



# TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

## BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES February 7, 2011

### PRESENT:

Tina Helm, Chair, Board of Selectmen  
Peter Bianchi, Selectman  
Jessie Levine, Town Administrator

### ABSENT:

Mark Kaplan, Selectman

### ALSO PRESENT:

Robert Brown, Chair, Conservation Commission  
Peter Stanley, Planning & Zoning Administrator  
Terry LeBlanc, Chief Clinical Officer, New London Hospital  
Don Griffin, Interim Chief Financial Officer, New London Hospital  
Jim Wheeler, Budget Committee  
Bill Helm, Budget Committee/New London Hospital  
Celeste Cook, Budget Committee/New London Hospital  
Greg Colby, Plodzik & Sanderson (auditor)  
Pat Trader, *Intertown Record*

Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

Conservation Commission: Chair Helm welcomed Bob Brown and Peter Stanley. Bob Brown referred to previous discussions about the gift of land from the DiClericos on Little Sunapee Road, who planned to divide the property in half and annex half to their home lot and gift the remaining portion, which is primarily wetlands, to the Town. This would add to the Town's land on the corner of Old Dump Road. Mr. Brown reminded the Selectmen of the process whereby the Conservation Commission can accept the gift with the approval of the Board of Selectmen rather than Town Meeting.

Mr. Stanley distributed a copy of the draft deed reflecting the property owners' desire to keep the land in its present condition. Mr. Bianchi said the Planning Board meeting did not include the conversation about keeping the land in its present condition, although he thinks it was understood by the Planning Board, which authorized the annexation. Mr. Stanley said the property is all wetlands so nothing could be done with it anyway.

**Mr. Bianchi moved to accept the gift of 0.82 acres from Bucklin Beach from Joseph and Laurie DiClerico subject to the Quit Claim Deed and as presented to the Planning Board. Tina Helm seconded the motion.**

Jim Wheeler asked about the loss of property tax revenue. Ms. Levine said that it was minimal. Mr. Brown said the property is assessed for about \$89,000, which Ms. Levine said amounts to about \$1300 of taxes per year. Mr. Stanley pointed out that even if this land had not been given to the Town, the merger of the two DiClerico properties would have resulted in lower property taxes. He said this is why a number of property owners have been merging separate parcels under the same ownership.

**Ms. Helm called for a vote and the motion passed 2-0.**

Mr. Bianchi referred to the budget hearing Monday night and read aloud from Bob Brown's e-mail to Tina Helm on December 17, 2010: "While we continue to be very serious about conservation land acquisition, we recognize that perhaps this is a year for some extra serious consideration, communication and team effort to jointly meet our objectives. We have discussed as a possible alternative to a CIP contribution, the expansion of the fund definition and scope as outlined in RSA 36-A:4-a."

Mr. Bianchi said that the Board of Selectmen dropped the ball and the Conservation Commission did not follow-up. Mr. Brown said that his e-mail used the word "perhaps" to generate discussion. Mr. Bianchi said that the Board of Selectmen voted to approve the two articles, but there was no further discussion about the Conservation Commission's proposal to lower its CIP contribution. Mr. Bianchi said that when the discussion came up at the budget hearing last week about going to \$10,000, he was surprised that it had not gone to \$0 in light of Mr. Brown's e-mail. Mr. Brown said that they had been discussing compromise, and \$0 did not seem like a compromise. Mr. Stanley said that Mr. Brown is also subject to the approval by the rest of the Conservation Commission, which held a meeting after Mr. Brown's e-mail. Ms. Helm said that the Conservation Commission has been collaborative in trying to work out a resolution, and now is the time for that.

