make an amendment.*

**Amendment #2:**

Paula Gilman **moved to amend** to add: “to offer those non-conforming lots for \$1.00 to the abutters...”; **seconded** by Dick De seve.

*Moderator Sisti...I believe the sum of the substance is, to offer those non-conforming lots for \$1.00 to the abutters... so we have a motion to amend the language...*

*Kristyn Fischev...if these properties are sold...I am assuming these are all non-conforming lots...is that right? No, says the Selectmen (per nodded head of Selectmen)...so, they are all jumbles of different lots...when they go to auction, do the abutters get a letter from the Selectmen stating they have first choice to buy before it goes to auction?*

*Selectmen Guarino...my understanding is that the last time we had an auction...the goal was to get the most available bids so we notified the neighbors that the land was going to be auctioned off...*

*Kristyn Fischev...so it's just a public auction, they don't get first dibs on it, it's just auctioned off...*

*Elizabeth Strauss...wondering how with what you said before about changing the intent of the article...and with the income to the town...just seems like a lot of land to sell...just to the abutter...if the lot is non-conforming, why would anyone want to buy at all?*

*Moderator Sisti...I don't think you understand the amendment. I don't believe that this was the intent. The non-conforming lots...the non-conforming lots would be the ones subject to the \$1.00 purchase...*

*Moderator Sisti reiterates the question with the amendment: To see if the town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to sell the following properties in the Town of Gilmanton to be sold at public auction; lots that do not conform in acreage to the existing zoning requirements shall be sold only to abutters for \$1.00 to be merged with an abutting lot*

*It was brought to the Moderator's attention that you cannot force anyone to merge their lots...that's state law...*

*Moderator Sisti...I don't think the language is going to make it...if somebody stood up and struck the "merger" aspect of it, then it might make it...*

*David Strang...point of order, what if there's more than one abutter? How can you deal with this amendment in a logical way? If I could propose an amendment...*

*Moderator Sisti stated that he is glad we are continuing this discussion...we must take each amendment one at a time...there is a structural problem...*

*David Strang...if an abutter wants to purchase one of these properties for \$1.00, you can show up at the auction with \$1.00, but I think we would be asking the Select Board to go into an analysis of what we have as of right here and now to find out if there's more than one abutter, in which case we can't make this language work because you have more than maybe two or three abutters...*

*Leslie Smith...with regard to the non-conforming lot...generally it's two acres for a building lot...in a non-conforming lot you could have 1.99 acres and someone could buy for \$1.00 then go to the Board for a variance...there should be more details and specifics...*

*Paula Gilman... "I withdraw my amendment."*

*Moderator Sisti...thank you that is the thing I was hoping you'd say...with the amendment withdrawn I will call Article #27 to a question.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #27** as written?

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Article #27, will appear, as written, on the ballot.**

**Article #28:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Fifty Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$52,500) for operating expenses of the Gilmanton Year-Round Library. **(By Petition)**

**Budget Committee Recommends: Yes**

**Selectmen Recommends: No**

Anne Kirby **moved \$52,500**, Article #28, as written and read; **seconded** by Kristyn Fischev.

*Anne Kirby...as representing the Library Association, I just want to comment this represents 70% of our budget...we will raise the \$18,000 of revenue.*

Moderator Sisti called **Article #28** in the amount of **\$52,500**?

**By voice vote in the affirmative, petitioned Article #28, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$52,500.**

**Article #29:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000) for Park and Recreation fireworks for the Crystal Lake Labor Day celebration. **(By Petition)**

**Budget Committee Recommends: No**

**Selectmen Recommends: No**

Michael Jean **moved \$4,000**, Article #29, as written and read; **seconded** by Betty Ann Abbott.

Moderator Sisti called **Article #29** in the amount of **\$4,000**?

**By voice vote in the affirmative, petitioned Article #29, will appear, as written, on the ballot in the amount of \$4,000.**

**Article #30:** To see if the voters will continue to support the current 208 hours of weekly paid Fire Department coverage using both full-time and part-time certified personnel as has been past practice. **(By Petition)**

Michael Jean **moved**, Article #30, as written and read; **seconded** by Betty Ann Abbott.

**Amendment #1:**

Chief Hempel **moved to amend** Article #30 by inserting the number “**four**” after the word “both” and before “full-time and part-time certified personnel...”; **seconded** by Betty Ann Abbott.

*Chief Hempel...this is just to clarify the position and the intent of this warrant article...as you may or may not be aware of, the fire department has been issued a new directive policy; that we are no longer to use part-time employees for a regular staffing situations. The intent of this warrant article is to show the will of the voter and tax payers for the Board of Selectmen. My hope is that if this warrant article passes, they will be interested in changing the policy...to move forward with staffing...the four is the current situation, a full-time fire chief and three full-time personnel. We also use certified part-timers...*

*John Funk...while we're getting use to SB2...with a warrant article that comes by petition, is this body able to change?*

*Moderator Sisti replied, “That is exactly what we asked for this week, and the answer is yes. All the other rules apply as long as you don't change the substance of the particular petition.*

Moderator Sisti calls **Amendment #1** to a question in the amount of amending Article #23 to read as follows: “To see if the voters will continue to support the current 208 hours of weekly paid Fire Department coverage using both four full-time and part-time certified personnel as has been past practice?”

**By voice vote in the affirmative, Amendment #1 passes as amended.**

Moderator Sisti called **Article #30, as amended?**

**By voice vote in the affirmative, petitioned Article #30, as amended, will appear on the ballot.**

*Moderator Sisti asks the body if there is any other business we should discuss*

*Dick De seve...the document and discussions on the tax rate is the weakness of this SB2 process...we went through this process a year ago and about 120 people were here, this year we have less...all these warrant articles are going to be voted on by the majority of the voters in about six weeks. During that time, this document is going to circulate. Those of us sitting here have had a chance to have it explained to us...this sheet is going to circulate around town in six weeks...other voters not present today will look at this and say, if we vote for these warrant articles...this is what it's going to do to our tax rate. That's the problem...people are not going to know what they are voting on. I would ask that the Selectmen, or somebody, put an explanatory letter in the Laconia Citizen or the Suncook Valley Sun, where ever, and explain what this actually means...this as it is, is potentially damaging.*

*Moderator Sisti, "Thank you and I appreciate that." Mr. Sisti then asked if there was anything else?*

*Selectmen Guarino...just wanted to thank everybody for coming today and wanted to also would like to thank Ralph Lavin for being a Selectman for the past three years...it takes a lot to serve, so, "thank you, Ralph, for serving." Mr. Lavin received a nice round of applause.*

*Moderator Sisti asks if there is anything else before we adjourn and stressed that he hopes in the future that we do better with attendance because this is pretty dismal. You guys did a great job, we shook it up in here pretty well, it's a lot better when we have 300 or more in here...*

*Meeting Adjourned at 3:05 p.m.*

*Respectfully Submitted,*

*Debra A. Cornett  
Town Clerk/Tax Collector*