Mr. Stanley updated the Board of Selectmen on changing the purpose of the conservation land fund. Mr. Stanley said that any purpose outlined in RSAs 36-A:4 and 36-A:4-a, if adopted in the two warrant articles, would expand the purpose of the fund to fulfill the conservation objectives of the Conservation Commission, so instead of simply being able to use the money to buy land, it could be used to purchase conservation easements or interest in land (as a first party or through a qualified organization). In addition, and on opinion of Town Counsel Bart Mayer, Mr. Stanley said it is not unrealistic to expect this money could be used to deal with an infestation of milfoil, and he thinks that is part of the Conservation Commission's compromise is to open this fund to more potential uses than originally intended. The goal is to get more bang for the Town's buck and be able to participate in projects that achieve stated objectives rather than pay for the entire cost. Mr. Stanley thinks it is a good approach, although there was some concern by members of the Conservation Commission for people wanting it for anything and everything. He said the fund still has to be used for conservation objectives as stated in the law.

Mr. Bianchi said the question came up at a previous Budget Committee meeting about the use of the Conservation Commission land fund. Mr. Bianchi said that it would depend on Article 24 being passed. Mr. Stanley said that Bart Mayer likened it to having a capital reserve for building maintenance, which has an expectation that the capital reserve will not be used for routine activities but for major activities that threaten the resource. Mr. Bianchi said that in ten years, with a changeover in personnel, people may not remember this conversation and he wants to make sure it is reflected in the record.

Mr. Bianchi pointed out that it would still require Town Meeting vote to spend out of the fund. Mr. Brown said that he would think that the fund would not be used for milfoil prevention and spent down for that purpose, but would be used for emergency treatment if necessary. Ms. Levine said that the statute does not specify treatment and not prevention, but the understanding now is that it would be held available for treatment if necessary. She added that is not to say that in ten years a different Board of Selectmen or Budget Committee or Conservation Commission may change the intention, but the understanding at this time is not to spend down the fund for milfoil prevention.

Mr. Bianchi stressed the importance of having this information documented, and said that the minutes cannot change the law but can document the intent. Chair Helm asked if the Conservation Commission was in favor of this, and Mr. Brown said that it is, after a lot of dialogue. Chair Helm said that she was delighted by this example of using Town dollars in the best possible way with reasonable restrictions.

Minutes of January 24, 2011: Mr. Bianchi moved to approve the minutes of January 24, 2011, seconded by Chair Helm. Two minor edits and minutes approved 2-0.

Brownie Troop: Ms. Levine said that she had received a request from Linda Potter on behalf of a new small Brownie troop to sell cookies at the Transfer Station. Ms. Levine said she wanted to bring this request to the Board of Selectmen so that there is some consistency in the decisions.

Mr. Bianchi said that he is concerned about the flow of traffic, especially on a Saturday morning when it is bumper-to-bumper, and someone could get hit by a car. Chair Helm agreed.

Mr. Bianchi said that he has no problems with the Brownies, Boy Scouts, or anyone else, and thinks it opens a can of worms about use of the Transfer Station and could open the door for anything going on at the Transfer Station. Chair Helm said that she does not think there should be political campaigning there either, as it slows down the flow of traffic on the busiest days and there is always the safety concern. Mr. Bianchi asked about First Amendment rights regarding campaigning, and Chair Helm asked Ms. Levine to look into it.

Ms. Levine will prepare a written policy on the Transfer Station after consulting with Town Counsel.

Mr. Bianchi said that we should hold off on the Brownie Troop's request until the policy is written. Ms. Levine said that she needs to get back to the Brownie Troop with a response, and the Selectmen said that the request should be denied until the policy is written.

Mr. Bianchi moved to deny the request and other requests until a policy was written. Seconded by Chair Helm and, there being no further discussion, approved 2-0.

2009 Audit: Chair Helm welcomed Auditor Greg Colby from Plodzik & Sanderson.

Mr. Colby reported that the annual financial report is a 41-page document that reports why the auditors were hired, lists disclosures, and at the end includes a management letter. Mr. Colby walked the Selectmen through the highlights and invited questions.

Page 1: Independent Auditor's Report – Mr. Colby explained that this outlined why the Selectmen hire the auditors to give an independent opinion on the finances, and he pointed out that with one exception, the information is reported. The one exception is GASB 45; the Government Accounting Standards Board is a rulemaking authority that oversees how and what should be disclosed in the financial statements. This particular rule has been coming down the road for a little while and there have been articles and information on GASB 45, and with that exception the financial statements are fine.

Mr. Colby explained that GASB 45 relates to the reporting of liability for retirement benefits, and said that it is not unusual for Town to have a qualification based on GASB 45. Plodzik & Sanderson audits about 125 towns and school districts and New London is not alone in receiving an adverse opinion on that basis. Given the need to hire an outside service to get that opinion addressed, a lot of boards and management have made the decision not to spend that money.

Pages 2-8, Management Discussion & Analysis: This is the report that is put together by management, in this case by Jessie Levine. It became a requirement about seven years ago to give highlights and condensed information on what's included from the management's perspective.

Page 11 – Balance Sheet as of 12/31/09: This is a snapshot taken as of the end of that year showing assets, liabilities and fund balance for each fund, with major funds on page 11. Auditors are given guidance on what should be major funds and non major funds. Page 39 – all non-major funds are aggregated and reported together on page 11. On page 11, the assets -- items "to the good" for the Town - - and then liabilities -- moneys owed to outside sources at the end of the year, with the largest being intergovernmental (owing school tax through June 30). The fund balance section, with a little over \$1,090,078 at the end of the year, is broken into two categories: 1) encumbrances that are set aside, and

unreserved undesignated fund of \$952,955 of surplus, which is what's left after all moneys and commitments have been recognized.

Page 38 – Schedule 3: This shows changes in the undesignated fund balance. It shows amount at the beginning of the year, the amount used to balance the tax rate, then budget surplus (revenue shortfall and unexpended balance of appropriations), and those numbers combined give new undesignated fund balance.

Page 35 – Schedule 1: This shows estimated and actual receipts for the year and variance positive or negative, which shows that overall we took in \$240,000 less than planned. Ms. Levine pointed out that shortfall is mostly from capital reserves from projects not completed and money not spent.

Page 36 – Schedule 2 – expenses: These five columns show what was appropriated by Town Meeting, actual expenditures, encumbrances into the following year, and the variance. Schedule 2 carries over page 36 and totals \$550,426, with a large positive variance under capital outlay because of capital projects that did not get done.

Mr. Colby said that the center section of the report, which he will not go through in detail, starts on page 16 and contains the notes of the basic financial statements. In conjunction with the MD&A, it gives an idea to the reader, defines the reporting entity, tells how the financial statements are presented, and lists required disclosures to meet governmental accounting standards.

The final page, page 41, is the independent auditor's communication of control efficiencies and other matters, or the management letter, so if there were problems or issues that were not discussed with individuals during the audit, if they were significant enough they would be disclosed here, and there are none to disclose, so it is an easy read in that nothing came to the auditor's attention that needed to be brought to the Board's attention

Mr. Bianchi pointed out the error in the MD&A on page 5, where the program revenues were misstated. Ms. Levine said that was her transcription error, not the auditors; she transferred information from the auditors into her report and mistyped. Mr. Bianchi asked if the auditors use the MD&A for their purposes, and Mr. Colby replied that no, the auditors' figures are generated first. Mr. Colby said those figures are not used to build their report; his figures are used to generate the MD&A. Ms. Levine repeated that it was her error, and Mr. Colby accepted responsibility for not proofreading it. Mr. Bianchi said that he was concerned.

Chair Helm asked Mr. Colby to explain GASB 45 and what can be done to ameliorate the qualification. Mr. Colby gave the Board of Selectmen summaries of an article and explained that it had to do with OPEB, which means that any benefits that the town may provide to retirees after they are done service with the Town. Most NH communities don't provide direct or explicit subsidy. What GASB 45 takes into account is an implicit subsidy, so if retirees are part of the retirement calculation for health insurance, and NH state law requires NH Retirement System to be part of the Town's group health insurance, the thought process is that the rates paid for current employees are implicitly higher because older retirees are part of the health plan. What needs to be done -- and there are two ways of doing it -- is 1) towns hire actuaries to come in and take a look at the pool of retirees and use actuarial tables and address the liability that goes into the financial report. Mr. Colby said it is not much of a concern because there are no explicit retiree benefits, so the liability is covered under pay-as-you-go because health insurance payments are budgeted on an annual basis. It is nothing the Town would fund – it would go on pages A&B and wouldn't affect generate fund financial statements -- and would not be a liability that would have to be recorded. Ms. Levine restated that the liability relating to the retirees would not need to be separately booked or paid for, as it is paid on an annual basis.

Mr. Colby said that it is a situation similar to GASB 34 regarding fixed asset accounting, which a lot of communities did not fund right off, and there were no implications. Some people have taken the wait and see approach to let others be the guinea pig. The second alternative is if a town has under-100 plan participants, there is a website called GASBhelp.com that costs less than hiring an actuary (which is \$10,000-12,000); the website is between \$1500-3000 depending on the size of the town. It uses actuarial tables and asks the town to plug in the information and generates a report based on that information.

Mr. Bianchi noted that if the Town chooses not to do either one, it would get the qualification every year, and to not get it would cost between \$2,000-15,000. Mr. Bianchi asked what would happen if it is not addressed. Chair Helm remembered Town Meeting a few years ago when an attendee pointed out the qualification regarding fixed assets, and she raised concerns about someone blowing it out of proportion. Mr. Colby said that where he lives, the town has done the modified approach through the website, and the School District has an adverse opinion, and as a taxpayer he is not in the least bit concerned about it. It affects Schedules A and B, but it does not give a true picture because capital assets are included at historical costs and do not reflect the Town's current worth anyway.

Jim Wheeler asked why the Town would choose to act on it until and unless it was brought up at Town Meeting. Chair Helm said that she would not. Mr. Wheeler said that he would not even put it on the schedule to address until we were forced into it.

Chair Helm thanked Mr. Colby for coming this morning. Mr. Colby said that he is available to answer questions that come up, and that the auditors will be back here within the month to do the audit for 2010.

Chair Helm referred to the questionnaire about financial controls. Mr. Colby said that the AICP gives guidance about the conduct of audits. Two to three years ago, AICP instituted risk assessment standards, and they are digging deeper into things and as part of that there is an inquiry into management, which includes interviews and questionnaires to boards and employees regarding policies, procedures and fraud so that if people see things on a day-to-day basis and there are problem areas, it gives people the avenue to address it in a non-threatening forum. Based on those responses, the auditors will design procedures around those areas, do testing and look at controls as necessary. Chair Helm said that she found it helpful to have the questionnaire because it forced her to look at how things are done in this town. Mr. Bianchi asked to put it on a future agenda to discuss it, and Ms. Levine said that it can be put on the next meeting agenda. Mr. Colby said that some boards do it jointly and some individually.

Ambulance Budget Proposal: Chair Helm asked Ms. Levine to provide an update on the Hospital's budget proposal. Ms. Levine explained that she had met with Terry LeBlanc and Don Griffin of New London Hospital and they had worked out a recommendation whereby the Town paid the ambulance the same amount paid in 2010, and would settle up based on actual Hospital losses in the Town's FY 2013. She said that the Hospital understood that this was not guaranteed and would need approval by next year's Town Meeting, but that this took the budget pressure off this year and allowed reconciliation based on actual performance.

Chair Helm welcomed Terry LeBlanc and Don Griffin of the Hospital. Ms. LeBlanc said that Ms. Levine summarized the conversations appropriately, and as a resident of the Town she is also concerned about the budget increase, and they looked closer at alternatives. The Hospital is comfortable with reconciling later, which (Hospital CEO) Bruce King had proposed to the Selectmen several months ago. Since the Hospital fiscal year is different from the Town's, they are fine with calculating it and having it paid in the future, knowing that they can't bind the future town meetings.

Mr. Bianchi said that when Bruce King met with the Selectmen to talk to them about the request, he did bring that option forward as a possibility, and one of the other options was to eliminate one shift from the ambulance, and the third option was to pay the \$132,000 request. Mr. Bianchi said that Chair Helm had

recused herself and the other two Selectmen voted unanimously to approve the \$132,000. He can't see any reason to change his original vote, with the hope and faith that the study is going to come up with a better model. He said that Ms. Levine has been instrumental in spearheading that and referred to New London Hospital's generosity to pay half of the study; that is his ace in the hole not to be in this position again. He understands that anything we do now is not binding into the future, but in his brief history on the Board the Town has not done this before. He took Bruce King's figures as good faith figures and has no reason to doubt them. He has every faith that keeping the budget at \$132,000 is the best way to continue. He has read Ms. Levine's e-mail on this subject and given it a lot of thought. The Selectmen's budget included the \$132,000, and if the Budget Committee wants to change it, they can do that.

Mr. Bianchi said that by simply saying it's not an obligation to the future Town Meeting, it could put in the position of an implied consent or good faith deal that we will fight in the future. He thinks it's better to "pony up" what is needed and work on the study.

Chair Helm said that she is not going to recuse herself from this discussion, since she will not benefit personally from this discussion. Chair Helm said that she would like to applaud the Hospital and Ms. Levine for trying, on behalf of the Town and the Hospital, to come up with some kind of compromise resolution, which is what government is all about. These are difficult times. She thinks that the Hospital would love to have the \$132,000 up front and be done with it, but they are showing a willingness to work with the Town and we should show that same courtesy and collaboration. Chair Helm noted the Budget Committee can accept the proposal but she would feel more comfortable if the Board of Selectmen could make a recommendation given new conversations and new information. She would like to recommend to the Budget Committee that they accept this new proposal. She said that there have to be changes going forward at the Hospital as there will be in the Town as well, as these are fluid times. It is not sustainable from the Hospital's point of view, and she cannot see that things are going to get worse and worse. She supports accepting this new proposal because she thinks it's a reasonable compromise and indicates to the Town that there has been good conversation between the various parties involved.

Mr. Wheeler asked if there is a change in what Bruce King proposed at the earlier Selectmen's meeting and what Ms. Levine is now discussing. Ms. Levine said that when Mr. King first proposed it, there was no baseline payment mentioned, and it has been bothering her that there could be a pay-later alternative that was not fully discussed. Ms. LeBlanc said that we never talked about what the base was going to be.

Mr. Wheeler asked Ms. LeBlanc if there is any indication of the January non-payer percentage, and Ms. Leblanc said no. Don Griffin said that for the Hospital as a whole, they are running close to budget, so at the very least it appears to be the same as what had been budgeted. Mr. Wheeler asked if that is keeping with the approximate 11% non-payer, and Ms. LeBlanc confirmed that.

Mr. Wheeler said that he is in support of this proposal, but his qualification on his full support is something that he was assured of earlier and that is that the Town has full access to the accounting records and the books, should we want them at the end of the negotiated period so that there is full transparency. Chair Helm asked Ms. LeBlanc to confirm that and she did. Ms. Levine said that in fact the agreement would give the opportunity for the Hospital to provide more actual information than a proposal based on projections.

Chair Helm said that there were some who would be concerned that the discussion did not come forward initially but the budget is an evolving process, and that if this is eventually going to save some money for the taxpayers, it would be irresponsible to think otherwise.

Bill Helm, who said he was wearing his hat as a Hospital trustee, said that the Hospital's bad debt line is what has been focused on, but there is another variable that is more important than bad debt and that is the amount that the individual payers pay compared to the list price. There is potential change in the amount

of money paid by Medicare, Medicaid, Anthem, etc., and that could turn out to be different from what was originally projected. Mr. Griffin explained that there are three major types of deductions from revenues: bad debt; contractual allowances, and patient free care. Contractual allowances are determined by contracts negotiated with Anthem, CIGNA, MVP, etc., which have marketing clout and the ability to provide customer service that takes some of the burden away from the Hospital for subscriber questions, so instead of paying the full amount of the Hospital bills, they contractually agree to pay a certain percent less than 100%. That contractual allowance is the amount they agree to pay and the difference is a deduction on revenue. This does fluctuate depending on the amount of in vs. out-patient business, but there is limited risk because the contracts are in place. It would take a big change in the mix of business (i.e., more CIGNA than Anthem, for example) to change the projections of revenue. We could end up losing more money on Medicaid business, which is between 5-8% of total business, whereas Medicare is the largest payer at about 45% of business. Because the Hospital is a critical access hospital, it gets a special designation for most business but excludes the ambulance. He does not think there is a much greater exposure to risk there. He thinks the Hospital has conservatively budgeted the exposure for contractual allowance.

Mr. Griffin said that he is not quite as comfortable, although a good estimate has been made, as to the money that is written off for patient free care. The economy has been tough and people have been doing with less, and the economy is improving for some but there are many people without jobs and with less disposable income. The Hospital has budgeted for a slightly greater percentage of patient free care, where up front a patient expresses that he or she would be unable to pay treatment bills and the Hospital negotiates an agreement for payment. The agreement to reduce the total cost is referred to as "patient free care," and that is implicit in ambulance gross revenue as well. The Hospital budgeted more because the Hospital as a whole is experiencing more, so there is some conservatism in the budget as well.

Mr. Griffin summarized that the Hospital has been reasonably conservative in its estimates of those three revenue reduction categories. He does not think that things would go drastically out of hand in this proposal. Ms. LeBlanc said that the other unknown is the number of runs; the fewer runs, the fewer revenue opportunities, so all that can be done is to estimate based on history.

Mr. Wheeler thanked Mr. Griffin and asked if there is a free care issue where only 50% of the normal rate is sought, but it is collected over three years; what would be used for New London's purposes when asking for money? Mr. Griffin said that the full amount of the non-payment would be declared up front, so if the entire \$1000 were waived, it would be \$0 in perpetuity, and if the Hospital agreed to accept \$500, then the Town's exposure is limited to that \$500. It could be that the Hospital eats the exposure if the person pays less. Mr. Wheeler pointed out, then, that the year end settlement would be based on billing, not actual revenue. Mr. Griffin said that financials have to be prepared within 90 days, so the "runoff" is only three months.

Ms. Cook, speaking as a member of the Budget Committee, asked if the Town agrees to pay the \$93,000 and the Hospital goes over the \$132,000 figure, where does the balance come from? Chair Helm said that it would be in next year's budget, and hopefully at that point there would be hard data. Ms. Levine said that a third option is to pick some other number in between the two, such as \$110,000 or \$115,000. Mr. Bianchi pointed out that if the town paid the \$132,000 and the Hospital did better, then they could be ahead of the game, but if the Hospital's estimate is too conservative, then it would be to the Hospital's financial benefit to have the Town settle up. Ms. LeBlanc said that the Hospital has not agreed to a cap on what the reconciliation would be. Mr. Bianchi said that if we budgeted for the \$132,000 now, then there would be a cap. He asked why the Hospital would accept \$93,000 and cap at \$132,000, which means it would end up in the same place in either scenario.

Chair Helm asked if the conversation could be deferred until Mr. Kaplan returns.

**Mr. Bianchi moved to confirm the original 2-0 vote to appropriate the \$132,637 that the Hospital originally requested. Seconded by Chair Helm.**

Celeste Cook questioned what would happen with the other towns that also saw a significant increase. Ms. Levine said that two towns (Springfield and Newbury) went down. Mr. Bianchi expressed concern about making a deal with the Hospital before the study is done and about going it alone this year. Ms. Levine said that she did notify the other towns of this possibility and did not receive negative feedback.

Mr. Bianchi said that after he voted for the original request, he heard from people asking why he did that. He said he felt comfortable supporting the Hospital's request by not micro-managing their books until we got the study done.

**Chair Helm called for a vote. Bianchi – yes, Helm – no. Motion does not pass because it is a tie vote.** Chair Helm said that this could be revisited next week.

Ms. Levine raised a question about the motion. Since the motion was to confirm the original vote, and since the motion did not pass, does that mean the original vote does not stand?

Chair Helm suggested that at the Board of Selectmen's meeting on February 14, the Board put this subject back its agenda to seek a full Board vote on the new proposal so that it will be on the record before the Budget Committee's public hearing on February 14, 2011.

**Mr. Bianchi moved to rescind his previous motion, seconded by Chair Helm.**

Discussion about whether this motion is valid. Mr. Bianchi said that he is happy to give the Hospital the money and hopes they have more than they need to help them out.

**Chair Helm called for a vote: Bianchi – yes; Helm – yes.**

Ms. Levine asked what this motion accomplished. Mr. Bianchi summarized that where we stand now is at this point in time the original 2-0 vote on November 15, 2010 will remain in the budget. Chair Helm said that there will be a vote at the Board of Selectmen's public meeting on February 14.

Mr. Bianchi said that all of this discussion should have come to the Board of Selectmen before it went to the Budget Committee, and the discussion should have been brought to the Board of Selectmen before Ms. Levine sent the e-mail out. He applauded her for doing the work and he's not against her initiative in doing this, but felt that a different process should have been followed.

Town Meeting Warrant: Ms. Levine asked the Board of Selectmen to confirm that they wanted the tax rate information after each warrant article, as it is hard to provide an apples-to-apples tax rate with the fiscal year conversion and the 18-month budget. Mr. Bianchi said that in light of the confusion, it could do more harm than good. Ms. Levine said that the question is going to come up anyway, so she thinks there should be some answer even if the total does not make sense.

Ms. Levine also asked if Board of Selectmen wanted to include vote tallies on the warrants. Mr. Bianchi said that he is in favor of doing so.

**Mr. Bianchi moved that the votes of the respective boards be listed in the Town Meeting Warrant in regard to money articles. Chair Helm seconded the motion. No discussion. Motion passed 2-0.**

Ms. Levine asked if the Board of Selectmen wanted her to show previous years' capital reserve deposits in Article 9. For the sake of transparency, the Board of Selectmen agreed.

Ms. Levine asked if the Selectmen are okay with the sequence of articles. Discussion regarding Article 7 on fiscal year and whether it should come up earlier. Mr. Bianchi said that he spoke to Michael Todd

about addressing each article separately to allow Town Meeting to be smooth, such as not talking about quarterly billing while the 18-month budget article comes in. Chair Helm said that when we meet with Michael Todd on February 22, that is a discussion that we collectively should reinforce.

Retirement Pension Reform Bill: Ms. Levine said that she attended the press conference on Senator Bradley's proposed pension reform bill. She suggested that the Board of Selectmen should pay attention to this bill and be prepared to testify in favor of it, as it is a good bill for the retirement system.

#### TOWN ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

Fiscal Year Change Tools: Ms. Levine said that she had posted a calculator on the website to help people estimate their property taxes with quarterly billing. She will publicize it shortly.

Emergency Management: Ms. Levine said that she and Emergency Management Director Pete Berthiaume had met with Nick Cricenti, who is the new director of sheltering for the Department of Health and Human Services. She thinks this new position will be effective in assisting towns with sheltering in emergency situations.

Finance Officer Search: Ms. Levine said that she had met with Hardy Hasenfuss and they had mapped out the search process to fill the finance officer's role.

Building Issues: Ms. Levine said that in addition to the leak from the HVAC system at Whipple, there is significant roof damage from ice dams. Bruss is working on those repairs as well, and has removed the snow from the Town Office building.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS & REPORTS

Planning Board Report: Mr. Bianchi reported that it was a long meeting on January 25, 2011, including a public hearing on the zoning amendments, which did not take long. The Planning Board approved the DiClerico annexation and a minor subdivision on Barrett Road below Hayes Road. There were a couple of mergers, including the Crowell property at Goose Hole, as well as discussion about the existing Ewing subdivision. Planning Board approved tree cuttings.

#### Application for Building Permit:

- William & Anna Green Revocable Trust, 139 Burpee Hill Road, (Map & Lot 082-023-000) interior renovations – Permit #11-002 – Approved.

#### Other items to be signed:

- Disbursement voucher and payroll for February 7 & 14, 2011.

There being no further public business, the Board of Selectmen moved into non-public session to discuss a personnel item pursuant to RSA 91-A.

Upon returning to public session, the Board of Selectmen adjourned the meeting at 10:35 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessie W. Levine  
Town Administrator